BEYOND "EAST" AND "WEST" IN TRANSLATION STUDIES

Systems and Interactions

DANIEL GILE

(ESIT, UNIVERSITÉ PARIS 3 SORBONNE NOUVELLE, FRANCE)

ABSTRACT

In contrast to most other academic disciplines and because of the historical circumstances of its birth, Translation Studies can be considered a set of "systems" with various levels of openness and interaction partly determined by their geo-cultural position, inter alia as "Eastern" or "Western", but more strongly influenced by their academic vs. professional or training foci and traditions. When analysing the roots and evolution of interaction patterns between these systems, it appears that while in Europe, borders between "East" and "West" tend to become blurred and geographic systems tend to merge, East-Asian systems lead a parallel but separate existence, mostly because of linguistic factors and because Chinese, Japanese and Korean scholars can afford institutionally to only publish in their respective languages and in their national publication systems. As to interaction between various branches of Translation Studies, sub-disciplinary systems remain separate though they now communicate far more than in the first decades of their existence, inter alia thanks to modern communication technology. As regards research paradigms, larger systems tend to influence smaller systems much more than the other way around, which is not without risks, in particular on the empirical research side, where TS is still methodologically weak; an exceedingly high visibility of theoretical contributions as opposed to meticulous data collection and analysis work may not be the best incentive for beginners to abide by the norms of systematic caution in design and inferencing.

1. INTRODUCTION

When asked to give a keynote speech at a conference focusing on "East and West", I was wondering what I could possibly contribute: I have been an observer of and actor in TS for over 30 years and have always been interested in its development process and patterns, but do not understand Russian or any East-European language, and the only "East" I can claim to be more or less familiar with is far-Eastern, more specifically Japanese, and to a lesser extent Chinese. Any view I could offer on "East and West" would thus necessarily be very partial and possibly not very relevant to the conference.

Moreover, as will be argued later in this paper, from the start, there has been considerable diversity and complexity in the structure and interaction patterns within TS worldwide, and I thought that East-West interaction could perhaps be seen in a broader context of flows between "systems" defined partly by geography, but to a larger extent by other parameters.

The following is an attempt to look at TS as a set of interacting systems, at what determines interaction patterns and at their effects. While working on this paper, I have become increasingly and painfully aware of the fact that I can only offer a first approximation, without the benefit of meticulous analyses of empirical data. I will not try to back all the ideas formulated here with evidence, as this would take far too much time and space, especially when trying to assign relative weights to patterns and trends. The following pages are submitted humbly as an exercise in awareness, in the hope that they can be of some use in more specific analyses to come.

2. THE INTERACTION OF SCIENTIFIC "SYSTEMS": GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

2.1 Social groups as systems

When persons interact on a regular basis, they form a social entity with specific behaviour patterns, a "social group". At micro-level, this can be a married couple, a family, a group of friends, colleagues sharing an office, or members of a sports team, etc. At a macro-level, they form larger social communities such as ethnic groups, followers of a religion, members of a profession, members of a scientific discipline, with their own distinctive behaviour patterns. In the following discussion, the concept of "systems" will be used to refer to such larger social groups – as an operational tool for reflection and analysis rather than as a name for sharply defined parts of reality.

For the purpose of this analysis, a "system" will be viewed here as a "local" subset of the world which is essentially shaped by "forces" acting on its "population", in our case, a (sub-) population of TS scholars. In the world of science, more specifically in the "scientific community" – a macro-system the borders of which are not clearly defined either – small systems are typically formed on the basis of regular interaction between researchers working in the same team, in the same laboratory or in the same town or country, that is, on a geographic and/or geo-institutional basis. Large systems are typically formed around a discipline (mathematicians, physicists, linguists) or sub-discipline, and their territory tends to be global, though the density of its population can vary greatly from country to country.

Systems are said to be "closed" when they do not interact with the world outside them. They are "open" when they do. The dichotomy is obviously an oversimplification of reality, as only rarely are systems "totally" closed. However, in many cases, they are only weakly influenced by outside forces and interaction with other systems, and in many other cases, the opposite is true. This makes the classification useful, in this case for the analysis of some aspects of the development of TS.

2.2 Open and closed systems in the scientific community

Scientific research is generally defined or described as a set of endeavours seeking to leverage the contribution of many individual scientists and research groups, which is reasonable in view of the huge amount of work and difficulties involved in the

task of exploring reality. It would therefore make sense to think of scientific systems as essentially open, with variable degrees of openness, the main determinant of openness being "economic": access to other systems costs money, time and effort (in subscriptions to journals, purchase of books, participation in conferences, time to read and understand theories, methods and findings of others, etc.), and these resources are limited for any system. One could therefore expect scientific systems to develop "openness management strategies" aiming at efficiency in the use of their resources, priority being given to publications, topics, research paradigms and people most relevant to the scientific needs of one's system. For instance, it makes sense for physicists working on specific topics within certain branches of physics to devote more resources to interaction with other physicists working on similar topics within the same branches of physics than to interaction with mathematicians, and to devote far less resources to interactions with biologists, let alone linguists or art historians. Significant engagement with the work of "neighbouring" systems would nevertheless be a fundamental aspect of research.

As an academic discipline, TS could therefore be expected to be made up of international systems spanning countries on all continents but focusing on different branches and sub-branches of translation such as literary translation, technical translation, audio-visual translation, conference interpreting, court interpreting, community interpreting, signed language interpreting, and perhaps on different methodologies and topics. As will be argued later, this is indeed the present trend, but the situation and patterns during the first decades of TS were quite different.

3. EARLY TS SYSTEMS AND THEIR INTERACTIONS

3.1 The birth of early TS systems

Most contemporary scientific systems are created from within science. At macro-scale, this can happen when interest in a certain topic within an existing discipline draws sufficient attention and generates sufficient theoretical activity and/or empirical findings for a sub-discipline or a new discipline to be created (as was the case of psycholinguistics). At micro-scale, small systems crystallize when a new operational or institutional entity is set up: typically a new research team, a new research institution, a new learned society.

The case of TS is atypical and more complex. TS as an academic discipline (as opposed to research about translation or interpreting without attempts to set up a translation-specific institutional entity) emerged in the 1970s, out of several culturally and professionally different environments.

In the (Western) TS literature, there is a tendency to attribute the birth of TS to the initiative of a group made up mostly of West-European specialists of comparative literature (and Gideon Toury, an Israeli scholar) who were interested in establishing an academic discipline devoted to research on translation, a landmark in the history of TS marking this intention being Holmes's "The name and nature of Translation Studies"

(1972/1988). The initial activities of this group were indeed academic rather than profession-oriented and its members were scholars rather than professional translators, though at least Toury had had professional translation experience as well. This pattern is traditional in the world of science.

What analysts of TS history tend to neglect is the birth at the same time of another dynamic movement explicitly aiming to establish a research discipline devoted to interpreting. This was the ambition of Danica Seleskovitch, a Paris-based conference interpreter and interpreter trainer who apparently had no background in research (see her biography in Wildund-Fantini 2007). She gathered around her other conference interpreters, in particular Marianne Lederer, whose background was similar, started developing her "Theory of Sense", later renamed "Interpretive theory" (see Lederer 2010 for a short account), set up a doctoral programme at ESIT, a training programme for professional translators and interpreters, and encouraged other colleagues to engage in research and obtain doctoral degrees. She considered that only practitioners really understood what interpreting was all about and could therefore conduct valid research into interpreting, and that interpreting theory (this was soon extended to translation theory) should be based on the observation of interpreting practice in the field. The crystallization of the Interpretive branch of TS deviates clearly from traditional patterns.

Around the same time, research into translation and interpreting was also developing in the Soviet Union and in East European countries. In particular, Ghelly Chernov, who had studied translation and interpreting and was engaged in an academic career, had worked as a conference interpreter and trained interpreters, developed his model of interpreting cognition around anticipation (see Chernov 2004) and became very influential. More generally, according to Vilen Komissarov (2009: 523), theoretical work in TS in Russia was largely carried out within a linguistics framework, and research has always been closely associated with the training of practitioners. This third case can therefore be viewed as located somewhere in-between the academic pole, as represented by the system which arose from within literary studies, and the professional pole, as represented by the Interpretive movement.

Such is also the case of Skopos theory, developed by Hans Vermeer in the 1970s (see for example Nord 1997). According to Christina Schäffner (2009: 116), its roots can be found in linguistic approaches, but its approach is more sociocultural. Through its focus on translation as involving specific communication functions and through its wide application in translator training programmes, it is also strongly associated with professional topics.

Other systems, in particular in Japan, Korea and China, emerged later, as explained in another section of this paper.

3.2 Interactions between early TS systems

Each of the three movements in the West had considerable internal coherence in its activities, with much interaction between its members and far less interaction with others as regards translation, and can therefore be considered a system.

One extreme in the openness-closeness continuum was the Interpretive movement. In the literature it produced, there are few traces of engagement with the ideas and findings of researchers from cognate disciplines, and even with the work of researchers outside the group.

In sharp contrast to Seleskovitch, Chernov chose a path of cooperation and interaction with linguists and psycholinguists (this can be seen clearly in Chernov 2004). According to Ivana Čeňková (personal communication), he also read regularly and discussed with his students theories and publications from research scholars in other countries, including West-European countries. The "Soviet School", as it is referred to by Pöchhacker & Shlesinger in their Interpreting Studies Reader (2001: 98), could therefore be considered an open system.

All these movements worked on translation and/or interpreting, and yet, they all operated as distinct systems with little interaction between them. This can be attributed to several factors:

1. The "economic" factors mentioned in Section 2, which could explain why there was little contact between scholars interested in literary translation and those aiming to explore conference interpreting,

2. Geopolitical factors, and in particular the separation maintained by political regimes between "East" and "West", which did nothing to facilitate the circulation of ideas and people between the two "blocs".

   Note however that the phenomenon is perhaps more complex than it appears at first sight, as the Soviet Union did make efforts to export some of its scientific literature to the West. For instance, in the 1960s, excellent mathematics textbooks from the USSR in Western languages could be found and bought in France at a fraction of the price of comparable Western books. This may have reflected the wish of the Soviet government to demonstrate to the West its excellence in the field. Conceivably, similar efforts could have been made with Soviet translation theories.

3. Institutional factors: More specifically, in the West, the emerging discipline was perhaps too under-developed, in terms of theory and/or empirical research findings and in the size of its population and of the literature produced, to be visible, benefit from institutional support and be integrated into mainstream scientific exchanges.

4. Linguistic factors: While many Eastern TS scholars could read Western literature, few Western TS scholars could read Russian, the main language of publication in the East.

5. Strategic factors: In at least some cases, it seems safe to say that there was a will on the part of "local" leaders to develop internally and limit the access of members to other theories and research paradigms. This was clearly the case of ESIT's Interpretive group. As alluded to earlier, in the literature it produced in the 1970s, the 1980s and the first half of the 1990s, besides the occasional reference to Piaget,

to neurophysiologist Barbizet, to some thinkers, there are virtually no citations of researchers from other disciplines who had worked on interpreting, in particular cognitive psychologists and psycholinguists, or of TS scholars who were working on translation or interpreting outside the ESIT paradigm. There is no mention of other theories such as the popular Skopos theory, of the works of Ingrid Kurz, Barbara Moser, Daniel Gile. The evidence, for instance the fact that Interpretive paradigm representatives took part in events where researchers from other groups were present such as the Venice symposium in 1977 (see Gerver & Sinaiko 1978) yet never cited their work, suggests a deliberate intention to close the system to outside influence. Note that Skopos theory authors very rarely cited Interpretive theory authors in spite of the fact that they were geographic neighbours, shared languages (German, English and French) and focused on training and professional practice.

4. THE 1990s

Important developments in the 1990s in the world of TS which are relevant to the topic could perhaps be summed up as follows:

1. The geopolitical separation between East and West having disappeared, it became easier for Eastern and Western TS scholars to meet, inter alia in TS conferences which were organized in former Eastern Europe – not least in Prague.

2. The same geopolitical changes generated an increased need for translation and interpreting and the creation of many new translator and interpreter training programmes in universities, which led to more interest in translation theory and research, including more TS papers, more TS meeting, more TS journals.

3. The Internet made communication and collaborative work between physically remote individuals and institutions easier than in the past, which accelerated the movement.

4. New global TS initiatives were launched, including TS journals and Bulletins, but also international organizations such as the European Society for Translation Studies (EST), which, despite its name, was not limited to European membership. All of these contributed to a rapid development of TS, as evidenced by scientometric indicators and in particular a spectacular increase in the production of TS publications. For instance, between 1993 and 1999, John Benjamins published 30 volumes in its new Translation Library collection, thus averaging more than 4 volumes per year, and during the same decade, many new TS journals were launched.

5. Appeals to engage in more "scientific" research and work with cognate disciplines began to gain strength. In the field of interpreting, this became very visible in

initiatives taken by the University of Trieste's school of languages for interpreting and translation (see for instance Gran 1990).

As to systems interaction, many Western authors discovered authors from the East, mainly contemporary authors, whom they met in conferences and whose recent papers they read (in English, and to a lesser extent in German). References were made to earlier authors, but their works could still not be read by Western authors for linguistic reasons. This applies not only to Russian texts, but also to Czech texts – though Levý's analysis of translation as a decision-making process, to cite just one example, raised the interest of many.

Another important change which came about in the 1990s with respect to systems interaction was the establishment in Europe of close contacts between the TS community at large and interpreting researchers. The initiative came from members of the TS community, who invited repeatedly interpreting researchers to join them as guest lecturers at conferences, as members of the Executive Board of the newly created European Society for Translation Studies (its first Secretary General was an interpreter), as members of the staff of the CERA chair Translation Studies programme in Leuven, Belgium (the 4th CERA Chair professor, in 1993, was an interpreter).

On the "technical" side, this exposed members of the interpreting research community to the influence of theories and findings about translation and vice-versa. In the literature on interpreting, it is easy to find evidence of such influence in the form of many more references to TS at large than before this contact was institutionalized. In the literature on translation, evidence of influence from interpreting research is more difficult to detect (see Gile 2006).

Sociologically speaking, interpreting researchers found themselves a welcomed minority in a far larger community, with a more extensive network, a more solid academic tradition and a wider range of ideas to explore. For instance, for the European interpreting research community of the 1980s and early 1990s, which was focused on conference interpreting, the concept of norms, the concepts of domestication and foreignization, reflection on the role of translation and interpreting in society became new avenues for investigation and generated some work and publications.

The integration of interpreting into Translation Studies was probably one of the strongest factors which drove the Interpretive movement to start opening up. Ignoring progress made elsewhere was no longer viable in view of the fact that much activity, including conferences and publications, was going on with virtually no participation of ESIT.

Also in the 1990s, several interpreting-related systems developed in various parts of the world. In particular, activity around community interpreting and court interpreting became regular, especially in Australia, but also in Nordic countries and in North America, and a Japanese Association for Interpretation Studies (JAIS) was set up by conference interpreter Masaomi Kondo. The Japanese movement started out among practitioners of conference interpreting and broadcast interpreting with theoretical input from the West, as evidenced by the fact that in its journal, *Tsuuyakurironkenkyuu* (*Interpreting Research*), Western theories and other contributions were very present,

including translations of Western texts. Research on signed language interpreting also developed in the 1990s, especially in North America.

In terms of systems and interactions, the 1990s were thus a period of change towards more interaction within TS and of openness towards cognate disciplines, but economic and linguistic barriers were still strong.

5. RECENT DEVELOPMENTS AND SYSTEMS INTERACTION

Recent developments, over the last decade, can perhaps be summed up as an acceleration of the changes which started in the 1990s. This is reflected not only in a faster growth of the TS community and of its body of publications, but also in increasing interaction between systems.

5.1 Geographic interaction

The globalization of TS has been accelerating. Thanks to an increasingly wide dissemination of the Internet throughout the world, including high-speed connections which make online symposia, lectures and courses possible at low cost for an ever-increasing part of the population worldwide, geographic distance is no longer a strong barrier preventing the circulation of ideas and exchanges. In all parts of the world where research on translation and interpreting is conducted, people have access to online journals and other publications. Conferences are organized on all continents, and well-known TS researchers are invited to lecture at such meetings and to teach at various universities throughout the world.

Sustained TS activity is now conducted in countries which joined the world of TS recently (though some of them have had rich translation traditions of their own for a long time). This, inter alia, is the case of China, which may soon become a giant in terms of literature production (it is already producing more papers on interpreting than any other single country), of Korea, of South Africa, of Latin American countries.

And yet, not all TS communities worldwide communicate well with each other. While "Western" TS scholars are often invited to the "East", including the Far East, to Africa, to Latin America, to North America, the reverse is not true. One reason for this lack of balance may be the stronger geographic concentration of scholars in Europe, which breeds more interaction and perhaps a higher productivity, but economic and linguistic determinants are probably much stronger. Travel costs to Europe from remote continents are high, and the economic situation of academics in many countries limits severely their travel possibilities.

What is probably even more fundamental is the linguistic issue: English has definitely become the lingua franca of TS, and the few citation analysis studies conducted so far which have addressed the issue have shown consistently that texts written in English account for an overwhelming proportion of citations in the literature (see for instance Gile 2005, Nasr 2010). As a consequence, outside their local system, there is a loss of visibility in the world of TS for authors who write in other languages,

in particular Chinese, French, German, Japanese, Korean, Russian, or Spanish to quote just a few examples of languages in which there is a significant literature – the example of Indian languages may be just as striking, but little is known in the West about TS activity in India.

Not unrelated to the linguistic factor are local socio-institutional conditions. In many European countries, in order to further their academic career, authors are under increasing pressure to write in international journals. Such journals publish papers in English and to a limited extent in some other European languages, but not in Chinese, Japanese or Korean and rarely in Russian. In Japan (as confirmed to me recently by Masomi Kondo in a personal communication), and apparently in China and Korea, an academic career can be completed successfully within the local academic "market". To authors from these countries, reading input from the West in English or other Western languages is beneficial and entails relatively little effort, but writing in a foreign language is more difficult, and the return on investment is modest, which explains why so few of them write in English in international TS journals. Incidentally, sociologically speaking, it is perhaps not unreasonable to postulate that at least some "leaders" of small systems may not be enthusiastic about the possibility of losing their local status if their respective systems were to open up too widely to the larger TS community and consequently to potential competition from foreign personalities.

5.2 Inter-disciplinary and intra-disciplinary interaction

As mentioned earlier, in the 1990s, there were calls for interdisciplinarity within TS, conferences were organized and texts published (see for example papers in Snell-Hornby et al. 1994 or Öztürk Kasar 2006). Actually, interdisciplinarity has always existed in Translation Studies: the group of "Western" literature scholars which called for the institutionalization of TS as a discipline obviously came from a literary studies tradition, East-European and Russian translation scholars drew from linguistic traditions, and, as mentioned earlier, so did Russian interpreting scholars. The repeated calls may have been a reaction to an inward turn within certain branches of TS which were dominant in the 1980s and 1990s, in particular in the Interpretive paradigm and skopos theory which may have been perceived as not taking sufficient notice of advances in other disciplines and what they could offer. In the 1990s, a deep change was indeed felt within the conference interpreting branch of TS, with strong interest in input from cognitive science, including neurolinguistic issues, the role of working memory and the novice-expert paradigm, relevance theory. In written translation, two paradigms became popular: one, the analysis of corpora, was directly linked to corpus linguistics, and the other, think aloud protocols (TAPs), was taken from psychology. Over the last decade, this trend has kept its momentum, and sociology has come in strongly, inter alia with Pierre Bourdieu's and Goffman's theories and concepts (in particular the concepts of habitus for the former, and of footing for the latter).

More conspicuous, perhaps, is the growing interface between research on various types/branches of interpreting. Conference interpreting no longer has a monopoly; in fact, it may well have become a minority component of what is now referred to as the

Interpreting Studies community, as more and more research is being conducted on community interpreting, something which is evidenced in particular in the Critical Link conference series (John Benjamins has published 5 volumes of proceedings between 1997 and 2009), in which the number of participants and the number of papers has been growing steadily. A few well-known conference interpreting researchers have even engaged in research into community interpreting. More generally, conference interpreting researchers have become more aware of other types of interpreting, and there are more contacts between these branches of Interpreting Studies, though in the field, practicing interpreters still form distinct communities and may not meet more often than in the past. Finally, there are now more contacts between signed language and spoken language interpreting trainers and researchers.

Another recent development is associated with technological advances. It is now possible to conduct process analysis in written translation with new tools such as affordable and non-invasive gaze analyzers, and significant work is done in triangulation mode, with such analyzers, key logging and various introspection methods, thus giving new impetus to a branch of empirical research into translation which started in the mid-1980s with Krings and Lörscher but has now become much more productive. This had led to several international partnerships and studies, in particular around a research group in Copenhagen (see for instance Mees et al. 2010).

6. CONCLUSIONS?

6.1 East and West

The unusual conditions under which TS emerged as a discipline, with several parallel systems arising from different backgrounds and operating in different environments, offer interesting opportunities for observation and reflection. In the following discussion, I will focus on Interpreting Studies, the branch which I know best. As explained in the introduction, my analysis will necessarily be tentative and limited to a few observations; the phenomenon is complex, and comprehensive investigations encompassing scientometric methods, surveys, ethnographic observation and perhaps highly documented historical research would be required before claims can be made.

One question is whether there are fundamental differences between "Western" (West European and North American) systems and "Eastern" systems, be they East-European, Soviet/Russian or Asian. The respective cultural, economic and geopolitical differences most probably had an impact on the way they emerged and the way they have been developing, but in terms of interaction between systems, the only difference which is clear to me is that Eastern systems have often sought input from Western systems – whereas the reverse has not been true. Actually, even that difference can probably be explained by factors other than the Western vs. Eastern distinction, namely, as already mentioned, economic and linguistic parameters, plus, in the case of Asian systems, the fact that they appeared when Western research had already been developing for some time.

Commonalities are more striking than differences. One of them is the time at which TS systems began to form in Europe, in the 1970s, in both East and West, across both translation and interpreting. It would be interesting to seek explanations for that coincidence. One other similarity is the importance of single personalities as drivers of development, at least in systems focusing on professional and training issues. In the West, Seleskovitch is an obvious name. In Japan, Kondo had a major role in creating and maintaining the impetus of the work of the Japan Association for Interpretation Studies during the first decade of its existence. In the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, Chernov may have had a similar role. In systems which originated in academic traditions such as the comparative-literature based movement in Western Europe and in the East-European system associated with the Prague school, there are central personalities (Toury, Hermans, Lambert, Levý, Kade, Neubert, Reiss, Vermeer, Nord…), but their development does not appear to have been initiated and/or sustained by single leaders and their action.

6.2 "Interaction"?

For TS, it appears that rather than talk about "open" systems which interact and "closed" systems which do not, a more powerful tool for analysis would be a classification in three categories: closed systems, systems open to one-way inward flows and systems open to two-way interaction.

Perhaps the closest to a closed system in TS was the Interpretive movement during the first two decades of its existence. East-European and Soviet systems, and especially Chinese, Japanese and Korean systems have been open to one-way inward flows from Western TS systems (and to non-TS systems), but despite a few focused operations such as special issues of TS journals on Japan (Meta 33/1(1988), The Interpreters' Newsletter N°1 (1992), TTR 22/1(2009)) or China (Interpreting 11/2(2009)), the occasional paper or reference to Far Eastern TS does not amount to much input into the West. Similarly, as I have argued elsewhere (Gile 2006) and as alluded to earlier in this paper, within TS, there seems to be a hierarchy between research into written translation and research into conference interpreting allowing one-way flows from the former to the latter, while a similar hierarchy allows one-way flows from some cognate disciplines into TS but not vice-versa – as will be mentioned briefly later, I believe that one-way flows within TS can be analyzed sociologically as reflecting power relations resulting from population size, whereas one-way flows between TS and cognate disciplines can also be ascribed to a large extent to technical issues, namely the relative methodological weakness of TS research.

Is it possible to assess with any measure of reliability and accuracy the impact of such interaction, or the lack thereof? The lack of openness of the Interpretive movement in its earlier years has not prevented it from achieving considerable and lasting influence in the world of interpreter and translator training in various parts of the world. Did the fact that it has been opening up somewhat since the second half of the 1990s generate significant theoretical development of Interpretive theory or increased its influence of ESIT in the world of TS? I have detected no clear signs of

such an effect. The same seems to apply to Chernov's probabilistic anticipation theory or even to Skopos theory, which, as far as I can see, has not developed much from interaction with other ideas and systems or influenced them over time.

One-way flows enrich the receiving system. TS gained something when Krings and Lörscher borrowed the TAP paradigm from cognitive psychology, when Gutt introduced Relevance theory and Baker and others introduced corpus linguistics in translation research, and from the literature, it is obvious that much has been built with input from the West in Chinese, Japanese and Korean systems. On the other hand, one-way flows deprive receiving systems of critical input from outside. This has had deleterious consequences. In conference interpreting, for instance, a substantial number of theses, dissertations and publications use concepts from cognitive psychology erroneously, something which presumably would not have happened had there been true two-way interaction between their authors and cognitive psychologists. The same problem can be found in the use of research methods taken from cognate disciplines, be it experimental set-ups, surveys or the use of statistics. Methodological flaws take out much of the potential value of the studies of TS scholars, which cannot be published in reputable journals from the cognate disciplines, and the input of TS to cognitive psychology, psycholinguistics or linguistics, to take those disciplines most relevant to conference interpreting as an example, remains far too small to make a difference.

What does seem to have made a marked difference in the development of TS is two-way interaction within the discipline. In particular, as mentioned earlier, contacts between interpreting research and translation research acted within conference interpreting research to prompt reflection on topics which had not been broached previously. As TS at large has been open to input from community interpreting as well, this has led to more contacts between conference interpreters and community interpreters and has perhaps helped give a higher profile to social issues within Interpreting Studies, thus contributing to what has been called a "social turn" or "sociological turn" paralleling a similar trend in translation research (regarding the latter, see for instance Wolf 2009). Research into signed language interpreting, which is increasingly present in conferences on (spoken language) interpreting and increasingly visible in collective publications on interpreting might join the TS community at large in two-way interaction in the near future, though it will probably remain a distinct system (distinct from community interpreting in the realm of spoken language interpreting) because of its specific environment and foci. Research into signed language interpreting is advanced in its reflection on the role of interpreters and on quality perception, which could benefit the TS community at large.

In terms of research paradigms, minority currents focusing on empirical research into the translation and interpreting process within distinct systems have become stronger when meeting within a larger TS community, and there is now considerable research involving researchers from several countries on the topic (see Mees et al. 2010, already referred to earlier, as an example). At the same time, the social dynamics of TS seem to be strongly influenced by the larger systems, which operate mostly within liberal arts paradigms, around reflection and theory rather than empirical research. In practical

terms, while there are now many TS publications reporting empirical research, in conferences, the majority of presentations offer theoretical reflection and development, and in contrast to what is common in empirical disciplines, keynote speeches in TS conferences practically always stay at the level of ideas rather than report on empirical research findings and their implications. One thus finds oneself in paradoxical situations where a keynote speaker at a conference devoted to research methodology or process research is a thinker who has never done empirical research him/herself. Inviting input from such a speaker is of course potentially beneficial to all because of the distance taken by him/her from the nuts and bolts of everyday data collection and analysis to embrace larger horizons. However, in a discipline where the scientific principles of systematic scepticism and rigorous inferencing are not well established yet, there is also a risk involved in exposing young researchers repeatedly to situations where such prominence is given to ideas presented without the backing of rigorous data collection and analysis – which is precisely the case of the present analysis.

No attempt will be made here to squeeze a "conclusion" out of an analysis which makes it a point to highlight the complexity of TS, and in particular the complexity of interactions between the geographic, sub-disciplinary and paradigmatic systems of which it is made up. This paper will therefore only conclude with a call for an increased awareness of such phenomena, which may be the key to understanding some dynamic movements within our discipline.

REFERENCES

Chernov, Ghelly (2004) *Inference and Anticipation in Simultaneous Interpreting*, Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Gerver, David and Wallace H. Sinaiko (eds) (1978) *Language Interpretation and Communication. Proceedings of the NATO Symposium on Language Interpretation and Communication, Venice, 1977*, New York and London: Plenum Press.

Gile, Daniel (2005) "Citation patterns in the T&I didactics literature." *Forum*, 3(2): 85–103.

—— (2006) "L'interdisciplinarité en traductologie: une optique scientométrique." In Kasar, Öztürk (dir). *Interdisciplinarité en traduction. Actes du 11ᵉ Colloque International sur la Traduction organisé par l'Université Technique de Yildiz*, Istanbul : Isis, 23–37.

—— (2009) *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training*, Revised Edition, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Gran, Laura (1990) "A review of research work on interpretation conducted at the SSLM of the University of Trieste and of recent similar studies conducted in Canada and the U.S.A." In Gran, Laura and Christopher Taylor (eds). *Aspects of applied and experimental research on conference interpretation*, Udine: Campanotto Editore, 4–20.

Holmes, James (1972/1988) "The name and nature of Translation Studies." In Holmes, James S. (ed.). *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 67–80.

Kasar, Öztürk (ed.) (2006) *Interdisciplinarité en traduction. Actes du 11ᵉ Colloque International sur la Traduction organisé par l'Université Technique de Yildiz*, Istanbul : Isis.

Komissarov, Vilen (2009) "Russian tradition." In Baker, Mona and Gabriela Saldanha (eds). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 2ⁿᵈ edition, London and New York, Routledge, 517–524.

Lederer, Marianne (2010) "Interpretive Approach." In Gambier, Yves and Luc Van Doorslaer (eds). *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Volume1, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 173–179.

Mees, Inger M., Fabio Alves and Susanne Göpferich (eds) (2010) *Methodology, Technology and Innovation in Translation Process Research. Copenhagen Studies in Language 38*, Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur.

Nasr, Maria (2010) *La didactique de la traduction. Une étude scientométrique*, Thèse de doctorat. ESIT. Université Paris 3 Sorbonne Nouvelle.

Nord, Christiane (1997) *Translating as a Purposeful Activity. Functionalist Approaches Explained* (= Translation Theories Explained, 1), Manchester: St. Jerome.

Pöchhacker, Franz and Miriam Shlesinger (2002) The Interpreting Studies Reader, London and New York: Routledge.

Schäffner, Christina (2009) "Functionalist approaches." In Baker, Mona and Gabriela Saldanha (eds). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 2nd edition, London and New York, Routledge, 115–121.

Snell-Hornby, Mary, Franz Pöchhacker and Klaus Kaindl (eds) (1994) *Translation Studies. An interdiscipline*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Widlund-Fantini, Anne-Marie (2007) *Danica Seleskovich. Interprète et témoin du XXème siècle*, Paris: Editions l'Âge d'Homme.

Wolf, Michalea (2009) "The implications of a sociological turn. Methodological and disciplinary questions." In Pym, Anthony and Alexander Perekrestenko (eds). *Translation Research Project 2*, Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group, Universitat Rovira i Virgili, 73–79.