TRANSLATION HISTORY

What is Translation History?

A Trust-Based Approach

ANDREA RIZZI
BIRGIT LANG
ANTHONY PYM

palgrave
macmillan

Translation History

Palgrave Macmillan is very excited to announce a new series:
Translation History
This new series is the first to take a global and interdisciplinary view of translation and translators across time, place, and cultures. It also offers an untapped opportunity for interactions between translation and interpreting studies, comparative literature, art history, and print and book history.
Translation History aims to become an essential forum for scholars, graduate students, and general readers who are interested in or work on the history and practice of translation and its cultural agents (translators, interpreters, publishers, editors, artists, cultural institutions, governments).
Thus, the editors welcome proposals which address new approaches to the subject area in the following ways:

- Work which historicise translation in all its forms and expressions: orality, textuality, ideology, language, sociology, and culture

- Work offering conceptual frameworks to scholars working on communication and mediation in the history of religion, political theory, print, science, and culture.

All proposals and final manuscripts are peer-reviewed by experts in the field, either on the editorial board or beyond.
The series publishes book-length studies (80,000 words), as well as shorter publications (25,000 to 50,000 words) which will appear as Palgrave Pivot publications.

More information about this series at
http://www.palgrave.com/gp/series/15957

Andrea Rizzi • Birgit Lang • Anthony Pym

What is Translation History?

A Trust-Based Approach

palgrave
macmillan

Andrea Rizzi
School of Languages and Linguistics
University of Melbourne
Melbourne, VIC, Australia

Birgit Lang
School of Languages and Linguistics
University of Melbourne
Melbourne, VIC, Australia

Anthony Pym
School of Languages and Linguistics
University of Melbourne
Melbourne, VIC, Australia

ISSN 2523-8701 ISSN 2523-871X (electronic)
Translation History
ISBN 978-3-030-20098-5 ISBN 978-3-030-20099-2 (eBook)
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-20099-2

This Palgrave Pivot imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Acknowledgements

This project has been generously supported by the Australian Research Council through a Future Fellowship (Andrea Rizzi, FT140100266), and by the Faculty of Arts at the University of Melbourne through the Trust and Cultural Exchange project. We wish to thank Cynthia Troup for her impeccable work as research assistant and copy-editor for the present book. All errors in this book are ours. We are also grateful to our students, in particular Samira Saeedi and the 2018 graduate students of the Translation Studies Masters programme at Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, and Dimitri Barua, John Gagne, Elizabeth Horodowich, Timothy McCall, Michael Rocke, and Tom Toremans.

About the Authors

We have written this book collegially, allowing for our different perspectives to emerge and develop as part of an ongoing reflexive dialogue. The idea of this volume originated with Andrea Rizzi, who leads a research project on Trust and Cultural Exchange, of which Birgit Lang and Anthony Pym are Chief Investigators. We wrote first drafts of individual chapters based on our relative research strengths. Those chapters then went through an intensive feedback and revision process, including several oral conversations, written exchanges between the authors, and several rounds of co-editing. Several of those conversations are still ongoing, as indicated by the various points where our arguments lead to open questions, inviting our readers to join in the discussion. At many other points, though, our basic agreement is strong enough for all chapters to be attributed to all three of us as co-authors.

All three authors currently work in the School of Languages and Linguistics at the University of Melbourne, so there is a clear historical and cultural position from which we speak. This has its clear advantages—we can speak with each other face to face—and disadvantages—our perspectives are limited by place and local history. We bring to this intellectual adventure expertise in European, British, and American scholarship. Anthony Pym has a background in European translation studies and has published widely in the field, while Birgit Lang and Andrea Rizzi come to translation more from area studies: Lang is a cultural historian of Germany and Austria, with expertise in the interdisciplinary exchange of knowledge and émigré intellectual and cultural history, in which translation plays a critical role; Rizzi is a historian of the Italian Renaissance, whose work explores translation in the context of early modern multilingualism. Our combined knowledge of languages is limited to Europe, and we remain very aware of that limitation: we mainly work with Ancient Greek, English, French, German, Italian, Latin, Spanish, Portuguese, and Catalan, and write in English, German, Italian, and Spanish. We all negotiate translation in all aspects of our professional lives (and private lives for that matter). Anthony Pym in particular has been working with Asian scholars and students for more than ten years. The author team has known each other for several years, have published together, and all have taught translation history at undergraduate and postgraduate level, in part collaboratively. The most important networks the author team share are the Trust and Cultural Exchange group (Malcolm Angelucci, Heather Dalton, Jackie Dickinson, Ana Dragoilovic, Veronique Duché, Nick Eckstein, David Garrioch, Adrian Hearn, Karen Jones, Richard Kanaan, Tamara Kohn, Catherine Kovesi, Una McIlvenna, Peter Sherlock, and Stephanie Trigg) as well as the editorship (together with Belén Bistué, Esmaeil Haddadian Moghaddam, and Kayoko Takeda) of Palgrave's *Translation History* series, of which this is the first volume. Taking this book as a starting point, we hope to continue and expand the discussion with scholars and students interested in the role, ethics, and praxis of translators and interpreters in the past and today.

Contents

1 Introduction: Towards a New Translation History 1

2 On Relationality: Trusting Translators 33

3 On Relativity: Trusting Historians 61

4 On Interdisciplinarity: Trusting Translation History 87

5 Conclusion 109

Glossary 113

Bibliography 117

Index 135

CHAPTER 1

Introduction: Towards a New Translation History

Abstract In asking what translation history is and how it might be written, we explore some of the leading concepts and approaches that historians (of literature, language, culture, society, science, translation, and interpreting) engage with when they encounter translation. We consider the conceptual foundations of translation history in order to propose a way forward.

Keywords Translation history • Trust • Methodology • Signalling • Intercultural mediation

This book is about translation history and how it might be written. In addressing these questions, we explore some of the leading concepts and approaches that historians (of literature, language, culture, society, science, translation, and interpreting) engage with when they encounter translation. We have written this book with historians in mind, as well as scholars and students of translation studies. In the present chapter we draw a long bow by considering the conceptual foundations of translation history in order to propose a way forward.

Before discussing what translation history can be, let us propose what we think it could best do: namely, address issues of complex social causation that enable or hinder intercultural communication.[1] We submit that

A. Rizzi et al., *What is Translation History?*, Translation History,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-20099-2_1

translation—by which we mean a spoken or written text-based interlingual transfer—is not possible without trust. By studying translation with reference to trust we can reach a clearer understanding of why translations were produced in the first place, and what challenges they appear to have 'solved'.

In broad terms, we contend that rather than fine-tuning or even challenging key concepts from translation studies (for instance the resemblance and relationality between start and target texts), translation history as a field of inquiry needs to hone its own conceptual tools and methodologies. These more flexible resources, in turn, can build a stronger bridge between discrete disciplines, and foster a greater awareness of translation among historians, as well as greater methodological confidence among scholars of translation.

Our contribution to honing methodology and concepts is to place the concept of *trust* at the centre of translation history. Including trust in our purview complements and expands the value of approaches that have been recommended and studied for years: researching translators as people in addition to translations as texts; examining translation norms—since norm-adherence can be one of the bases of trust—and investigating translator-client relations, collaborative translation, and translation cultures. All of these matters have been studied before, so what does this book do that is new?

By examining theories and practices of trust from sociological, philosophical, and historical studies, and with reference to interdisciplinarity, we outline a methodology that enables us to approach translation history and intercultural mediation from three discrete, concurrent perspectives on trust and translation: the interpersonal, the institutional, and the regime-enacted.[2] Further, we suggest the use of trust as both an object of study and an analytical tool for understanding intercultural mediation. This involves recognising that trust is not the 'innocent' concept it is often taken to be, but one requiring closer empirical and theoretical attention than it has so far received in translation studies. Trust describes social practices (including translation) and also constructs them.[3]

What might a translation history that includes trust look like? To canvass a reply, we address the following array of related questions: first and foremost, as we have already anticipated, what is translation history? Why is the trust aspect of translation history important, and what problems can it address? Who and what is trusted in translation and interpreting? What kinds of trust exist in translation? And, following from these questions, how might we write interdisciplinary translation history that is trustworthy in its claims to represent a genuine, localised encounter between two or more disciplines?

Each chapter offers a response to these questions in a manner that began with self-reflexive enquiry. The authors of this volume work on translation from different and complementary perspectives: Andrea Rizzi is a literary historian, Anthony Pym is a translation scholar, and Birgit Lang is a cultural historian. In writing this volume we have each been brought to examine more openly our different perspectives on translation from these formative vantage points, appreciating ways in which our backgrounds have also conditioned our respective styles of writing. We have chosen to use the plural 'we' as the speaking subject of all chapters as a mark of our collaborative ethos, and to underscore our unity in diversity. We discuss and refine our positions and arguments not to find essentialist common ground, but to hone our ideas for the near future of translation history as a robust and incisive field of empirical research and dialogue.

We have not wished to write a book that insists on a narrow suite of norms or methodologies for the study of translation history. Our wish is to propose a new area for attention that can inspire historians and translation scholars to explore more closely the role of translators, interpreters, translations, and their clients in the history of intercultural exchange. As the first volume of the Translation History series published by Palgrave Macmillan, we hope that this contribution will mark the beginning of an enriching conversation about the role that translation history can play in enhancing our understanding of cultural mediation in the past, and in the present.

What is Translation History?

Since at least 1992, scholars have lamented a 'lack of history in translation history'.[4] At the same time, literary historians have engaged with philosophical and social theories to explain practices and theories of translation. For instance, literary historians Rita Copeland, Lawrence Venuti, and Marie-Alice Belle have adopted the Foucauldian concept of genealogy to identify and explain historical attitudes and to understandings of translation—fluency, transparency, progress, imitation, and assimilation, among others.[5] The social turn within translation studies has brought key concepts from the work of French sociologists Pierre Bourdieu and Bruno Latour: social capital, habitus, and network are some of the most significant ideas to have influenced studies of translation and translators over the past twenty years. In the last seven years, UK and North-American-based literary historians have contributed to more nuanced approaches to the study of early modern translation in Europe in the context of social and commercial changes. This scholarship calls for closer collaboration between literary and book historians by 'situating translators at the interface' between the production and consumption of texts.[6]

Meanwhile, trust—as a key socio-cultural aim and ambition for intercultural mediation—has remained underexplored in translation.[7] Fundamentally, we propose, translators and interpreters exchange their trustworthiness.[8] Over the past thirty years, scholars of literature, translation, and science have produced substantial histories of translation and interpreting in English.[9] Historians have only comparatively recently engaged with interlingual and textual translation as the centrepiece of their research.[10] In the literature on history and translation that has been published in the last fifty years or so, very few studies have offered what Julio-César Santoyo has called 'a global or globalising vision of what the translation activity has been throughout its approximately four thousand, five hundred years of history'.[11] Here we understand Santoyo to be referring to histories focussing on practices of translation rather than theories, because there is no shortage of anthologies of ancient, early modern, modern, and contemporary statements on theories of translation. In these edited collections, excerpts from Marcus Tullius Cicero, Jerome (Eusebius Hieronymus), Martin Luther, Friedrich Schleiermacher, and twentieth-century intellectuals tend to be anthologised chronologically, and according to the generally positivist understanding that changes in approach become progressively more sophisticated.[12] Most of these anthologies focus on Euro-American theories, but 2006 saw the publication of a trailblazing anthology of early modern Chinese texts presenting concepts and practices relating to translation.[13]

To date, most contributions to translation history can be described as collections of essays or monographs on translation theories and practices from a particular region, language, or period.[14] Fortunately, research during the past three decades has produced studies that seek to chart the history of translation in the east and west beyond specific nations or regions, and across centuries.[15] Now there are also available edited collections and dedicated journal issues that foreground specific aspects of translation and interpreting: methodologies (Pym, Lépinette, and Alcalá), travel and translation (De Biase), policy and translation (D'hulst, O'Sullivan, and Schreiber), translatability (Budick and Iser), gender (Agorni, Ferguson), science (Olohan and Salama-Carr, Dietz) collaboration and translation (Bistué, Cordingley and Manning), and retranslation (Deane-Cox), among others. Tellingly, most of these works do not pay attention to trust.[16] Some translation scholars have discussed trust with reference to translation, but marginally, or as part of a wider discussion of the ethics of translation.[17] Trust has remained an elusive subject in translation studies, even if, to quote Finland-based translation studies scholar Andrew Chesterman,

> [t]ranslators, in order to survive as translators, must be trusted by all parties involved, both as a profession and individually. [...] Without this trust, the profession would collapse, and so would its practice.[18]

What waits to be written about translation and history? Some scholars have recently asked what audiences translation histories should be written for.[19] The accepted view is that translation history is by nature interdisciplinary, but it is not clear what kind of interdisciplinarity should be undertaken or at least fostered by translation historians. We return to the topic of interdisciplinarity in Chap. 4. Here we simply note that, in practice, the parameters for creatively productive relationships between translation history and translation studies, as well as other discrete disciplines, have not yet been tested.

How, then, might translation history help to refresh fundamental questions and suggest new paths for future research? As part of envisaging what translation history could be in the near future, let us take a step back and examine what it has been. The importance of 'knowing the past [...] for the [translation and interpreting] profession' can hardly be underestimated. Knowing the past has the potential to contribute to the broader histories of literature, philosophy, and ideas.[20]

Obviously, not everything automatically comes under the purview of translation history. Here we maintain that what we study involves some kind of translational *product*, a text, be it written, spoken, or graphic. And we further restrict our object to the kinds of products that are the result of *mediated* intercultural communication. The presence of a third party in the exchange, transfer, or appropriation of material or non-material goods does not necessarily change the outcome of the transaction (although it often does). Interpreter Doña Marina, 'La Malinche' (*c.* 1500–1527) was instrumental to the conquest of Mexico by her lover Hernán Cortés. Her role as interpreter of Nahuatl for the Spanish colonisers played out in several complex ways. Evidence indicates that she took a decision-making role on behalf of Cortés and his Spanish army, and mediated between the Spanish and different Mayan, Tlaxcalans, Totonac, and Aztec communities. Studying the mediatory agency of such figures and their intercultural roles can shed light on what was bartered, sold, appropriated, or lost, and on the cultural, political, and linguistic dynamics underpinning the end result (in this case, the fall of the Aztec capital Tenochtitlan, and the Spanish conquest of the Aztec Empire).[21]

For the translation history we have in mind it is crucial to understand the diversity of roles and strategies employed by the mediators and clients in their transfer and reception of translation.[22] As a third-party player, any kind of intercultural mediator (translator, interpreter, editor, publisher, or patron) needs to build trust with at least one other party. The need to build trust works from various degrees of distrust on the part of clients or patrons. Comprehending these degrees of trust or distrust can illuminate the inequalities that underscore intercultural transfers (as in the case of Doña Marina) and the consequences of such relational dynamics: colonisation, foreignisation, gender discrimination, misunderstanding, lack of communication, or silence. Thus, trust is fundamental in transfers involving three parties or more, and is more problematic there than in dyadic transactions. Although, in George Simmel's phrase, the third party may be an 'egoistic exploiter of the situation', a great number of ancient or early modern interpreters were slaves or low-class subjects forced into mediatory roles as a means to survive.[23] Yet, even when the mediator is anonymous or invisible, trust in the third party is a 'deal-maker' or a 'deal-breaker'.

Especially since the 1990s, several scholars of translation studies (and a couple of cultural historians) have been involved in a lively debate about the relationship between history and translation. Pym, and Europe-based Lieven D'hulst and Sergia Adamo have variously argued for the need to include more history in the study of translation and translators.[24] Jean Delisle has claimed that it is necessary to 'write history like historians do'.[25] In Adamo's view, translation scholars should develop their 'historical awareness'. This would surely be useful, but, frequently, it is just as probable that historians are lacking *translation* awareness.[26] While scholars working with written texts (literature, archival documents, archaeological artefacts, or scientific data) often deal at some point with a translation, a failure to acknowledge their reliance on translated texts as primary or secondary sources is not uncommon. Does it matter that court depositions studied by social or religious historians were translated into Latin by functionaries of the papal Inquisition? Or that sermons given by preachers in early modern squares were transcribed and published in Latin instead of the original code-switching of vernacular languages? Answers to these questions have strong implications for ways in which archival sources are studied and interpreted. Understanding the material factors and social processes surrounding the production of texts requires historians to question their sources beyond *prima facie* descriptions. A focus on cultural transactions and the roles played by the parties involved in these exchanges prompts further questions about reliability (who wrote or produced this, for what purpose, and for whom) and, ultimately, about trust.

A broader issue, no less relevant to our discussion, is the presumed scope of the historian's task. Much as there might be a popular conception of the historian's work as the simple collection and ordering of facts (who translated what, where, and when), we inherit a tradition in which the historian's task is also to *interpret* facts, to construct narratives, and to thus make the past newly meaningful. There is certainly nothing wrong with the kind of historical work that strives for correct details. Yet we would like the book series we are launching to strive for more: as soon as one asks *who was trusting (or distrusting) whom and why*, an element of speculation enters the ordering of data; the historian is obliged to think imaginatively from the perspective of the various agents involved in translation, and our work becomes, in part, the telling of stories about characters. In this, we take our momentum from the now-ageing New Literary History movement, whose object of knowledge is no less problematic: it is no easier to define a 'translation' than it is to define what is 'literary', and the need for interpretation and meaning-making ensues from there.[27]

Our narratives are nevertheless even more complex than those of many literary histories, for the reason that more than one language space is necessarily involved. Here we can draw on some of the lessons of *histoire croisée*, where the epistemological risks of assuming knowledge of the other give rise to an approach that is empirical, reflexive, and inductive—one might want to add 'translational'.[28] This sense of working 'bottom-up', from the details of encounters to the larger, sense-giving constructs of history, is also superficially compatible with the methods of actor-network theory. Such methods centre research on the encounters through which knowledge is transferred and transformed as one historical actor presumes to speak on behalf of another: unsurprisingly, perhaps, actor-network theorists call their work 'the sociology of translation'.[29] Rather than assuming any social, cultural, or linguistic boundaries, the tracing of networks implies an initial situation of radical distrust, where no knowledge of the other can be assumed, and no predictions can be made. To the extent that the work of the historian can then be to trace the ways in which trust is accrued, the actor-network approach certainly remains of interest.

However, when the actor-network theorists Michel Callon and Bruno Latour describe 'translation' as

> the negotiations, intrigues, calculations, acts of persuasion and violence thanks to which an actor takes, or causes to be conferred upon itself, authority to speak or act on behalf of another actor or force,[30]

the extreme negativity of the actions allows little appreciation of why anyone might actually trust a translator. The actor-network approach tends to lead to histories of distrust. By contrast, we propose to pay attention to trust: to the emotions and logics by which people do, indeed, allow translators to speak on behalf of others.

A further question is whether our sense of the historian's task is irremediably culture-bound. For Euro-American cultures, historiography was born in ancient Greece: Roman philosopher and lawyer Cicero described Herodotus (fifth century BCE) as the 'father of history'. But the term 'history' in ancient Greek meant something quite different from what is understood to mean in Euro-American cultures today. For Aristotle, a historian was an author concerned with human affairs. Herodotus describes his work as containing *logoi* and *legomena* (narrative accounts) that do not fall into the category of verifiable events. He does not present himself as responsible for his account of the past, but calls upon the Muses for authority.[31] Other ancient Greek historians such as Thucydides and Xenophon understood ἱστορία ('history', although recently translated as 'inquiry') variously as a form of investigation by means of writing.[32] So this understanding of history is not a single, solid tradition that we can presume to be continuing. Indeed, it can be connected with ancient Chinese historiography. Take, for instance, the first comprehensive history of 'China': Sima Qian's work *Shiji* (*Records of the Historian*) written *c*. 90 BCE, during the Han dynasty. Euro-American translators and scholars have described *Shiji* as 'records', 'memoirs', or 'annals'. Its author, Sima Qian, is presented as 'Grand

Scribe, Grand Historian, or Grand Historiographer'.[33] The *Shiji* contains five discrete sections that can be called annals, chronological tables, treatises, hereditary homes, and biographies. Whereas in ancient Greek historiography the author sought to convince the readers of the accuracy and reliability of the narrative, and the 'trustworthiness of his judgements', in the *Shiji* there is no authorial position foregrounded in the text.[34] As its composite structure suggests, the *Shiji* was not meant to be a coherent and persuasive narrative. Rather, it was produced and assembled to *enable* knowledge.

At least initially it might thus seem that the ancient Greek and Chinese histories offer two incompatible approaches to 'history' writing: in ancient Greek historiography, authors persuaded the reader of their trustworthiness, and that is what made their work authoritative; in the case of Sima Qian, there is no transparent author–text linkage, since the various parts of the text allow for multiple counter-voices to speak. However, in the postface (called 'Zixu' 自序 or 'self-narration') and in the letter to Ren An that follows it, Sima Qian establishes a clear link between authorial intention and the text as a whole.[35] In the case of Herodotus, trust depends heavily on the author's reputation (even if Herodotus does not actually claim to be a trustworthy historian); in the case of the *Shiji*, trust is placed on the value of the written material and the intention motivating the work.

That said, as Alexandra Lianeri and Sunkyung Klein have demonstrated, the differences between these two historiographies are not as marked as earlier scholars have suggested.[36] Both the ancient Greek and Chinese historiographies contain didactic and event-based elements. Multiple, fragmentary viewpoints are presented in both. Perhaps the key difference is in their reception. Early modern and modern Euro-American historical criticism anachronistically attributed to ancient Greek historiography qualities such as critical inquiry and objectivity.[37] Instead, both ancient Greek and the *Shiji* 'ranked questions of morality and social conduct as more crucial than the accurate recording of events'.[38] The differences between these two ancient historiographies are not so much in their treatment of sources or scope, but in the trust-signalling of their authors and its reception by readers.

Among our suggestions for a 'new' translation history is that we turn towards evidence for trust-making, trust, and distrust among readers, audiences, and clients. Such a history does not bind itself narrowly to the textual strategies of translation, or the production or reception of intercultural texts. Instead, we are especially interested in the dynamics of trust or distrust between the various agents involved in the production, dissemination, and reception of translations. What is trust, though?

Why is the Trust Aspect of Translation History Important?

In his study of the science of language *After Babel* (1975/1992), George Steiner argues that the first step in the production of a translation is trust:

> The hermeneutic motion, the act of elicitation and appropriate transfer of meaning, is fourfold. There is initiative trust, an investment of belief, underwritten by previous experience but epistemologically exposed and psychologically hazardous, in the meaningfulness, in the 'seriousness' of the facing or, strictly speaking, adverse text.[39]
>
> Steiner holds that a 'leap of faith' is taken by the translator who selects a start text, assuming that the work is worthy of translation. By the same token, the translator has to trust the process of translation. Translation is a 'commitment of trust' that is tested in action.

Trust is helpfully defined by Charles Tilly as 'a historical product rather than a phenomenon whose variation we can explain without reference to history'.[40] We need detailed, empirical study to appreciate the specific ways in which trust is produced through cultural and linguistic mediation. Specifically with reference to translation and interpreting, by 'trust' we mean not only who was *entrusted* to produce the texts we can access and study today, but also how *trustworthy* the authors of these texts were considered to be by their contemporaries. Chesterman describes trust in translation as 'the value governing the accountability norm', formulated as stating that 'a translator should act in such a way that the demands of loyalty are met with regard to the various parties concerned'.[41] This value might work in a twenty-first-century professional context (although there is less direct accountability of this kind in current freelance markets, and because of tendencies to outsource in-house translators and interpreters), but proves of little help when studying the past. Moreover, Chesterman does not clarify who, exactly, would best check the accountability or loyalty when there are no professional standards or charters serving as a touchstone for the norm. Trust—or 'loyalty' as proposed by German scholar Christiane Nord—is a value or a moral principle that binds the translator or interpreter to a network of clients and patrons. We understand that, as a historical product, trust in all its variations is informed by a complex web of rhetorical, emotional, and attitudinal factors: signalling or promise-making, sincerity, and readers' and audiences' receptivity to texts and agents. As such, it seems helpful to envisage that past translators' trustworthiness may have been directed to a 'profession as an intercultural space', in the sense of a network of agents bound by shifting levels of trust or distrust.[42]

The matter of trust and its relevance to the translator was, of course, discussed centuries before Steiner. In *The War with Jugurtha* (first century BCE), Sallust recounts the meeting between the ancient Roman questor Sulla and King Bocchus of Mauritania. The meeting took place perilously late at night. In the words of Sallust, the meeting was made possible and successful not by the interpreter's linguistic skills, but by the trust that both parties placed in the African interpreter Dabar—who was a grandson or great-grandson of Masinissa and therefore a potential rival of Jugurtha. The use of an African mediator sympathetic to the Roman cause Jugurtha created an imbalance of power relations 'since having an African translator will not help Bocchus re/cast [sic] Roman arguments to his advantage, or convey to the Romans better his opinion. Rather, it achieves the opposite effect, accelerating his realisation that he must acquiesce to Rome'.[43] Sixteenth-century French translator Étienne Dolet says that *fides* (fidelity) 'emerges in proportion to the translator's self-detachment from the servitude of word and clause'.[44] These examples show the two sides of trust in translation: the client's and the translator's. In the case presented by Sallust, the clients trust the interpreter's identity and political positioning; in the case of Dolet, translators signal their reliability as self-detached mediators in order underscore their ethos of trustworthiness. Both sides indicate the three-way process: firstly, the translator trusts or distrusts the start text, patron, or client; secondly, the translator offers evidence of trustworthiness; thirdly, clients trust or distrust their go-between. The three stages do not necessarily unfold in this order, nor do they always emerge strongly from archival evidence. Yet when evidence is available, it can shed light on the cultural specificity of trust: its production and reception in the transfer of texts.

Let us focus once more on useful definitions of trust. According to German sociologist Niklas Luhmann, trust has been interpreted as a functional and rational practice: 'trust is a solution to a specific problem of risk'.[45] What risks are involved in translation and interpreting? Poor (and poorly paid) translation affects critical political and cultural transfers between states or societies. More narrowly, it can have significant economic implications: publishers and clients lose money from poorly performed and produced translations, especially when interpreting legal documents. As with any other service, the production of translations involves potentially risky investments of resources. Translators also risk their reputations every time they accept a job. From the perspective of the end user, clients accept the risk that the texts they paid for may not be reliable or accurate. Context, local purpose, and a set of cultural beliefs or principles ('regimes', as discussed below) inform what a 'good' translation is for a specific culture, society, and intended purpose. Considering these elements is vital when a historian wishes to understand the role and practice of translation with reference to a particular past.[46]

Most clients today trust translation for its cost-effectiveness and efficiency: it is easier to seek the help of a translator than study an additional language, just as it is more cost-effective and practical to consult a doctor than to study medicine.[47] However, trust practices are not always based on rational choices, nor are they necessarily driven by convenience or efficiency. The choice to rely on someone else's translation instead of translating oneself may be determined by low self-esteem, fear of misunderstanding, or excessive respect. Clients may also prefer to rely on translators' and interpreters' advice and interpretations than on their own judgment. In most cases, though, ignorance of additional languages makes the services of translators and interpreters unavoidable and likely to be approached with a conventional confidence. Such a confidence in translators and their network of trust is often deliberately fostered by the publishing industry, as well as translation training and accreditation.

As mentioned above, Steiner only considers the internal process of translation, in which translators trust their sources. In this phase, the go-betweens face a series of challenges that prompt them to choose specific stances and strategies. But for the purposes of translation history, there are at least two further aspects or stages of translation that involve trust: the production of the translated text (the book, or the audio system that makes simultaneous translation possible during conferences, for instance) and the reception of translation. In these phases, several agents collaborate, with varying degrees of interpersonal, institutional, and cultural trust or distrust.

Interpersonal trust denotes the professional and social relationship between translators, commissioning editors, publishers, marketing staff, patrons, or supervisors. This relationship is based on professional or semiprofessional skills and feelings of trust: contracts and agreements inform how these professional collaborations are performed, and there are also 'states of mind' between partners (goodwill, fear, or ignorance, for instance) that are expressed more or less openly. Annette Baier proposes that, when these states of mind are exchanged, the parties involved can appreciate one another's motives.[48] The study of contracts and exchanges of states of mind between professionals by means of letters or verbal and written negotiations has the potential to shed light on ethical approaches and understandings of translation and the role of translators and interpreters. Examining the production and *mise-en-page* or performance of translation can reveal the dynamics of these professional relationships and, more broadly, a society's approach to cultural and linguistic diversity.

Beyond the personal, there is an institutional level of trust in translation. Trust in professionalism is of the kind that German sociologist Ferdinand Tönnies, writing in the late nineteenth century, considered typical of a *Gesellschaft* community.[49] Clients and go-betweens do not need to know professionals directly: they have enough confidence in the profession and the training that comes with it to be satisfied that the product or service will be of adequate standard. Even if living in an 'age of risk', western readers today are seldom offered the opportunity to check the credentials of translators or interpreters before using their services.[50] Nowadays, when a novel in translation is published by a well-known publisher, the publisher's trade name and reputation are presumed to instil enough confidence in a reader such that she or he buys and reads the work without questioning the motives, criteria, and strategies underpinning the translation. In this case, the clients do not need to actively trust translators, but display a 'strong, thin' trust—or impersonalised confidence—based on the reputation of an institution or profession rather than individuals.[51]

Outside institutions, in the more unstable domain of freelancing or global unregulated services, thin trust might not be sufficient. Online scammers fake their identities and services to make money quickly, prompting clients and mediators to distrust and seek further evidence of the credentials, experience, and reliability of intercultural service providers.[52] Scammers expose the risk behind relying on institutional or 'thin' trust; they encourage clients or mediators to establish thicker levels of trust. When the stakes are higher, distrust can become the default approach. A recent study shows that immigrants in Europe tend to distrust interpreters who have been allocated to them by governments of the European Union to assist with administrative or legal processes.[53] Note that it is not the interpreter *per se* that is distrusted, but the service that is offered by the state or local authority. The examples of migrants or scammers mentioned here are interesting because they show how the personal and institutional levels can be porous: distrust of institutions may lead to distrust in individuals.

In addition to the personal and institutional levels of trust, a third level is represented by regime enactment. In this volume, we use the term 'regimes' to represent any set of cultural values that informs, specifically, trustworthiness in translation. 'Regimes' have been variously defined by translation scholars and historians. For Naoki Sakai they are ideologies or ideas of translation.[54] Pym understands regimes as translation principles that are generally accepted within a specific culture and period. They can also be seen as 'features […] that would have been beneficial for both groups' (for instance, Church and Latinist translators of science in twelfth-century Toledo: in other words, patrons/readers and translator).[55] In this book, we follow Peter Burke's slightly broader view of regimes as 'cultures of translation': a system of conventions or practices adopted by translators—and expected or accepted by contemporaneous readers and patrons.[56] For example, collaborative translation was, in past cultures, more common than it is today. The expectation that certain texts would be produced by teams helped to guarantee the trustworthiness of the translation, as in the case of the Translators' College (Siyi guan) in China (1467–1748), where translators were obliged to work collegially.[57]

Cultural and translational conventions are inevitably relational and involve networks. Broadly speaking, there are two types of networks in translation: horizontal (interpersonal relationships) and vertical (translator and client are part of a web of agents and institutions such a court, university, team of professionals, third-party contractors, and so on).[58] Here we use the term 'networks' by adopting Hosking's definition of 'trust networks, which arise where people peacefully interact regularly or work together to achieve some common purpose that requires mutual trust'.[59] Tilly further argues that trust networks assume 'ramified interpersonal connections, consisting mainly of strong ties, within which people set valued, consequential, long-term resources and enterprises at risk to the malfeasance, mistakes, or failures of others'.[60] The purposes underpinning translation and interpreting in a given society can vary, but it is fair to say that key aims behind the development of trust networks in translation are to exchange intelligence, acquire data or information from other cultures, soft power, or entertainment. Thin trust tends to inform the production and reception of translation, unless the risk stakes are higher (for instance, translation of confidential, religious, or political material). Twenty-first-century Australian readers may be confident that the translated news material they read in mainstream, English-language newspapers reflects what their culture expects of a translation. Commonly, such readers would not question the relevance and reliability of the translation. The collaborative production and reception of translation reveals trusting or distrusting attitudes expressed at both cognitive and emotional levels.

Why is it important to understand past attitudes of trust or distrust towards historical translators? We suggest that evidence of such attitudes can reveal much about a specific society's cultural, political, and linguistic power relations. Let us look at an example. The study of translations and rewritings of Italian or English texts has shed much light on the power relationships between Italian and English as languages in use at the Elizabethan court. In particular, Lord Admiral Nelson's report on the 1588 victory of the English fleet against the Spanish Armada was immediately translated into Italian by Petruccio Ubaldini. Ubaldini's version of the report was then translated back into English. Why would such an important report be translated into Italian first, and retranslated into English within a year or so? To address this question, the historian is prompted to study the manuscript and printed versions of the report, and seeks any further evidence of Ubaldini's role in the production of the translation. By such research, it becomes clear that Ubaldini's translation was used by Elizabeth I's court as the necessary means of authorising the news of the Catholic Armada's defeat. A network of trust was mobilised to facilitate the serial production of translations that conveyed news of the defeat of the Spanish Armada: this network comprised Queen Elizabeth I, her trusted entourage, members of the burgeoning print industry in London, a growing readership of printed texts in and beyond England, and the Italian translator Ubaldini. The Italian translation was first used to 'clothe' the English source in a more prestigious vernacular. The Italian translator was also trusted as the conveyor of an emotionally and politically charged message to the non-English audience, the 'other'.

Producing a court-authorised account of the defeat through an Italian translation was aimed at making the story more believable, and thus trustworthy, to a Catholic readership. Given the conflicting information that spread immediately after the defeat of the Catholic fleet, an 'official' English account that had been translated into Italian by an Italian diplomat and translator promised trust. Surprisingly, within eighteen months, the English court decided, through the intervention of the printer and engraver Augustine Ryther, that the narrative of this crucial political and religious event should reach a 'national' audience instead. English rather than Italian was thus the obvious language for this published version of events. As a result, the Italian translation was translated back into English. Why did the court not simply publish the Lord Admiral's account? The most likely reason is that they did not want to relinquish the cultural capital of the Italian language, and preferred to present the published, official version of the events as a Catholic-endorsed account. Translation (and the work and reputation of the translator) inspired trust within a highly uncertain and conflicting political and social context.[61]

The case of Ubaldini's sixteenth-century translation shows the importance of studying translation history through multiple prisms: the trustworthy signalling of the translator ('trust me, I am Italian, the English victory is real, don't believe the Catholic propaganda!'), the English court's trust in the other (that is, an 'alien' Italian, with an unstable cultural and social capital), and the trust–distrust in translation as a reliable and authoritative conveyor of historical events for two enemy factions ('is the English version more or less trustworthy than the Italian?'). In this example of a translation openly published as such, translation is assumed to be both accurate reported speech (the Italian version of the English account) and reported speech of the reported speech. Ryther can be read calling upon the translator as a trustworthy author:

> A Discovrse concerninge the Spanishe fleete invadinge Englande in the yeare 1588 and ouerthrowne by her Ma:ties Nauie vnder the conduction of the Right-honorable the Lorde Charles Howarde highe Admirall of Englande: written in Italian by Petruccio Vbaldino citizen of Florence, and translated for A. Ryther vnto the which discourse are annexed certaine tables expressinge the several exploites, and conflictes had with the said fleete. (London: Hatfield, 1590)

Here the translator's self-detachment and commitment are hard to demarcate. This evidences the resonance between trust and efficiency that Pym refers to in his critique of the professional exclusivity of translators: readers, patrons, publishers find it more efficient to trust a translator than to become one. In the case of Ubaldini's translation, it was more efficient for Elizabeth I and her court to exploit the trustworthiness of the translation (and translator) than to produce an 'original' text.[62]

This example from early modern England also shows how the study of trust-signalling, and the reception of such signalling, sheds light on the fundamentally unequal power relations in intercultural mediation. The translator is, in this case, exploited by the English court to deliver a strong political message. At the same time, Ubaldini risked his reputation with his Catholic clients and patrons (Francesco Grand Duke of Tuscany and son of Cosimo I de' Medici, for instance). Inequality in intercultural exchanges between three or more parties is almost inevitably a feature of the translation history we are sketching out in this volume.

Who and What is Trusted in Translation and Interpreting?

Like any other documents, past translations are products of material culture, cultural and economic capital, and patronage or social networking. Each was produced for a discrete culture and readership. And they were produced to be perceived as trusted cultural resources.[63] Readers and audiences assumed the existence of an anterior text. Most of the early modern European translators explicitly confirm the existence of a start text:

> I wished to present Pliny's work before you, offering you some of my own emendations […] newly completed in the many places where the text was missing, with numerous errors emended, and most diligently corrected by Antonio Brucioli
>
> (Ho voluto il presente libro di Plinio mettervi avanti, dedicandovi alcune mie correttioni fattevi sopra […] nuovamente in molti luoghi, dove quella mancava, supplito, et da infiniti errori emendata, et con somma diligenza corretta per Antonio Brucioli)[64]

As this sixteenth-century example shows, in their prefaces, or introductory material, translators often acknowledged roles for the reader, patron, and dedicatee in the internal process of translation (we return to this point below). At the same time, they also made elaborate promises about their translative achievements. They promised, for instance, to have cleaved to certain standards or ideals for texts, such as correctness, in order to make their work trustworthy. Antonio Brucioli and the young printer Gabriele Giolito presented their 1543 Tuscan edition of Pliny's *Natural History* as a more accurate version of the 1476 translation made by Cristoforo Landino and printed by Nicola Jenson:

> translated by Cristoforo Landino and newly completed in the many places where text was missing
>
> (tradotta per Christophoro Landino, et nuovamente in molti luoghi, dove quella mancava, supplito)[65]

This new version is expressly framed as a collaborative work in which Pliny the ancient author, Landino the fifteenth-century translator, and the sixteenth-century editor-translator and printer are named in full for their respective contributions to the 'newly completed' edition. In other words, the collaborative nature of this translation is used by the printer and translator to promote the topicality and trustworthiness of the newly printed text. Brucioli and Giolito ask their readers to trust the start text, Pliny's Latin treatise, through their reliable translation, and their diligence or hard work.

In sixteenth century Europe, it was extremely common for printers and editors to promote the accuracy taken with newly edited texts, as well as the texts' resultant reliability, especially in connection with a translation of an authoritative ancient work. Even so, in the prefatory material of their 1543 *Natural History*, Brucioli and Giolito do not reveal that, rather than depending on the Florence 1476 edition, they reprinted one published in 1534 by Tommaso Ballarino in Venice. According to its title page, the earlier 1476 edition had been checked and improved by one Giovan de Francesio, who also composed a preface to the reader. Brucioli and Giolito's wholesale reprint of this 1534 edition made good sense in market terms: the more recent edition had already revised and standardised the fifteenth-century text, thus offering a less outdated text in a more stable Florentine language.

This example shows something of the complex signalling of trust performed by past translators and their collaborators or patrons. A new translation (and the reputation of the translator and publisher) needed to be set against earlier translations and translators. The reputation of each text or translator was accordingly assessed, promoted, or critiqued, offering the reader a narrative of trust or distrust. Regimes effect the production and reception of texts.

Translators' prefatory signalling of trust reveals how translators might publicly define their acceptance (or non-acceptance) of contemporary regimes. Translators have long discussed or mentioned their praxis when addressing their readers, and have noted at least some of the strategies used in the production of the material (collaboration between translator, editor, printer, artist, patron in the production of text, images, and so forth). Signalling is persuasion: a rhetorical and psychological strategy employed to reassure or convince an audience. The signalling mechanisms we find accompanying so many translations in pre-modern cultures (and in contemporary cultures such as Iran or India) helped readers to trust or distrust what they were buying and reading, or listening to.[66] In a way, translation history can be conceptualised as a history of signalling status, in which a series of changing factors and values (training, reputation, status, social networks, among others) shaped the ways in which intercultural mediation was presented and received.[67] Past readers and listeners were asked to 'believe' the translator, editor, or printer.[68] Strategies of persuasion change over time and across cultures: we find translators constructing their professional selves as 'prudential' (subordinating honesty to decorum) or 'sincere' ('honesty' is superior to decorum). Translation history can illuminate these rhetorical concerns and changes by undertaking detailed empirical study of ways in which different translations have been 'framed' for their clients or readers. The resultant appraisals can concern not whether a translation is 'good' or 'bad', but how convincing the mechanisms of persuasion have been in the commissioning, production, and dissemination of translation.

Did past clients trust their go-betweens and the texts they produced for them? Did a particular mediator trust the translated text? These questions have the potential to highlight translators' role, status, and reputation, and also a community's approach to intercultural communication.

What Kinds of Trust Exist in Translation?

At a conceptual level, we also ask ourselves whether we can trust that past histories of translation can continue to serve current and future questions. As discussed above, the grand narrative of western historiography being 'invented' in ancient Greece as a critical inquiry into events is problematic, at best. Essentialist understandings of ancient historiography undermine the richness and variety of approaches to writing and translating history that can be found across the ancient world. In Lianeri's words,

> in order to question and transform the present, one needs to transform the ways this present depends on its images of the past, on the opposition between tradition and otherness.[69]

We argue that long-established genealogies of thought on translation also need to be closely reconsidered for those critical possibilities that they eclipse—for new narratives that may prove non-linear, non-progressive, and non-binary. Critique and decolonisation of Eurocentric narratives needs to happen from both within and beyond the now deeply conventional stories and their structures.

One grand Euro-American narrative strongly endures today—namely, that of the 'literal versus free' rendering (or 'word versus meaning') of start texts. This narrative developed in early modern Europe and consolidated in the nineteenth century. According to such an account, in premodern European culture, grammar and rhetoric were positioned at the two extremes: ancient orators, poets, and teachers such as Cicero, Horace, and Quintilian preferred to translate literally or freely. In 1984, UK-born and US-based scholar Glyn P. Norton questioned this polarised understanding of translation theory by offering a detailed discussion of European humanists of the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries, debating the terms *fidus interpres* (faithful interpreter) and *interpretes* (interpreters/translators) as they were used by Cicero and Horace (first century BCE). It seems that at some point in the history of translation (possibly the sixteenth century) the adjective *fidus* came to describe the translated text (the French *belle infidèle*) more than the translator. Renaissance and modern scholars have investigated what Horace and several authors after him have meant by 'nec verbo verbum curabis reddere' ('no need to translate for word word'), but what does *fidus* mean? Norton makes a tantalising and fleeting suggestion about the concept of 'fidelity':

> Fidelity, as an associated feature of *interpres*, may be seen to characterize at least originally the person rather than his work, his reliability as negotiating agent rather than a property of his utterance.[70]

For sixteenth-century French and Italian humanists, *fidus* denoted the 'state of trust' between equals, whereas *fidelis* described trust between unequal parties (slave and master, for instance). Norton goes on to say that *fidus* represents the capacity of the negotiating agent to inspire trust.

So what do *fidelis* and *fidus* mean? What kind of trust and trustworthiness do they refer to?

Social and religious historian Ian Forrest examines the Latin lexicon used to describe a person as trustworthy or faithful.[71] His study identifies four nonexclusive categories of trustworthy agents: *boni homines*, *fideles*, *probi homines*, and *legali* or *legitimi homines*. Each category is accompanied by a stand-alone adjectival noun: *bonus*, describing a virtuous, worthy, proficient, innocent, or serviceable person; *fidelis*, referring to a faithful, constant, sworn, trustworthy, reliable, loyal subject or vassal; *probus*, a person of upright character, a righteous or honest man, a person of ability or status, and more abstractly a proof; *legalis*, describing a loyal man, someone with legal rights; *legitimus*, meaning someone who is legitimate, law-worthy, or genuine. *Bonus* is the least specific term, and possibly for this reason it was used commonly across Europe from the Roman era onwards to describe 'notables, witnesses, and local representatives'.[72]

From such a historically informed glossary, a clear difference emerges between *fidelis* and *fidus*. This difference supports a freshly nuanced appreciation of the conventional claims that translators made about their work during the 'long middle ages' in western Europe. *Fidelis* describes the translator who wished to be viewed as less skilled, less authoritative. Faithfulness in this case posits a self-perceived subordination of the translator to an earlier author or translator.[73] *Fidus*, instead, denotes the trustworthiness of the cultural broker. The two approaches to translation were not mutually exclusive, and reflected a

> constant looping of perceptions, judgement, assumptions, respect, envy, distrust, and trust between multiple individuals was what made up the culture of *fides* in parishes, the varied landscape into which episcopal attributions of trustworthiness intruded.[74]

Looking at ancient China and sutra translation, we find two comparable approaches to trust-signalling available to translators. Monk translators produced refined (wén, 文) or unhewn (zhì, 質) renderings of Sanskrit or Húyû Buddhist sutras. 'Unhewn translation' in ancient Chinese refers to interrelated concepts that included trustworthy (xìn), tedious (fán), or coarse (yè).[75] A 'refined translation' was considered elegant (yâ), eloquent (biàn), pedantic (shî), or flowery (huâ).[76] A closer study of the earliest Chinese texts on translation reveals a further layer of meaning around 'trustworthiness'. Kongzi (Confucius, 551–479 BCE) advised young students to be respectful towards their elders, and to be 'prudent and sincere (xín)'. As we have seen, 'xín' also means trustworthy, a key adjective for unhewn translation. After cultivating these skills, students are advised to devote themselves to 'refined studies' (wén); that is, the learning of literature, music, rites, among other practices. In this ancient corpus of literature, 'wén' also describes a style of translation (literary and refined).[77]

We are not attempting to canvass here a grand narrative between such different ancient and premodern cultures. However, together the foregoing examples show the existence of comparable approaches to translation in which the trustworthiness of the translator (and of the translated text) is transacted and received. As already indicated, these are approaches that do not stand in opposition to one another, but vary according to contexts or regimes, even within the same translator or text. Clearly, these approaches to trust crossed cultural, linguistic, and social boundaries.

The trust-signalling enacted by the terms *fidus* and *fidelis* takes our discussion, and translation history, to ethical considerations about translators. We discuss these in Chap. 2. Suffice it to say here that visibility and trust go hand in hand: the more visible a translator (by means of trust-signalling) the more evidence readers or clients will have for trusting or distrusting the go-betweens and their translation.[78]

To sum up, let us return to the starting point of this introduction: what is translation history? We propose that it refers to a scholarly interest in the visibility of historical translators and their trust-signalling, and the ways their translations were trusted and distrusted. The focus of our field is simultaneously the actors, the go-betweens, and the texts or product they were concerned with. Of course, it is not just translators who are involved in the transfer of texts and knowledge. Interpreters, dragomans, or diplomats have also played a crucial role in the history of translation. Our suggested attunement to matters of trust alerts both the historian with an interest in exchange and the translation scholar interested in historical agency to hone conceptual tools so as to identify and explain the interpersonal, institutional, and regime-enacted levels of intercultural mediation.

Summary of Chapters

Chapter 1 has provided necessary groundwork, outlining the differences between interpersonal, institutional, and cultural trust and their relevance to translation history. Chapter 2 examines what a translation history focussed on trust might 'look like'. In particular, we examine a three-part sociological approach that could help translation historians avoid looking for no more than illusory and unrealistic big laws, and to search instead for the mutual influences of open-ended factors that conditioned translation in the past. Chapter 3 explores the issue of relativity—the position we do history from. This is especially important in translation history because of the field's intercultural focus: almost by definition, our histories study other groups of people, so there are always several different perspectives in play. With reference to claims and practices of interdisciplinarity, Chap. 4 surveys two decades of work by US-based historians of science and European translation scholars. It provides a model for understanding differing depths of interdisciplinarity in research and is an invitation for scholars to define their interdisciplinary aims and means. All the chapters aim to foster greater awareness of translation among historians, and greater methodological confidence among scholars of translation. Finally, a brief Conclusion and a Glossary of key terms and concepts close the book.

Notes

1. Anthony Pym, *Method in Translation History* (London and New York: Routledge, 2014, 1st ed. 1998), 29.
2. We return to the definition of these three perspectives in the context of trust-signalling and its reception below in this chapter and in Chap. 2.
3. Jouni Hakli, 'Geographies of Trust', in *Social Capital and Urban Networks of Trust*, ed. Jouni Hakli and Claudio Minca (London: Routledge, 2009), 22–45, at 24.
4. Anthony Pym, 'A Complaint Concerning the Lack of History in Translation Histories', *Livius. Revista de Estudios de Traducción* 1 (1992): 1–11, and *Method in Translation History*, 234. See discussion in Marie-Alice Belle, 'At the Interface between Translation History and Literary History: A Genealogy of the Theme of "Progress" in Seventeenth-Century English Translation History and Criticism', *The Translator* 20 (2014): 44–63, at 45 and Anne Malena, 'Where is the "History" in Translation Histories?', *TTR: Traduction, Terminologie, Rèdaction* 24 (2011): 87–115. There are also three recent journal special issues dedicated to history in translation studies. See the references given at endnote 9 in the present chapter.
5. See Rita Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation* (London: Routledge, 1995); and Belle, 'At the Interface', 46.
6. Marie-Alice Belle and Brenda M. Hosington, 'Translation, History, and Print: A Model for the Study of Printed Translations in Early Modern Britain', *Translation Studies* 10 (2016): 2–21. This model builds on several recent studies on English and French Renaissance translations and translators and invitations to reconsider research methodologies in translation history: see at least Guyda Armstrong, *The English Boccaccio: A History in Books* (Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 2013); Anne

E. B. Coldiron, *Printers Without Borders: Translation and Textuality in the Renaissance* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015); and a special issue on 'Translation and Print Culture in Early Modern Europe', ed. Brenda M. Hosington, *Renaissance Studies* 29 (2015). On 'rethinking' methodologies in Translation History' see Carol O'Sulllivan, 'Introduction: Rethinking Methods in Translation History', *Translation Studies* 5 (2012): 131–138 and Christopher Rundle, 'Theories and Methodologies of Translation Histories: The Value of an Interdisciplinary Approach', *Translator* 20 (2014): 2–8. Our focus in this volume goes beyond the study of specific nations, book history, and the history of print, and general calls for interdisciplinarity or collaboration.

7. Apart from George Steiner, as mentioned below in this chapter, only Pym has made some forays into the significance of trust in translation. See Pym, *Method in Translation History*, 183–186 and Anthony Pym, *On Translator Ethics. Principles for Mediation between Cultures*, trans. Heike Walker (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2012), 70–104.
8. Pym, *On Translator Ethics*, 70.
9. One of the earliest discussions of translation history is the ongoing *Medieval Translator/Traduire au Moyen Age* series, which began with a conference in Cardiff in 1987. Several edited volumes have since been published under the editorship of Roger Ellis and others. In 1993, a special issue of *TTR: traduction, terminologie, redaction* focussed on 'L'Historie en traduction', edited by Paul St Pierre. Other significant contributions from the 1990s are Jean Delisle and Judith Woodsworth, *Translators through History* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2012, 1st ed. 1995); Pym, *Method in Translation History: The Translatability of Cultures. Figurations of the Spaces Between*, ed. Sanford Budick and Wolfgang Iser (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996); Tesjaswini Niranjana, *Siting Translation: History, Post-structuralism, and the Colonial Context* (Oakland: University of California Press, 1992); *Portraits de traducteurs*, ed. Jean Delisle (Ottawa: Les Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa, 1999); Vicente Rafael, *Contracting Colonialism: Translation and Christian Conversion in Tagalog Society Under Early Spanish Rule* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988); Frances E. Karttunen, *Between Worlds: Interpreters, Guides, and Survivors* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1994); *Translation/History/Culture. A Sourcebook*, ed. André Lefevere (London and New York: Routledge, 2002, 1st ed. 1992); Ruth Roland, *Interpreters as Diplomats. A Diplomatic History of the Role of Interpreters in World Politics* (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1999); and Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics*. Perhaps the most influential contribution from the same period, despite its narrow focus on modern Italian literature, is Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*

(London and New York: Routledge, 2008, 1st ed. 1995). Of course, this list is only indicative and in no way meant to be exhaustive.

10. See, for instance, *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Peter Burke and R. Po-chia Hsia (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007) and Natalie Rothman, *Brokering Empire: Trans-imperial Subjects between Venice and Istanbul* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2012).
11. Julio-César Santoyo, 'Blank Spaces in the History of Translation', in *Charting the Future of Translation History*, ed. George L. Bastin and Paul F. Bandia (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 2006), 11–44, at 12.
12. See, for instance, Rueben A. Brower, *On Translation* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959); George Steiner, *After Babel. Aspects of Language and Translation* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1998, 1st ed. 1975); George Mounin, *Teoria e storia della traduzione* (Turin: Einaudi, 1965); *Translation/History/Culture*; Douglas Robinson, *Western Translation Theory from Herodotus to Nietzsche* (Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing 1997); and *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti (London and New York, 2012, 1st ed. 2000).
13. Martha Cheung, *An Anthology of Chinese Discourse on Translation* (Manchester: St Jerome Publishing, 2006).
14. The list is too long to be comprehensive. For edited volumes see at least *Translating Others*, ed. Theo Hermans, 2 vols. (London and New York: Routledge, 2006); *Missionary Linguistics V/Linguistica Misionera V. Translation Theories and Practices*, ed. Otto Zwartjes, Klaus Zimmerman et al. (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2014); *Tudor Translation*, ed. Pérez Fernández, Edward Wilson-Lee, and Fred Schurink (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011); *The Culture of Translation in Early Modern England and France, 1500–1660*, ed. Tania Demetriou and Rowan Tomlinson (Basingstoke and New York, 2015); and the *Medieval Translation* series edited by Roger Ellis and Ruth Evans. For monographs see Rebekah Clemens, *A Cultural History of Translation in Early Modern Japan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015); Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility*; Roberto A. Valdeón, *Translation and the Spanish Empire in the Americas* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2014); and Anne E. B. Coldiron, *Printers without Borders*.
15. Louis G. Kelly, *The True Interpreter. A History of Translation Theory and Practice in the West* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979); Pym, *Method in Translation History*; Frederick R. Rener, *Interpretatio: Language and Translation from Cicero to Tyler* (Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1989); Belén Bistué, *Collaborative Translation and Multi-version Texts in Early Modern Europe* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013); *Translators through History*; Douglas Robinson, *Who Translates? Translator Subjectivities beyond Reason*

(Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001); *Agents of Translation*, ed. John Milton and Paul Bandia (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2009); *Translators, Interpreters, and Cultural Negotiators. Mediating and Communicating Power from the Middle Ages to the Modern Era*, ed. Federico Federici and Dario Tessicini (Houndmills and New York: Palgrave, 2014); Jan Walsh Hokenson and Marcella Munson, *The Bilingual Text. History and the Theory of Literary Self-Translation* (Manchester and Kinderhook: St. Jerome Publishing, 2007); Karttunen, *Between Worlds*; Scott L. Montgomery, *Science in Translation. Movements of Knowledge through Cultures and Time* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2000); and Ruth Roland, *Interpreters as Diplomats*.

16. Pym, *Method in Translation History*; Brigitte Lépinette, *La historia de la traducción. Metodología. Apuntes bibliográficos* (Valencia: Universitat de València, 1997); Samuel López Alcalá, *La historia, la traducción y el control del pasado* (Madrid: Universidad Pontificia Comillas, 2001); *Travel and Translation in the Early Modern Period*, ed. Carmine G. Di Biase (Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi B. V., 2006); *Politics, Policy and Power in Translation History*, ed. Lieven D'hulst, Carol O'Sullivan, and Michael Schreiber (Berlin: Frank & Timme, Verlag für wissenschaftliche Literatur, 2016); *The Translability of Cultures*; Mirella Agorni, *Translating Italy for the Eighteenth Century: Women, Translation, and Travel Writing, 1739–1797* (Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 2002); Margaret Ferguson, *Dido's Daughters: Literacy, Gender, and Empire in Early Modern England and France* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2003); special issue on 'Translating and Translations in the History of Science', ed. Bettina Dietz, *Annals of Science* 73 (2016); special issue on 'Science and Translation', ed. Maeve Olohan and Myriam Salama-Carr, *The Translator* 17 (2011); Bistué, *Collaborative Translation*; *Collaborative Translation: From the Renaissance to the Digital Age*, ed. Anthony Cordingley and Céline Frigau Manning (London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2017); and Sharon Deane-Cox, *Retranslation: Translation, Literature and Reinterpretation* (London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014).
17. Anthony Pym, *Translation and Text Transfer: An Essay on the Principles of Intercultural Communication* (Frankfurt am Main and New York: Peter Lang, 1992, reprinted Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group, 2010), 159–180; Andrew Chesterman, *Memes of Translation. The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2000), 180–183; Kristiina Abdallah and Kaisa Koskinen, 'Managing Trust: Translating and the Network Economy', *Meta* 52 (2007): 673–687; Anthony Pym, *On Translator Ethics*. 146–147, and 'Translating as Risk Management', *Journal of Pragmatics* 85 (2015): 67–80.

18. Chesterman, *Memes of Translation*, 182.
19. Christopher Rundle, 'Translation as an Approach to History', *Translation Studies* 5 (2012): 232–240; Outi Paloposki, 'Translation History: Audiences, Collaboration and Interdisciplinarity', *MonTI* 5 (2013): 213–239, at 213.
20. Pym, *Method in Translation History*, vii.
21. Recent histories of intercultural go-betweens include Alida C. Metcalf, *Go-betweens and the Colonization of Brazil, 1500–1600* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2005); Karttunen, *Between Worlds; Renaissance Go-betweens. Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Andres Höfele and Werner von Koppenfels (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2005); *Translators, Interpreters*; Roland, *Interpreters as Diplomats*; Valdeón, *Translation and the Spanish Empire*; and Rothman, *Brokering Empire*. On Malinche see most recently María Laura Spoturno, 'Revisiting Malinche: A Study of Her Role as an Interpreter', in *Translators, Interpreters*, 121–135.
22. We recognise political scientist Boaventura de Sousa Santos's understanding of translation as a process of cultural or political mediation between cultures. Sousa also suggests that the intercultural translator is a mediator between different languages, cultures, and ideologies who can enact, through translation, change, decolonisation, and dialogue. See *Epistemologies of the South: Justice Against Epistemicide* (London: Routledge, 2015), chapter 8, especially page 214. Santos' concept is close to Tzvetan Todorov's conception of cross-cultural dialogue. One example of 'intercultural translators' offered by Sousa is Mahatma Gandhi: see Boaventura De Sousa Santos, *The End of the Cognitive Empire: The Coming of Age of Epistemologies of the South* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2018), 216–219. For the purposes of this volume, however, we have a more restrictive definition of translation in mind: it is textual mediation (whether written, spoken, or graphic).
23. *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*, trans. and ed. Kurt H. Wolff (Glencoe, IL: The Free Press, 1950), 162. On Simmel's essay on the third party see Metcalf, *Go-betweens and the Colonization*, 20.
24. Anthony Pym, 'Complaint Concerning the Lack of History'; Lieven D'hulst, 'Pour une historiographie des théories de la traduction: questions de méthode', *TTR* 8 (1995): 13–33; Pym, *Method in Translation History*; and Sergia Adamo, 'Microhistory of Translation', in *Charting the Future*, 81–100.
25. Jean Delisle, 'Réflexions sur l'historiographie de la traduction et ses exigences scientifiques', *Équivalences* 26 and 27 (1997–1998): 21–43.
26. Burke and Po-chia Hsia, *Cultural Translation*, 3.
27. Hayden White, 'The Problem of Change in Literary History', *New Literary History* 7 (1975): 97–111.

28. Michael Werner and Bénédicte Zimmermann, 'Beyond Comparison: *Histoire Croisée* and the Challenge of Reflexivity', *History and Theory* 45 (2006): 30–50.
29. Madeleine Akrich, Michel Callon, and Bruno Latour, *Sociologie de la traduction. Textes fondateurs* (Paris: Presses de l'École des Mines, 2006).
30. Michel Callon and Bruno Latour, 'Unscrewing the Big Leviathan: How Actors Macro-structure Reality, and How Sociologists Help Them to Do So', in *Advances in Social Theory and Methodology. Toward an Integration of Micro and Macro Sociologies*, ed. Karin D. Knorr and Aaron Cicourel (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 2006), 277–303, at 279.
31. See *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus*, ed. Emily Baragwanath and Mathieu de Bakker (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 2–3.
32. See Aristotle, *Poetics*, IX, 141b, 1–4: 'The difference between the historian (ἱστορικὸς) and the poet is not that between using verse or prose; Herodotus' work could be versified and would be just as much a kind of history in verse as in prose. No, the difference is this: that the one relates actual events, the other the kinds of things that might occur. Consequently, poetry is more philosophical and more elevated than history' (Loeb Classical library 1999, translation by Stephen Halliwell). See Alexandra Lianeri, 'Translation and the Language(s) of Historiography. Understanding Ancient Greek and Chinese Ideas of History', in *Translating Others*, 1, 67–86, at 69–70.
33. Lianeri, 'Translation', 72. See also Esther Sunkyung Klein, *Reading Sima Qian from Han to Song. The Father of History in Pre-modern China* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2019), 3–14.
34. Grant Hardy, *Worlds of Bronze and Bamboo. Sima Qian's Conquest of History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999).
35. Hanmo Zhang, *Authorship and Text-Making in Early China* (Amsterdam: De Gruyter, 2018), 241–305, especially page 247. Zhang attributes the letter to Ren An not to Siam Qian but to Yan Yung, a contemporary official of the emperor.
36. Lianeri, 'Translation' and Sunkyung Klein, *Reading Sima*.
37. On early modern reception of ancient Greek historiography see Gary Ianziti, *Writing History in Renaissance Italy: Leonardo Bruni and the Uses of the Past* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012).
38. Lianeri, 'Translation', 75.
39. George Steiner, *After Babel. Aspects of Language and Translation* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1998, 1st ed. 1975), 312. On Steiner and trust see Chesterman, *Memes of Translation*, 180–181.
40. Charles Tilly, *Trust and Rule* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 26.

41. Chesterman, *Memes of Translation*, 18 (cf. also 68–69, and 180–181), with reference to Christiane Nord, *Text Analysis in Translation* (Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1991).
42. Pym, *Translation and Text Transfer*, 173.
43. Sallust, trans. J. C. Rolfe (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971), 109, 4: 'Sulla a Boccho occulte adcersitur; ab utroque tantummodo fidi interpretes adhibentur, praeterea Dabar internuntius, sanctus vir et ex sententia ambobus' ('Sulla was summoned secretly by Bocchus; both men brought to the meeting only trustworthy interpreters, besides Dabar as a go-between, an upright man to the liking of both of them'). The quote is from James T. Chlup, 'Sallust's Melian Dialogue: Sulla and Bocchus in the "Bellum Iugurthinum"', *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 8 (2013): 191–207, at 200.
44. Taken from Glyn P. Norton, *The Ideology and Language of Translation in Renaissance France and their Humanist Antecedents* (Genève: Droz, 1984), 106.
45. Niklas Luhmann, 'Familiarity, Confidence, Trust: Problems and Alternatives', in *Trust Making and Breaking. Cooperative Relations*, ed. Diego Gambetta (New York: Blackwell, 1988), 94–108, at 95.
46. 'Regimes' are used with very different meanings. See below and Chap. 2 for our use of this term.
47. On functional understandings of trust see Luhmann, 'Familiarity, Confidence, Trust' and Russell Hardin, *Trust and Trustworthiness* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2002). On translation as cost-saving measure for its clients see Anthony Pym, *On Translator Ethics*, 146–147 and *Ibid*., 'Translating as Risk Management'.
48. Annette C. Baier, *Moral Prejudices. Essays on Ethics* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994), 126.
49. Ferdinand Tönnies, *Community and Society*, trans. Charles P. Loomis (New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1988, 1st ed. German 1887, 1st ed. English 1957).
50. On risk society and the erosion of trust see *The Politics of Risk Society*, ed. Jane Franklin (Cambridge, UK and Malden, MA: Polity Press, 1998), *Passim*.
51. Geoffrey Hosking, *Trust: A History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 46–49.
52. A translator scammer directory is available online to alert and assist translators and agencies: http://www.translator-scammers.com/translator-scammers-directory.htm.
53. See the special issue of *Language Problems and Language Planning* on mediation strategies 42(3) (2018), especially pages 288–307 and 344–364. See also Rosalind Edwards, Claire Alexander, and Bogusia Temple,

'Interpreting Trust: Abstract and Personal Trust for People Who Need Interpreters to Access Services', *Sociological Research Online* 11 (2006).

54. Naoki Sakai, *Translation and Subjectivity. On Japan and Cultural Nationalism* (Minnesota and London: Minnesota University Press, 1997), 21.
55. See Sakai, *Translation and Subjectivity*, 76 and Pym, *Method in Translation History*, 130–131.
56. Peter Burke, 'The Circulation of Historical and Political Knowledge between Britain and the Netherlands (1600–1800)', in *Translating Knowledge in the Early Modern Low Countries*, ed. Harold John Cook and Sven Dupré (Münster: LIT Verlag, 2012), 41–52, at 41. See also *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Peter Burke and R. Po-Chia Hsia (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 11.
57. We come back to this example in Chap. 2. The point here is that trust also works with a series of conventions and expectations. In the words of Barbara Misztal, it is trust habitus: 'habit and its social forms—that is, custom and tradition' (Barbara A. Misztal, *Trust in Modern Societies. The Search for the Bases of Social Order* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1996), 102).
58. On twenty-first century translation networks see Abdallah and Koskinen, 'Managing Trust: Translating and the Network Economy', and the other articles in this special issue of *Meta*. See especially, in the same issue, a general introduction to network types and how they fit into translation studies by Deborah Folaron and Hélène Buzelin, 'Introduction: Connecting Translation and Network Studies', *Meta: Journal des traducteurs* 52 (2007): 605–642. We come back to the discussion of networks in Chap. 2.
59. Hosking, *Trust: A History*, 45.
60. Tilly, *Trust and Rule*, 12.
61. Michael William Wyatt, *The Italian Encounter with Tudor England. A Cultural Politics of Translation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005) and Andrea Rizzi, 'English News in Translation: The "Comentario del Successo dell'Armata Spagnola" by Petruccio Ubaldini and its English Version', *Spunti e Ricerche* 22 (2007): 89–102.
62. Pym, *On Translator Ethics*, 71–73.
63. Susan Miller, *Trust in Texts: A Different History of Rhetoric* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2008).
64. *Historia Naturale di C. Plinio Secondo di Latino in volgare tradotta per Christophoro Landino, et nuovamente in molti luoghi, dove quella mancava, supplito, et da infiniti errori emendata, et con somma diligenza corretta per Antonio Brucioli* (Venice: Giolito, 1543), ii [USTC 849933]. Andrea Rizzi's translation. See Andrea Rizzi, 'Editing and Translating Pliny in

Renaissance Italy: Agency, Collaboration and Visibility', *Renaessanceforum* 14 (2018): 117–138.

65. *Historia Naturale di C. Plinio*, 1543, title page. Rizzi's translation.
66. On Iran see Esmaeil Haddadian-Moghaddam, *Literary Translation in Modern Iran. A Sociological Study* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2015). On India see Shibani Phukan, 'Towards an Indian Theory of Translation' in *Wasafiri* 27 (2003): 27–30.
67. An assessment of signalling mechanisms in the European Union is offered by Anthony Pym, François Grin, Claudio Sfreddo, and Andy L. J. Chan, *The Status of the Translation Profession in the European Union* (Luxembourg: European Commission, 2012).
68. We follow here Michel de Certau's definition of belief in his 'Une pratique sociale de la difference: croire', in *Faire croire: modalités de la diffusion et de la reception des messages religieux du XIIe au XVe siècle* (Rome: École Française de Rome, 1981), 364–364, 373–375.
69. Lianeri, 'Translation and the Language(s) of Historiography', 83.
70. Norton, *The Ideology and Language of Translation*, 66.
71. Ian Forrest, *Trustworthy Men. How Inequality and Faith Made the Medieval Church* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2018). We are grateful to Oren Margolis for alerting us to this work.
72. Forrest, *Trustworthy Men*, 100.
73. See Jamie Goodrich, *Faithful Translators. Authorship, Gender, and Religion in Early Modern England* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2014).
74. Forrest, *Trustworthy Men*, 221.
75. See Cheung, *An Anthology of Chinese Discourse*, 69.
76. Cheung, *An Anthology of Chinese Discourse*, 69.
77. Cheung, *An Anthology of Chinese Discourse*, 41.
78. On visibility and trust see the succinct discussion by Chesterman, *Memes of Translation*, 182.

CHAPTER 2

On Relationality: Trusting Translators

Abstract By discussing examples and sources from premodern history and early modern Europe in particular, this chapter closely examines the interpersonal, institutional, and regime-enacted types of trust, as well as the ethos of past and present translators and interpreters from the perspective of trust-signalling and its reception. This discussion of translation centred on the theme of trust invites scholars to follow translators, their work, and their networks of trust both downstream (from the translated text or culture to readers and clients) and upstream (from the reception of a given translation and translator to the translated text or request to translate).

Keywords Trust • Interpersonal • Institutional • Regimes • Visibility • Networks

Trust is often silent, whereas distrust tends to leave traces. Such traces can emerge through a study of the reception of the translated text, or from the pre-emptive claims of trustworthiness made by translators themselves. For instance, concern that unscrupulous interpreters working for the early modern French judicial system would abet a guilty person led judges to demand that new notaries, clerks, and interpreters transcribe and translate documents 'from the Flemish language into the French language, faithfully, *without changing the substance of the facts in any way*'.[1] For similar reasons, the Translators' College (Siyi guan) in China (1467–1748)

A. Rizzi et al., *What is Translation History?*, Translation History,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-20099-2_2

housed up to sixty translators of different identities and languages, who produced translations or official documents; these were then paraphrased in Chinese, and back-translated by other translators to verify the reliability and quality of the first translation.[2] In both examples we see regimes of relative distrust at work in translation. From such archival material we can gather evidence of the distrustee, and about who was trained or paid to trust or to be trustworthy. We also gauge the historical interactions between social systems (in these cases legal, political, and intercultural), as explained shortly.

Whether visible or not, trust is in every relation that translators and interpreters enter into with texts, and with those people around them. As discussed in Chap. 1, translation has implications for at least three levels of trust: interpersonal (between translator, editor, publisher, author, or client, for instance), institutional (trust in a profession), and regime-enacted. All three types of trust are relational from the micro to the macro levels. Whether the historian is interested in the relationship between early modern printer and scholar Aldo Manuzio (*c.* 1450–1515) and his network of translators and scholars, or in the development of the print industry in seventeenth-century Japan, the study of trust in translation investigates the relationships and transactions between individuals, groups, organisations, professions, and regimes of knowledge. Hence a micro history of translation might suggest that the concept of 'the progress of poetry' crystallised in seventeenth-century England.[3] In fact, similar concepts existed in antiquity and early modern Italy, and eventually made their way into England by means of translation.[4] This presents a challenge for historical studies as well as translation studies: to find means of grasping the interaction between small-scale and large-scale processes of intercultural mediation.[5] Translation history is well positioned to find the in-between space between micro and macro levels.

Whether at micro or macro levels, any form of translation (textual, visual, oral) is a social act involving at least three actors (translator, editor, and patron, for instance), and one, two or more texts (start texts and target texts). There is only one text when the translation is a pseudotranslation, but, importantly, the one text is *presented* as a translation and received as such.[6]

How might we understand 'social' in the context of trust? The sphere of the social can be handled conceptually by thinking in terms of 'the various mediations that place people into "social" relations with one another'.[7] This conceptualisation breaks any national, identity, and institutional bounds, and offers a perspective different from more traditional concepts of the social realm as comprising societies, classes, categories, and institutions. It also offers a broader scope for the study of mediations that are not just discoursal (language-based) but non-discoursal too (kinaesthetic or emotional). As an expressed emotion, for instance, trust can be both a discoursal and non-discoursal form of mediation. The presence of translators' portraits presenting their work to patrons or readers on the title page of an early modern translation conveys several emotionally-charged and non-discoursal signs of trustworthiness.

How does one study discoursal mediations, especially since they can be irregular and unpredictable? Let us offer an example here. In their prefaces or letters of dedication, early modern European translators often invoke their trustworthiness as faithful messengers or interpreters of the translated text or culture. A quantitative study of these statements can reveal the frequency of such self-fashioning pronouncements, their rhetorical nature, effect, register, and intertextual connections with earlier works.[8] Still, such a study cannot explain what trust or distrust meant *in practice* to the translator, interpreter, or patron. This is because social signals (both textual and visual) used for the production of trustworthiness are determined by semiotic practices that require both quantitative and qualitative approaches.

To be sure, the collection of 'hard' data on the numbers of translations produced by particular translators or printers, where, with what materials, and with what technology offers crucial information that can indicate how receptive a certain society, court, or group was to intercultural mediation and exchange. Yet the use of a quantitative causality is insufficient for an understanding of semiotically generated mediations such as interpreting and translation. The social dimension of translation requires concepts and tools that can explain conditions behind the quantitative production and reception of translations. William H. Sewell Jr. proposes the examination of three levels of social agency in history: 'eventful', which deals with the ephemera and contingencies of agency and socio-cultural production; 'conjunctural', associated with economic, technological, and political factors, and, thirdly, 'structural', concerned with the mental, cultural, and social structures informing change (we call this level 'regimes').[9] All three levels are complementary and interconnected. This tripartite division of causality behind the production and reception of translation allows translation historians to focus on several aspects of intercultural mediation at the same time. Historians may wish to focus on contingent social agency (the study of one translator, and her or his network of patrons, publishers, fellow intellectuals, and readers), or on the cultural, social, and economic elements informing how translations were produced and translators were perceived by their community.

Inevitably, the regime-enacted level of trust informs the interpersonal and institutional spheres. Regimes include values and perceptions about skills, knowledge, aesthetic or literary practices, and social capital that can support or undermine the translators' trustworthy-signalling across time and space. Regimes also include 'substantive attributes of entities in social networks'.[10] Attributes are generally culture-specific physical attributes (physical appearance of texts or interpreters) and have the power to influence the making of networks of trust.

Regimes need to be supported by human and non-human resources, which include skills, technology, economic capital, and materials such as libraries, paper, presses, and computers. Attention to these resources supersedes any dichotomy between theory and practice, since it encourages the study of both macro and micro aspects of translation, while also focussing on the agency of translators and their collaborators. Take, for instance, Leonardo Bruni's work as translator from Greek into Latin in the first three decades of the fifteenth century. He helped to foster a politico-cultural regime now usually termed the 'Italian Renaissance', which championed the prestige of classical Latin, the reputation of humanist scholars, and the theory and practices of learning and translation postulated by ancient intellectuals such as Cicero and Quintilian. These principles in turn required the use of specific human and non-human resources. For Bruni, relevant human attributes included a preference for rhetorical translations (that is, eloquent and 'free'), the authority of the fifteenth-century translator who can outclass the start author or earlier translator, and the ideal of translation as the work of an individual rather than as collaboration. Non-human resources included the use of humanistic minuscule handwriting style, the *bianchi girari* miniatures, and the tendency to use folio-sized paper instead of quarto. All non-human and human resources were aimed at validating regimes—for instance the prestige of classical Latin and of the new intellectual during the rise of merchant economies in Italian and other European city-states. It follows that the study of resources informs our understanding of the overarching cultural regimes. At the same time, regimes explain the preference of certain resources over others. Resources may therefore be read as texts than can allow us to 'recover the cultural schemas they instantiate'.[11]

Concerning non-human resources, in 2001 David Hamilton observed how the study of printing had changed in the preceding sixty years:

> since the 1950s, the history of moveable-type printing has moved from studies of 'communication' to the analysis of the mutually-constitutive practices of writers, printers, book-sellers, translators and proof-readers who, collectively, are implicated in the organisation and use of communication technologies.[12]

This statement indicates how understanding processes of communication (rather than its content) is crucial if we wish to understand the history of the commensurabilty and trustworthiness of translation and translators. It also alerts us to two aspects: on the one hand, the production of communicative texts is always the result of collaboration between agents (publishers, authors, editors, marketing departments, and so on); on the other hand, the trust that readers or listeners put into a communicative act depends on how they perceive non-human resources (technology, for example), as well human resources (agency or professionalism).

The three levels of trust (interpersonal, institutional, and regime-enacted) represent the micro and the macro processes of intercultural mediation mentioned above. As a social and cultural event, intercultural mediation is transformative, in the sense that it reproduces and inevitably alters the communication and perception of translated texts and cultures. But it also has potential to empower the translators, their patrons, and clients with social, cultural, and economic capital. A tripartite eventful sociological approach might help translation historians to avoid looking for no more than tenuous large-scale laws, and to search instead for the mutual influences of contingent, open-ended factors.

Let us put the tripartite levels into practice. In her monograph *Brokering Empire*, Toronto-based historian Natalie Rothman has recently shed much light on early modern trans-imperial subjects (1571–1669) and their contribution to trade in early modern Venice and its territories. These subjects were cultural and commercial brokers, religious converts, and dragomans (diplomatic interpreters). Unusually, Rothman explores archival sources as a means to understand cultural mediation in early modern Venice and the Ottoman Empire: she examines how trans-imperial subjects made claims about their identity, roles, and skills, and how these claims were received by the Venetian Board of Trade. Their claims or pleas are available from archival documents such as Petitions to the Venetian State, transcripts of trials, and the official responses from the Venetian State. Rothman brilliantly demonstrates the fluidity and complexity of the eventful and conjunctural dimensions of these mediators' lives and pleas: the contingent strategies adopted by these subjects to reassure or convince Venetian or Ottoman officials of their good service and their right to live or work in Venice and its territory. The ways in which official dragomans fashioned themselves as necessary and trustworthy to the State and beyond reveals their personal life exigencies, as well as the cultural values expected or assumed by the Venetian government.

Where are trust and translation in *Brokering Empire*? Rothman offers invaluable quantitative data on intercultural mediators' pleas and the outcomes of their petitions, but less on the types of trust (personal, institutional, or regime-enacted) invoked and expected by these go-betweens and their clients and patrons. Take, for instance, the petition made by Teodoro Dandolo (1608), who asked the Venetian State to employ him as official interpreter of Persian, Turkish, Arabic, and 'Indian'. Having lived in the Uzbek city of Bukhara, he had recently moved to Aleppo, then Venice (where he was converted to Christianity), and Rome.[13] His application to be trained as a Public Dragoman was turned down, because some members of the Venetian Board of Trade doubted his trustworthiness: even if he had converted to Christianity, it was feared that he could still favour Muslim nations. Despite this fear, four months later the same Board approved his application to become a commercial broker of the 'Turks and Levantines' trading in Venice. Why did the Board not trust Dandolo as a dragoman, but found him trustworthy as a commercial broker? Did an interpreter rely on personal as well as institutional trust, while the broker relied on relationships of thin trust? Were the two roles subject to different regimes and expectations? In this case the answer lies in the patrician mindset of those who comprised the Board of Trade in early seventeenth-century Venice—the nobles' uncertainty about the political and legal reputation of converts in their city. The choice to eventually approve Dandolo's application to become a commercial broker shows a tension between varying degrees of interpersonal distrust and the demand to employ more interpreters in Venice. This example points to the asymmetry of trust in intercultural translation. It also shows how trust and distrust may coexist in the same web of unequal intercultural relationships. We now turn to a detailed discussion of networks of intercultural mediation, especially to consider how they can be studied in the context of translation history.

Understanding the Dynamics of Trust Networks

To establish themselves as part of collaborative networks, translators and interpreters in early modern Europe habitually outlined their connections to a great variety of cultural, social, and economic agents; these could include friends, rulers, and dedicatees. In the words of US-based scholar Paul D. McLean, such networks offered a 'generative ecology for the emergence of a quasi modern, relational conception of the self'.[14] Along these lines, the statements written down by translators tend to reveal complex interrelationships between their work as individuals with skills, purpose, and ambition, and the community for which they made their translations.

Let us return to the use and meaning of the term 'network', which we have already touched on in Chap. 1. This term has been variously adopted by translation scholars. Michael Cronin discusses 'networks of intertextual influence', by which he means the ubiquity of printed and online texts that allows translations to be accessed and shared globally.[15] Cronin also refers to the technological networks used by translators. Anthony Pym uses 'network' to describe chains of relationships between translations, translators, and institutions (universities, printing presses, and so forth) within and beyond national and international borders.[16] Pym also suggests that translation historians focus on movements of objects (texts, technology, and materials) and subjects (authors, translators, patrons, printers, and suchlike) in time and space.

Networks differ from bodies of work in that they reveal connections between texts and people as the connections emerge, rather than relying on preset criteria. There is always a point of departure, but the ends are open both downstream (as one traces where translations and translators go) and upstream (as one traces where they came from). Pym describes this approach as one led by 'methodological curiosity' as well as reductive and expansive narratives.[17] A mapping of networks provides the necessary skeleton for any research project in translation history, perhaps before texts are analysed in a systematic way. Cultural historians have recently shown strong interest in how information and knowledge moved from place to place, and how these cultural materials changed in the process.[18] Scholars are increasingly interested in studying brokers and go-betweens.[19] This interest underpins a clear shift in historiography, where the main interest is no longer in what 'truths' crossed from one culture to another, but who mediated such a transfer and how the process was enacted. In the words of philosopher of science Ian Hacking, '[c]ommunication of ways to think is what matters', and such broader movements can be grasped on the level of networks.[20]

The micro level of a translator or text can be triangulated with the macro contexts of the regimes that influence what texts are available to be translated, why they are or are not translated, for whom they are transferred, and how they are translated. This is not new, of course. The social turn in translation studies has recognised that translations are almost never produced by a single individual; rather, they tend to be the result of a 'complex channel of mediators'.[21] Following sociological approaches—Bruno Latour's actor-network theory, for example, and Pierre Bourdieu's concept of the literary field—translation scholars and historians are now highly critical of the depersonalised (or 'text-only' approach) to the study of translation. In 2007, cultural historians Peter Burke and Ronnie Po-chia Hsia affirmed the need to focus on *who* translated, and *those for whom* the translations were undertaken (as well as *what* the materials were, and *how* they were translated) in a manner that resonates beyond translation studies. Concerns about agency in translation also chime strongly with new trends in literary history. Over the past five decades, authorship studies and book historians have offered highly nuanced accounts of the various modes of authorship and collaboration in the production of any text, including translations. The printed book is now seen as an intricate space in which authorial, social, and economic factors play out, including trust and distrust.[22]

So how can we study trust within networks of translation, and what can trust tell us about them? It is worth recalling here that by 'trust' we mean not only who was entrusted to produce the texts we can access and study today, but also how trustworthy the intercultural mediators and their networks were considered. Trust or distrust encapsulates complex rhetorical, emotional, and attitudinal signals: promise-making, sincerity, and readers' and audiences' reactions to texts and agents. Emotional reactions to translations (and the rhetoric of emotions used by translators in the prefaces to their work) emerge, for example, from complaints about the interpreting done by a foreign go-between—a very common occurrence before nation states decided to train their own interpreters.[23] We know from cognitive psychology that emotions can be the result of perceptions based on the appraisal of a situation, person—or text, in our case. Perception is therefore followed by appraisal, which leads to emotions and action readiness.[24] Specific emotions are not hardwired in the psyche, and are not equal in all cultures. Similarly, trust bears different meanings and expressions in different cultures and languages. Understanding how trust or distrust is expressed in a given context, and what it means for a community, helps to unlock the way a community values translation and interpreting. The distrust-led practices of the French judicial system and the Translators' College (Siyi guan) in China discussed above are examples of how this unlocking can happen by researching eventful, conjunctural, and regime-enacted elements of social and intercultural history.

Downstream Flows of Trust

When talking through an interpreter, speakers and their audiences may be put in a context in which the mediatory voice is assumed to be 'transparent'.[25] In some historical cultures of translation, this is perceived as the illusion effect of translation, whereby all parties involved are asked to assume that the interpreter was trained to successfully convey content and context. Brian Harris called this illusion the 'norm of the true interpreter'.[26] There is a sincerity rule at play here, a downstream claim that 'exchange speech acts satisfy a condition of mutual trust'.[27] Forced assumptions of accuracy and honesty underpin the reception of the interpreter's work—and of the translated text. These assumptions are forced because of the context of simultaneous interpreting, in which the client often lacks the time or space to question or distrust the interpretation of communication. In addition, the interpreters' mediation presupposes a commitment of service without an explicit oath of fidelity. Further, this assumption is not always accepted, especially when it is forced from above (by a government, for instance). In recent years, refugees who need to rely on an interpreter to argue their case have been less inclined to risk being misinterpreted by mediators. For this reason, some prefer to rely on family members or friends (personal, thick trust) or online machine translation instead of professionals (institutional, thin trust).[28] Evidently, clients who need to avail themselves of interpreters for legal or administrative processes weigh up the reasons why they need to communicate, and what they expect from the mediation.

It happens, therefore, that claims of trust made or implied downstream can be met by upstream distrust. In these cases, the client may fill the space between reason and expectation with emotions of distrust. Trust, in these terms, is 'a psychological state comprising the intention to accept vulnerability based upon positive expectations of the intentions or behaviour of another'.[29] When clients are not prepared to accept vulnerability, they distrust the intercultural mediation. Taking an oath, as interpreters do in court nowadays—and did in early modern France—may instil confidence in the role and practice of the mediator. Oaths of fidelity were a common practice in premodern Europe. They were not just a vassalic act of submission to a ruler, since they could also 'symbolise the creation or confirmation of an interpersonal bond'.[30] As a symbolic act of trust, the medieval oath is comparable to the prefatory statements accompanying ancient, medieval, modern, and some contemporary translations. In these pronouncements, translators (or their publishers, editors, patrons, or peers) make claims about the validity of their work, its accuracy, correctness, fidelity, and clarity of expression. These statements signal to their readers or listeners that the texts and their translators are trustworthy.

Past translators made recourse to a wide range of literary and artistic strategies of self-presentation and translation. Such strategies were inseparable from highly specific choices regarding material and artistic aspects of the premodern book (*mise en page*, typeface, printing technologies, paratextual elements such as annotations and corrections, decorative and figurative elements such as landscapes and portraits). More broadly, such strategies were in dynamic relationships with the socio-cultural and commercial contexts that influenced the production of text-objects. Indeed, words, images, *mise en page*, ink, and other material and artistic elements signal the collaborative nature of translation. Collaboration underscores trust: the collective efforts of translators, editors, and printers in the early printing era promised new books to be 'with all diligence thoroughly corrected'.[31]

Looking at European early modern translation, artists, authors, editors, printers, readers, and patrons as well as self-described translators all contributed to the conception, production, and transmission of translations. To understand the downstream rhetoric of claims made by translators and patrons for whom they worked is to apprehend what risks might have been perceived by the client. That is, the translators' promises, self-reflexive statements, and claims of meeting patrons' expectations allow us to study the trust-making aspects of intercultural communication.

The history of translation and interpreting is rich with claims and self-serving statements about the cause, process, and intended reception of translation. Some of these marks also took the form of 'artistic visibility'. Take, for instance, the presence of monkeys and dogs in paratextual images accompanying translations, where they witness the translators' self-awareness, and the collaborative nature of their work. The likeness between humans and apes was deeply unsettling for thinkers of the European ancient world as well as medieval and Renaissance writers. This uneasy view of apes inspired numerous visual representations of monkeys acting as men, or being devious or mischievous. In medieval manuscripts, monkeys and other 'irreverent' beasts occupy the 'cultural space of the [printed or manuscript] margins', and were often used to symbolise vices such as deceit, fraud, vanity, and promiscuity, among others.[32]

Indeed, imitation was a key source of fascination and amusement for early modern European audiences. Scholars and authors understood *imitatio* as a creative process that could transform both writer and reader—provided that the imitation was performed by scholars with the appropriate training and skills, who addressed their work to an educated audience. Late medieval and Renaissance authors commonly referred to monkeys either to praise or blame imitators or followers of ancient authorities. Being a close imitator of an influential textual authority such as Marcus Tullius Cicero was a practice commended by some Renaissance scholars, whereas for others this practice was perceived as too slavish an imitation. The spectrum of possibilities for literary and rhetorical production swung between imitation of eloquent speech as a worthy and civilising process, and the danger of losing one's own voice by following a literary or oratorical model too closely, or poorly. A fine line separated a 'good' imitator who internalised and competed against the model from a 'bad' imitator of a commendable model: the latter was known as a 'Schlur-affen', or lazy ape, from Desiderius Erasmus's 'ape of Cicero'. Late medieval and Renaissance authors and translators such as Petrarch, Coluccio Salutati, Angelo Poliziano, or Paolo Cortesi variously praised or mocked their peers for imitating ancient literary authorities like monkeys.[33] The negative connotation is that which persisted through centuries, as indicated by French translator Maurice-Edgar Coindreau (1892–1990):

> Firstly, a translator is a person with no rights, only duties. He must show loyalty to the author like a dog, but as a special dog who behaves like a monkey. If I'm not mistaken, Mauriac [the French novelist] wrote: "The novelist is God's monkey". Well, the translator is the novelist's monkey. He is obliged to pull the same faces, like it or not.[34]

Coindreau's remark addresses the question of where translation sits in the history of literary imitation. We suggest that the question could well be readdressed: what regimes informed the work of translators and interpreters across cultures and history?

Upstream Flow of Trust

How can historians navigate the upstream flows of trust in the history of intercultural translation? Unsurprisingly, upstream journeys are harder than those downstream. This is because often the members of a network on the receiving end of translation leave no traces of trust. One could argue that silence may be indicative of trust. The silence of trust can be as telling as the non-translated or the almost untranslatable. We say *almost* because nothing is untranslatable, as much as nothing is totally translatable. In the words of French philosopher Jacques Derrida,

> [t]otally translatable, it disappears as a text, as writing, as a body of language. Totally untranslatable, even within what is believed to be one language, it dies immediately. Thus triumphant translation is neither the life nor the death of a text, only or already its living on, its life after life, its life after death.[35]

For the British Indian writer Salman Rushdie, untranslatable words travel uncomfortably between languages and texts, and force translators to make difficult choices.[36] And difficult choices sometimes require translators or interpreters to comment on their strategies, leaving clues about their own skills, how they trusted the start texts, and how they claim to have produced a trustworthy text or not.

A thick and thin kind of upstream trust is appealed to in the common practice of referencing, as in the notes that we give here at the end of the chapter: 'trust us, we have read all these books and have borrowed their authority'. Medieval Islamic historians had a somewhat similar practice in the use of the textual *isnad* ('support'), which listed the chain of prior authorities who had passed down a report (*ḥadīth*), particularly when leading back to the Prophet Muhammad ibn ʿAbdullāh. When the Qur'anic texts came to be translated into Latin in the mid-twelfth century, the Christian translators had no similar tradition, since the authority of their sacred texts came first from the hierarchy of the Church (institutional trust), and second from an appeal to faith (perhaps describable as interpersonal trust in 'the Word of God'). The main translator thus omitted the *isnad*: 'I, the Latin translator, have silenced these Saracen authorities, whose names are too foreign to our language and, even if copied out with care, would bear no fruit'.[37] In 1930, the English scholar David Samuel Margoliouth noted that use of the *isnad* nevertheless 'gave the Muslims an obvious advantage in their controversies with Jews and Christians, who gave more the appearance of taking their information on trust'.[38] It seems more reasonable, however, to see two different kinds of upstream trust here: the Islamic practice sought a genealogy, a chain of prior mediators, and hence trust in people, whereas the Christian practice invested trust in the written word itself.

With reference to reception, it can be challenging for the historian to find such visible clues. Scholars of translation studies have been recommending that twenty-first-century readers be aware of translators' and interpreters' 'voices' and strategies. A way of acknowledging the 'translator's individual and social signature' is suggested by Belgian scholar Theo Hermans (who is based at University College London).[39] Hermans encourages today's readers to consider translation as reported or echoed speech in which 'the translator, as an authorial presence, lets the original author speak in his or her own name'. This type of reading unsettles ordinary perceptions of contemporary translation, giving more prominence to the agency of translators. Meanwhile, there is ample evidence that past readers and clients read translation as echoed speech. This is because translators tended to be more visible and vocal about their translation strategies—at least the translators of the past we are very familiar with: from those in twelfth-century Spain to James Strachey's *Standard Edition* of Sigmund Freud's works in English, begun in the mid-twentieth century.[40] The visibility of translators' names, and the editorial evidence of their work in books, letters, decrees, notices, and so on; the *mise-en-page*, presentation, and conservation of the translation has the potential to offer clues to the perceived trustworthiness of translators, and also to their role in successful trading or cultural ventures. Rothman among others has unearthed evidence of ways in which the work of dragomans was received by their clients.[41]

Sometimes the only available evidence can be found by studying 'the translator's role in mediating the values inscribed in the translation to its prospective readers'.[42] In her study of retranslations and re-editions of Gustave Flaubert's novel *Madame Bovary* and George Sand's *Le Mare au Diable* in late nineteenth- and twentieth-century England, Sharon Deane-Cox considers prefatory, textual, and extratextual elements contributing to the production and reception of re-editions or retranslations. Prefatory discourses often provide evidence 'for the type and extent of interactions between the (re)translations'. They also shed light on economic or symbolic motivations underpinning retranslation or re-editing, the agency of translators, printers, or editors, and the dynamics of the target literary system.[43] Unfortunately, scholars of premodern literature cannot always rely on extratextual material such as book reviews or book contracts, making it difficult to gauge the reception of retranslations or re-editions in the target literary field.

Another way of tracing translation relations upstream is to start from analysis of various versions of a translation, noting how the text evolved, what references were drawn on, what contributions there may have been from other translators, and how the text changed in the hands of revisers, editors, and printers. This is the work of 'genetic criticism', which is of interest to translation history to the extent that it can reveal relations between people over time.

Where one translation leans on or borrows from another, the processes of textual comparison can then be moved further upstream. Methods from forensic linguistics can be used to decide legal cases where one translator has been formally accused of plagiarising another.[44] Once again, however, the historical interest lies not so much in the details of the texts, but in the nature of the trust relations involved. If, in a particular cultural context, imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, could a plagiarised translation be an expression of sincere trust in the previous translator?

In a study of nineteenth-century English novels translated into Chinese, China-based translation scholar Chuanmao Tian finds that the translations done in the 1990s liberally plagiarised those done in previous decades, and that the translations done in the 1950s were indeed more linguistically trustworthy than those of the 1990s.[45] Did the later translators simply put blind faith in the earlier ones? Probably the causes for these different approaches are more connected with the opening up of non-governmental publishing houses in China in the 1990s, the absence of effective copyright control, and the widespread study of English among the target readership. In China in the 1950s, there were relatively few translators, and they were highly trained and carefully vetted: translators were obliged to work for government publishers, and were usually in-house employees or university professors. In the 1990s, when nearly every university student knew at least enough English to translate in a basic way, and there were several commercial publishers, it became relatively easy to concoct a 'new' translation by drawing on old ones, and readers bought cheap translations at their peril.

As already mentioned, a key issue with upstream flows of trust is the lack of evidence. When this is the case, the only option for the historian of translation is to focus downstream, and devote special attention to the translator's and interpreter's rhetoric of trust-signalling or ethos building. It is to claims to 'fidelity'—whether that of the translator (*fidelis*) or the cultural broker (*fidus*), as discussed in Chap. 1—that we now return.

'Trust Me': The Ethos of the Translator

The notion of ethos was first discussed, in the West, by Aristotle (fourth century BCE). In his treatise know as *Rhetoric*, Aristotle presents ethos as the author's or the speaker's ability to establish a trustworthy character, and thus as an effective means of persuasion.[46] Orators need to look morally correct in the eyes of their audience. According to Aristotle, they also need to demonstrate three key qualities: virtue, good sense, and goodwill, so that 'anyone who is thought to have all three of these good qualities will inspire trust in his [*sic*] audience'. It is tempting to see correspondences between Aristotle's discussion of the ethos and skills of the ancient speaker and the advice given to young students by Kongzi (Confucius, 551–479 BCE). Confucius tells young learners to be respectful towards their elders, to be 'prudent and sincere' (xín), and, after cultivating these skills, to devote themselves to 'refined studies' (wén). These ethical instructions anticipate the norms of prudence, honesty, good sense, and goodwill that have been recalled and reinterpreted by translators, interpreters, diplomats, orators, and authors throughout the Euro-American early modern era.[47]

The ethos of communication and persuasion brings together almost all practitioners of rhetoric, from politicians through to literary authors. They share a communal ethos with their clients: this type of ethos is not based on personal relationships, but on 'assumed friendly trust among those with shared education'.[48] In this context, however, translators and interpreters are particularly interesting because they are bound by a pre-existing text, or message, that needs to be translated for a new audience or readership. Translators work 'translatively' in the sense that their subjectivity is ostensibly hidden behind the main text and emerges in the liminal spaces of stylistic preferences, prefaces, footnotes, or reviews.[49] The translation history we are interested in examines these liminal spaces where the translators' claims to trustworthiness are intended to meet the expectations of their readers and clients, and gain trust. Different cultures and societies make different assumptions about the roles and social functions of translators. The mismatch between trust claims, readers' expectations, and perceived betrayal of regimes in some cases results in the persecution and death of the translator—see, for instance, William Tyndale's death following his 1525 English translation of the Christian New Testament. A mismatch can also provide translators with an important role within specific professional contexts. Early in the history of psychoanalysis as a profession, undertaking to translate psychoanalytic studies provided many lay analysts (who were medically untrained) with a means to gain some standing in their growing professional networks.[50]

Some regimes expect detachment or limited responsibility from the translator or interpreter: it is not the translator or interpreter who takes responsibility for the content of the message, but the first author or the patron. Other regimes emphasise the service provided by translators rather than the inherent value of the product, the text. By 'service' we mean a suite of relational values that are significant for the receiving culture: the prestige of the translated author or culture; nation-building by means of domestication of foreign texts and ideas, or social, cultural, and economic forms of capital for patrons, dedicatees, clients, readers, and translators themselves.

Translation history offers untapped sources of evidence for ways in which translators and other intercultural mediators strategically presented themselves, their work, and their projects to contemporary readers and patrons. In their addresses to readers and audiences, translators often underplayed their skills by using the rhetorical trope of modesty. In the preface to his 1803 translation of the Spanish classic *Amadís de Gaula*, Robert Southey warns the reader that 'it cannot be supposed that I have uniformly succeeded [in his translation]'.[51] In his preface to a two-volume translation from Dutch into Sinitic and square-form kana character *New Writings on Calendrical Phenomena* (1798–1802), Japanese interpreter Tadao Shizuki describes himself as 'for the moment but a tongue man'. *Setsujin* ('tongue man') is a loan word from Chinese, and was used to describe interpreters who could translate from one or more 'barbaric' languages belonging to marginal Chinese tribes.[52] These examples, chosen from two disparate contexts and cultures, show translators conventionally understating their own skills so as to convince their audience that their translation is not about proving their own skills and virtues, but about upholding the cultural significance of the start text and the readers' learning.

Past translators' self-deprecatory preambles could be rhetorically conventional, but the ultimate purpose was often to establish their trustworthiness as intercultural mediators. This is evident in Andrea Negroni's 1594 petition to the Republic of Venice to be employed as the official dragoman following the death of Michiel Membré. In this letter, the interpreter reminds the government of his past loyal service:

> we went to the Pasha, where I did what befitted my loyalty, and stated clearly against the Turkish adversaries
>
> (quello, che conveniva alla mia fideltà, et con viva voce contra a li Turchi)[.][53]

Another example is Anne Locke's 1590 translation of Calvinist Jean Taffin's *Des marques des enfans de Dieu, et des consolations en leurs afflictions*, a work of spiritual reflection and comfort that was first published in 1584. Locke dedicated her translation to Anne Dudley, Countess of Warwick, a supporter of Locke and a committed evangelical Protestant. Locke's translation was motivated by political turmoil. Protestants were suffering from the religious wars raging in the Low Countries, and English Protestants were concerned that the same would happen in their country. This translation helped to support the Puritan cause.[54] Locke's description of the translation as a 'poore trauaile', and as having been requested by someone is compounded by her hope that her 'poore basket of stones' would strengthen the walls of Jerusalem: a modest posturing underscoring an ambitious religious disposition.[55] Locke declares she has translated according to her duty ('I haue according to my duetie'), thus aligning her self-presentation with the Aristotelian regimes of prudence and modesty.

In the foregoing examples, loyal service and duty are key claims made by translators and interpreters to assert their trustworthiness. Translation history has the potential make visible and interpret such strategies of persuasion, while also shedding light on the attitudes and expectations of translators and translations within and across cultures. In Chap. 1 we discussed the trust-signalling of Renaissance translators who made claims to be either *fidelis* (less skilled, subordinate to an authority) or *fidus* (trustworthy as an equal). Also in Chap. 1 we have noted comparable signalling by ancient Chinese translators. Here below we suggest that focussing on such rhetorical posturing and trust-signalling across cultural, linguistic, and social boundaries may point the way towards a history of translators' visibility not yet written.

From Thick to Thin Trust? A New History of Translators' Visibility

Translators' roles and practices prove to be remarkably different across time and cultures. Considering such a diversity of conceptions and understandings of who translators are and what they do, perhaps the most productive way to learn about shifts of intercultural mediatory roles across history is to follow Marc Bloch's now classic advice on comparative history: never link societies that are widely separated in time and space, and whose alleged similarities cannot be explained 'by mutual influence or by a common origin'.[56]

Translators and interpreters in the premodern Mediterranean world were learned or multilingual men and women who offered their skills to a patron, ruler, friend, or to agents of manuscript or print cultures (editors, printers, scribes). Face-to-face and written translations were often performed by the same people, and early modern European documents make no clear distinction between oral and written translation. Only from the sixteenth century onwards did 'dragomans' or 'interpreters' become distinct: the first term refers to official face-to-face interpreters employed, for instance, by the Venetian Board of Trade; the latter term described translators of written materials, and occasional or non-official (oral) interpreters.[57] In sixteenth-century Venice, several of the well-documented dragomans were captives and converts, but dragomans could also be members of well-off Venetian, Greek, or Ottoman families.

The professionalisation of interpreters is a relatively recent development in the long history of translation. By contemporary measures, it seems that premodern translators most closely approached some level of professional status in early modern China. Mongolian, Siamese, Persian, Burmese, and Muslim translators and interpreters, among others, worked in the Chinese imperial Translators' College (Siyi guan) and Interpreters' Station (Huitong guan) between 1407 and 1748. They were sourced from the Imperial Academy (Guozijian) or schools. All translators working in the College were subjected to an admission examination and some training.[58] At least two hundred years later, the interpreters who worked for Venetians *baili* (ambassadors based outside Venice) were apprenticed for several years before employment.[59] Translation formed an essential part of the training of speakers, politicians, intellectuals, and artists, especially in cities and towns of the Mediterranean world that sought to cultivate political and cultural independence. For instance, in sixteenth-century

Italy, 'interpreti e traduttori' were defined as 'teachers of languages' ('professori delle lingue'), and they were not distinguished from teachers, preachers, scholars, and everyday multilingual speakers.[60]

Typically, today, a profession is established and recognised on the basis of self-definition and control over expertise or popularity. Modern professionals are ascribed recognised attributes, such as 'high degree of systematic knowledge; strong community orientation and loyalty; self-regulation; and a system of rewards defined and administered by the community of workers'.[61] Twenty years ago, Lawrence Venuti argued that, since the seventeenth century, Anglo-American translators progressively lost their visibility before their readers. The growing invisibility of translators fostered the inconspicuousness of the foreign culture and the fluency and accessibility of content.[62] Yet not all translators are invisible, and not all cultures take the translator's and interpreter's invisibility for granted. In contemporary Iran, for instance, translators from English into Persian appear to have gained more cultural capital and social visibility than ever before.[63] Iran might be an exception, but it is a case that questions the linear history of invisibility suggested by Venuti. Indeed, possibly the smaller the language (contemporary Czech, for example), the greater the visibility of the main translators into that language: the names of translators stand a greater chance of appearing large type on book covers, and translators are more likely to be interviewed on television, for example, as commentators on what is happening in the major cultures. We know that the smaller the market for books in a particular language the greater the percentage of translations to non-translations in that market.[64] So when more than fifty per cent of the cultural products available are translations, some translators can become highly visible as opinion-makers, and the domain of translation can be an important cultural activity.[65]

From the perspective of translation history, the professionalisation of cultural mediation appears to have traded individuality and visibility for professionalism and invisibility. Pushing this hypothesis further, it might not be true that translators' agency is less visible today than in premodern Europe, especially if we look beyond Europe. It might simply be possible (hence worth exploring) that a different type of agency has progressively been made visible to the western client, namely the profession, the institution, and the publishing market as opposed to the personal skills, motivations, and claims of the translator. Behind the name of the translator, readers see the profession and the regimes of translation, followed by the approval of the publishing industry. The publishing industry invites the thin trust of the readers without any need for the translators to offer any personal detail beyond their names.

The point we are making here is that the alleged invisibility of translators in the West and in at least some parts of the East suggests that there are new narratives of translation to be written. These would benefit, we believe, from a turn towards the institutions and regimes of trust or distrust. In turn, this would make possible explorations of when and how, in translation history, the thick trust of interpersonal relationships (between translator and patron or reader) may have given way to institutional, thin trust—or the other way round, as suggested by the example from China discussed above. At least for the West, translation historians could seek to trace the 'self-annihilation' (Venuti's word) that translators may have variously imposed upon themselves.[66]

'Professionalisation' describes how the business of producing, transmitting, and receiving intercultural texts is driven by discrete and contextualised regimes and practices. Apart from at least one contemporary exception (Iran), professionalisation seems to have progressively restricted self-fashioning and persuasive strategies for the translating self.[67] Authors appeal to readers and publishing companies; translators tend to garner indirect connections with readers, and much more direct relations with clients such as publishing companies, governments, corporations, and translation and mediation services. The growing professionalisation of translators and interpreters is little considered in recent discussions about the translators' invisibility.

Can professionalism and individualism coexist? Recent research has addressed this question, but more research is needed to understand historically professionalism and individualism.[68] As already mentioned, histories of translation in China and Japan suggest that professionalism was established there before Europe, and that professionalism and individualism coexisted. Translators from Chinese into Japanese in early-eighteenth-century Nagasaki constituted a community of professionals who inherited their position, and were recognised within the tightly controlled jurisdiction of the Tokugawa shogunate.[69] Certainly, a Japanese translator such as Kanzan Okajima (1674–1728) managed to exploit personal and social forms of capital while also performing translation and interpreting 'professionally'. A different case is the already mentioned Translators' College (Siyi guan) in China (1467–1748), where teamwork mattered more than individual effort or recognition. In premodern Europe, translators (who were often also authors, editors, teachers, students) used conventions such a modesty, or fidelity to a 'hierarchy of production' (God, ancient authors, medieval exegetes, and translator) to promote their work and trustworthiness.[70] In the history of western translation it seems that trust was based on personal trust before it could turn into institutional trust. The medieval *accessus ad auctores* that prefaces texts visualised the line of production and the reputation of the agents who contributed to the afterlife of the translated text. A difference, we suggest, between now and then, at least in the West and in some realms such as literature and history, is not so much that visibility might have turned into invisibility, but that the focus of attention has, in the course of centuries, shifted from the trustworthiness of non-professional authors or mediators to the trustworthiness of the profession. In western Europe, some four hundred years ago, the reader was asked to trust at least one member of the line of production, whereas today, at least in the West, the reader or listener tends to be asked to trust the profession with its implied codes of practice, training, and values. At stake in the present is not the reputation of the translator but the repute of the intersecting institutions that produce professional and high-quality translations: publishing companies, systems of formal training and accreditation for translators, and the regimes regulating translation and interpreting.

The invisibility of the western translator is therefore less significant with respect to trust. Industrial standards for language-service companies seek to ensure quality not by evaluating the product (the translation) but by regulating the production *process*, for example by requiring that all translations be reviewed by someone other than the translator. The product is assumed trustworthy if the industrial process has been followed correctly. Such standards also seek to regulate translators not in terms of personal skills but through reference to institutional training or certification. In the catalogue of International Standards, for example, for ISO17100 (2015) 'Translation services', all translators covered by the standard must have 'a certificate of competence in translation awarded by an appropriate government body'.[71] The 'scandal' of invisibility exposed by Venuti seems, from this perspective, a matter of increased institutional supervision that claims a global scope.

Notes

1. Paul Cohen, 'Torture and Translation in the Multilingual Courtrooms of Early Modern France', *Renaissance Quarterly* 69 (2016), 899–939, at 911. Italics are in Cohen's article, and denote the use of Latin.
2. Carla Nappi, 'Full. Empty. Stop. Go: Translating Miscellany in Early Modern China', in *Early Modern Cultures of Translation*, ed. Karen Newman and Jane Tylus (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015), 212–227, at 224.
3. Marie-Alice Belle, 'At the Interface between Translation History and Literary History: A Genealogy of the Theme of "Progress" in Seventeenth-Century English Translation History and Criticism', *The Translator* 20 (2014): 44–63.
4. Thomas Gray (1716–1771): 'Progress of Poetry from Greece to Italy, and from Italy to England'. Quoted from *Eighteenth-Century Poetry: An Annotated Anthology*, ed. David Fairer and Christine Gerrard (London: John Wiley & Sons, 2014), 426.
5. William H. Jr. Sewell, *Logics of History. Social Theory and Social Transformation* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 76.
6. On pseudotranslation see at least Gideon Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 1995), 40–52; *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies: Investigations in Homage to Gideon Toury*, ed. Anthony Pym, Miriam Shlesinger, and Daniel Simeoni (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2008), especially 133–162; and James Thomas, 'Fabre d'Olivet's Le Troubadour and the Textuality of Pseudotranslation', in *Literary Translation. Redrawing the Boundaries*, ed. Jean Boase-Beier, Antoinette Fawcett, and Philip Wilson (Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 134–148.
7. Sewell, *Logics of History*, 329.
8. See for instance Andrea Rizzi, *Vernacular Translators in Quattrocento Italy. Scribal Culture, Authority, and Agency* (Turnhour: Brepols, 2017).
9. Sewell, *Logics of History*, 109.
10. Paul D. McLean, *Culture in Networks* (Cambridge, UK and Malden, MA: Polity Press, 2017), 24.
11. Sewell, *Logics of History*, 136.
12. We quote from Susan Miller, *Trust in Texts. A Different History of Rhetoric* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2008), 83.
13. Natalie Rothman, *Brokering Empire: Trans-imperial Subjects between Venice and Istanbul* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2012), 89.

14. Paul D. McLean, *The Art of the Network: Strategic Interaction and Patronage in Renaissance Florence* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007), 3.
15. Michael Cronin, *Translation and Globalisation* (London and New York: Routledge, 2003), 26, 42–75.
16. Anthony Pym, 'Cross-Cultural Networking: Translators in the French-German Network of *Petites Revues* at the End of the Nineteenth Century', *Meta* 52 (2007): 744–762. See also the other articles in the special issue on *La traduction et les études de réseaux/Translation and Network Studies*, ed. Hélène Buzelin and Deborah Folaron in *Meta* 52(4) (2007).
17. Anthony Pym, *Method in Translation History* (London and New York: Routledge, 2014, 1st ed. 1998), 91.
18. *Translating Knowledge in the Early Modern Low Countries*, ed. Harold J. Cook and Sven Dupré (Münster: Lit Verlag, 2012), 6.
19. See, for instance, Rothman, *Brokering Empire* and Pamela H. Smith and Paula Findlen, *Merchants & Marvels: Commerce, Science, and Art in Early Modern Europe* (London and New York: Routledge, 2002) and Simon Schaffer, *The Brokered World: Go-betweens and Global Intelligence, 1770–1820* (Sagamore Beach, MA: Science History Publications, 2009).
20. Ian Hacking, *Historical Ontology* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002), 172.
21. Pascale Casanova, 'Consécration et accumulation de capital littéraire', *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 144 (2002): 7–20, at 17.
22. See at least David McKitterick, *Print, Manuscript and the Search for Order, 1450–1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
23. See for instance Bernard Lewis, *From Babel to Dragomans. Interpreting in the Middle East* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 24–28.
24. Barbara H. Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2006), 14.
25. Theo Hermans, 'The Translator's Voice in Translated Narrative', *Target* 8 (1996): 23–48.
26. Brian Harris, 'Norms in Interpretation', *Target* 2 (1990): 115–119, at 118.
27. John Keane, *Public Life and Late Capitalism. Towards a Socialist Theory of Democracy* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 159. Source: Barbara A. Misztal, *Trust in Modern Societies. The Search for the Bases of Social Order* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1996), 12.
28. See Rosalind Edwards, Claire Alexander, and Bogusia Temple, 'Interpreting Trust: Abstract and Personal Trust for People Who Need Interpreters to

Access Services', *Sociological Research Online* 11 (2006): http://www.socresonline.org.uk/11/1/edwards.html (accessed 14 July 2018). See also Nike K. Pokorn and Jaka Čibej, '"Do I Want to Learn a Language Spoken by Two Million People?", Mediation Choices by Mid-Term and Long-Term Migrants', *Language Problems and Language Planning* 42 (2018): 308–327.

29. Denise M. Rousseau, Sim B. Sitkin, Ronald S. Burt, and Colin Camerer, 'Not So Different After All: A Cross-Discipline View of Trust', *Academy of Management Review* 23 (1998): 393–404, at 398. See also Guido Möllering, 'The Nature of Trust: From Georg Simmel to a Theory of Expectation, Interpretation and Suspension', *Sociology* 35 (2001): 403–420.
30. Susan Reynolds, *The Middle Ages without Feudalism. Essays in Criticism and Comparison on the Medieval West* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), 8.
31. Paolo Trovato, *Con ogni diligenza corretto. La stampa e le revisioni editoriali dei testi letterari italiani (1470–1570)* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1991). See also Brian Richardson, 'The Social Transmission of Translations in Renaissance Italy: Strategies of Dedication', in *Trust and Proof. Translators in Renaissance Print Culture*, ed. Andrea Rizzi (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2018), 13–32.
32. Michael Camille, *Image on the Edge: The Margins of Medieval Art* (London: Reaktion Books, 1992), 9. In some of these representations, monkeys mimic or parody the first sinners, and they signify Adam and Eve's becoming sinful and debased.
33. Kenneth Gouwens, 'Human Exceptionalism' in *The Renaissance World*, ed. John J. Martin (London and New York: Routledge, 2007), 415–434; Thomas M. Greene, *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), 147–170; Sebastian Brandt, *Narrenschiff* (*Ship of Fools*) (Basel: Johan Bergmann, 1494), 108; and Horst W. Janson, *Apes and Apes Lore* (London: Warburg Institute, University of London, 1952), 227 (n21). On Renaissance *imitatio*and translation see Frederick M. Rener, *Interpretatio. Language and Translation from Cicero to Tytler* (Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1989), 293–317; Martin M. McLaughlin, *Literary Imitation in the Italian Renaissance. The Theory and Practice of Literary Imitation in Italy from Dante to Bembo* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995); Rita Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Tradition and Vernacular Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); and Peter Mack, *A History of Renaissance Rhetoric 1380–1620* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).
34. This passage is from Coindreau's 'Credo du traducteur' published in *L'express* 1213 (1974): 74. The English translation is from http://culturesconnection.com/20-quotes-about-translation/ (accessed 10 October 2016).

35. Jacques Derrida, *Acts of Literature*, ed. Derek Attridge, trans. *Varii* (New York and London: Routledge, 1992), 17.
36. Salman Rushdie, *Shame* (London: Cape, 1983), 104. See Jenni Ramone, *Salman Rushdie and Translation* (London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2013), 45–46.
37. Robert of Kent, cited in Marie-Thérèse d'Alverny, 'Deux traductions latines du Coran au Moyen Âge', *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge* 16 (1947–1948): 69–131, at 80.
38. David Samuel Margoliouth, *Lectures on Arabic Historians* (New York: Lenox Hill, 1972, 1st ed. 1930), 58.
39. Theo Hermans, 'Positioning Translators: Voices, Views, and Values in Translation', *Language and Literature* 23 (2014): 285–301, at 299.
40. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud Translated from the German by James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud* (London: Hogarth Press, 1953–1974).
41. Rothman, *Brokering Empire*. For evidence of trust in dragomans, see 186. For distrust, see 168.
42. Hermans, 'Positioning Translators', 119.
43. Sharon Deane-Cox, *Retranslation: Translation, Literature and Reinterpretation* (London: Bloomsbury Academics, 2014), 34 and 48.
44. See, for example, Maria Teresa Turell, 'Textual Kidnapping Revisited: The Case of Plagiarism in Literary Translation', *International Journal of Speech, Language and the Law* 11 (2004): https://journals.equinoxpub.com/index.php/IJSLL/article/view/536 (accessed 3 March 2019).
45. Chuanmao Tian, 'Effects of Government Policy on the Retranslation Boom in the 1990s Mainland China and Beyond', *International Journal of English Language and Culture* 2 (2014): 12–17.
46. Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, trans. W. Rhys Roberts (New York: Dover, 2004), II.1, 7: 'The first [way of convincing the audience] depends upon the personal character of the speaker [*ethos*]; the second upon putting the audience into a certain frame of mind [*pathos*]; the third on the proof, or apparent proof, provided by the words of the speech itself [*logos*]'. See Marie-Alice Belle, 'Rhetorical *Ethos* and the Translating Self in Early Modern England', in *Trust and Proof. Translators in Renaissance Print Culture*, ed. Andrea Rizzi (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2018), 62–84, at 65–67.
47. On the influence of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in the development of early modern English prefatory epistle see Belle, 'Rhetorical *Ethos*'.
48. Susan Miller, *Trust in Texts*, 47.
49. We use term 'translatively' from Anthony Pym, *On Translation Ethics. Principles for Mediation between Cultures*, trans. Heike Walker (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2012), 61. The presence of the translator's voice in lexical and syntactic patterns has been studied by

forensic linguistics, for example in deciding accusations of plagiarism in translation. See note 44.

50. Birgit Lang, 'Psychoanalysts through Translation: Julien (Johan) Varendonck (1879–1924)–Anna Freud (1895–1982)', in *Brussels: 1900: Vienna*, ed. Piet Defraeye, Helga Mitterbauer, and Chris Reyns (Amsterdam: Brill, 2019).
51. Juan Miguel Zarandona, '*Amadis of Gaul* (1803) and *Chronicle of the Cid* (1808) by Robert Southey. The Medieval History of Spain Translated' in *Charting the Future of Translation History*, ed. Georges L. Bastin and Paul F. Bandia (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 2006), 309–332.
52. Rebekah Clements, *A Cultural History of Translation in Early Modern Japan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 168.
53. Rothman, *Brokering Empire*, 263–264.
54. Brenda Hosington, 'Tudor Englishwomen's Translations of Continental Protest Texts: The Interplay of Ideology and Historical Context', in *Tudor Translation*, ed. Fred Schurink (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 121–142, at 133–135.
55. Jean Taffin, *Of the Markes of the Children of God, and of Their Comforts in Afflictions. To the Faithfull of the Low Countrie*, trans. A. Locke (London, 1590), A4.
56. Marc Bloch, *Land and Work in Mediaeval Europe; Selected Papers* (London and New York: Routledge, 2015, 1st ed. 1967), 46.
57. Rothman, *Brokering Empire*, 166.
58. Nappi, 'Full. Empty. Stop'.
59. Rothman, *Brokering Empire*, 169.
60. Tommaso Garzoni, *La piazza universal di tutte le professioni del mondo* (Venice: Michiel Miloco, 1645, 1st ed. 1585), 349–350. See George McClure, *The Culture of Profession in Late Renaissance Italy* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004) which explores professional themes and the rhetoric of translation in early modern Italy.
61. Jo Anne Brown, *The Definition of a Profession. The Authority of Metaphor in the History of Intelligence Testing, 1890–1930* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 19.
62. Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* (London and New York: Routledge, 2008, 1st ed. 1995) and the response to Venuti's work in Anne E. B. Coldiron 'Visibility Now: Historicizing Foreign Presences in Translation', *Translation Studies* 5 (2012): 189–200.
63. We are grateful to Samira Saeedi for sharing with us her in progress doctoral research findings on translators in contemporary Iran. See also Esmaeil Haddadian-Moghaddam, *Literary Translation in Modern Iran. A Sociological Study* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2015).

64. Anthony Pym and Grzegorz Chrupala, 'The Quantitative Analysis of Translation Flows in the Age of an International Language', in *Less Translated Languages*, ed. Albert Branchadell and Lovell Margaret West (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2004), 27–38.
65. See Anthony Pym, 'On the Social and the Cultural in Translation Studies', in *Sociocultural Aspects of Translating and Interpreting*, ed. Anthony Pym, Miriam Shlesinger, and Zuzana Jettmarová (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2006), 1–25, at 25. These observations also concern whether it is possible to regard translation as a 'field' in Bourdieu's sense. When translators do assume publicly visible roles, they tend to enter into competition with each other and thus begin to satisfy the basic criteria for an activity to be considered a field.
66. See Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility*, 7: 'The translator's invisibility is thus a weird self-annihilation, a way of conceiving and practicing translation that undoubtedly reinforces its marginal status in British and American cultures'.
67. The professional history of conference interpreting is comparatively short. As a profession it began at the end of WWI. See Jesús Baigorri-Jalón, *From Paris to Nuremberg. The Birth of Conference Interpreting*, trans. Holly Mikkelson and Barry Slaughter Olsen (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing, 2014). On the much longer history of non-professional, global history of diplomacy and interpreting see Ruth Roland, *Interpreters as Diplomats. A Diplomatic History of the Role of Interpreters in World Politics* (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1999). On the porous boundaries between native, natural, and trained translators and interpreters see Luis Pérez-Gonzalez and Sebnem Susam-Saraeva, 'Non-professional Translating and Interpreting', *The Translator* 18 (2012): 149–165.
68. Andy L. J. Chan, 'Why are Most Translators Underpaid?', *Translation Journal* 9 (2005): http://www.translationjournal.net/journal/32asymmetric.htm (accessed 9 January 2019) and Kristiina Abdallah, 'Translators' Agency in Production Networks', in *Translators' Agency*, ed. Tujia Kinnunen and Kaisa Koskinen (Tampere: Tampere University Press, 2010), 11–46.
69. Emiko Okayama, 'A Nagasaki Translator of Chinese and the Making of a New Literary Genre', in *Translation and Translation Studies in the Japanese Context*, ed. Nana Sato-Rossberg and Judy Wakabayashi (London and New York: Continuum, 2012), 53–72, at 67. See also Rebekah Clemens, *A Cultural History of Translation in Early Modern Japan*, p. 175.
70. Coldiron, 'Visibility Now', 191.
71. ISO17100, *Translation Services—Requirements for Translation Services* (2015), https://www.iso.org/standard/59149.html (accessed 12 March 2019).

CHAPTER 3

On Relativity: Trusting Historians

Abstract Relativity, in the humanities, initially concerns the ways that an object can be seen differently from different perspectives. What you describe as a historian depends on where you are and why you are doing history, so your description is never a neutral or wholly objective portrayal. This chapter proposes that the way to live with relativity in translation involves accepting it, outing our personal and cultural involvement, and not shying away from the uncomfortable things of history. It also concerns critically revising facile assumptions of a confronted self and other, which in history are always more than a simple confrontation: they are, for example, complicated by the underlying dissemination of technologies, the spread of the western translation form, and the negotiation of translation regimes. This means that the positions from which we work, our assumed groundings, are themselves in translational movement. Awareness of these movements means that the task of translation history is not just to undo illusions of objectivity, but also to elaborate the possibilities of history as a mode of tracking and changing perceptions, and of keeping check on ourselves as we seek to change perceptions.

Keywords Translation history • Historical relativism • Translation technologies • Trust • Translation traditions

A. Rizzi et al., *What is Translation History?*, Translation History,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-20099-2_3

What we say as historians depends in the first place on where we are and why we are doing history. This can mean at least three things for translation history. First, we can be never entirely external, detached, or neutral with respect to this particular object. Second, the very positions from which we speak are in historical movement and thus to some extent translational in themselves. And third, we should not shy away from the bad things of our past, one of which might be the expansion of one particular translation form (and its mode of study) across virtually all others, a process that has gone strangely unseen.

Where Can Historians Find Trust?

Framed by uncertainty, translation presupposes positions of relative ignorance: the translation is ostensibly for someone who needs it or could need it. Any translative act would thereby assume a zone where people by definition share fewer common references than in non-translational communication; they can take less for granted. This means that not only is there no neutral position with respect to this object translation, but the object itself is born of potential suspicion, as an always imperfect and often unstable attempt to build knowledge. And the observer will not only be more one side than the other but will be cast into that position through asymmetric ignorance. The historian can thus scarcely remain detached or aloof, assuming some universal vision. One enters a world where everything moves and little is sure.

So how might one find a footing in such zones? Who or what can the historian trust? The sociology of Niklas Luhmann looks like it should be of some help here, since he has clever things to say about trust (notably as a 'reduction of complexity') and about virtually everything else. Except translation.[1] The problem is that Luhmann describes social systems as comprising nothing but communication, to the extent that between social systems there is, for him, in fact no communication but merely 'irritation', 'resonance', or 'dependence'.[2] This is worrying. What is translation if not communication between social systems? And yet Luhmann seems to be saying there is no such thing. Others have dealt with this problem by toning down the non-communication to the level of an 'intelligibility barrier' being crossed (Theo Hermans), or of 'semi-communication', at least, through a filter of some kind (Hans Vermeer).[3] Both are good metaphors. Yet something quite different and rather more interesting happens when Vermeer and Hermans effectively go beyond Luhmann and start to talk about translation as a developing system in itself. We may not actually need the term 'system' to describe that process ('culture', 'interculture', or 'community' might do) but if translation in itself is somehow a communicative network worthy of our historical attention, then the non-communication part would then logically concern its relations with *other* such entities, not necessarily across the binary divide between languages, the binarism instituted by a translation form. So what systems might translation be irritating, resonating against, or otherwise failing to communicate with? That might be where trust lies, for both translators and their historians.

Some answers surface in a series of case studies on Hispanic translation history.[4] In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, when teams were rendering Arabic science into Latin and then Romance, there seem to have been no Arabic scientists around to participate in the process: the translation teams comprised Jewish intermediaries and church Latinists, with a few Mozarab informants on occasional fringes (Arabic-speaking scientists were present in Rome in the sixteenth century, but here we pursue the twelfth-century case). There was indeed some kind of communication happening from Arabic to Latin; a border was being marked out with each successive rendition, in effect establishing the frontiers of Christendom and its thought processes; but the institutions that were irritating each other, the ones between which there was little effective understanding, were the adepts of proto-science (the translators and their readers) confronting the Church and later working for the Crown. When the translating teams sought to establish relations of trust, basically in order to have their projects financed and authorised, it was with bishops and kings that they had to negotiate, not with anything in the Arabic language. And as translation historians, it is thus not just the experts in Arabic that we have to trust, but more especially the historians of bishops and kings.

Similar frontiers can be found in other case studies. For example, in the bilingual legal system operating in Tlaxcala in Mexico in the sixteenth century, the colonised conducted trials in Nahuatl and the colonisers conducted trials in Spanish; interpreters were only being used when a colonial overseer (*corregidor*) actually attended the Mexica tribunals, which was for less than half the sessions.[5] So the translation was not really happening horizontally, between cultures on the same level, but hierarchically, within the legal system, as one part of the system kept tabs on the other. Trust was produced by and for the overseer, and once again it is the experts in that particular institutional history that we have to trust.

There are many variations here: translation can interact with any number of other social institutions. The important point is that the historical interaction (irritation, resonance, dependence) need not concern the two sides of the actual translation equation; the complexity to be reduced need not be the non-correspondence between language systems. When doing the history of trust, we are more likely to find the points of tension and resolution elsewhere. Further, as translation itself develops as an interculture, with its own regimes, it tends to gain greater social power as a social entity in its own right, and thus more capacity to interact authoritatively with other institutions.

Thus the decisive contribution from Luhmann might not be a certain propensity to see systems everywhere, but a theoretical explanation of why it is so hard to get outsiders to appreciate the complexity and uncertainty of translation. Just try to get a judge to understand why, around the world, some Indigenous language practices allow gratuitous affirmation (it is polite to say 'yes' to everything a superior says). A legal system will necessarily depend on translators and interpreters, but it is rarely disposed to interact with the internal workings of their decisions. It mostly finds it more efficient to accept renditions at face value. Trust, as the early Luhmann puts it, is indeed a mechanism for reducing complexity: rather than communicate with the inner complexity of translation, some simply chose to trust what translators say.

So where is trust? In theory it can be found in any of the relations that translators have with those around them, and not merely with those on the authorial side of business. How should we look for it? Luhmann offers a very practical clue: '[t]rust only has a social value when there is the possibility of distrust'.[6] That is, look for the instances of doubt, uncertainty, questioning, indeed irritation between systems. That is where the potential for distrust lies, and thus a social role for trust.

When engaging in that kind of questioning, it is important that we not exclude spoken translation ('interpreting') from our field of inquiry, either directly, when audio and visual materials are available, or indirectly, when it can be inferred from written documents—Cohen does this in his study of torture practices in early modern France.[7] In spoken mediation, the relations between participants are more evident, the actual or inferred negotiations are thus easier to construct, and the reasons for trust and distrust can be located with more certitude. This is to the extent that spoken interactions can be characterised by what might be termed 'proximity of alternative action', potentially violent: what would happen if the translation were *not* there? What would happen if the rendition were otherwise? When the possibility of communicative failure is relatively close, the reasons for seeking trust are more likely to be at hand.[8] Orality assumes that proximity.

Where Does the Historian Speak From?

The problematics of trust on the level of the translator are, as intimated, partly repeated on the level of the historian. In particular, the discursive trickery of feigned neutrality and transparency is no less operative in the historian's account of the past than it is in the translator's account of an anterior text. In both cases, the posturing that can aspire to what we have called 'thin trust' may conceal not just chains of interpretation and intervention, but also problematic personal involvement. We propose that, in the case of history writing (if not of translation across the board), our positions as speakers should not be hidden. Subterfuge is not the only way of gaining and maintaining trust: there are 'thicker' kinds of trust that can appreciate what we do as people. Some minor outing is called for.

Let us propose that the reasons why we do translation history usually have little to do with a desire for neutrality or transparency. They more often concern a personal engagement with translations and translators, which were operative in the past but have now become, for the moment, things on the table in front of us. As soon as we start to interact with a particularly translational object, we cannot help but think from a particular position. This is because, since there are necessarily at least two sides in any translation, often more, we will be situated more one side than the other, in accordance with our provenance and aspirations. There is no neutral position.

Is there any simple way to overcome our initial positionality? Teamwork can indeed help moderate personal positions but by no means removes the problem. As we make timid forays into the history of translation between English and Chinese, to take a non-random example, we become increasingly aware that we do so as scholars for whom a variety of English is a first language, in the context of a western European educational heritage; that is, more on one side than the other, engaged in a process of discovering our westernness. This does not hold in all cases, of course: we could come from bilingual and bicultural families, or more easily, we can and do seek to work with fellow historians whose backgrounds mirror ours: more Chinese than western. Some kind of equilibrated debate might indeed be claimed through teamwork (in research as in translating), but neutrality is something else. In the discussions that we initiate *within* teams, the problem of positionality reappears, further complicated by internal power relations. And then different teams themselves take up different positions.

There are two substantial debates to be engaged in here. The first concerns the degree to which personal involvement invites us to manipulate the past. The second has to do with the idea that there is a scientific testing process that is larger than all of us.

The Historian In-the-Present

Personal engagement ensues from the idea that all history is written in the present.[9] That is, history is necessarily done in relation to data (including memories) and people (including clients, readers, and other historians) that all exist in the time and communicative range of the historian, albeit with a necessary imaginary projection towards future engagements, effects, and actions. There is no actual dialogue with the past, since the past is only a construct based on things in the present. To be sure, those things on the table have been put there, or maintained, by the social expenditure of energy, and that energy has been directed by ideological interests of all kinds—if something is easily available to us, someone has probably wanted it to be available. Only some cultures store written documents in vast libraries; only selected memories are transmitted from generation to generation, and the larger cultures of our time have tended to store and transmit in conformity with monolingual mindsets, which makes our task all the more meaningful and urgent.

So one needs to take account of the ideologies that underlie the presence of data, often ideologies that work in the interests of large centralised cultures, frequently to the exclusion of intercultural dependencies and minor mediators like translators. Our own position is by no means neutral, but neither are the positions of the things on the table. This means that translation history can require that one actively seek out the marginal, the hidden, the implicit, the concealed, the repressed, always as interaction in the present. It also implies that historians are working with their own interests and motivations, in cooperation or conflict with other interests and motivations, to seek out and present alternative explanations of data.

This view has been misinterpreted as meaning that you can use history to simply project your own opinions and preferences on the past. The historian-in-the-present would perhaps be an incessant manipulator of external facts. Sergia Adamo, for example, opposes the historian-in-the-present to a microhistorical approach that would have the researcher somehow cleanse themselves of all personal interests and immerse themselves in descriptions of the 'utterly alien': we enter the details of daily life in the past, eschewing the grand narratives and following the intricate enmeshments of power, ideas, and practices on the level of individual life.[10] This insistence on the specific, this resistance to assumed system, the delight in the complex detail that speaks to many forces, all that is very necessary in translation history and provides its own moments of intrigue and fascination. It can indeed draw variously on microhistory, where the great example remains Carlo Ginzburg, on *Alltagsgeschichte*, on a new cultural history 'from below', and indeed on actor-network theory and other approaches inspired by the detailist moment of Michel Serres and Gilles Deleuze.[11] It is very much welcome in translation history.

That deep, intimate engagement with the details of a complex object should more or less automatically put in check any facile instrumentalisation of history, and it by no means contradicts the idea that all history is done in the present. Yet that kind of research has very little to do with encountering the 'utterly alien', as Adamo puts it, not any more than it involves projecting yourself on the past and somehow abandoning the present. It can more intimately arouse a sense of *not* knowing the experience that lies somewhere beyond the available documents, indeed of *never* being able to know that experience of the other. The historical object is difficult to instrumentalise because it remains constantly elusive.

To illustrate the point, here we pick up and compare two quite different case studies: the first on the legendary School of Translators in twelfth-century Toledo, and the second on Henri Albert's French translations of Friedrich Nietzsche in the late nineteenth century.[12] Both studies began from close attention to documents, including not only translations but also anything pertaining to the personal and social milieux of the translators. In the Toledo study, this was particularly difficult to trace because of all the mediating ideologies and technologies that had to be encountered and compensated for. Who *wanted* to find a school in Toledo? Why did Francis Bacon stress a *certain kind of* learning there? Why did *French* writers then insist on the role of a *French* archbishop? Who had reasons to interpret selected documents in certain ways, to lie by omission, or to bend truths to please demanding clients? It is very hard to see through all the mediating interests. The same holds, for that matter, in Ginzburg's microhistory of the sixteenth-century miller Menocchio, whose experience has to be inferred from the Inquisition's written account of his oral interrogation and in view of his own very limited writing skills.[13] The history is not of his personal 'cosmos', as Ginzburg suggests in his title, but of attempts to glean it from encounters with mediating writings.

In the case of Henri Albert, the elusive status of the historical object actually ensues from what seems *not* to be said in the documentary evidence: a certain concealment of the translator's intercultural status (he was from German-occupied Strasbourg), the playing of a double personality (he reviewed German literature in France and French literature in Germany), and an elusive sexuality (important at certain points in Nietzsche translations). In an ideal world, more research would give more answers to all these questions. From a very practical perspective, though, you rationalise personal investment in the search: Yes, let us get closer to the experience of the other, in theory, but at what cost? Should one go to Strasbourg in search of Henri Albert's personal archive? To discover what kind of value? Why invest time, effort, and money in *this* translator rather than any other? Who would finance the research? Who would want to publish it? Who would read it? Rather than encounter the 'utterly alien', one runs into practical constraints on many levels.

Translation history works from utterances in situations, but the translation historian is also producing utterances in situations. And at each such encounter, one necessarily *bets* on a possible outcome. In the Toledo study, one of the underlying wagers (investing time and effort) was that oral translation performed in an intercultural group was indistinguishable from a teaching activity. In the Nietzsche study, the bet was that the French translator was hiding his own Germanic past in order to advance in Parisian literary circles, and so on. Each bet involves an expenditure of effort of some kind, but each also projects hypothetical rewards. And at some points the efforts are so high, and/or the rewards so low, that the bet is called off and you move on to something else. There might be an 'utterly other' somewhere out there, but we rarely have world enough or time to meet it.

So why should a historian place such bets? Because, as noted, we have our own interests and motivations, inescapably. One can *bet* that the twelfth-century translation activities were profoundly intercultural, rather than a matter of Hispanic or Gallic glory, and that can be part of a wider bet that translators in general belong to intercultures, which in turn can contribute to an attempt to develop an intercultural ethics for translators as such. In the Nietzsche case, the wider bet was actually that certain nationalist translation practices blocked the possibility of a 'United States of Europe' in the 1890s (it *was* a possibility) and that this contributed to half a century of conflict. Those were wider ideas, looking for wider disciplines.

To place a bet does not mean that you find what you are looking for. Far from it. In both these particular cases, the research actually finished up documenting the *defeat* of the very ideas the historian wanted to champion: Hispanic cultures periodically expelled their intermediaries and instilled monocultural ideals, and French intellectuals received a non-Germanic Nietzsche and sought no *entente* with Germanic culture—Europe headed towards its most disastrous wars. In the engagement with primary documents, in the construal of utterance in situation, you must be prepared to test your desires against evidence, to find that you are wrong, that other bets may have greater chances of paying off, or that more work is needed. Those things on the table seem inanimate but they can indeed say no to you.

These basic epistemological problems concern all research. One of the classic formulations comes from sociolinguistics, where William Labov described the 'observer's paradox' as the attempt to observe language systematically as if it were not being observed systematically.[14] If you can resolve the paradox, you can perhaps claim to be objective. There are several ways to try to do this: you can hide (putting microphones under sofas); you can make people speak so intensively that they forget they are being observed; you can use several different observers and observational situations; and so on. In the 1970s those kinds of things seemed acceptable. These days, though, most human sciences would tend to accept that research is an action that cannot help but affect the object of knowledge, that people should not be spied on without their consent, and that it is better openly to enlist participation in the co-creation of knowledge. That may seem not to apply in the field of history, since the people we think we are observing are usually no longer around. But if we accept, as proposed, that the things and people we work with are actually in our present, then something like the observer's paradox does indeed apply to all our dealings with the people who help us do history: we observe the object as if *we* were not being observed (and as if that second level of observation had no influence on the first). We return to this below.

A Universal Testing Ground?

An alternative solution to the observer's paradox is to insist that, no matter where observations come from, they can then be tested repeatedly in many different situations such that false hypotheses will be rejected and a general scientific consensus should eventually emerge. For Andrew Chesterman, some of the problems of relativity are thus solved:

> Hypotheses and theories can emerge anywhere, in a given context of discovery, but they are assessed anywhere they can be assessed, in a universalist context of justification. There is no added value in assessing them specifically in country or culture X, any more than there is added value in the fact that they were first formulated in country or culture Y.[15]

This seems to make sense in fields like medical research (although there are still many different medical cultures). But is it what happens in translation history?

Let us begin with the idea that there is an 'added value' because of provenance. If a Chinese colleague can cite Chinese *chengyu* or elaborate something from Tai Chi (Martha Cheung's 'pushing hands', for example, has become an intriguing model for translation history), her Chinese publishers and readers will be happier than if she risked an allusion to Shakespeare or Herodotus. Actually, they might be even happier if a non-Chinese speaker cited the *chengyu* or Tai Chi, perhaps as a form of cultural homage from the outside.[16] In the late nineteenth century, things could have been quite the opposite, of course: anything European was likely to have carried more weight in Chinese argument. Provenance can indeed give added value, even before any moment of testing. To ignore this seems tantamount to believing in a world without separate cultures—which in turn defeats one of the foundations of translation history. The way we are observed necessarily influences the way we observe history.

So what about what Chesterman calls 'hypotheses and theories'? The exploring of large-scale hypotheses, for example those concerning the tendencies of retranslations or perhaps of indirect translations, does indeed allow for testing in many case studies, and certain generalised principles may indeed emerge.[17] That process of testing, however, also allows for the opposite kind of result: we soon find the numerous *other* factors and principles that make successive retranslations diverge or converge, or the many *other* reasons that produce pseudotranslation and indirect translations. Chesterman's search for understanding would apparently test the hypotheses, note the result, and move on to more testing, without necessarily delving into the complex local reasons why the hypothesis does or does not apply in a given situation: his 'universalist context of justification' can be used to locate cultural differences but also risks extracting the gold only to leave behind the history. His interest is indeed overtly in a certain kind of detached, neutral-looking scientific research—mostly of the kind that has little time for bottom-up involvement individual situations. There is no neutrality in translation history, no paradise in which 'hypotheses and theories' live independently of provenance and evaluation.

Our Positions, For Example

What does the notion of 'position' entail? It is not just a question of inheriting a culture or two. Here we write in English, as residents of Australia, in reference mainly to European cultures, with occasional reference to China and Japan as token others (not randomly selected: they are Australia's major trade partners). That might be one sense of a position: a point from which to see the rest of the world, perhaps a set of blinkers to be confessed and accounted for. It is from such points that we see the changes of history. However, on the level of centuries and millennia, beyond our limited biographies, that position assumes reference points that are themselves fundamentally unstable. The English language that we speak from is a compound of Romance and Germanic whose current form is hard to make out in what was spoken a thousand years ago; Australia had no European presence just 250 years ago; and we have five passports between us, with more years spent outside Australia than in. In terms of languages and culture, the ground we think we are standing on is in fact moving, sometimes fast in times of regime change, but mostly so slowly as to be virtually imperceptible, like continental plates. Yet it is moving nonetheless. And it is doing so thanks to processes of cultural expansion, contraction, dominance, subservience, absorption, extinction, immigration, and other acts of personal and collective mobility, processes in which translation is variously involved.

That is not to say (as do some) that all those movements are themselves 'translation', on the same level as our interest in the translating of texts. One of the terms for this conceptual bundling is 'cultural translation', about which there are so many fantastic usages and claims that we cannot go into them here.[18] Suffice to say that we do not presume that our histories are able to offer some arcane expert knowledge of all kinds of movements; we are not specialists in everything (which is precisely why we have to trust other researchers at almost every turn). Yet translation can play a special role in the study of those wider processes, and not just because the texts on the table provide a special kind of irreducible empirical evidence, constantly offering more than our reductive hypotheses. There is also a properly epistemological reason for claiming a special place at the table.

Consider, for a moment, the fact that text translation has the particular honour of being the major problem for Willard V. Quine's thought experiment of 1960 intended to explore indeterminacy. Consider, too, the way text translation is referred to as the 'extreme case' of interpretative difficulty in Hans-Georg Gadamer's hermeneutics.[19] The philosophers were not great translation historians, nor great translators, but they might be telling us something nevertheless. If there is something special in translation, it is likely to be in the degree to which it requires interpretative decisions framed by extreme forms of *uncertainty*. The principles at stake—epistemological indeterminacy and the need for engaged interpretation—certainly apply across the board, to all communicative acts, but they become especially visible in the case of translation, simply because the passage from one language to another involves fewer shared referents and thereby greater interpretative risks than communication within the one language. We thus recognise that translation is marked by exceptional uncertainty, and that this uncertainty similarly concerns the very positions from which we believe we speak. In so doing, of course, we also explain why the principles of trust are of special importance in the case of translation, since it is only when we are uncertain about probable misunderstanding or betrayal that we need to trust. So no, we cannot offer expert knowledge of all the movements in the world, but yes, we might be able to propose a way of thinking about them in terms of positionality and trust.

Let us consider two particular ways in which translation informs our own positionality: the marking of borders and the expansion of technologies.

Borders Instituted Through Translations

Imagine, if you will, a text being pushed and pulled by various forced across time and space—let us say a Buddhist sutra, the 1848 political pamphlet known as *The Communist Manifesto*, or the word-processing computer program Microsoft Word. The trajectories of the text are not random: people are transforming, interpreting, and reinterpreting it as it moves from language to language. Some translation processes will affect this incrementally: successive oral retellings introduce more or less constant modifications and adaptations, to suit clients, audiences, or creative license; manuscript copying similarly enacts countless incremental modifications and updates; software localisation and updating runs through series of versions and market adaptations, each only partially covering the previous. Some acts of translation, though, strongly mark out a time and place of language change: one language version stops on this side, another continues on the other, and the linguistic space of those sides is not shared in the wider frame of text use.

In the Song Dynasty, Buddhist sutras went into Chinese along with not just glosses, spoken explanations, and question-and-answer follow-ups, but also music and perfumes so that the appropriate atmosphere was created for their understanding. There was one side, then the other, and a highly marked place of transition. *The Communist Manifesto* by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels is similarly cited and re-cited in spoken fragments and reworked into political tracts and inspired speeches across the globe, mostly forgetting the languages it has been transmitted through, but then there are also printed book publications that clearly mark the points where the whole text has been rendered from one language to another. And most computer software, although internally a conglomerate of old and new code, comes in clearly distinct language versions, at least with respect to user-visible strings. In all these cases, there are background translational activities constantly at work in the transmission of text, but there are also specially indicated points at which translations, perhaps in a fuller sense of the term, mark out the places where one language stops and another starts, and they do so in both space and time. That is, some translations mark points of reference for their own history.

This has a practical importance for the ways in which translation history can be organised. When deciding questions of periodisation or regionalisation, we can look at the points marked out by translations themselves, particularly in terms of intensities of translation flows. Where is the border between the fourteenth-century English poet Geoffrey Chaucer and contemporary English? At the points where Chaucer is *translated* into contemporary English. Where was the border between Islamic and Christian science in the twelfth century? At the points where translations were done in Hispania, especially in Toledo. These borders are made up of points, not continuous lines, since they do not represent the presumed ownership of territory or mandate. And those points move with time, shifting the very grounds on which we presume to stand. To use translations as the markers for our periodisation or cultural limits means operating in a non-linear world where everything is in movement. Physics has accepted something like this relativity since Albert Einstein published his theory of relativity in 1905, but many of us are still navigating by the limited movements of the stars.

When you enter these moving geometries, you soon discover that you are not alone. Others are also seeking orientation in terms of translations as points. The Vatican II theory of 'inculturation', for example, has become Catholic parlance for what Protestants more generally call 'adaption'. It is linguistically a matter of adapting Christian texts to non-Christian cultures: 'the incarnation of the Gospel in autonomous cultures', as Pope John Paul II put it in his 1985 encyclical 'Slavorum Apostoli'.[20] This could be a case of simple cultural imperialism, imposing Christian culture wherever you go. The theory of inculturation nevertheless tempers the invasion with two defenses.

First, John Paul II's encyclical on the ninth-century translators Cyril and Methodius takes pains to point out that their linguistic work, including the establishment of the Slavonic alphabet, 'made a fundamental contribution to the culture and literature of all the Slav nations'.[21] That is, the standardisation of languages, the translation of authoritative religious texts, can assist the survival not just of the invading ideology but also the receiving cultures. The Pope's account is certainly tendentious, but it remains a hypothesis that can be tested historically on other cases. In many contexts, when missionary committees decide which language variety will receive translated scriptures, they implicitly condemn other varieties to moribund status.

Second, and more interestingly, John Paul II recognised that the concept of inculturation envisages 'also the introduction of these [autonomous] cultures into the life of the Church'.[22] That is, the act of translation changes not just the other but also the self. In a few moments of great lucidity, which can happen in complex institutions, the Catholic church sees itself as the product of a sequence of historical translations. In the instruction document *Varietates Legitimae* (1994) we find an introductory reflection on the 'Process of Inculturation throughout the History of Salvation':

> The people of Israel throughout its history preserved the certain knowledge that it was the chosen people of God, the witness of his action and love in the midst of the nations. It took from neighboring peoples certain forms of worship, but its faith in the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob subjected these borrowings to profound modifications […]. The encounter between the Jewish world and Greek wisdom gave rise to a new form of inculturation: the translation of the Bible into Greek introduced the word of God into a world that had been closed to it and caused, under divine inspiration, an enrichment of the Scriptures.[23]

And so on throughout the history of the church. Such perception of the translative self is certainly not a constant in theology: it is often a discussion of which self one wants to be. Pope Benedict XVI, for example, made much of the Hellenisation of Jewish belief (he describes the Greek Septuagint not as a satisfactory translation of the Bible but 'an independent textual witness') and argued against successive attempts to dehellenise the church, in fact arguing that faith cannot be separated from reason and science.[24] In linguistic questions of translation, the early 'dynamic equivalence' instruction *Comme le prévoit* posits an open kind of interculturality and accepts that a 'translation of the liturgy […] often requires cautious adaptation'.[25] By contrast, the later instruction document *Liturgiam authenticam* (2001) opens relatively little prospect for self-transformation:

> The work of inculturation, of which the translation into vernacular languages is a part, is not therefore to be considered an avenue for the creation of new varieties or families of rites; on the contrary, it should be recognized that any adaptations introduced out of cultural or pastoral necessity thereby become part of the Roman Rite, and are to be inserted into it in a harmonious way.[26]

It is not hard to argue that the theory of inculturation provides little more than fanciful justification for cultural invasion. In the historical transition from liberal to conservative definitions of the Catholic translative self, scant mention is made of any rights or priorities of other cultures—they are by definition 'enriche' by salvation, so it seems, so they might as well stay silent in their gratitude.[27] There remains, however, a certain admirable self-awareness in the description of imperialism from within, as the positions are seen to be in movement and exteriority is denied. The institution grows by being translated and receiving translations, over long stretches of time, without fixed lines separating the sides of the translations.

Does inculturation apply just to the Catholic Church? Can similar movements, the same moral problematics, be found elsewhere? Much the same mode of thought could be applied to most of the world's empires and expansive economic systems, few of them as stable and long-lasting as the Catholic Church: capitalism, the European Union, liberal humanism, modernity, information technology, and so on, including publishing in English and the international system of universities—the very institutions we are working in. And if inculturation is a process of absorption and transformation, then it is not hard to find its opposites, since these kinds of institutions also historically break up or decompose, with translations then marking out series of minor regionalisms or fragments—history is littered with defunct empires and ideological systems, whose translations tell the story.

Once you start to think in these terms, translation is only poorly portrayed as an affair of just two sides. The two sides are indeed there, in the constitution of all those border points by the 'fuller' kinds of translations, but the history also lies in the ways the things being ostensibly separated are themselves also in movement. This quite simple point also has an ethical dimension. In the spirit of the 'utterly alien', a certain pessimistic moralisation presupposes a fundamental human situation where the self faces the other: the translator faces the text, or the author, or the foreign culture, or the other language. In the wake of Levinas, the ethical challenge would be to interact with that other as a completely independent person, rather than as an object that can be understood in terms of what one already knows.[28] These terms appear in Antoine Berman's critique of domestication as 'ethnocentric translation' and his call for close attention to the letter of the foreign text: 'the ethical act consists in recognising and receiving the Other as Other'.[29] The ethics of alterity thus assumes solid and separate initial positions, apparently to be respected as eternal. In terms of a historical model like inculturation, though, those initial positions are never separate—translation has already taken place—and so it is illusory to seek any moral superiority in retaining cultural alterity, in effectively *denying* that the other can find a place in the position of the self. Berman wanted the translator to receive foreign authors as if in a welcoming inn for travellers from afar ('l'auberge du lointain'), each foreigner marked with their difference, like a star on clothing—he was not offering them full citizenship in mainstream French society.[30] Most mobile cultures are now loath to be detained in specially designed inns.

This is not to say that expansive translative institutions are to be in any way justified or considered the one true path to universal enlightenment. Far from it—many very bad things come from cultural expansion! Large-scale translation history can nevertheless help undo the elegiac simplicities of idealist ethics.

The Consequences of Technology

The question of positionality is also affected by the wider drivers of historical change, notably technologies, particularly those of communication. Once people adopt a new technology and do not go back, the change can be permanent and far-reaching. The horse, gunpowder, the printing press, the internet: the major technologies change not just the way we do things but also the relations of production and their ideological consequences. It is basic Marx:

> The hand-mill gives you society with the feudal lord; the steam-mill gives you society with the industrial capitalist. In accord with their material productivity, people establish not just their social relations but also principles, ideas, and categories.[31]

We now know that there are few fatalities in history; the mechanics of Marxism work at best for some of the big things, on the scale of centuries. But there is no technological fatality: you can still ride a bicycle to work. Then again, when people do not want to go back, something fundamental changes, in more than one way and often in accordance with logics that are not entirely foreseeable. In the face of improving machine translation, for example, translators can indeed become posteditors, but they can also shift their work into high-level rewriting, promotional activities, and cross-cultural consulting—indeed, all the kinds the language services that are *not* well served by postedited machine translation. In a social context where virtually everyone has access to free online machine translation, where translation becomes a widespread social activity rather than a narrow professional reserve, translators should have a clear economic interest in doing more than translate.[32] The very nature of their social and professional status thus changes. The one thing we cannot do, as historians or educators with a historical conscience, is sideline technologies as transitory deviations from the one true nature of high-level professional translation, as if romantically extolling the virtues of a cottage industry amidst the throes of the industrial revolution.

The kinds of changes that we see now in the impacts of machine translation can be mapped onto changes of similar dimensions ensuing from previous technologies. What were the consequences of translating on paper rather than parchment? This transition coincided with the court-based institutionalisation of translation in Baghdad in the ninth century and again in Castile in the thirteenth century. The cheaper support no doubt marginally made control easier, favoring a written rather than spoken process of collaborative redaction, to the point where Castilian King Alfonso the Learned is said to have 'cut out' (*tollo*) bad sentences and 'put in' (*puso*) good ones, without any noted knowledge of the start language Arabic.[33] The royal client could revise on paper, in writing, but not quite so readily on parchment. In passing, the existence of paper-based drafts also gave rise to a slightly wider distribution of translated texts, as nobles would receive the unfair copies.

Of greater consequence, of course, was impact of the printing press. On the scale of centuries—by no means immediately—Johannes Gutenberg's machine led to the establishment of fixed start texts, and thus to an object to which one could be faithful or equivalent, at the same time as it led to the standardisation of national languages. So it makes sense in this case to talk about translation going from one language to another, rather than operating incremental jumps. The press also led to new forms of institutional control over what could be published and distributed in those languages. Much later, the steam printing press provided books at prices suitable for wider readerships and the ideal of universal education, all of which opened new markets for translations that could be based on ideals of equivalence or accuracy in standard centralised languages. When John Milton asks why popular novels translated into Brazilian Portuguese almost never attempt to reproduce dialectical variation, one of his main answers is that the translations were being used to teach people to read.[34]

As electronic communication takes over from the printing press, we should not be surprised to see the norms of equivalence and accuracy being challenged, in some cases in ways that recall pre-print incremental translation practices.[35] The important point, though, is that the basic technologies change our ideas about what translation is or should be. When tracing the consequences of technology, Marx continued: 'the categories [of ideas and principles] are no more eternal than are the relations of production they express; they too are historical and transitory products'.[36] Technologies underlie the nature of what we study and how we think about it.

The Western Translation Form

Any half-serious investigation along these lines should show that different cultures have different translation practices and thus different ideas about what constitutes a valid translation (we will call this a 'translation form'). This is not, however, a history of differences facing each other across a void. If we take to heart the fundamental role of technologies, we should not be surprised to see the international spread of the printing press, and then especially of steam technologies, as taking with it certain ideas about what a translation should be. Without falling into the trap of any one-to-one mapping, it is at least intriguing to consider that transport by steam train and steam boat required new degrees of accuracy in timetables and human movement: for Lewis Mumford, the key technology of the modern industrial age was actually not the stream engine but the clock, not because it was invented but because it was allowed to rule social life.[37] Further, international transport and communication (ships, trains, and telegrams) required clear time zones (Greenwich Mean Time was adopted internationally in 1871), with assumed temporal homogeneity within each zone. The world was thus divided into separate geographical and temporal spaces, each with a clear geographical and temporal line around them.

Prior to the technological need for bordered spaces, frontier regions could be relatively fluid and porous, allowing for overlapping ownership and multiple sovereignty; communities could live in spaces whose linguistic limits could be negotiated in translations of the discontinuous, non-incremental kind. Naoki Sakai cites the case of Siam, where the presence of the French and English required the adoption of territorial cultural practices, one of which was the use of something like western-style translation to mark out the frontiers of languages. One can find similar examples in India.[38]

The spread of modernity involved not just technologies, communication practices, social mobility, and pronounced relations of cross-cultural dominance. In that mess of factors, one of the things that travelled out from Europe was a conceptualisation of translation as involving just two sides, a relation of quantitative co-variance (if the start text is longer, so is the translation), and eclipse of the translator's voice (the person who says 'I' is assumed to be the author, not the translator). This western translation form travelled outwards along paths that are yet to be traced and for reasons that are associated with modernity in many different ways. One can note the instances in which translation historians have recorded the arrival of the form as something substantially new: in Japan in the eighteenth century, in South Asian Islamic literatures in the eighteenth century, in the Indian subcontinent from the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, in the Ottoman Empire in the late nineteenth century.[39] There is no guarantee that all these reports concern exactly the same phenomenon. But they do seem to indicate that the kind of translation we easily take for granted is a profoundly historical phenomenon, moving along the lines opened up by steam. And just us the western translation form has travelled, so has the academic discipline that was developed to study it—admittedly several generations later, but moving along roughly the same paths nevertheless.

Many of us have been so busy looking at individual situations in the past, trying to build up complete collections of data, or testing abstract universalist hypotheses that we have failed to see our own secular history. We thought we were standing on a firm idea of what translation is. But that is not so. When we look at the translations in front of us and the translations that constitute where we are, we realise that there is no ground that is groundless: translation above as below.

Reflexivity (Dialogue with Ourselves)

Roberto Valdeón opens his *Translation and the Spanish Empire in the Americas* with an account of the 'black legend', the widespread narrative that everything Spain did in its colonies was morally bad.[40] Valdeón traces how the legend started from Bartolomé de Las Casas's 1552 description of how the Spanish had destroyed the peoples and cultures of the Caribbean. That account is described as a 'fiction' whose subsequent translations into English, French, and Dutch spread the idea that Spanish had effectively massacred the docile and pacifist pre-Columbians of the entire continent. The English and Dutch regimes then used that account, manipulating translations of Las Casas, to justify their own colonialisations as being morally superior to Spain's. The 'black legend', says Valdeón, would thus be a widespread tale of bigotry that not only overlooks the Spanish voices (and subsequent laws) that sought justice for the indigenous populations, but also falsely homogenises and idealises the supposedly pacific existence of indigenous populations prior to the empire. Valdeón calls for more 'balanced academic accounts' that consider evidence from all sides of the encounters, refusing to accept unified cultures or moral innocence on any one side.[41] That plea is justified by a certain historical practice: as soon as you draw as close to raw data, in this case the basic texts of the empire, some degree of nuance tends to ensue as a matter of course. History is complex on all sides, and complete innocence is very hard to find.

Then again, that kind of justification of history, invoking nothing but comparative iniquities, is a not a good place to start from and could be a terrible place to finish—no one is going to win from it. The critique of extreme legend all too easily leaks into contextual justification, cultural complacency, and a certain reluctance to look further: Surely it was *all* a fiction, after all? Somehow the Hispanic discourse on the black legend has magically wiped the historical slate clean, enabling reborn pride in past conquests, with scarcely a trace of historical guilt. As soon as the Spanish conquest is viewed in negative terms, especially by a foreigner, the immediate defence is: 'Black Legend! You're not going to accuse us yet again!'

Black is black: the Spanish conquest of the Americas incurred genocide, significant ethnocide, and clear linguacide, reducing some six thousand languages at the time of contact to a handful today. Certainly no less justified historical shame should be attached to our own inherited culture, since the colonialisation of Australia can also be seen in terms of genocide, ethnocide, and major language death.[42] Black is black, on whatever side you look, and translation (and active non-translation) has been implicated in all those iniquitous processes. To seek contextual justification, to quibble about balance and fairness, or to argue about one conquest being somehow better or worse or less intentional than another, any of that would be to ignore the prolonged process by which European culture, no matter what its flag, has come to be imposed on the rest of the world. One cannot write history as if that did *not* happen, as if it were in some way morally normal, as if one set of crimes were marginally better or worse than others, or as if any of us were somehow external to that problematic just because some crimes were apparently not as bad as others believe. 'Fair and balanced' reporting does not expiate guilt.

The important point to be made here does not concern the existence of one legend or another, but the temptation to make global condemnations or confessions *prior* to doing any translation history, then not actually tracing the crimes when the history is done: let us compare the translations, looking at books rather than counting the iniquities that incurred because of the way translations were used or not used. We must try to see what actually happened in and through translations, with what mixes of virtue and vice, in the world of actions as well as in texts. Translations, or the lack of them, are unlikely to be good or bad in themselves; what they do in historical situations is what counts. And paradoxes abound.

Laura Rademaker traces the history of Groote Eylandt in the very north of Australia, where from 1944 missionaries sought to evangelise in English only, imposing the colonial language through a politics of assimilation.[43] This worked well enough, apparently, since English was indeed learnt and the Aboriginal culture continued to transmit itself in parallel Indigenous languages. In the 1960s, though, missionary policies changed: the missionaries began to translate into Anindilyakwa; to speak the language of more intimate belief, to try to win hearts as well as minds. Such Biblical moves to translation are undoubtedly positive for language maintenance. Yet the move is in this case reported as being resented by the Indigenous community, who saw the parallel language space of their own beliefs being invaded, and who had come to see their acquired competence in English as positive empowerment. The missionaries' move to translation, even if well meant, threatened to usurp Indigenous culture and disempower the community.

Guilt alone can never be the only motivation for doing history, not any more than revindication is sufficient motivation for those on the receiving end of European expansion. Both extreme positions simplify the oppositions and overlook the complexity of the others thus created. Yet reasoned guilt can and should provide one possible impetus for historical action. Linguists in Australia are currently engaged in the teaching of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander languages to communities where intergenerational transmission has failed. That is, recordings and descriptions are being used to revive languages. In cultural situations now dominated by English and English-based creoles, translation is inevitably part of that process towards full bilingual education or, in minimalist agendas, post-vernacular maintenance. Translation was involved in the bad things in the past; it can be part of better things in the future.

Notes

1. Niklas Luhmann, *Vertrauen. Ein Mechanismus der Reduktion sozialer Komplexität* (Stuttgart: Ferdinand Enke, 1989, 1st ed. 1968).
2. Niklas Luhmann, *Soziale Systeme: Grundriss einer allgemeinen Theorie* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1984) and *Die Realität der Massenmedien* (Wiesbaden: Westdeutsche Verlag, 1996, 1st ed. 1995).
3. Theo Hermans, 'Translation, Irritation and Resonance', in *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*, ed. Michaela Wolf and Alexandra Fukari

(Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2007), 57–75 and Hans J. Vermeer, *Luhmann's 'Social Systems' Theory: Preliminary Fragments for a Theory of Translation* (Berlin: Frank & Timme, 2006), 6.
4. Anthony Pym, *Negotiating the Frontier. Translators and Intercultures in Hispanic History* (London and New York: Routledge, 2014, 1st ed. 2000).
5. Charles Gibson, *Tlaxcala in the Sixteenth Century*, trans. Agustín Bárcena (Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1991, 1st ed. 1952), 79–84.
6. Luhmann, *Soziale Systeme*, 181 (our translation).
7. Paul Cohen, 'Torture and Translation in the Multilingual Courtrooms of Early Modern France', *Renaissance Quarterly* 69 (2016): 899–939.
8. Anthony Pym, 'Risk Analysis as a Heuristic Tool in the Historiography of Interpreters. For an Understanding of Worst Practices', in *New Insights in the History of Interpreting*, ed. Jesús Baigorri-Jalón and Kayoko Takeda (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2016), 247–269.
9. Anthony Pym, *Method in Translation History* (London and New York: Routledge, 2014, 1st ed. 1998).
10. Sergia Adamo, 'Microhistory of Translation', in *Charting the Future of Translation History. Current Discourses and Methodology*, ed. Georges L. Bastin and Paul F. Bandia (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 2006), 81–100. See also Jeremy Munday, 'Using Primary Sources to Produce a Microhistory of Translation and Translators: Theoretical and Methodological Concerns', *The Translator* 20 (2014): 64–80 and references therein.
11. Carlo Ginzburg, *Il formaggio e i vermi. Il cosmo di un mugnaio del '500* (Turin: Einaudi, 1999, 1st ed. 1976), and Peter Burke, 'Overture to the New History: Its Past and Future', in *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*, ed. Peter Burke (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001, 1st ed. 1991), 1–24. On *Alltagsgeschichte* see David F. Crew, '*Alltagsgeschichte*: A New Social History "From Below?"', *Central European History* 22 (1989): 394–407. Michel Serres, *Hermès III. La traduction* (Paris: Minuit, 1974) and Gilles Deleuze, *Différence et répétition* (Paris: Presses Universitaires France, 1968).
12. Anthony Pym, 'Twelfth-Century Toledo and Strategies of the Literalist Trojan Horse', *Target* 6 (1994): 43–66 and 'Lives of Henri Albert, Nietzschean Translator', in *Translators' Strategies and Creativity*, ed. Ann Beylard-Ozeroff, Jana Králová, and Barbara Moser-Mercer (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 1998), 117–125.
13. Ginzburg, *Il formaggio e i vermi*, 101–105.
14. William Labov, *Sociolinguistic Patterns* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972), 202.

15. Andrew Chesterman, 'Universalism in Translation Studies', *Translation Studies* 7 (2014): 82–90, at 82.
16. *The Pushing-Hands of Translation and its Theory. In Memoriam Martha Cheung, 1953–2013*, ed. Douglas Robinson (London and New York: Routledge, 2016).
17. Outi Paloposki and Kaisa Koskinen, 'A Thousand and One Translations: Revisiting Retranslation', in *Claims, Change and Challenges in Translation Studies*, ed. Gyde Hansen, Kirsten Malmkjaer, and Daniel Gile (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2004), 27–38 and James Hadley, 'Indirect Translation and Discursive Identity: Proposing the Concatenation Effect Hypothesis', *Translation Studies* 10 (2017): 183–197.
18. For some of the usages and claims, see Anthony Pym, *Exploring Translation Theories*, 2nd ed. (London and New York: Routledge, 2014), 138–154.
19. Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Wahrheit und Methode* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1960).
20. John Paul II, *Slavorum Apostoli*, https://goo.gl/ZS8LPx (accessed 19 January 2019).
21. *Ibid*.
22. *Ibid*.
23. Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, *Varietates Legitimae. Inculturation and the Roman Liturgy: Instruction*, 29 March 1994, http://www.adoremus.org/doc_inculturation.html (accessed 20 January 2019).
24. Benedict XVI, 'Faith, Reason and the University Memories and Reflections', Meeting with the Representatives of Science Lecture of the Holy Father, September 12, 2006, https://goo.gl/MbCYG7 (accessed 20 January 2019).
25. Consilium for Implementing the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Comme le prévoit. On the Translation of Liturgical Texts for Celebrations with a Congregation*, 1969, https://goo.gl/zne7JH (accessed 20 January 2019), 21.
26. Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, *Liturgiam authenticam. On the Use of Vernacular Languages in the Publication of the Books of the Roman Liturgy*, 28 March 2001, https://goo.gl/GKpTGf (accessed 20 January 2019), 5.
27. For an early and still-valid critique of this silencing, see Sherry Simon, 'Délivrer la Bible. La théorie d'Eugène Nida', *Meta* 32 (1987): 429–437.
28. Emmanuel Levinas, *Totalité et infini. Essai sur l'extériorité* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1961) and *Entre nous, essais sur le penser à l'autre* (Paris: Grasset, 199).

29. Antoine Berman, *La traduction et la lettre ou l'Auberge du lointain* (Paris: Seuil, 1999, first published 1985), 74.
30. *Ibid.*, 89.
31. Karl Marx, *Misère de la philosophie* (Paris and Brussels: A. Frank, C. H. Vogler, 1847), 100 (our translation).
32. Anthony Pym, '*Translators Do More than Translate*. Paper presented to the International Federation of Translators World Congress, Brisbane, 2017', unpublished and Dorothy Kenny, 'Sustaining Disruption? The Transition from Statistical to Neural Machine Translation', *Revista Tradumàtica. Tecnologies de la Traducció* 16 (2018): 59–70.
33. Antonio Ballesteros Beretta, *Alfonso X el Sabio* (Barcelona: El Albir, 1984), 815.
34. John Milton, 'As traduções do Clube do Livro', *TradTerm* 3 (1996): 47–65.
35. Karin Littau, 'First steps Towards a Media History of Translation', *Translation Studies* 4 (2011): 261–281 and Anthony Pym, 'The Medieval Postmodern in Translation Studies', in *And Translation Changed the World (and the World Changed Translation)*, ed. Alberto Fuertes and Ester Torres-Simón (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015), 105–123.
36. Marx, *Misère de la philosophie*, 100 (our translation).
37. Lewis Mumford, *Technics and Civilization* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1934).
38. Naoki Sakai, 'The Modern Regime of Translation and Its Politics', in *A History of Modern Translation Knowledge: Sources, Concepts, Effects*, ed. Lieven D'hulst and Yves Gambier (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2018), 61–74 and Bernardo A. Michael, *Statemaking and Territory in South Asia: Lessons from the Anglo–Gorkha War (1814–1816)* (London: Anthem, 2012). On Siam see also Thongchai Winichakul, 'Siam Mapped: The Making of Thai Nationhood', *The Ecologist* 26 (1996): 205–221.
39. Yukino Semizu, 'Invisible Translation: Reading Chinese Texts in Ancient Japan', in *Translating Others*, ed. Theo Hermans (Manchester: St. Jerome, 2006), II, 283–295, at 283; Ronit Ricci, 'On the Untranslatability of "Translation": Considerations from Java, Indonesia', in *Translation in Asia: Theories, Practices, Histories*, ed. Ronit Ricci and Jan van der Putten (Manchester: St. Jerome, 2011), 57–72, at 62; Harish Trivedi, 'In Our Own Time, On Our Own Terms: "Translation' in India"', *Translating Others*, I, 102–119, at 104, 106, 107; and Saliha Paker, 'Ottoman Conceptions of Translation and its Practice: The 1897 "Classics Debate" as a Focus of Examining Change', *Translating Others*, II, 325–348, at 345.

40. Roberto Valdeón, *Translation and the Spanish Empire in the Americas* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2014), 4.
41. *Ibid*., 14.
42. See Colin Tatz, 'Confronting Australian Genocide', *Aboriginal History* 25 (2001): 16–36.
43. Laura Rademaker, *Found in Translation: Many Meanings on a North Australian Mission* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2018).

CHAPTER 4

On Interdisciplinarity: Trusting Translation History

Abstract This chapter provides a show-and-tell case study of ways in which US-based historians of science and European translation scholars of the past two decades or so have engaged with the question of translation in the history of science. It provides insight into the ways these historians and scholars have related to one another's scholarship, revealing the degree of interdisciplinarity and, ultimately, trust that is invested in other disciplines. In this chapter, therefore, we explore how translation history might gain the trust of other historical disciplines.

Keywords Interdisciplinarity • History of science • Translation studies

In the current political climate of competitive research funding, interdisciplinarity has scientific currency among the scholarly community and is endorsed by research funding agencies. There is little consensus, though, on what interdisciplinarity is or, indeed, how it can or should be measured. In the context of interdisciplinarity research, Robert P. Crease provides a pragmatic definition of trust as 'deferring with comfort to others, in ways sometimes in our control, sometimes not, about a thing, or things beyond our knowledge or power that can potentially hurt us'.[1] For our purposes, an analysis of interdisciplinary trust encompasses both translation history as an emerging field of knowledge as well as the positionality of scholars, which we have discussed in Chap. 3. A focus on the practice

A. Rizzi et al., *What is Translation History?*, Translation History,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-20099-2_4

of interdisciplinarity as a scholarly approach prompts us to reflect on the diverse scholarly networks that shape it; to pay attention to discrete disciplinary boundaries, and to the risks brought by cleaving to such boundaries, but also by transcending them.

In this chapter we engage with interdisciplinarity so as to foster a greater awareness of trust (or distrust) in translation among historians, and greater methodological confidence among scholars of translation. This raises the question of how such an undertaking can be met, considering that there are many different ways to write history and to study translation. In any interdisciplinary research inquiry or project, it is crucial that the researchers involved cultivate an in-depth understanding of the vocabulary and concepts of different disciplinary vernaculars. Just as crucial is the communication work required of all the project team.[2]

Interdisciplinarity

In the last three decades, the academic sphere has grown increasingly interdisciplinary and collaborative. Interdisciplinarity has been strongly associated with being able to provide a rich understanding of relevant research topics, and with the ability to solve real-world problems.[3] Scott Frickel, Mathieu Albert, Barbara Prainsack, and Helga Nowotny have identified three key ideas associated with interdisciplinary research: superiority to knowledge based on expertise and experience in a single discipline, a way to increase public accountability, and a means of enhancing the impact of research in the world at large.[4] Translation and trust play only a marginal role in current explorations of interdisciplinarity, and are not often considered together.[5] Questions of interdisciplinarity and linguistic translation have nevertheless been discussed in translation studies focussed on the study of human communication, where translation is conceptualised as 'a complex type of mediated interlingual and intercultural communication'.[6] More broadly, trust is only mentioned as a desideratum in the study of interdisciplinarity where scholars analyse interdisciplinary collaborations.[7] Before we explore in more detail the dialogue between historians of science and translation scholars, we define our understanding of translation, engage with the traditions of distrust of interdisciplinarity in the humanities, and sketch a new model of interdisciplinarity.

For the purposes of this chapter, translation is understood as discoursal only. It is important to acknowledge, however, that in the history of science, and in studies of interdisciplinarity, the term ‘translation’ is also used figuratively to describe epistemic change; that is, shifts in the beliefs about the nature of knowledge and knowing. For example, information scholar Carol L. Palmer describes the investigation of new disciplinary ideas, theories, and methods that are not readily understood by scholars of other disciplines as ‘translation’.[8] For at least eight decades, historians of science have also described scientific change as ‘translation’. Such descriptions have followed from the fact that, from the 1920s, science itself was widely considered a (universal) language.[9] Although this assumption shifted with the critique of universalism in the 1970s and 1980s, a figurative vocabulary that associates science with language has remained influential to this day.[10] It has enabled scholars to describe epistemic change in a vivid and intuitive manner, and to make the history of science accessible and trustworthy to readers and scholars from other disciplines. We suggest that the figurative use of the term ‘translation’ as part of a vocabulary for describing change risks deflecting all-important attention from linguistic translation and engagement with translation history. An insistently allegorical use of ‘translation’ stands in the way of developing an interdisciplinary vernacular between fields of knowledge.

What is interdisciplinary research? For the Australian Research Council (ARC) interdisciplinary research is ‘taken as an overarching term that incorporates a multitude of terms used to describe research approaches that do not fit within a traditional single disciplinary structure’.[11] The productive tension between disciplines and interdisciplinarity foregrounded in this quote seems cogent. Exposure to and negotiation of different disciplinary logics is assumed to create a dialogue between the single disciplines involved. This knowledge about different disciplinary epistemologies has repercussions for both the knowledge produced and the producers of knowledge. In other words, both the factual and the social identity of the disciplines and scholars in question are affected by interdisciplinarity (or the lack thereof).

What role does trust play in interdisciplinary research in the humanities? Palmer argues that ‘[i]n the humanities, collaboration is less formal in nature, but those involved in interdisciplinary scholarship can have a strong dependence on local colleagues or outside experts who serve as translators of concepts and ideas’.[12] In other words, she maintains that in humanities networks and collaborations thick trust is more prevalent than in other academic disciplines. At the same time, the interdisciplinarity as a new paradigm of academic inquiry is confronted with a certain amount of distrust by humanities scholars. At its most extreme, interdisciplinarity has been perceived as an anti-humanities project, imposed on the liberal arts by research funding bodies that have internalised a scientific and monetary understanding of knowledge formation. This stance can be traced to the early critics of interdisciplinarity, which include influential French philosophers such as Jacques Derrida and Jean-François Lyotard.[13] Julie Thompson Klein argues that the early rise of this *critical* interdisciplinarity in the humanities challenged 'the existing structure of knowledge and education'.[14] The methods of critique now variously and variably associated with post-structuralism, post-colonial theory, Foucauldian studies of knowledge, and other approaches provide important insights into the relationship between power and knowledge, but also represent an orthodoxy of practice in the humanities.[15] Consequently, such critique can become dogmatic, and its totalising gesture does not help scholars to navigate a changing research landscape. Recent assessments draw a more complex picture of interdisciplinarity.[16] Klein's own rich take on interdisciplinarity focuses on the careful differentiation between theory, practice, and institutional realities to analyse the history of interdisciplinarity in the American academe.[17]

These differing positions partly arise from the fact that different disciplines and fields of knowledge embrace interdisciplinarity at different paces. The paces, in turn, depend upon a range of factors, including the strength of specific disciplinary traditions, the methodological openness of a given field of knowledge, as well as external factors such as the location of the university. In the humanities, some fields of knowledge—gender and sexuality studies, for example—have been orientated towards interdisciplinarity from their beginnings. Some disciplines, such as translation studies, have broadened their base to become more interdisciplinary in recent decades; others, such as political science or linguistics, have maintained more rigid disciplinary identities.[18] This asynchronicity means that institutional commendation of interdisciplinarity (for instance by research funding bodies) has provided an opportunity more for some researchers and university departments than for others. Studies in the analysis of science, environmental studies, and medicine in particular have profited considerably.

Despite the relative hype surrounding interdisciplinarity, and a wealth of interdisciplinary knowledge produced, there exists a surprising silence in scholarship when it comes to describing benchmarks for interdisciplinary academic success.[19] Studies have explored the complex positionality of emerging and mid-career interdisciplinary scholars and their career prospects.[20] Much energy has been invested in understanding the institutional dynamics of running interdisciplinary centres for research and teaching.[21] Yet exactly what can constitute meaningful interdisciplinary exchange and valid interdisciplinary knowledge remains underexamined. Undoubtedly this is in part because interdisciplinarity means different things to different people. It follows that there remains a remarkable degree of uncertainty broadly associated with this kind of knowledge production, which in turn creates 'the need for mutual trust and credibility'.[22]

To provide a conceptual tool that enables us to discuss the varying degrees of interdisciplinary engagement, we adapt physicist Peter Galison's metaphor of the 'trading zone' which he has used to map the exchange of knowledge between differing sets of scientists in localised scenarios. Rather than presupposing a universal scientific language, Galison borrows instead from linguistic anthropology. He argues that three 'language' formations exist in localised trading zones: jargon (function-specific terms based on interactional expertise); pidgin (an interlanguage between two fields of knowledge), and creole (a sustainable language in its own right).[23] How these formations come into existence, with some turning out to be successful while others die, is the question at the heart of his investigation.[24] To enable researchers to think about the depth and sustainability of interdisciplinarity, we suggest adapting Galison's account of the trading zone to serve an analysis of interdisciplinarity. Galison himself supports such a reinterpretation of his original model, conceding that

> the utility of a trading zone resonates in today's world, where complex questions and difficult problems beg for interdisciplinary attention and increasingly scarce resources force people to look for innovative ways to increase productivity.[25]

Let us think with Galison about interdisciplinarity as a localised, qualitatively scaled encounter. To do so, we need to adapt his three-stage model of jargon, pidgin, and creole to practices of interdisciplinarity in the humanities. Galison identifies jargon as function-specific, an attempt between trading partners to 'hammer out a *local* coordination despite vast *global* differences'.[26] In the humanities, the most common scholarly means for expanding our disciplinary base is to borrow concepts, methods, or approaches from other disciplines often referred to as the 'auxiliary' or ancillary sciences. Historians, for example, have long employed auxiliary sciences (such as codicology, paleography, and philology) to help them evaluate, use, and interpret source materials.[27] Typically such borrowing trusts the in-depth understanding developed by other disciplines and utilises that understanding, while simplifying and decontextualising it. By doing so, the borrowing reduces the complexity of the borrowed discipline, but also creates a new situated knowledge. Galison's pidgin, then, becomes a discursive space in which scholars develop a more in-depth interdisciplinary inquiry, a more even-handed dialogue, by actively reflecting upon different disciplinary traditions, and creating a recognisable interlanguage that, ideally, can be identified and utilised by both disciplines. The third stage implies the formation of a new field of knowledge, or even a newly nameable discipline, such as gender studies.

Translation, Science, and Interdisciplinarity

Translation became a topic of interest for historians of science just under two decades ago. Scott L. Montgomery's ambitious *Science in Translation* (2000) was the first book-length study to give linguistic translation causal agency in the history of science. In a range of case studies, this work focuses on knowledge transfer between cultures: Montgomery's three main topics are the history of astronomy in the ancient Greek and medieval Arabic and European worlds; the making of Japanese science, and the development of Indian English. For Montgomery, translation becomes the pivotal conduit in the movement of knowledge, representing 'a cultural act with epistemological intent and result'.[28] A key finding of his exploration is the historical diversity of the role of translators whom he evokes. They range from monks to scholars, mercenaries to commercial journeymen, individual diplomats to groups of translators, and more. Indeed, Montgomery perceives substantive changes to scientific texts—through additions and omissions, rewritings and errors, through linguistic evolution, changes in manuscript culture and concepts of authorship—as inevitable to the processes of cultural adaptation.[29]

Montgomery farewells any sentimental attachment to an 'original' text by contending that languages are incommensurable, and hence originals and their translation can be assumed to be different regardless of whether they are connected by scientific content.[30] This contrasts with previous notions in the history of science about the universal validity of scientific language as a code, or language, that transcends actual linguistic differences.[31] To unravel his argument further, it is important to recollect that in the history of translation there exists a distinction between translation as a skill, and translation as an art. Already Friedrich Schleiermacher's 1813 speech to the Royal Academy of Sciences in Berlin distinguishes between translation in the real (business) world, and translation in the arts and academe.[32] Schleiermacher was a renowned translator of Plato, and his influential speech positions the language of science in the academic realm. Yet the growth of scientific specialisation saw scientific terminology become more and more distinct.[33] As a consequence, the study of scientific translation increasingly came to be considered the study of 'technical translation', and thus a more mechanistic undertaking; it fell into theoretical disregard, which Montgomery regrets.[34] He paints with a broad brush to plead for an emancipation of scientific translation from technical and literary translation, and the inclusion of scientific translation in the history of science and history of translation. His understanding of scientific change is underpinned by an epistemological certainty: that linguistic translation changes science—which, in turn, defeats the notion of a universal scientific language.

Interdisciplinarity in Montgomery

Montgomery's volume can be described as the first sustained engagement with linguistic translation in the history of science, but is his work interdisciplinary? *Science in Translation* has expanded the contemporary understanding of the history of science. Yet how does the author address other forms of disciplinary knowledge? We could respond that he does so fairly typically, by borrowing and referencing specific concepts from cognate disciplines (philosophy and translation studies, in particular) that help him to make his case. Let us briefly consider the way Montgomery does this with reference to Thomas S. Kuhn's theory of paradigm shifts, and to the theory of the indeterminacy of translation developed by American logician and philosopher Willard V. Quine.

Kuhn's now classic study *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962) offers an explanation of the ways in which radical scientific change plays out in the world of physics. Kuhn does not assume scientific progress to be a linear and cumulative process. Rather, he argues that the accumulation of anomalies inexplicable within an accepted scientific framework can lead to a paradigm shift which creates its own 'language'—a language that, in turn, becomes normalised. In this circular model, translation plays a role not on the factual but on the social side of the dissemination of disciplinary knowledge. The 1969 postscript to Kuhn's much-debated monograph explores in detail how scientists amid a global paradigm shift have an opportunity of recourse. The jarring of discourses creates polarisation, but also makes possible a moment of reflection that permits scientists to become 'translators' (in a figurative sense). While such non-linguistic translation between different world views remains a 'threatening process, [...] entirely foreign to normal science', it provides 'translators' with the opportunity to convert others to their own viewpoint by persuasion.[35]

Kuhn's book conceptualises a scientific paradigm shift as a comprehensive change, and describes the conceptual languages deployed before and after such a shift as strictly incommensurable entities. To do so, he references Quine's theory of the indeterminacy of translation, which stipulates that translation and meaning are indeterminate; that is, not singly fixed or clear. Recently Quine's position has been redubbed the first representative of 'linguistic individualism'.[36] Certainly his views have been highly influential in the history and philosophy of science; in the words of philosopher Crispin Wright, Quine's concept of the indeterminacy of translation became 'a standard-bearer for one of the late twentieth century's most characteristic philosophical preoccupations: the scepticism about semantic notions'.[37] For Galison, Kuhn's stance was a result of the struggles between positivist philosophers of science who did not problematise the role of language in the formation of knowledge, and anti-positivists such as Quine who, in a radical shift away from such secure grounds, proclaimed that 'there was no common linguistic structure'.[38]

Several observations are pertinent here. Firstly, like many other historians of science in the twentieth century, in *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* Kuhn uses language in a figurative sense, never in a linguistic sense. The effect of this, Montgomery argues, 'is to divert attention away from the richness of linguistic transfer itself'.[39] Secondly, Kuhn uses Quine's account of the indeterminacy of translation as an auxiliary concept—as an interdisciplinary means of reinforcing an argument, and refining concepts. Thirdly, the reference to Quine in Montgomery's *Science in Translation* can be viewed simultaneously as an interdisciplinary reference, akin to Kuhn's, and as a reference within the narrower field of linguistic translation in its pertinence to the history of science (with respect to Kuhn, who already incorporated Quine into his narrative).

Roads Not Travelled Very Far: Montgomery and Translation Studies

Montgomery's embrace of translation studies is of a different nature to that of Quine, in the sense that it takes the author more obviously into the realm of another discipline. Montgomery's reference points for translation theory are mainly US-based, but he also extends a nod towards the European-based cultural turn in translation studies.[40] We could argue that Montgomery shares with scholars of translation studies an approach described by Mary Snell-Hornby as 'prospective, functional and oriented towards the target-text recipient'.[41] His effort to consider languages as incommensurable entities makes translation a necessity in any study of a global history of science. Yet ultimately, his use of incommensurability creates the same problem as Kuhn's: overdetermination. To assume the incommensurability of languages (and cultures) somehow does too much work too quickly, taking away the interest and pleasure of engaging with localised encounters. It acknowledges the problem linguistic particularity and instability, but cannot sufficiently account for the ways in which mediators of the past actively addressed the problem. Thus Montgomery's readers are bereft of a framework capable of explaining intercultural communication and the dissemination of knowledge.[42]

When Montgomery's *Science in Translation* was published in 2000, one approach identified with translation studies would have been available to explore these questions further.[43] Skopos theory has allowed scholars of linguistic translation to consider a range of factors in the categorisation of technical texts beyond content, including register (the degree of formality, for instance) and situational diversity (such as end-user expectation); text types (informative, expressive, appellative, phatic); their variety (leading-edge knowledge, didactic-instructive texts, collective and combinatory knowledge resources), and the technical medium and the work processes involved.[44] Skopos theory became available to English-languages readerships about the time of the publication of *Science in Translation*.

Montgomery does not differentiate between genres of scientific translation and their rhetorical function, although a functionalist perspective would have shifted the focus away from textual equivalence, that is the assumption that a source language text and a target language text are commensurate with one another. His reluctance to reflect on translators' agency means that he does not engage with questions of trust in the widest sense. Instead, his narrative conveys a sense of distrust, or, as one reviewer describes the monograph, 'instructive and readable, but also frightening accounts of the fragile process of creating and transferring scientific knowledge'.[45] Montgomery's choice to refrain from taking a more deeply interdisciplinary approach is, of course, legitimate. Considering *Science in Translation* was such an innovative book in its focus on linguistic translation in the history of science, his aim was to challenge historiographical norms. At the same time, a more searching and vigorous engagement might have yielded an even richer interpretation of the significant role of translation.

Interdisciplinary Shifts and Risks: Darwin in Translation

Nearly two decades have passed since Montgomery's study was first published, and both the history of science and translation studies have become more confident, and better equipped, in their exploration of linguistic translation and history of science respectively. In light of the recent rise of interdisciplinarity, there emerges the question of whether the putative exchange between linguistic translation and the history of science has become more in-depth, or whether we are witnessing a redefinition of the concept of auxiliary science as an emerging interdisciplinary practice.[46] We address this question by first examining the special issue of a journal in which translation scholars analyse the translation of science—and then considering the European reception of the oeuvre of nineteenth-century English naturalist Charles Darwin.

Beforehand, however, it is useful to recognise the interdisciplinary tension within translation studies itself, where linguists and cultural historians have worked side by side to tackle the history of science, and slowly developed a joint vernacular. This is well illustrated in the 2011 special issue of *The Translator*, a peer-reviewed, international journal of translation studies that advocates a range of disciplinary perspectives and methodologies. Titled 'Translating Science', the special issue was edited by Maeve Olohan and Myriam Salama-Carr. Writing a decade after Montgomery's monograph, the editors emphasise that, while translation teaching usually encompasses scientific or technical translation, the work of many translation scholars has maintained an empirical focus on literary texts.[47] Nonetheless, the contributions in the special issue exemplify a rapprochement between cultural historical approaches (here presumed to include literary studies), and linguistic approaches. Of the ten articles, three deploy a linguistic framework (based on specific corpora, and referencing literature that falls squarely into the discipline of linguistics), all concerned with contemporary practice in scientific translation.[48] Four employ a linguistic framework to address issues variously connected with a cultural historical inquiry in the widest sense.[49] These include Karen Bennett's insightful account of the legacy of the scientific revolution in contemporary scientific translation from Portuguese into English, as well as the discussion by Hala Sharkas of the historical, educational, linguistic, and practical factors that have contributed to the uptake of glossing as a cultural practice in the Arabic world. Of the remaining three articles, two use a methodology based in literary studies to investigate specific translations of philosophical and psychiatric texts, while the last resembles a history of science framework comparable to Montgomery's.[50]

On a solely discursive level we could thus conclude that, at least in this special issue of *The Translator*, the boundaries within translation studies have become porous, beginning to form an interlanguage. The linguists soften their rigid methodology by applying their methods to scientific historical texts, by considering historical factors, and by referencing secondary literature from the history of science. The cultural historians choose the history of science as a topic in the first place (a greater step for them than for the linguists, who have a longer tradition of embracing science as a special language), and give a detailed textual and historical analysis; in their close textual readings and historical contextualisation they, too, reference historians of science. This cross-referentiality represents an important aspect of a language shared across the long-standing, institutionalised divide between the disciplines of linguistics and cultural history. It also represents an interdisciplinary opening, and is written evidence that another discipline was consulted, which in turn inspires trust in the reader of the 'Translating Science' issue of the journal.[51]

Within the confines of a journal special issue, the scope and depth of interdisciplinary encounter is shaped to some degree by the guest editors. Let us consider another example, beyond such confines. The translation of Darwin's works in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is another point of connection between the history of science and translation, pertinent here due to the formative influence of Darwin's ideas inside and outside the English-speaking world, and the accessibility of many translations on the online platform for Darwin's works and related resources, http://darwin-online.org.uk/, which continues to expand.[52] The first thoroughgoing study to investigate the issue of translation in relation to Darwin came out of the history of science. With the title *H. G. Bronn, Ernst*

Haeckel, and the Origins of German Darwinism, Sander Gliboff's monograph on the translation and transformation of Darwin's thought in Germany concentrates partly on the figure of Darwin's first translator, German biologist H. G. Bronn. Gliboff argues against previous assumptions that Bronn's translation of *On the Origin of Species* was *not* aimed at 'twisting Darwin into conformity with outmoded views that Bronn himself had never even espoused' as Britta Rupp-Eisenreich argues.[53] According to Gliboff's study, the shifts in meaning that ensued from Bronn's translation—which made Darwin somewhat unhappy at times—can explained by the linguistic challenges and institutional differences between English and German science.[54]

Like Montgomery, Gliboff constructs his research question and his nuanced approach to translation by referencing other historians of science. This is in line with the above-mentioned turn in the history of science towards connecting scientific knowledge 'to particular places, movable objects, including, but not limited to, books and national traditions or 'styles''.[55] Gliboff's reference to translation scholars remains limited to fellow historians of science, namely Montgomery and Nicolaas A. Rupke.[56]

Translation scholars too appear to have ignored Gliboff's monograph: of 106 citations indexed via the online search engine Google Scholar, the single identifiable reference to a matter directly concerning translation is, again, by another historian of science.[57] Similarly, the articles and book chapters on Darwin in translation published during the past decade remain mostly siloed within their own disciplinary context.[58]

This seems ever more curious, since historians of science and translation scholars tend to present a corresponding narrative about the limits of Darwin's international networks when *On the Origin of Species* was first published in 1859, his welcoming stance towards translation as a means of disseminating knowledge, but also his frustration with attempts to translate his publications. The recent scholarly accounts explore to varying degrees the ways in which translation affected the reception of Darwin's works in specific locations and languages (this can include reference to several translations if more than one scholarly language prevails, as in the case of Belgium). Again, we see an approximation between translation studies and the history science in regard to content. Even so, one example from this array of studies also illustrates a potential pitfall: Carmen Acuña-Partal's otherwise well-written and well-argued comparative article makes extensive use of the Darwin Correspondence Database, and traces the European reception of Darwin's oeuvre, but fails to consider relevant scholarly works within translation studies as well as the history of science.[59] This is particularly clear in her treatment of the translation of Darwin into German, where a reference to Gliboff's monograph is missing. Although Acuña-Partal eloquently presents Darwin's views on translation, this results in a decreased ability to place Darwin's views into historical perspective. There are many structural reasons why such oversights can occur in interdisciplinary scholarship, including time constraints, due to increasing fields of knowledge that need to be covered; university search engines and other information technology of variable quality that privilege some languages over others; a researcher's overt reliance on her or his immediate network of familiar scholars, and peer-review processes that become more difficult to maintain for interdisciplinary scholarship.[60]

Interdisciplinarity and Translation History

As the foregoing examples show, interdisciplinarity is an intellectual adventure that creates a discursive opening, a possibility to embrace other languages and new epistemic concepts. So far this chapter has identified ways in which, in practice, some purportedly interdisciplinary endeavours treat the other discipline in the manner of an auxiliary science, and what a more in-depth interdisciplinary embrace within a shifting discipline can look like. We have also identified a few of the risks of interdisciplinarity. Historian of science and specialist in early Chinese history Carla Nappi has recently declared that the new multi-sited, polyvocal dialogue that has taken hold in the history of science has been 'enabled by translation: not merely among languages but also among different contexts of knowledge production, evaluation, and dissemination'.[61] With academic funding bodies in the western world open to interdisciplinary approaches, now seems like an opportune moment to reflect on the trustworthiness of interdisciplinary inquiry, and on the trust invested in its translation scholars.

With practical evaluation in mind, we would surely benefit from a shared means with which to formulate interdisciplinary goals. As translation historians, is our aim to expand our disciplinary base, or to create a more dialogic interdisciplinary inquiry? We need coherent and effective ways to convey the knowledge and experience that we bring to the interdisciplinary encounter. Klein asserts that '[i]n the current complexity of knowledge and culture, faculty development becomes all the more important'.[62] We propose a call to self-reflexivity, which enables new ways to understand our positionality at a time when interdisciplinary approaches promise funding and prestige, but also create tension with the single disciplinary base that many, but not all scholars in translation history have.

At the moment, in our roles as scholars, editors, reviewers, and so forth, we can seek out some data capable of yielding information about the positionality of a given study: from the short biographical blurbs that accompany journal articles, book chapters, and monographs; implicitly, by scanning the bibliography for foreign-language titles, for instance; from published interviews given by scholars; through university and other websites; by informing ourselves about the social and intellectual identity of a given field (for instance, by recollecting that American scholars can be expected to read two languages other than English if this is relevant to the field of their doctoral research). Some of this information is more or less reliable, some is not specific enough to help us understand the intellectual context for a specific academic work.

To develop a language of and for interdisciplinarity and, simultaneously, to build trust, it becomes essential to undertake a certain amount of localised 'self-translation', specific to the piece of knowledge produced; not as a forced confession, not in a polemic, but as a deliberate attempt that encourages readers to apprehend the epistemological and linguistic translations we have undertaken as translation scholars, and the kind of methodological, procedural, and career choices we have made. This involves a more sustained effort to convey our respective positionalities, where we outline our methodology, for instance—or, as in the present volume, in the About the Authors section. The idea is to show awareness of one's limitations, while providing information for the localised interdisciplinary inquiry at hand. We need to keep deepening our understanding of how interdisciplinary we are, how time and other constraints, and access to resources, shape scholarly lives. If we do not go the journey alone, and choose to invite a scholar from another discipline to collaborate on a project, then we need time to build mutual trust, to develop a joint vocabulary, and design the research work. Perhaps the most important factor in adopting an interdisciplinary approach is time: reading time, time to understand another discourse, time to identify the right journals to publish in, time to translate—linguistically and conceptually.

Returning to Galison: we need to know what kind of interdisciplinarity we wish to aspire to, and what projected outcomes are realistic in a given context. Key questions of relevance here are: what is the aim of the interdisciplinary nature of the inquiry? How in-depth do we envisage an interdisciplinary dialogue to be? What is our own disciplinary background, and our interdisciplinary mode of inquiry? How do we demonstrate acknowledgement of the disciplines involved? If the key feature of discipline formation is self-referential communication, how do we respond to the fact that interdisciplinary inquiries encroach on territories more usually identified with single disciplines?[63] Methodologically, the question arises of how we best refer to other disciplines. Through direct references to content, method, theory; through bibliographical work, and cross-referentiality in bibliographies? What can we learn from individual disciplines that thrive on highly detailed case studies, and what from those that tend to privilege metanarratives? As we broach an interdisciplinary project, do have a broad sense of historiographical developments in the fields of knowledge in question?

In this context it is particularly important to maintain sensitivity to the inherently and changeably political nature of language, an understanding to which translation scholars have contributed vastly.[64] With reference to science, English is the established language for conveying the scope and results of scientific research, and this has implications for the reach and currency of new scholarship in the history of science, if not also its authority inside and outside the English-speaking world. To return for a moment to the scholarship on Darwin mentioned above: should a scholar who works on the French translations of Darwin reference the French historians of science, or historians of science that write in other languages about the French reception of Darwin? What languages do we speak, read, access by other means (from machine translation to polyglot research assistants); what languages do we write our academic work in, and what does this mean for our bibliographies? What kind of trust can we and do we want to build in our research teams and scholarly networks? And how do we establish trust across cultures and languages of discrete scholarly disciplines (still so structurally important in the university sector and the scholarly realm)? These questions are pertinent for our understanding of our own research practice in a global world in which knowledge is insistently on the move, just like people and goods.

We are convinced that historians of translation are already well placed to creatively pursue the possibilities for a productive 'interlanguage' as part of an interdisciplinary approach that can be identified and utilised by all disciplines involved. Such an approach would produce new insights and understanding within translation history. Even if we choose the more conventional path of integrating disciplinary knowledge into our own discipline by means of an auxiliary science (jargon), due to lack of resources for example, we should at least be able to identify what kind of interdisciplinarity we practice. This has the added advantage of debunking the myth of interdisciplinarity as an anti-humanities project, but most importantly it has the potential to increase the trust our colleagues have in us.

Notes

1. Robert P. Crease, 'Physical Sciences', in *The Oxford Handbook of Interdisciplinarity*, ed. Robert Frodeman, Julie Thompson Klein, and Carl Mitcham (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 79–87, 96.
2. Carol L. Palmer, 'Information Research on Interdisciplinarity', in *The Oxford Handbook of Interdisciplinarity*, 174–178, at 183.
3. John H. Aldrich, *Interdisciplinarity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 11.
4. Scott Frickel, Mathieu Albert, and Barbara Prainsack, 'Introduction: Investigating Interdisciplinarities', in *Investigating Interdisciplinary Collaboration: Theory and Practice across Disciplines*, ed. Scott Frickel, Mathieu Albert, and Barbara Prainsack (New Brunswick, NJ and London: Rutgers University Press, 2017), 11.
5. Herewith a recent selection (in chronological order); note that none of the works listed below deals with the question of trust and/or translation, while all are at least partly shaped by the discrete disciplinary vantage points of their authors: Julie Thompson Klein, *Interdisciplinarity: History, Theory, and Practice* (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1990); Bharath Sriraman, Viktor Freiman, and Nicole Lirette-Pitre, *Interdisciplinarity, Creativity, and Learning: Mathematics with Literature, Paradoxes, History, Technology, and Modeling* (Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 2009); Joe Moran, *Interdisciplinarity*, 2nd ed. (Abingdon, Oxon and New York: Routledge, 2010); Francisca Antonia Suau Jiménez and Barry Pennock Speck, *Interdisciplinarity and Languages Current Issues in Research, Teaching, Professional Applications and ICT* (Bern: Peter Lang, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften, 2011); Robert Frodeman, Julie Thompson Klein, and Carl Mitcham, *The Oxford Handbook of Interdisciplinarity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); Aldrich, *Interdisciplinarity*; Andrew Barry and Georgina Born, *Interdisciplinarity Reconfigurations of the Social and Natural Sciences* (Abingdon, Oxon and New York: Routledge, 2013); and Ana María Rojo López and Nicolás Campos Plaza, *Interdisciplinarity in Translation Studies: Theoretical Models, Creative Approaches and Applied Methods* (Bern: Peter Lang, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften, 2016).
6. See *Interdisciplinarity in Translation Studies*, 13.

7. Crease, 'Physical Sciences', 96.
8. Palmer, 'Information Research', 184.
9. Peter Louis Galison, 'Trading with the Enemy', in *Trading Zones and Interactional Expertise. Creating New Kinds of Collaboration*, ed. Michael E. Gorman (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2010), 25–52, at 42.
10. Key works for our context are: Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. With an Introductory Essay by Ian Hacking*, 4th ed. (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2012); Susan Leigh Star and James R. Griesemer, 'Institutional Ecology, "Translations," and Boundary Objects: Amateurs and Professionals in Berkeley's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, 1907–1939', in *Boundary Objects and Beyond: Working with Leigh Star*, ed. Geoffrey C. Bowker *et al.* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2016), 173–195; and Gillian Beer, *Open Fields: Science in Cultural Encounter* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).
11. The ARC is one of two Australian government agencies that competitively allocate research funding to academics and researchers at Australian universities: see https://www.arc.gov.au/policies-strategies/policy/arc-statement-support-interdisciplinary-research: 'Interdisciplinary research is conducted across the research landscape alongside other discipline-specific or single-discipline modes of enquiry. […] Interdisciplinary research can be a distinct mode of research or a combination of researchers, knowledge and/or approaches from disparate disciplines' (accessed 12 January 2019).
12. Palmer, 'Information Research', 184.
13. Jacques Derrida, 'The Principle of Reason: The University in the Eyes of Its Pupils', *Diacritics* 13 (1983): 3–20; Jean-Francois Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, trans. Geoffrey Bennington and Brian Massumi (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984).
14. Julie Thompson Klein, *Humanities, Culture, and Interdisciplinarity: The Changing American Academy* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005), 5.
15. Thompson Klein, *Humanities, Culture, and Interdisciplinarity*, 6.
16. All the while insisting on the work of humanities as thriving on 'all the contradictions of the particular, the caesura, the disturbing, the disruptive, the inexplicable, the absurd, the grotesque, the sublime, the ephemeral, and the unique. We may occasionally be prescient—but we are not policy makers, and should not accommodate or retrofit what we do with those kinds of goals in mind' (Janet Ward, 'Interdisciplinarity, German Studies, and the Humanities', *German Studies Review* 39 (2016): 517–527).
17. See in particular Thompson Klein, *Humanities, Culture, and Interdisciplinarity*, 55–80.
18. For translation studies, Rojo López points out that scholars initially turned to literary studies and linguistics to understand the complexity of transla-

tion but today embrace other disciplines such as psychology, bilingual studies, neurology, and sociology: López and Plaza, *Interdisciplinarity in Translation Studies*, 13.

19. Katri Huutoniemi, 'Evaluating Interdisciplinary Research', in *The Oxford Handbook of Interdisciplinarity*, 309–320.
20. See, for instance, Mathieu Albert, Elise Paradis, and Ayelet Kuper, 'Interdisciplinary Fantasy: Social Scientists and Humanities Scholars Working in Faculties of Medicine', *Investigating Interdisciplinary Collaboration*, 84–103; Jessica K. Graybill and Vivek Shandas, 'Doctoral Student and Early Career Academic Perspectives', in *The Oxford Handbook of Interdisciplinarity*, 404–418; and Stephanie Pfirman and Paula J. S. Martin, 'Facilitating Interdisciplinary Scholars', in *The Oxford Handbook of Interdisciplinarity*, 387–403.
21. For example, Aldrich, *Interdisciplinarity*.
22. Huutoniemi, 'Evaluating Interdisciplinary Research', 317.
23. Peter Louis Galison, *Image and Logic: A Material Culture of Metaphysics* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1997), 783.
24. Galison, *Image and Logic*, 47.
25. Peter Louis Galison, 'Trading with the Enemy', in *Trading Zones*, 25–52, at 267.
26. Galison, *Image and Logic*, 873.
27. Richard Krzys, 'Library Historiography', in *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science*, ed. Miriam A. Drake, 2nd ed. (New York and Basel: Dekker, 2003), III, 1621–1641, at 1624.
28. Scott L. Montgomery, *Science in Translation: Movements of Knowledge through Cultures and Time* (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 2000), 291.
29. Montgomery, *Science in Translation*, 279 and 290.
30. In particular Montgomery, *Science in Translation*, 253–270 and 291; repeated in 'Scientific Translation', in *Handbook of Translation Studies*, ed. Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2010), 299–305. On the current discussion on incommensurability in linguistics see David Gil, 'Describing Languoids: When Incommensurability Meets the Language-Dialect Continuum', *Linguistic Typology* 20 (2016): 439–462.
31. Montgomery references in particular the 1937 paper by José Ortega y Gasset, 'The Misery and Splendor of Translation', trans. Carl R. Shirley, *Translation Review* 13 (2012): 18–30.
32. Friedrich Schleiermacher, From 'On the Different Method of Translating', in *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*, trans. Waltraut Bartsch and ed. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 36–54, at 3.

33. Montgomery, ‘Scientific Translation’, 302. By the 1930s, the notion of scientific language as a code was well established: see, for example, Ortega y Gasset, ‘The Misery and Splendor’.
34. Legal translation avoids this issue by referring to parallel texts of a piece of legislature, rather than by using to the term translation: see Susan Šarčević, ‘Translation and the Law: An Interdisciplinary Approach’, in *Translation Studies—An Interdiscipline*, ed. Mary Snell-Hornby, Franz Pöchhacker, and Klaus Kaindl (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 1992), 301–307, at 303.
35. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 202.
36. Matej Drobňák, ‘Quine on Shared Language and Linguistic Communities’, *Philosophia* 46 (2018): 83–99, at 85.
37. Crispin Wright, ‘Indeterminacy of Translation’, in *A Companion to the Philosophy of Language. Volume 1*, ed. Bob Hale, Crispin Wright, and Alexander Miller (Chichester, West Sussex and Malden, MA: Wiley, 2017), 670–702, at 670.
38. Galison, ‘Trading with the Enemy’, 795. On Kuhn’s shifting understanding of incommensurability see Howard Sankey, ‘Kuhn’s Changing Concept of Incommensurability’, *The British Society for the Philosophy of Science* 44 (1993): 759–774, and Xinli Wang, *Incommensurability and Cross-Language Communication* (Aldershot, UK and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007), 25–51.
39. Montgomery, *Science in Translation*, 4.
40. US scholarship on translation referenced by Montgomery: Reuben A. Brower, *On Translation* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959) and Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation* (London and New York: Routledge, 2008, 1st ed. 1995). European translation studies referenced: *Translation, History, and Culture*, ed. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere (London and New York: Pinter Publishers, 1990).
41. Mary Snell-Hornby, ‘The Turns of Translation Studies’, in *Handbook of Translation Studies*, ed. Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2010), 366–370, at 367.
42. By comparison, at about the same time Anthony Pym developed a rich notion of interculture—meaning a space in which translators work, and languages and cultures are negotiated and displaced: Anthony Pym, *Negotiating the Frontier: Translators and Intercultures in Hispanic History* (London and New York: Routledge, 2014, 1st ed. 2000).
43. For Skopos theory see: Christiane Nord, *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained* (Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 1997); Katharina Reiss and Hans J. Vermeer, *Towards a General Theory of Translational Action: Skopos Theory Explained* (Milton

Park, Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2013, first published in German in 1984); and Hans J. Vermeer, 'Skopos and Commission in Translational Action', in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti (London and New York: Routledge, 2012, 1st ed. 2000). Earlier attempts such as Rudolf Walter Jumpelt, *Die Übersetzung naturwissenschaftlicher und technischer Literatur. Sprachliche Massstäbe und Methoden zur Bestimmung ihrer Wesenszüge und Probleme* (Berlin: Langenscheidt, 1961) were not picked up in the history of science. For a discussion of Jumpelt see Monika Krein-Kühle, 'Laying the Foundations for Scientific and Technical Translation', *The Translator* 17 (2011): 439–444. For the role of translators see Anthony Pym, *Method in Translation History* (London and New York: Routledge, 2014, 1st ed. 1998).

44. For an overview see Klaus Schubert, 'Technical Translation', in *Handbook of Translation Studies*, ed. Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2010), 350–355, and Sue Ellen Wright, 'Scientific, Technical, and Medical Translation', in *The Oxford Handbook of Translation Studies*, ed. Kirsten Malmkjær and Kevin Windle (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 243–261.
45. Peter Fawcett, 'Book Review: "Science in Translation"', *The Translator* 7 (2001): 99–103, at 103.
46. Thompson Klein, *Humanities, Culture, and Interdisciplinarity*, 87.
47. Maeve Olohan and Myriam Salama-Carr, 'Translating Science', *The Translator* 17 (2011): 179–199, at 180.
48. Lidia Cámara and Eva Espasa, 'The Audio Description of Scientific Multimedia', *The Translator* 17 (2011): 415–437; Krein-Kühle, 'Laying the Foundations', and Mark Shuttleworth, 'Translational Behaviour at the Frontiers of Scientific Knowledge', *The Translator* 17 (2011): 301–323.
49. Karen Bennett, 'The Scientific Revolution and Its Repercussions on the Translation of Technical Discourse', *The Translator* 17 (2011): 189–210; Min-Hsiu Liao, 'Interaction in the Genre of Popular Science', *The Translator* 17 (2011): 349–368; Hala Sharkas, 'The Use of Glossing in Modern Original Scientific Writing in Arabic', *The Translator* 17 (2011): 369–389; and Sonia Vandepitte, Liselotte Vandenbussche, and Brecht Algoet, 'Travelling Certainties. Darwin's Doubts and Their Dutch Translations', *The Translator* 17 (2011): 275–299.
50. Literary approach: Lieve Jooken and Guy Rooryck, 'The Freedom of Expressing One's Ideas', *The Translator* 17 (2011): 233–254; Dolores Sánchez, 'Translating Science: Contexts and Contests', *The Translator* 17 (2011): 325–348; and Ruselle Meade, 'Translation of a Discipline', *The Translator* 17 (2011): 211–231.

51. Another example for an interdisciplinary investigation in the history of science is the 2016 special issue 'Translating and Translations in the History of Science' of *Annals of Science*. The editor Bettina Dietz is a German-trained historian of science whose understanding of translation history references a range of translation scholars, in particular: Doris Bachmann-Medick, *Übersetzung als Repräsentation fremder Kulturen* (Berlin: E. Schmidt, 1997); Michaela Wolf and Alexandra Fukari, *Constructing a Sociology of Translation* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2007); and Lawrence Venuti, *The Translation Studies Reader* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000).
52. The platform was established in 2002. The continuing broad interest in the local reception of Darwin is best illustrated by the seven-part series titled 'Global Darwin' in the journal *Nature* from October to December 2009, the year of the 150th anniversary of the publication of *On the Origin of Species* (24 November 1859), and the 200th anniversary of Darwin's birth (12 February 1809).
53. Britta Rupp-Eisenreich, 'Darwinisme Allemand', in *Dictionnaire du Darwinisme et de l'évolution*, ed. Patrick Tort (Paris: PUF, 1996).
54. Sander Gliboff, *H.G. Bronn, Ernst Haeckel, and the Origins of German Darwinism: A Study in Translation and Transformation* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2008), 192.
55. Gliboff, *H.G. Bronn*, 13.
56. Montgomery, *Science in Translation*; Nicolaas A. Rupke, 'Translation Studies in the History of Science: The Example of Vestiges', *British Journal for the History of Science* 33 (2000): 209–222.
57. Thierry Hoquet, 'Translating Natural Selection: True Concept, but False Term?', in *Classification and Evolution in Biology, Linguistics and the History of Science: Concepts–Methods–Visualization*, ed. Heiner Fangerau, Hans Geisler, Thorsten Halling, and William Martin (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2013), 67–95.
58. For the same time frame, studies of French, Dutch, and Italian translations of Darwin's work (mainly concerned with *On the Origin of Species*) consist of relatively small-scale, detailed analyses of particular translations from English: Carmen Acuña-Partal, 'Notes on Charles Darwin's Thoughts on Translation and the Publishing History of the European Versions of [on] the Origin of Species', *Perspectives. Studies in Translatology* 24 (2016): 7–21; Annie Brisset, 'Clémence Royer, ou Darwin en colère', in *Portraits De Traductrices*, ed. Jean Delisle (Arras, France and Ottawa: Artois Presses Université; Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa, 2002), 173–203; Eve-Marie Gendron-Pontbriand, 'Le Traitement de la modalité épistémique dans les traductions françaises de "On the Origin of Species" de Charles Darwin', *Meta* 61 (2016): 87–112; Vandepitte, Vandenbussche, and Algoet,

'Travelling Certainties'; and Ana Pano Alamán and Fabio Regattin, *Tradurre un classico della scienza: traduzioni e ritraduzioni dell'Origin of Species di Charles Darwin in Francia, Italia e Spagna* (Bologna: Bononia University Press, 2015).

59. Acuña-Partal is a specialist in the Spanish reception of Darwin. For the comparative aspects she overtly relies on *The Literary and Cultural Reception of Charles Darwin in Europe*, ed. Thomas F. Glick and Elinor S. Shaffer (London: Bloomsbury, 2014). She likely is familiar with Glick's work through Thomas F. Glick, Miguel Angel Puig-Samper, and Rosaura Ruiz, *The Reception of Darwinism in the Iberian World: Spain, Spanish America, and Brazil* (Dordrecht and Boston: Kluwer Academic, 2001). As mentioned, her main source for the article is the Darwin Correspondence Database http://www.darwinproject.ac.uk/. This database was digitised between 2009 and 2013. A 30-volume print edition of *The Correspondence of Charles Darwin* (Cambridge University Press, 1985–) will be completed by 2022.
60. The peer review process presents a double challenge in this context. On the one hand, it can be overtly limiting towards new interdisciplinary works, and often provides reviewers with few guidelines for how to evaluate interdisciplinary research. On the other hand, the current shift to process rather than product-oriented quality control which is more open to interdisciplinarity can easily fail to notice factual errors or unacknowledged limitations in interdisciplinary research. See J. Britt Holbrook, 'Peer Review', in *The Oxford Handbook of Interdisciplinarity*, 321–332, and Katri Huutoniemi, 'Evaluating Interdisciplinary Research'.
61. Carla Nappi, 'The Global and Beyond. Adventures in the Local Historiographies of Science', *Isis* 104 (2013): 102–110, at 108.
62. Thompson Klein, *Humanities, Culture, and Interdisciplinarity*, 218.
63. Peter Weingart, 'A Short History of Knowledge Formations', in *The Oxford Handbook of Interdisciplinarity*, 3–14, at 8.
64. A selection of recent titles includes: *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Politics*, ed. Fruela Fernandéz and Jonathan Evans (Milton Park and New York: Routledge, 2018); Henry Meschonnic, *Ethics and Politics of Translating*, trans. and ed. Pierre-Pascale Boulanger (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2011); Scott L. Montgomery, *Does Science Need a Global Language? English and the Future of Research* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2013); and Anthony Pym, *On Translator Ethics. Principles for Mediation between Cultures*, trans. Heike Walker (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2012).

CHAPTER 5

Conclusion

Abstract In this concluding chapter, we propose that a focus on trust can help translation historians shed revealing light on the relational character of translation and writing history. It also offers a new gaze not only on the role, ethics, and praxis of translators and interpreters in the past and today, but also on scholarly methods, and thus promising continued intellectual debate and jouissance.

Keywords Trust • Self-reflexivity • Interdisciplinarity • Positionality

The Most Unknown is a feature-length documentary film released in 2018, in which nine frontline scientists in fields ranging from physics to astrobiology meet one another on a series of academic 'blind dates'.[1] All the ensuing discussions share a common feature: each scientist stresses how much remains to be discovered in her or his field, and they do so in quantitative terms—so many species to describe, so much of the brain we do not know about, so many potential scenarios for extraterrestrial life, and so on. If a translation historian were to be invited on such a date, what would such a scholar have to say?

Surely we, too, would have to confess sincere humility before the vast unknown in our field. Between us, we might know nine languages; we might know about translations between those languages. Yet we live in a city where more than 250 languages are spoken in homes, and we know

A. Rizzi et al., *What is Translation History?*, Translation History,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-20099-2_5

only a small part of what is happening in translations between those languages, in all their possible combinations. Then make the calculations for the more than six thousand languages in the world, multiply that answer by more than four millennia of written texts, add ten millennia or more for the history of translations of spoken texts: the part of translation history that we might assume to know something about is an almost imperceptible part of such an immense whole.

So what can we do in the face of the unknown concerning translation's insistent dynamism, in all its forms? The ideal response is to set in motion processes of discovery, as many as possible, from as many different perspectives as possible—yet held together by a basic approach and set of questions that help us talk with one another, and with others. That response must nevertheless accept that as research fosters and encounters new interpersonal relations, new institutions, new regimes, new translation forms, so the methods and questions of our approach will continue to evolve and become something different again.

In this volume we have proposed to embrace trust as a magnifying glass through which to consider translation history. We provide readers with a range of definitions and conceptual tools for analysing trust in its connections with translation, interpreting, printing, and publishing. Meanwhile, we recognise that there is something indeterminate about combining the two nouns 'translation' and 'history'. One could prefer the term 'history of translation', which would perhaps make it clearer that this volume envisages a particular kind of object. Even then, 'translation' can denote a specific kind of *process*, an activity or even a movement, as well as a particular kind of *product*, a class of texts that is called 'translations'—albeit labelled with different words, and for historically different reasons. We embrace that range of meanings: we are interested in both processes and products, and very much in the history of ideas about what translation is. Yet the collocation 'translation history' takes us even further, suggesting a particular way of doing history *or* a historical perspective *or* a project in which translators, interpreters, diplomats, traders, and other intermediaries or go-betweens are foregrounded and studied.

Analysing trust, we argue, sheds revealing light on the relational character of translation and of writing history. We submit that it includes consideration of the interpersonal, the institutional, and the regime-driven. Like a nesting doll, these different layers of trust are embedded within another. Depending on the specific context, we contend, these formations might present quite differently and have varied cultural meanings. The way we do history, necessarily with more than one language and culture involved, is bound to be a particular kind of activity, with its own focus, methods, and metalanguage, hopefully of interest to historians of other objects of knowledge. There is a difference, after all, between a Matryoshka doll and a so-called Chinese box, although both objects rely on a recursive principle. In foregoing chapters, we suggest following translators downstream (from the translated text or culture to the readers and client) or upstream (from the reception of translation and translator up to the translated text or request to translate). To hone in on the posturing of translators (or the lack thereof), we need to consider the position they speak from (personally, institutionally, regime-bound) as well as the locale and timing of their utterances. Translators inhabit specific forms of translation, which allow them to make sense of their translative practice, and endorse their understanding of what constitutes a valid translation.

We also call for reflexivity in our own practice as translation historians. We maintain that, like academic inquiry in the humanities more generally, translation history is relative, driven by our interest in the past, and, simultaneously, by our interests in the present. We ask what translation history allows us to do: to decide on questions of periodisation or regionalisation; to reflect on translation forms; to embrace complex histories that are burdened by particular challenges that we need to take into account. As scholars, how can we navigate a world that considers translations as products of movements of people, materials, and non-material things (such as ideas or narratives), while also considering how, to what extent, and at what cost we create interdisciplinary meaning, and how these two trajectories intersect? After all, if trust is a mechanism for reducing complexity, how do we consider what is gained and what is lost?

Problematising and investigating trust allows us to move towards translation history in a self-reflexive manner. It calls for new kinds of declarations of positionalities, a new gaze not only on the role, ethics, and praxis of translators and interpreters in the past and today, but also on our own scholarly methods. To some this might represent a daunting task, others might deem it unimportant. Yet if this volume is to foster dialogue between historians and translation scholars, a call for both interdisciplinarity and self-reflexivity are of the essence, and should strengthen our trust in an encounter that promises continued intellectual debate and jouissance.

Note

1. *The Most Unknown*, dir. Ian Cheney, 2018. The most surprising thing in the discussion is not that the scientists are all in some way working on major questions such as, 'how did life begin?', or, 'what is consciousness?' (as the publicity insists). What is bewildering is that the cutting-edge scientists have remarkably little to say to each other, at least not beyond several versions of 'wow!'.

Glossary

Auxiliary science Discipline that serves as a support for another discipline, for example in history a discipline that helps to evaluate, use, and interpret source materials such as numismatics, see also *Interdisciplinarity*, *Jargon*.

Client The person or institution that pays the translator, financially or in-kind.

Collaboration Coordinated action between different people, here in order to produce a translation. (This is not "collaboration" in the sense of working for the enemy.)

Creole See *Trading zone*.

Crosscultural Pertaining to movements from one culture to another; cf. *Transcultural*.

Distrust An active lack of trust; a calculation of the probability of deceit or betrayal.

Domestication Traditional term for the kind of translation that adapts the text to the target culture; the opposite of *Foreignization*.

Dragoman Here, a diplomatic interpreter.

Externality The assumption that the observer stands outside the object of knowledge observed, has no effect on that object, and is not affected by it.

A. Rizzi et al., *What is Translation History?*, Translation History,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-20099-2

Foreignisation Traditional term for the kind of translation that retains features of the start culture, see also *Domestication*.

Genetic criticism Detailed comparison of successive versions of a text.

Go-between Here, an agent who performs textual mediation between two or more parties, also *Mediator*.

Hermeneutics The study of the ways in which texts are interpreted.

Inculturation For Vatican II, the process by parts of one culture enters another and both cultures are thereby changed.

Intercultural Pertaining to the overlaps of cultures; cf. *Transcultural*.

Interdisciplinarity Combining two or more academic disciplines into one activity. See also *Trading zones*.

Interdisciplinary research Research that involves the combining of two or more fields of knowledge or disciplines.

Interpreter A translator who produces a spoken text.

Interpreting The use of translation to produce a spoken text; also called "interpretation" (particularly in the United States).

Jargon See *Trading zone*.

Macrohistorical approach A way to write history by observing the large-scale tendencies of the past such as increasing professionalisation or the effects of technologies; cf. *Microhistorical approach*.

Mediator See *Go-between*.

Microhistorical approach A way to write history by observing closely and in detail the small-scale events of the past such as the daily life of translators or the successive versions of a translation; cf. *Macrohistorical approach*; see also *Genetic criticism*.

Modernity A historical questioning of tradition, associated with the development of individualism, participative politics, equality, and public education.

Networks Relations between people.

Observer's paradox The attempt to observe a thing as if it were not being observed (from William Labov).

Pidgin See *Trading zone*.

Positionality The status of the observer with respect to the thing observed.

Postediting The correcting of raw machine-translation output.

Pseudotranslation A text presented as a translation but for which there is no start text.

Regime A set of cultural beliefs or principles that enable coordinated action leading to the production and reception of translations. Regimes are more general than translation forms, which only concern what a translation is held to be. They can concern such things as who is entitled to translate and how translations should be carried out.

Relationality Dependence of actions or actors on other actions or actors.

Relativism The belief that what a person thinks and does depends on their historical and cultural context; opposed to *universalism*.

Relativity See *Relativism*.

Source text See *Start text*. Here we use *start text* in recognition of intertextuality (all texts draw on previous texts) and in view of the way translations are also produced from databases (glossaries, translation memories, and machine-translation output).

Start language The language the translator works from; also called the *source language*.

Start text Text that has been translated, is to be translated, or is assumed to have been translated (in the case of pseudotranslation); also called *source text*.

Target culture The culture that the translation is designed for; also called the "host culture" (the adjective "target" describes the perspective of the translator).

Target language The language the translator works into (also called the "host language").

Target text The text produced by the translator; the translation.

Text A string of spoken, written and/or iconic signs.

Thick trust Trust based on close connections with and knowledge of a person or institution.

Thin trust Impersonalised trust based on the reputation of an institution or profession rather than individuals.

Trading zone Metaphor to describe the ways in which different scientific fields of knowledge are able to exchange goods (Peter Galison), here applied to interdisciplinary encounters. These include:

– **Jargon**: Formation of limited exchange between disciplines. Here used to describe a strictly limited and hierarchical interdisciplinary exchange in the humanities, see also: *Auxiliary science*.

- **Pidgin**: An in-depth interdisciplinary inquiry, actively reflecting upon different disciplinary traditions and creating a recognisable interlanguage that ideally can be identified and utilized by both disciplines.
- **Creole**: A sustainable interdisciplinary "language" in its own right; implies the formation of a new field of knowledge such as gender studies or indeed translation studies.

Transcultural Pertaining to movements between cultures.

Translation A text that is held to have been produced by work on an anterior text to which it has a set of assumed relations; see *Translation form*.

Translation form A historical set of maxims or ideal relations that define what a translation is held to be. Different cultures may have different translation forms.

Translational Pertaining to aspects of the translation product; cf. *Translative.*

Translative Adjective to describe aspects of the translation process; cf. *Translational.*

Translative action An action that brings about a translation, as a whole or in part.

Trust Belief in the reliability or capacity of someone or something; historical product informed by a complex web of rhetorical, emotional, and attitudinal factors: signalling or promise making, sincerity, and the reception of readers and audiences to texts and agents.

Trust networks Regular interactions between people working together to achieve some common purpose requiring trust.

Universalism The belief that a statement holds true in all possible historical and cultural contexts; the opposite of *Relativism*.

Bibliography

Abdallah, Kristiina, 'Translators' Agency in Production Networks', in *Translators' Agency*, ed. Tujia Kinnunen and Kaisa Koskinen (Tampere: Tampere University Press, 2010), 11–46.

Abdallah, Kristiina and Kaisa Koskinen, 'Managing Trust: Translating and the Network Economy', *Meta* 52 (2007): 673–687.

Acuña-Partal, Carmen, 'Notes on Charles Darwin's Thoughts on Translation and the Publishing History of the European Versions of [on] the Origin of Species', *Perspectives. Studies in Translatology* 24 (2016): 7–21.

Adamo, Sergia, 'Microhistory of Translation', in *Charting the Future of Translation History. Current Discourses and Methodology*, ed. Georges L. Bastin and Paul F. Bandia (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 2006), 81–100.

Agents of Translation, ed. John Milton and Paul Bandia (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2009).

Agorni, Mirella *Translating Italy for the Eighteenth Century: Women, Translation, and Travel Writing, 1739–1797* (Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 2002).

Akrich, Madeleine, Michel Callon, and Bruno Latour, *Sociologie de la traduction. Textes fondateurs* (Paris: Presses de l'École des Mines, 2006).

Albert, Mathieu, Elise Paradis, and Ayelet Kuper, 'Interdisciplinary Fantasy: Social Scientists and Humanities Scholars Working in Faculties of Medicine', in *Investigating Interdisciplinary Collaboration: Theory and Practice across Disciplines*, ed. Scott Frickel, Mathieu Albert, and Barbara Prainsack (New Brunswick, NJ and London: Rutgers University Press, 2017), 84–103.

Aldrich, John H., *Interdisciplinarity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014).

A. Rizzi et al., *What is Translation History?*, Translation History,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-20099-2

Armstrong, Guyda, *The English Boccaccio: A History in Books* (Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 2013).
Bachmann-Medick, Doris, *Übersetzung als Repräsentation fremder Kulturen* (Berlin: E. Schmidt, 1997).
Baier, Annette C., *Moral Prejudices. Essays on Ethics* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994).
Baigorri-Jalón, Jesús, *From Paris to Nuremberg. The Birth of Conference Interpreting*, trans. Holly Mikkelson and Barry Slaughter Olsen (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing, 2014).
Ballesteros Beretta, Antonio, *Alfonso X el Sabio* (Barcelona: El Albir, 1984).
Barry, Andrew and Georgina Born, *Interdisciplinarity Reconfigurations of the Social and Natural Sciences* (Abingdon, Oxon and New York: Routledge, 2013).
Beer, Gillian, *Open Fields: Science in Cultural Encounter* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 173–195.
Belle, Marie-Alice, 'At the Interface between Translation History and Literary History: A Genealogy of the Theme of "Progress" in Seventeenth-Century English Translation History and Criticism', *The Translator* 20 (2014): 44–63.
———, 'Rhetorical *Ethos* and the Translating Self in Early Modern England', in *Trust and Proof. Translators in Renaissance Print Culture*, ed. Andrea Rizzi (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2018), 62–84.
Belle, Marie-Alice and Brenda M. Hosington, 'Translation, History, and Print: A Model for the Study of Printed Translations in Early Modern Britain', *Translation Studies* 10 (2016): 2–21.
Benedict XVI, 'Faith, Reason and the University Memories and Reflections', Meeting with the Representatives of Science Lecture of the Holy Father, September 12, 2006, https://goo.gl/MbCYG7 (accessed 20 January 2019).
Bennett, Karen, 'The Scientific Revolution and Its Repercussions on the Translation of Technical Discourse', *The Translator* 17 (2011): 189–210.
Berman, Antoine, *La traduction et la lettre ou l'Auberge du lointain* (Paris: Seuil, 1999, first published 1985).
Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies: Investigations in Homage to Gideon Toury, ed., Anthony Pym, Miriam Shlesinger, and Daniel Simeoni (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2008).
Bistué, Belén, *Collaborative Translation and Multi-version Texts in Early Modern Europe* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013).
Bloch, Marc, *Land and Work in Mediaeval Europe; Selected Papers* (London and New York: Routledge, 2015, 1st ed. 1967).
Brisset, Annie, 'Clémence Royer, ou Darwin en colère', in *Portraits De Traductrices*, ed. Jean Delisle (Arras, France and Ottawa: Artois Presses Université and Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa, 2002), 173–203.
Brower, Reuben A., *On Translation* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959).

Brown, Jo Anne, *The Definition of a Profession. The Authority of Metaphor in the History of Intelligence Testing, 1890–1930* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992).

Burke, Peter, 'Overture to the New History: Its Past and Future', in *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*, ed. Peter Burke (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2001, 1st ed. 1991), 1–24.

———, 'The Circulation of Historical and Political Knowledge between Britain and the Netherlands (1600–1800)', in *Translating Knowledge in the Early Modern Low Countries*, ed. Harold John Cook and Sven Dupré (Münster: LIT Verlag, 2012), 41–52.

Callon, Michel and Bruno Latour, 'Unscrewing the Big Leviathan: How Actors Macro-structure Reality, and How Sociologists Help them to Do So', in *Advances in Social Theory and Methodology. Toward an Integration of Micro and Macro Sociologies*, ed. Karin D. Knorr and Aaron Cicourel (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 2006), 277–303.

Cámara, Lidia and Eva Espasa, 'The Audio Description of Scientific Multimedia', *The Translator* 17 (2011): 415–437.

Camille, Michael, *Image on the Edge: The Margins of Medieval Art* (London: Reaktion Books, 1992.

Casanova, Pascale, 'Consécration et accumulation de capital littéraire', *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 144 (2002): 7–20.

Chan, Andy L. J., 'Why are Most Translators Underpaid?', *Translation Journal* 9 (2005): http://www.translationjournal.net/journal/32asymmetric.htm (accessed 9 January 2019).

Chesterman, Andrew, 'Universalism in Translation Studies', *Translation Studies* 7 (2014): 82–90.

———, *Memes of Translation. The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2000).

Cheung, Martha, *An Anthology of Chinese Discourse on Translation* (Manchester: St Jerome Publishing, 2006).

Chlup, James T., 'Sallust's Melian Dialogue: Sulla and Bocchus in the "Bellum Iugurthinum"', *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 8 (2013): 191–207.

Clemens, Rebekah, *A Cultural History of Translation in Early Modern Japan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

Cohen, Paul, 'Torture and Translation in the Multilingual Courtrooms of Early Modern France', *Renaissance Quarterly* 69 (2016): 899–939.

Coldiron, Anne E. B., 'Visibility Now: Historicizing Foreign Presences in Translation', *Translation Studies* 5 (2012): 189–200.

———, *Printers Without Borders: Translation and Textuality in the Renaissance* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

Collaborative Translation: From the Renaissance to the Digital Age, ed. Anthony Cordingley and Céline Frigau Manning (London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2017).

Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, *Varietates Legitimae. Inculturation and the Roman Liturgy: Instruction*, 29 March 1994, http://www.adoremus.org/doc_inculturation.html (accessed 20 January 2019).

———, *Liturgiam Authenticam. On the Use of Vernacular Languages in the Publication of the Books of the Roman Liturgy*, 28 March 2001, https://goo.gl/GKpTGf (accessed 20 January 2019).

Consilium for Implementing the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Comme le prévoit. On the Translation of Liturgical Texts for Celebrations with a Congregation*, 1969, https://goo.gl/zne7JH (accessed 20 January 2019).

Copeland, Rita, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

Crease, Robert P., 'Physical Sciences', in *The Oxford Handbook of Interdisciplinarity*, ed. Robert Frodeman, Julie Thompson Klein, and Carl Mitcham (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 79–87.

Crew, David F., '*Alltagsgeschichte*: A New Social History "From Below?"', *Central European History* 22 (1989): 394–407.

Cronin, Michael, *Translation and Globalisation* (London and New York: Routledge, 2003).

Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe, ed. Peter Burke and R. Po-chia Hsia, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

d'Alverny, Marie-Thérèse, 'Deux traductions latines du Coran au Moyen Âge', *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge* 16 (1947–1948): 69–131.

D'hulst, Lieven, 'Pour une historiographie des theories de la traduction: questions de méthode', *TTR* 8 (1995): 13–33.

de Ceertau, Michel, 'Une pratique sociale de la difference: croire', in *Faire croire: modalités de la diffusion et de la reception des messages religieux du XIIe au XVe siècle* (Rome: École Française de Rome, 1981).

de Sousa Santos, Boaventura, *Epistemologies of the South: Justice Against Epistemicide* (London: Routledge, 2015).

———, *The End of the Cognitive Empire: The Coming of Age of Epistemologies of the South* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2018).

Deane-Cox, Sharon, *Retranslation: Translation, Literature and Reinterpretation* (London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014).

Deleuze, Gilles, *Différence et répétition* (Paris: Presses Universitaires France, 1968).

Delisle, Jean and Judith Woodsworth, *Translators through History* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2012, 1st ed. 1995).

Delisle, Jean, 'Réflexions sur l'historiographie de la traduction et ses exigences scientifiques', *Équivalences* 26 and 27 (1997–1998): 21–43.

Derrida, Jacques, 'The Principle of Reason: The University in the Eyes of Its Pupils', *Diacritics* 13 (1983): 3–20.

———, *Acts of Literature*, ed. Derek Attridge and trans. varii (Routledge: New York and London, 1992).
Drobňák, Matej, 'Quine on Shared Language and Linguistic Communities', *Philosophia* 46 (2018): 83–99.
Edwards, Rosalind, Claire Alexander, and Bogusia Temple, 'Interpreting Trust: Abstract and Personal Trust for People Who Need Interpreters to Access Services', *Sociological Research Online* 11 (2006): http://www.socresonline.org.uk/11/1/edwards.html (accessed 14 July 2018).
Eighteenth-Century Poetry: An Annotated Anthology, ed. David Fairer and Christine Gerrard (London: John Wiley & Sons, 2014), 426.
Fawcett, Peter, 'Book Review: "Science in Translation"', *The Translator* 7 (2001): 99–103.
Ferguson, Margaret, *Dido's Daughters: Literacy, Gender, and Empire in Early Modern England and France* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2003).
Folaron, Deborah and Hélène Buzelin, 'Introduction: Connecting Translation and Network Studies', *Meta: Journal des traducteurs* 52 (2007): 605–642.
Forrest, Ian, *Trustworthy Men. How Inequality and Faith Made the Medieval Church* (Princeton, NJ and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2018).
Frickel, Scott, Mathieu Albert, and Barbara Prainsack, 'Introduction: Investigating Interdisciplinarities', in *Investigating Interdisciplinary Collaboration: Theory and Practice across Disciplines*, ed. Scott Frickel, Mathieu Albert, and Barbara Prainsack (New Brunswick, NJ and London: Rutgers University Press, 2017), 5–24.
Frodeman, Robert, Julie Thompson Klein, and Carl Mitcham, *The Oxford Handbook of Interdisciplinarity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).
Gadamer, Hans-Georg, *Wahrheit und Methode* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1960).
Galison, Peter Louis, 'Trading with the Enemy', in *Trading Zones and Interactional Expertise. Creating New Kinds of Collaboration*, ed. Michael E. Gorman (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2010), 25–52.
———, *Image and Logic: A Material Culture of Metaphysics* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1997).
Gendron-Pontbriand, Eve-Marie, 'Le Traitement de la modalité épistémique dans les traductions françaises de "On the Origin of Species" de Charles Darwin', *Meta* 61 (2016): 87–112.
Gibson, Charles, *Tlaxcala in the Sixteenth Century*, trans. Agustín Bárcena (Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1991, 1st ed. 1952), 79–84.
Gil, David, 'Describing Languoids: When Incommensurability Meets the Language-Dialect Continuum', *Linguistic Typology* 20 (2016): 439–462.
Ginzburg, Carlo, *Il formaggio e i vermi. Il cosmo di un mugnaio del '500* (Turin: Einaudi, 1999, 1st ed. 1976).
Gliboff, Sander, *H.G. Bronn, Ernst Haeckel, and the Origins of German Darwinism: A Study in Translation and Transformation* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2008).

Glick, Thomas F., Miguel Angel Puig-Samper, and Rosaura Ruiz, *The Reception of Darwinism in the Iberian World: Spain, Spanish America, and Brazil* (Dordrecht and Boston: Kluwer Academic, 2001).
Goodrich, Jamie, *Faithful Translators. Authorship, Gender, and Religion in Early Modern England* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2014).
Gouwens, Kenneth, 'Human Exceptionalism' in *The Renaissance World*, ed. John J. Martin (London and New York: Routledge, 2007), 415–434.
Graybill, Jessica K. and Vivek Shandas, 'Doctoral Student and Early Career Academic Perspectives', in *The Oxford Handbook of Interdisciplinarity*, ed. Robert Frodeman, Julie Thompson Klein, and Carl Mitcham (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 404–418.
Greene, Thomas M., *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982).
Hacking, Ian, *Historical Ontology* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002).
Haddadian-Moghaddam, Esmaeil, *Literary Translation in Modern Iran. A Sociological Study* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2015).
Hadley, James, 'Indirect Translation and Discursive Identity: Proposing the Concatenation Effect Hypothesis', *Translation Studies* 10 (2017): 183–197.
Hakli, Jouni, 'Geographies of Trust', in *Social Capital and Urban Networks of Trust*, ed. Jouni Hakli and Claudio Minca (London: Routledge, 2009).
Hardin, Russell, *Trust and Trustworthiness* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2002).
Hardy, Grant, *Worlds of Bronze and Bamboo. Sima Qian's Conquest of History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999).
Harris, Brian, 'Norms in Interpretation', *Target*, 2 (1990): 115–119.
Hermans, Theo, 'Positioning Translators: Voices, Views, and Values in Translation', *Language and Literature* 23 (2014): 285–301.
———, 'The Translator's Voice in Translated Narrative', *Target* 8 (1996): 23–48.
———, 'Translation, Irritation and Resonance', *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*, ed. Michaela Wolf and Alexandra Fukari (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2007), 57–75.
Hoquet, Thierry, 'Translating Natural Selection: True Concept, but False Term?', in *Classification and Evolution in Biology, Linguistics and the History of Science: Concepts—Methods—Visualization*, ed. Heiner Fangerau, Hans Geisler, Thorsten Halling, and William Martin (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2013), 67–95.
Hosington, Brenda, 'Tudor Englishwomen's Translations of Continental Protest Texts: The Interplay of Ideology and Historical Context', in *Tudor Translation*, ed. Fred Schurink (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 121–142.
Hosking, Geoffrey, *Trust: A History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).

Huutoniemi, Katri, 'Evaluating Interdisciplinary Research', in *The Oxford Handbook of Interdisciplinarity*, ed. Robert Frodeman, Julie Thompson Klein, and Carl Mitcham (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 309–320.

Ianziti, Gary, *Writing History in Renaissance Italy: Leonardo Bruni and the Uses of the Past* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012).

Janson, Horst W., *Apes and Apes Lore* (London: Warburg Institute, University of London, 1952).

John Paul II, *Slavorum Apostoli*, https://goo.gl/ZS8LPx (accessed 19 January 2019).

Jooken, Lieve and Guy Rooryck, 'The Freedom of Expressing One's Ideas', *The Translator* 17 (2011): 233–254.

Jumpelt, Rudolf Walter, *Die Übersetzung naturwissenschaftlicher und technischer Literatur. Sprachliche Massstäbe und Methoden zur Bestimmung ihrer Wesenszüge und Probleme* (Berlin: Langenscheidt, 1961).

Karttunen, Frances E., *Between Worlds: Interpreters, Guides, and Survivors* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1994).

Keane, John, *Public Life and Late Capitalism. Towards a Socialist Theory of Democracy* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

Kelly, Louis G., *The True Interpreter. A History of Translation Theory and Practice in the West* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979).

Kenny, Dorothy, 'Sustaining Disruption? The Transition from Statistical to Neural Machine Translation', *Revista Tradumàtica. Tecnologies de la Traducció* 16 (2018): 59–70.

Krein-Kühle, Monika, 'Laying the Foundations for Scientific and Technical Translation', *The Translator* 17 (2011): 439–444.

Krzys, Richard, 'Library Historiography', in *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science*, ed. Miriam A. Drake, 2nd ed. (New York and Basel: Dekker, 2003), III, 1621–1641.

Kuhn, Thomas S., *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. With an Introductory Essay by Ian Hacking*, 4th ed. (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2012).

Labov, William, *Sociolinguistic Patterns* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972).

Lang, Birgit, 'Psychoanalysts Through Translation: Julien (Johan) Varendonck (1879–1924)–Anna Freud (1895–1982)', in *Brussels: 1900: Vienna*, ed. Piet Defraeye, Helga Mitterbauer, and Chris Reyns (Amsterdam: Brill, 2019).

Leigh Star, Susan and James R. Griesemer, 'Institutional Ecology, "Translations," and Boundary Objects: Amateurs and Professionals in Berkeley's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, 1907–1939', *Boundary Objects and Beyond: Working with Leigh Star*, ed. Geoffrey C. Bowker, et al. (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2016), 173–195.

Lépinette, Brigitte, *La historia de la traducción. Metodología. Apuntes bibliográficos* (Valencia: Universitat de València, 1997).
Levinas, Emmanuel, *Entre nous, essais sur le penser à l'autre* (Paris: Grasset, 1991).
———, *Totalité et infini. Essai sur l'extériorité* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1961).
Lewis, Bernard, *From Babel to Dragomans. Interpreting in the Middle East* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2004).
Lianeri, Alexandra, 'Translation and the Language(s) of Historiography. Understanding Ancient Greek and Chinese Ideas of History', in *Translating Others*, ed. Theo Hermans, 2 vols. (London and New York: Routledge, 2006), I, 67–86.
Liao, Min-Hsiu, 'Interaction in the Genre of Popular Science', *The Translator* 17 (2011): 349–368.
Littau, Karin, 'First Steps Towards a Media History of Translation', *Translation Studies* 4 (2011): 261–281.
López Alcalá, Samuel, *La historia, la traducción y el control del pasado* (Madrid: Universidad Pontificia Comillas, 2001).
Luhmann, Niklas, 'Familiarity, Confidence, Trust: Problems and Alternatives', in *Trust Making and Breaking. Cooperative Relations*, ed. Diego Gambetta (New York: Blackwell, 1988), 94–108.
———, *Die Realität der Massenmedien* (Wiesbaden: Westdeutsche Verlag, 1996, 1st ed. 1995).
———, *Soziale Systeme: Grundriss einer allgemeinen Theorie* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1984).
———, *Vertrauen. Ein Mechanismus der Reduktion sozialer Komplexität* (Stuttgart: Ferdidand Enke, 1989, 1st ed. 1968).
Lyotard, Jean-Francois, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984).
Mack, Peter, *A History of Renaissance Rhetoric 1380–1620* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).
Malena, Anne, 'Where is the "History" in Translation Histories?', *TTR: Traduction, Terminologie, Rèdaction* 24 (2011): 87–115.
Margoliouth, David Samuel, *Lectures on Arabic Historians* (New York: Lenox Hill, 1972, 1st ed. 1930).
Marx, Karl, *Misère de la philosophie* (Paris and Brussels: A. Frank and C. H. Vogler, 1847).
McClure, George, *The Culture of Profession in Late Renaissance Italy* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004).
McKitterick, David, *Print, Manuscript and the Search for Order, 1450–1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
McLaughlin, Martin M., *Literary Imitation in the Italian Renaissance. The Theory and Practice of Literary Imitation in Italy from Dante to Bembo* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).

McLean, Paul D., *Culture in Networks* (Cambridge, UK and Malden, MA: Polity Press, 2017).

———, *The Art of the Network: Strategic Interaction and Patronage in Renaissance Florence* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007).

Meade, Ruselle, 'Translation of a Discipline', *The Translator* 17 (2011): 211–231.

Meschonnic, Henry, *Ethics and Politics of Translating*, trans. and ed. Pierre-Pascale Boulanger (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2011).

Metcalf, Alida C., *Go-between and the Colonization of Brazil, 1500–1600* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2005).

Michael, Bernardo A., *Statemaking and Territory in South Asia: Lessons from the Anglo–Gorkha War (1814–1816)* (London: Anthem, 2012).

Miller, Susan, *Trust in Texts: A Different History of Rhetoric* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2008).

Milton, John, 'As traduções do Clube do Livro', *TradTerm* 3 (1996): 47–65.

Missionary Linguistics V/Linguistica Misionera V. Translation Theories and Practices, ed. Otto Zwartjes, Klaus Zimmerman et al. (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2014).

Misztal, Barbara A., *Trust in Modern Societies. The Search for the Bases of Social Order* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1996).

Möllering, Guido, 'The Nature of Trust: From Georg Simmel to a Theory of Expectation, Interpretation and Suspension', *Sociology* 35 (2001): 403–420.

Montgomery, Scott L, *Does Science Need a Global Language? English and the Future of Research* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2013).

———, *Science in Translation: Movements of Knowledge Through Cultures and Time* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2000).

———, 'Scientific Translation', in *Handbook of Translation Studies*, ed. Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2010), 299–305.

Moran, Joe, *Interdisciplinarity*, 2nd ed. (Abingdon, Oxon and New York, NY: Routledge, 2010).

Mounin, George, *Teoria e storia della traduzione* (Turin: Einaudi, 1965).

Mumford, Lewis, *Technics and Civilization* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1934).

Munday, Jeremy, 'Using Primary Sources to Produce a Microhistory of Translation and Translators: Theoretical and Methodological Concerns', *The Translator* 20 (2014): 64–80.

Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus, ed. Emily Baragwanath and Mathieu de Bakker (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

Nappi, Carla, 'Full. Empty. Stop. Go: Translating Miscellany in Early Modern China', in *Early Modern Cultures of Translation*, ed. Karen Newman and Jane Tylus (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015), 212–227.

———, 'The Global and Beyond. Adventures in the Local Historiographies of Science', *Isis* 104 (2013): 102–110.

Niranjana, Tesjaswini, *Siting Translation: History, Post-structuralism, and the Colonial Context* (Oakland: University of California Press, 1992).

Nord, Christiane, *Text Analysis in Translation* (Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1991).

———, *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained* (Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 1997).

Norton, Glyn P., *The Ideology and Language of Translation in Renaissance France and their Humanist Antecedents* (Genève: Droz, 1984).

Okayama, Emiko, 'A Nagasaki Translator of Chinese and the Making of a New Literary Genre', in *Translation and Translation Studies in the Japanese Context*, ed. Nana Sato-Rossberg and Judy Wakabayashi (London and New York: Continuum, 2012), 53–72.

Olohan, Maeve and Myriam Salama-Carr, 'Translating Science', *The Translator* 17 (2011): 179–199.

Ortega y Gasset, José, 'The Misery and Splendor of Translation', trans. Carl R. Shirley, *Translation Review* 13 (2012): 18–30.

Paker, Saliha, 'Ottoman Conceptions of Translation and its Practice: The 1897 "Classics Debate" as a Focus of Examining Change', in *Translating Others*, ed. Theo Hermans, 2 vols. (London and New York: Routledge, 2006), II, 325–348.

Palmer, Carol L., 'Information Research on Interdisciplinarity', in *The Oxford Handbook of Interdisciplinarity*, ed. Robert Frodeman, Julie Thompson Klein, and Carl Mitcham (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 174–178.

Paloposki, Outi, 'Translation History: Audiences, Collaboration and Interdisciplinarity', *MonTI* 5 (2013): 213–239.

Paloposki, Outi and Kaisa Koskinen, 'A Thousand and One Translations: Revisiting Retranslation', *Claims, Change and Challenges in Translation Studies*, ed. Gyde Hansen, Kirsten Malmkjaer, and Daniel Gile (Amsterdam and Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing, 2004) 27–38.

Pano Alamán, Ana and Fabio Regattin, *Tradurre un classico della scienza: traduzioni e ritraduzioni dell'Origin of Species di Charles Darwin in Francia, Italia e Spagna* (Bologna: Bononia University Press, 2015).

Pfirman, Stephanie and Paula J. S. Martin, 'Facilitating Interdisciplinary Scholars', in *The Oxford Handbook of Interdisciplinarity*, ed. Robert Frodeman, Julie Thompson Klein, and Carl Mitcham (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 387–403.

Phukan, Shibani, 'Towards an Indian Theory of Translation', *Wasafiri* 27 (2003), 27–30.

Pokorn, Nike K. and Jaka Čibej, '"Do I Want to Learn a Language Spoken by Two Million People?", Mediation Choices by Mid-term and Long-term Migrants', *Language Problems and Language Planning* 42 (2018): 308–327.

Politics, Policy and Power in Translation History, ed. Lieven D'hulst, Carol O'Sullivan, and Michael Schreiber (Berlin: Frank & Timme, Verlag für wissenschaftliche Literatur, 2016).

Portraits de traducteurs, ed. Jean Delisle (Ottawa: Les Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa, 1999).

Pym, Anthony, 'A Complaint Concerning the Lack of History in Translation Histories', *Livius. Revista de Estudios de Traducción* 1 (1992): 1–11.

———, 'Cross-Cultural Networking: Translators in the French-German Network of *Petites Revues* at the End of the Nineteenth Century', *Meta* 52 (2007): 744–762.

———, *Exploring Translation Theories*, 2nd ed. (London and New York: Routledge, 2014).

———, 'Lives of Henri Albert, Nietzschean Translator', in *Translators' Strategies and Creativity*, ed. Ann Beylard-Ozeroff, Jana Králová, and Barbara Moser-Mercer (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 1998), 117–125.

———, 'The Medieval Postmodern in Translation Studies', *And Translation Changed the World (and the World Changed Translation)*, ed. Alberto Fuertes and Ester Torres-Simón (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing 2015), 105–123.

———, *Method in Translation History* (London and New York: Routledge, 2014, 1st ed. 1998).

———, *Negotiating the Frontier. Translators and Intercultures in Hispanic History* (London and New York: Routledge, 2014, 1st ed. 2000).

———, 'On the Social and the Cultural in Translation Studies', in *Sociocultural Aspects of Translating and Interpreting*, ed. Anthony Pym, Miriam Shlesinger, and Zuzana Jettmarová (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2006), 1–25.

———, *On Translator Ethics. Principles for Mediation between Cultures*, trans. Heike Walker (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2012).

———, 'Risk Analysis as a Heuristic Tool in the Historiography of Interpreters. For an Understanding of Worst Practices', *New Insights in the History of Interpreting*, ed. Jesús Baigorri-Jalón and Kayoko Takeda (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2016), 247–269.

———, 'Translating as Risk Management', *Journal of Pragmatics* 85 (2015): 67–80

———, *Translation and Text Transfer: An Essay on the Principles of Intercultural Communication* (Frankfurt am Main and New York: Peter Lang, 1992, repr. Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group, 2010).

———, '*Translators Do More than Translate*', Paper presented to the International Federation of Translators World Congress, Brisbane, unpublished, 2017.

———, 'Twelfth-Century Toledo and Strategies of the Literalist Trojan Horse', *Target* 6 (1994): 43–66.

Pym, Anthony and Grzegorz Chrupala, 'The Quantitative Analysis of Translation Flows in the Age of an International Language', in *Less Translated Languages*, ed. Albert Branchadell and Lovell Margaret West (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2004), 27–38.

Pym, Anthony, François Grin, Claudio Sfreddo, and Andy L. J. Chan, *The Status of the Translation Profession in the European Union* (Luxembourg: European Commission, 2012).

Rademaker, Laura, *Found in Translation: Many Meanings on a North Australian Mission* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2018).

Rafael, Vicente, *Contracting Colonialism: Translation and Christian Conversion in Tagalog Society Under Early Spanish Rule* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988).

Ramone, Jenni, *Salman Rushdie and Translation* (London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2013).

Reiss, Katharina and Hans J. Vermeer, *Towards a General Theory of Translational Action: Skopos Theory Explained* (Milton Park, Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2013, first published in German in 1984).

Renaissance Go-betweense. Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe, ed. Andres Höfele and Werner von Koppenfels (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2005).

Rener, Frederick R., *Interpretatio: Language and Translation from Cicero to Tyler* (Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1989).

Reynolds, Susan, *The Middle Ages Without Feudalism. Essays in Criticism and Comparison on the Medieval West* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012).

Ricci, Ronit, 'On the Untranslatability of "Translation": Considerations from Java, Indonesia"', *Translation in Asia: Theories, Practices, Histories*, ed. Ronit Ricci and Jan van der Putten (Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 2011), 57–72.

Richardson, Brian, 'The Social Transmission of Translations in Renaissance Italy: Strategies of Dedication, in *Trust and Proof. Translators in Renaissance Print Culture*, ed. Andrea Rizzi (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2018), 13–32.

Rizzi, Andrea, 'English News in Translation: The "Comentario del Successo dell'Armata Spagnola" by Petruccio Ubaldini and its English Version', *Spunti e Ricerche* 22 (2007): 89–102.

———, *Vernacular Translators in Quattrocento Italy. Scribal Culture, Authority, and Agency* (Turnhour: Brepols, 2017)

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

———, *Who Translates? Translator Subjectivities Beyond Reason* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001).

Rojo López, Ana María and Nicolás Campos Plaza, *Interdisciplinarity in Translation Studies: Theoretical Models, Creative Approaches and Applied Methods* (Bern: Peter Lang, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften, 2016).

Roland, Ruth, *Interpreters as Diplomats. A Diplomatic History of the Role of Interpreters in World Politics* (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1999).
Rosenwein, Barbara H., *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press, 2006).
Rothman, Natalie, *Brokering Empire: Trans-imperial Subjects between Venice and Istanbul* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2012).
Rousseau, Denise M., Sim B. Sitkin, Ronald S. Burt, and Colin Camerer, 'Not So Different After All: A Cross-Discipline View of Trust', *Academy of Management Review* 23 (1998): 393–404.
Rundle, Christopher, 'Theories and Methodologies of Translation Histories: The Value of an Interdisciplinary Approach', *Translator* 20 (2014): 2–8.
———, 'Translation as an Approach to History', *Translation Studies* 5 (2012): 232–240.
Rupke, Nicolaas A., 'Translation Studies in the History of Science: The Example of Vestiges', *British Journal for the History of Science* 33 (2000): 209–222.
Rupp-Eisenreich, Britta, 'Darwinisme Allemand' in *Dictionnaire du Darwinisme et de l'évolution*, ed. Patrick Tort (Paris: PUF, 1996), 848–855.
Rushdie, Salman, *Shame* (London: Cape, 1983).
Sakai, Naoki, 'The Modern Regime of Translation and Its Politics', *A History of Modern Translation Knowledge: Sources, Concepts, Effects*, ed. Lieven D'hulst and Yves Gambier (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2018), 61–74.
———, *Translation and Subjectivity. On Japan and Cultural Nationalism* (Minnesota and London: Minnesota University Press, 1997).
Sánchez, Dolores, 'Translating Science: Contexts and Contests', *The Translator* 17 (2011): 325–348.
Sankey, Howard, 'Kuhn's Changing Concept of Incommensurability', *The British Society for the Philosophy of Science* 44 (1993): 759–774.
Santoyo, Julio-César, 'Blank Spaces in the History of Translation', in *Charting the Future of Translation History*, ed. George L. Bastin and Paul F. Bandia (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 2006), 11–44.
Šarčević, Susan, 'Translation and the Law: An Interdisciplinary Approach', in Translation Studies—An Interdiscipline, ed. Mary Snell-Hornby, Franz Pöchhacker, and Klaus Kaindl (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 1992), 301–307.
Schaffer, Simon, *The Brokered World: Go-betweens and Global Intelligence, 1770–1820* (Sagamore Beach, MA: Science History Publications, 2009).
Schleiermacher, Friedrich, 'From "On the Different Method of Translating"', in *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*, trans. Waltraut Bartsch and ed. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 36–54.

Schubert, Klaus, 'Technical Translation', in *Handbook of Translation Studies*, ed. Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2010), 350–355.

Semizu, Yukinoe, 'Invisible Translation: Reading Chinese Texts in Ancient Japan', in *Translating Others*, ed. Theo Hermans, II (Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 2006), 283–295.

Serres, Michel, *Hermès III. La traduction* (Paris: Minuit, 1974).

Sewell Jr., William H., *Logics of History. Social Theory and Social Transformation* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2005).

Sharkas, Hala, 'The Use of Glossing in Modern Original Scientific Writing in Arabic', *The Translator* 17 (2011): 369–389.

Shuttleworth, Mark, 'Translational Behaviour at the Frontiers of Scientific Knowledge', *The Translator* 17 (2011): 301–323.

Simon, Sherry, 'Délivrer la Bible. La théorie d'Eugène Nida', *Meta* 32 (1987): 429–437.

Smith, Pamela H. and Paula Findlen, *Merchants & Marvels: Commerce, Science, and Art in Early Modern Europe* (London and New York: Routledge, 2002).

Snell-Hornby, Mary, 'The Turns of Translation Studies', in *Handbook of Translation Studies*, ed. Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2010), 366–370.

Spoturno, María Laura, 'Revisiting Malinche: A Study of Her Role as an Interpreter', in *Translators, Interpreters, and Cultural Negotiators. Mediating and Communicating Power from the Middle Ages to the Modern Era*, ed. Federico Federici and Dario Tessicini (Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 121–135.

Sriraman, Bharath, Viktor Freiman, and Nicole Lirette-Pitre, *Interdisciplinarity, Creativity, and Learning: Mathematics with Literature, Paradoxes, History, Technology, and Modeling* (Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 2009).

Steiner, George, *After Babel. Aspects of Language and Translation* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1998, 1st ed. 1975).

Suau Jiménez, Francisca Antonia and Barry Pennock Speck, *Interdisciplinarity and Languages Current Issues in Research, Teaching, Professional Applications and ICT* (Bern: Peter Lang, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften, 2011).

Sunkyung Klein, Esther, *Reading Sima Qian from Han to Song. The Father of History in Pre-modern China* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2019).

Tatz, Colin, 'Confronting Australian Genocide', *Aboriginal History* 25 (2001):16–36.

The Culture of Translation in Early Modern England and France, 1500–1660, ed. Tania Demetriou and Rowan Tomlinson (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015).

The Literary and Cultural Reception of Charles Darwin in Europe, ed. Thomas F. Glick and Elinor S. Shaffer (London: Bloomsbury, 2014).

The Politics of Risk Society, ed. Jane Franklin (Cambridge, UK and Malden, MA: Polity Press, 1998).

The Pushing-Hands of Translation and its Theory. In Memoriam Martha Cheung, 1953–2013, ed. Douglas Robinson (London and New York: Routledge, 2016).

The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Politics, ed. Fruela Fernandéz and Jonathan Evans (Milton Park and New York: Routledge, 2018).

The Sociology of Georg Simmel, trans. and ed. Kurt H. Wolff (Glencoe, IL: The Free Press, 1950).

The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Translated from the German by James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud (London: Hogarth Press, 1953–1974).

The Translatability of Cultures. Figurations of the Spaces between, ed. Sanford Budick and Wolfgang Iser (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996).

The Translation Studies Reader, ed. Lawrence Venuti (London and New York: Routledge, 2012, 1st ed. 2000).

Thomas, James, 'Fabre d'Olivet's Le Troubadour and the Textuality of Pseudotranslation', in *Literary Translation. Redrawing the Boundaries*, ed. Jean Boase-Beier, Antoinette Fawcett, and Philip Wilson (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 134–148.

Thompson Klein, Julie, *Humanities, Culture, and Interdisciplinarity: The Changing American Academy* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005).

———, *Interdisciplinarity: History, Theory, and Practice* (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1990).

Tian, Chuanmao, 'Effects of Government Policy on the Retranslation Boom in the 1990s Mainland China and Beyond', *International Journal of English Language and Culture* 2 (2014): 12–17.

Tilly, Charles, *Trust and Rule* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

Tönnies, Ferdinand, *Community and Society*, trans. Charles P. Loomis (New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1988, 1st ed. in German 1887, 1st ed. in English 1957).

Toury, Gideon, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 1995).

Translating Knowledge in the Early Modern Low Countries, ed. Harold J. Cook and Sven Dupré (Münster: Lit Verlag, 2012).

Translating Others, ed. Theo Hermans, 2 vols. (London and New York: Routledge, 2006).

'Translation and Print Culture in Early Modern Europe', ed. Brenda M. Hosington, special issue of *Renaissance Studies* 29 (2015).

Translation, History, and Culture, ed. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere (London and New York: Pinter Publishers, 1990).

Translation/History/Culture. A Sourcebook, ed. André Lefevere (London and New York: Routledge, 2002, 1st ed. 1992).

Translators, Interpreters, and Cultural Negotiators. Mediating and Communicating Power from the Middle Ages to the Modern Era, ed. Federico Federici and Dario Tessicini (Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).

Trivedi, Harish, 'In Our Own Time, On Our Own Terms: "Translation in India"', in *Translating Others*, ed. Theo Hermans, 2 vols. (London and New York: Routledge, 2006), I, 102–119.

Trovato, Paolo, *Con ogni diligenza corretto. La stampa e le revisioni editoriali dei testi letterari italiani (1470–1570)* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1991).

Tudor Translation, ed. Fred Schurink, (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

Turell, Maria Teresa, 'Textual Kidnapping Revisited: The Case of Plagiarism in Literary Translation', *International Journal of Speech, Language and the Law* 11 (2004): https://journals.equinoxpub.com/index.php/IJSLL/article/view/536 (accessed 3 March 2019).

Valdeón, Roberto, *Translation and the Spanish Empire in the Americas* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2014).

Vandepitte, Sonia, Liselotte Vandenbussche, and Brecht Algoet, 'Travelling Certainties. Darwin's Doubts and Their Dutch Translations', *The Translator* 17 (2011): 275–299.

Venuti, Lawrence, *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* (London and New York: Routledge, 2008, 1st ed. 1995).

Vermeer, Hans J., 'Skopos and Commission in Translational Action', in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti (London and New York: Routledge, 2000).

———, *Luhmann's 'Social Systems' Theory: Preliminary Fragments for a Theory of Translation* (Berlin: Frank & Timme, 2006).

Walsh Hokenson, Jan and Marcella Munson, *The Bilingual Text. History and the Theory of Literary Self-Translation* (Manchester and Kinderhook: St. Jerome Publishing, 2007).

Wang, Xinli, *Incommensurability and Cross-Language Communication* (Aldershot, UK and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007), 25–51.

Ward, Janet, 'Interdisciplinarity, German Studies, and the Humanities', *German Studies Review* 39 (2016): 517–527.

Weingart, Peter, 'A Short History of Knowledge Formations', *The Oxford Handbook of Interdisciplinarity*, ed. Robert Frodeman, Julie Thompson Klein, and Carl Mitcham (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 3–14.

Werner, Michael and Bénédicte Zimmermann, 'Beyond Comparison: *Histoire Croisée* and the Challenge of Reflexivity', *History and Theory* 45 (2006): 30–50.

White, Hayden, 'The Problem of Change in Literary History', *New Literary History* 7 (1975): 97–111.

Winichakul, Thongchai, 'Siam Mapped: The Making of Thai Nationhood', *The Ecologist* 26 (1996): 205–221.
Wolf, Michaela and Alexandra Fukari, *Constructing a Sociology of Translation* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: J. Benjamins, 2007).
Wright, Crispin, 'Indeterminacy of Translation', in *A Companion to the Philosophy of Language. Volume 1*, ed. Bob Hale, Crispin Wright, and Alexander Miller (Chichester, West Sussex and Malden, MA: Wiley, 2017), 670–702.
Wright, Sue Ellen, 'Scientific, Technical, and Medical Translation', *The Oxford Handbook of Translation Studies*, ed. Kirsten Malmkjær and Kevin Windle (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 243–261.
Wyatt, Michael William, *The Italian Encounter with Tudor England. A Cultural Politics of Translation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
Zarandona, Juan Miguel, '*Amadis of Gaul* (1803) and *Chronicle of the Cid* (1808) by Robert Southey. The Medieval History of Spain Translated' in *Charting the Future of Translation History*, ed. Georges L. Bastin and Paul F. Bandia (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 2006), 309–332.
Zhang, Hanmo, *Authorship and Text-Making in Early China* (Amsterdam: De Gruyter, 2018).

Index[1]

A

Aboriginal languages, *see* Indigenous languages
Actor-network theory, 7, 40, 67
Acuña-Partal, Carmen, 98, 99, 108n59
Adamo, Sergia, 6, 67
Agorni, Mirella, 5
Albert, Henri, 67, 68
Albert, Mathieu, 88
Alcalá, Samuel López, 4
Aleppo, 38
Alfonso the Learned, King of Castile, 78
Anindilyakwa language, 82
Arabic
  language, 63, 78
  sciences, 63
  scientists, 63
Aristotle, 8, 47
Australia, 71, 81, 82
  Groote Eylandt, 82
Australian Research Council (ARC), 89
Auxiliary science, 92, 96, 99, 101
Aztec
  Empire, 6
  people, 6

B

Bacon, Francis, 67
Baghdad, 78
Baier, Annette, 13
Ballarino, Tommaso, 18
Belgium, 98
Belle, Marie-Alice, 3
Benedict XVI, Pope, 75
Bennett, Karen, 97
Berman, Antoine, 76
Biàn (Chinese), 21
Bible, 75
Bistué, Belén, 5
Bloch, Marc, 50
Bocchus, King of Mauritania, 11, 29n43
Bourdieu, Pierre, 3, 40, 59n65
Brazilian Portuguese language, 78

[1] Note: Page numbers followed by 'n' refer to notes.

A. Rizzi et al., *What is Translation History?*, Translation History,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-20099-2

Bronn, H. G., 98
Brucioli, Antonio, 17, 18
Bruni, Leonardo, 36
Budick, Sanford, 5
Bukhara, 38
Burke, Peter, 14, 40

C
Callon, Michel, 8
Castile, 78
Chaucer, Geoffrey, 73
Chengyu (Chinese), 70
Chesterman, Andrew, 5, 10, 70
China, 14, 21, 33, 41, 46, 50, 52, 71
Chinese language, 4, 9, 21, 34, 46, 48–50, 52, 65, 70
Christian, 44, 45, 48, 73, 74
Cicero, Marcus Tullius, 4, 8, 20, 36, 43
Client, 6, 9–14, 17, 19, 22, 34, 37, 38, 41, 42, 45, 47, 48, 51, 52, 66, 67, 73, 78, 111
Cohen, Paul, 64
Coindreau, Maurice-Edgar, 43
Collaboration, 4, 5, 13, 18, 24n6, 36, 37, 40, 42, 88, 89
Confucius, *see* Kongzi
Copeland, Rita, 3
Cordingley, Anthony, 5
Cortés, Hernán, 6
Cortesi, Paolo, 43
Cosimo I de' Medici, 17
Crease, Robert P., 87
Creole, 82, 91
Cronin, Michael, 39
Cross-cultural, 27n22, 77, 79
Cyril, translator, 74
Czech language, 51

D
Dabar, African interpreter, 11, 29n43
Dandolo, Teodoro, 38
Darwin, Charles, 96–99, 101, 107n52, 107n58, 108n59
De Biase, Carmine G., 5
de Francesio, Giovan, 18
Deane-Cox, Sharon, 5, 45
Deleuze, Gilles, 67
Delisle, Jean, 6, 24n9
Derrida, Jacques, 44, 90
D'hulst, Lieven, 5, 6
Dietz, Bettina, 5, 107n51
Distrust, 6, 8–15, 18, 19, 21, 22, 33–35, 38, 40–42, 52, 64, 88, 90, 95
Dolet, Étienne, 11
Domestication, 48, 76
Doña Marina, 5, 6
Dragoman, 22, 37, 38, 45, 49, 50
Dudley, Anne, Countess of Warwick, 49
Dutch language, 48, 80, 107n58

E
Einstein, Albert, 74
Elizabeth I, Queen of England, 15, 16
Emotions, 8, 35, 40, 41
Engels, Friedrich, 73
English language, 4, 15–17, 23n6, 45, 46, 48, 51, 65, 71, 73, 76, 79, 80, 82, 95–98, 100, 101
Erasmus, Desiderius, 43
European Union, 13, 76
Externality, 62, 67, 81, 90

F
Fán (Chinese), 21
Ferguson, Margaret, 5
Fidelis (Latin), 20–22, 47, 49
Fides (Latin), 11, 21
Fidus (Latin), 20–22, 47, 49
Flaubert, Gustave, 45
Foreignisation, 6

Francesco, Grand Duke of Tuscany, 17
Freud, Sigmund, 45
Frickel, Scott, 88

G
Gadamer, Hans-Georg, 72
Galison, Peter, 91, 92, 94, 100
Genetic criticism, 46
Gesellschaft, community, 13
Ginzburg, Carlo, 67, 68
Giolito, Gabriele, 17, 18
Gliboff, Sander, 98, 99
Go-between, 11, 13, 19, 22, 27n21, 29n43, 38–40, 110
Greece, 8, 19
Greek language, 8, 9, 36, 50, 75, 92
Gutenberg, Johannes, 78

H
Hacking, Ian, 40
Han dynasty, 8
Harris, Brian, 41
Hermans, Theo, 45, 62
Hermeneutics, 72
Herodotus, 8, 9, 28n32, 70
Hieronymus Eusebius, *see* Jerome
Histoire croisée, 7
Hosking, Jeffrey, 14
Hsia, Po-chia, 40
Huâ (Chinese), 21

I
Inculturation, 74–76
India, 19, 79
Indigenous languages, 64, 82
Individualism, 52
Inquisition, 7, 68
Intercultural, 1–6, 9, 11, 13, 17, 19, 22, 27n21, 27n22, 34, 35, 37, 38, 40–42, 44, 48–50, 52, 66, 68, 75, 88, 95
Interdisciplinarity, 2, 5, 23, 24n6, 87–108, 111
Interdisciplinarity research, 23, 87
Interpreter, 3–6, 10–14, 20, 22, 29n43, 33–42, 44, 45, 47, 49–52, 59n67, 63, 64, 110, 111
Interpreting, 1, 2, 4, 5, 10–12, 14, 17–19, 35, 40–42, 52, 53, 59n67, 64, 73, 110
Iran, 19, 51, 52, 58n63
Iser, Wolfgang, 5
Islamic
  historians, 44
  literatures, 80
  science, 73
Isnad (Arabic), 44, 45

J
Japan, 34, 52, 71, 80
Jargon, 91, 101
Jenson, Nicola, 17
Jerome, 4
Jerusalem, city, 49
John Paul II, Pope, 74
Jugurtha, 11

K
Kanzan, Okajima, 52
Klein, Julie Thompson, 90, 99
Klein, Sunkyung, 9
Kongzi (Confucius), 21, 47
Kuhn, Thomas S., 93–95

L
La Malinche, *see* Doña Marina
Labov, William, 69
Landino, Cristoforo, 17, 18

Las Casas, Bartolomé de, 80
Latin language, 7, 36, 44, 63
Latour, Bruno, 3, 8, 40
Lépinette, Brigitte, 4
Levinas, Emmanuel, 76
Lianeri, Alexandra, 9, 19
Locke, Anne, 49
Low Countries, 49
Luhmann, Niklas, 11, 62, 64
Luther, Martin, 4
Lyotard, Jean-François, 90

M
Macrohistorical approach, 34
Manning, Céline Frigau, 5
Manuzio, Aldo, 34
Margoliouth, David Samuel, 45
Marx, Karl, 73, 77, 78
Mayan, people, 6
McLean, Paul D., 39
Mediator, 6, 11, 13, 19, 27n22, 38, 40–42, 45, 48–50, 53, 66, 95
Membré, Michiel, 49
Methodius, translator, 74
Microhistorical approach, 67
Milton, John, 78
Modernity, 76, 79
Montgomery, Scott L., 92–98, 104n31, 105n40
Mozarab, 63
Muhammad ibn ʿAbdullāh, Prophet, 44

N
Nagasaki, 52
Nappi, Carla, 99
Natural History, *see* Pliny
Negroni, Andrea, 49
Nelson, Lord Admiral Horatio, 15
Network, 3, 8, 10–12, 14, 15, 19, 30n58, 34, 36, 38–48, 63, 88, 89, 98, 99, 101
New Literary History, 7
New Testament, 48
Nietzsche, Friedrich, 67–69
Nord, Christiane, 10
Norton, Glyn P., 20
Nowotny, Helga, 88

O
Observer's paradox, 69, 70
Olohan, Maeve, 5, 96
O'Sullivan, Carol, 5
Ottoman, 38, 50
  Empire, 37, 80

P
Palmer, Carol L., 89
Persian language, 38, 50, 51
Petrarch, 43
Pidgin, 91, 92
Plato, 93
Pliny, 17, 18
  Natural History, 17, 18
Poliziano, Angelo, 43
Positionality, 65, 66, 72, 77, 87, 90, 99, 100
Postediting, 46
Prainsack, Barbara, 88
Professionalisation, 50–52
Professionalism, *see* Professionalisation
Pseudotranslation, 34, 54n6, 70

Q
Quine, Willard Van Orman, 72, 93–95
Quintilian, 20, 36

R
Rademaker, Laura, 82
Regime, 12, 14, 18, 22, 29n46, 34–36, 38, 40, 41, 44, 48, 49, 51–53, 64, 71, 80, 110

Relationality, 2, 33–59
Relativism, *see* Relativity
Relativity, 22, 61–86
Ren An, 9
Romance languages, 63, 71
Rome, 11, 38, 63
Rothman, Natalie, 37, 38, 45
Rupke, Nicolaas A., 98
Rupp-Eisenreich, Britta, 98
Rushdie, Salman, 44
Ryther, Augustine, 16

S
Sakai, Naoki, 14, 79
Salama-Carr, Myriam, 5, 96
Sallust, 11
Salutati, Coluccio, 43
Sand, George, 45
Santoyo, Julio-César, 4
Scammers, 13, 14, 29n52
Schleiermacher, Friedrich, 4, 93
Schreiber, Michael, 5
Septuagint, *see* Bible
Serres, Michel, 67
Setsujin (Japanese), 48
Sewell Jr., William H., 35
Shakespeare, William, 70
Sharkas, Hala, 97
Shizuki, Tadao, 48
Sima Qian, 8, 9
  Shiji or 'Annals, 8, 9
Simmel, George, 6
Sinitic language, 48
Siyi guan, *see* Translators' College
Skopos theory, 95
Snell-Hornby, Mary, 95
Source text, *see* Start text
Southey, Robert, 48
Spain, 45, 80
Start language, 78
Start text, 10, 11, 17, 18, 20, 34, 44, 48, 78, 79
Steiner, George, 10–12, 24n7
Strasbourg, 68
Sulla, Roman questor, 11, 29n43
Sutra, 21, 72, 73

T
Taffin, Jean, 49
Target culture, 20
Target text, 2, 34, 95
Tenochtitlan, 6
Text, 5, 9–12, 16–20, 22, 33–35, 40, 44, 46–48, 53, 65, 72, 73, 76, 79, 92, 95, 111
Thick trust, 41, 52, 89
Thin trust, 13, 15, 38, 41, 50–53, 65
Thucydides, 8
Tian, Chuanmao, 46
Tilly, Charles, 10, 14
Tlaxcalans, 6
Tokugawa shogunate, 52
Toledo, 14, 67, 68, 73
Tönnies, Ferdinand, 13
Totonac, people, 6
Trading zone, 91
Transcultural, 67
Translational, 5, 7, 14, 62, 65, 73
Translation form, 50, 62, 63, 79–80, 110, 111
Translative, 17, 47, 75, 77, 111
Translative action, 17
Translators' College (Siyi guan), 14, 33, 41, 50, 52
Trust, 2, 4–22, 30n57, 33–108
Trust networks, 14, 39–47
Tyndale, William, 48

U
Ubaldini, Petruccio, 15–17
Universalism, 89

V
Valdeón, Roberto, 80
Vatican, 74
Venice
  baili, 50
  Board of Trade, 37, 38, 50
  State, 37, 38
Venuti, Lawrence, 3, 24n9, 51–53
Vermeer, Hans, 62

W
Wén (Chinese), 21, 47
Wright, Crispin, 94

X
Xenophon, 8
Xín (Chinese), 21, 47

Y
Yâ (Chinese), 21
Yè (Chinese), 21

Z
Zhì (Chinese), 21