

# A CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS THE HISTORIOGRAPHICAL STUDY OF TRANSLATION. A PROPOSAL FOR A TRANSLATION HISTORIOGRAPHY READER<sup>1</sup>

Pilar Ordóñez López  
mordonez@trad.uji.es  
Universitat Jaume I

José Antonio Sabio Pinilla  
jasabio@ugr.es  
Universidad de Granada

## Abstract

Following an increase in the publication of anthologies focusing on the diachronic dimension of translation discourse in recent years, it seems timely to consider the historical research that has been carried out in this area in the last decades. The present article argues that there is a need to compile a *translation historiography reader* that serves to provide some keys to understanding the evolution of this multi-faceted and dynamic discipline. In line with the traditional remit of this genre, the proposed reader will have a mainly pedagogical function and will contain a well-contextualised selection of texts representative of research in the area of the History of Translation over the past forty years.

**Keywords:** Translation Historiography. Translation History. Theory of Translation. Reader. Anthologies.

---

<sup>1</sup>This article is the English version of “Contribución al estudio historiográfico de la traducción. Propuesta de un manual de lecturas guiadas y sus aplicaciones” by Pilar Ordóñez López & José Antonio Sabio Pinilla. It was not published on the print version of MonTI for reasons of space. The online version of MonTI does not suffer from these limitations, and this is our way of promoting plurilingualism.

Given that the genre of anthology has been extensively used in the diachronic study of discourse on translation within a variety of traditions and languages, in this study we argue for the need to compile a translation historiography reader, in particular one that comprises a wide and representative selection of work on historiographical research within the field of translation during the last four decades. Such a volume, focused on the historical study and the theories of translation, will provide some key insight into the evolution of the discipline of Translation Studies. A historiographical perspective will allow us to explore how the study of this evolution has been approached, and, more specifically, it will help us to avoid two of the most common fallacies in historical study, i.e., to study the past within the ideas of the present and to try to explain past translation practice in an isolated, non-contextualised manner (cf. D'hulst 1991, 2001; López García 2011; Fernández Sánchez 2012). Furthermore, the reader we are proposing will allow us to reflect the wide variety of approaches to translation which, from different perspectives, are applied in the study of the discipline. In this sense, our proposal is aimed at showing the existing variety of historiographical approaches and at emphasising the need to adopt an international perspective in order to avoid a Eurocentric vision (cf. Tymoczko 2007: 15-53). Last, but not least, it is important to bear in mind the pedagogical function of the proposed volume, a work intended for the academic context and as an instrument for the teaching of the theory and history of translation.

### **1. Historiographical research within Translation Studies: different approaches and relevance**

Lambert (1993: 4) distinguishes between *history* and *historiography*: history makes reference mainly to the historical material, whilst historiography deals with the discourse of the historian. According to Delisle (2008: 82) *historiography* has three different meanings: a) the art of writing the history; b) the collective historical works produced in a specific period of time or within a specific discipline, in this case Translation Studies; and c) the historical view of this production, using research methods applied by historians and modelled on the way in which history is written. Finally, D'hulst (2010: 397-398) differentiates three levels or subdisciplines: *history*, defined as 'the proper sequence of facts, events, ideas, discourses, etc.'; *historiography*, 'the history of histories', in which historical concepts and methodology, as well as specific methods from other areas, such as linguistics, philosophy and literature, are combined in the analysis of historical investigation; and *metahistoriography*, which deals with the explicit discussion of concepts and methods used in the writing of history, as well as epistemological and methodological problems arising from such concepts and methods, which are, furthermore, related to a range of spatial, temporal and ideological aspects and to accessing and interpreting sources.

Translation theories are the result of a complex historicity; they evolve and reflect problems of the past, which reappear in different variants. Different theories coexist in parallel, influence each other, and take on an increasingly defined shape (cf. Pym 2010). Scholars such as Lambert, Hermans, D'hulst, Delisle, Pym, Bastin and Bandia have pointed out the need to study the history of translation and its foundations. In the map of the discipline proposed by Holmes (1972, 1988) no specific section is devoted to the history of translation. Nevertheless, when dealing with descriptive studies, covering both the product (the description and comparison of translations, both synchronically and diachronically) and the function (the description of the function of translations in a socio-cultural context), Holmes refers to the diachronic dimension, which leads us, within the product, to a 'general history of translation — however ambitious such

a goal may sound at this time', and within the function, to the identification of the influence 'in histories of translations and in literary histories' (1988: 72). Besides, at the end of his work, Holmes draw attention to the dialectic relation existing between the three branches, into which two dimensions of analysis should be incorporated, i.e. the historical and the methodological (or metatheoretical) dimension:

[...] in each of the three branches of translation studies, there are two further dimensions that I have not mentioned, dimensions having to do with the study, not of translating and translations, but of translation studies itself. One of these dimensions is historical: there is a field of the history of translation theory, in which some valuable work has been done, but also one of the history of translation description and of applied translation studies (largely a history of translation teaching and translator training) both of which are fairly well virgin territory. Likewise there is a dimension that might be called the methodological or meta-theoretical, concerning itself with problems of what methods and models can best be used in research in the various branches of the discipline (how translation theories, for instance, can be formed for greatest validity, or what analytic methods can best be used to achieve the most objective and meaningful descriptive results), but also devoting its attention to such basic issues as what the discipline itself comprises (cf. Holmes 1988: 79).

This perspective is present in work by authors such as Toury, Hermans, Lefevere and Lambert, who, following the postulates of Polysystem Theory, have contributed to the development of Descriptive Translation Studies (cf. Lambert 1995) and introduced the concepts of norm, manipulation and rewriting. This, in turn has made it possible to incorporate into the historical study of translation aspects such as ideology, manipulation and power, as well as the agents of translation –especially the translator– as part of the latest paradigms associated with the *Cultural and Ideological Turns* (Bassnett, Venuti, Tymoczko, Gentzler), including postcolonial and genre studies, as well as sociological and even philosophical studies, in which new relations between the past and the present emerge in an increasingly global context (Cronin 2003 and Tymoczko 2007). At the same time, the predominantly descriptive approaches that characterise the final decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century have led to studies of interpretative nature (cf. Bastin & Bandia 2006: 2), with the development of a methodology based on the historiography of translation. The incorporation of an interpretative component has, in turn, led to a higher awareness of the interrelation and interdependence of the history of translation with other fields of knowledge, such as sociology, history and comparative literature, in which, as stated by Santoyo (2009: 489), translation tends to be –or used to be– absent.

All things considered, a shift in the theoretical approach has been brought about with the principles of Polysystem Theory. Its decisive role in the evolution of descriptive translation studies is evident from the fact that translations are considered to be works of the receiving system, that the historical nature of translation is emphasised, and that there is an interest in methodological issues based on the work of the historian (cf. Delisle 1997-98; Pym 1992, 1998). More recently, postmodern historiographical approaches have emerged; these adopt a pluralistic, non-canonical view, in which the ideology of those who write history is of crucial importance (Bandia 2006; Fernández Sánchez 2010). In view of these recent trends within historical research, modern approaches frequently make a distinction between the past (as the historical reality) and history (considered a narrative interpretation), which implies that 'historical knowledge is not only associated with a set of contents, but also with certain discursive practices that are culturally determined' (Fernández Sánchez 2010: 232)<sup>2</sup>.

In the academic context, the study of the past of the discipline is carried out from numerous perspectives, depending on the profile of the researcher and on his/her translation background. The object of study is, by its very nature, characterised by a considerable heterogeneity which, in recent years, has been further expanded to incorporate aspects which go beyond those that are traditionally associated with the study of translation in a strict sense. In modern historiographical research, we encounter a number of proposals to classify the objects historiographical study and its potential contribution to theoretical and historical research in Translation Studies; D'hulst (2001: 21-32), for instance, follows the model of classical rhetoric:

<sup>2</sup> Our translation.

- *Quis?*, who are the translators? What backgrounds (as individuals and as a group) do they have?
- *Quid?*, what type of works have been translated?
- *Ubi?*, where have the translations been made? Where have they been published?
- *Quibus auxiliis?*, patronage, ideological framework, etc.
- *Cur?*, why are translations made? What consequences do they cause? How are translations related to originals?, etc.
- *Quando?*, issues related to periodization.
- *Cui bono?*, social function of translations, their reception and use in society, etc.

It is thus necessary to analyse the methods that have been proposed to study the past of the discipline, taking into consideration not only the facts, sources and data, but also how they have been analysed and investigated, and how the arising problems have been tackled. As stated by Pym (2010), D'hulst (2011) and Munday (2012), there still remain many questions regarding certain key issues in the study of the theory and the history of translation. One such question is concerned with the position that the history of translation should occupy and the functions it should serve within translation studies; another is the relation between historical investigation on the one hand and comparative literature and national literary histories on the other. Further matters yet to be resolved are how to determine, define and classify the objects of study within historical research, and the application of the different theories. In sum, these questions deal with the analysis of the role played by theoretical and historical issues in contemporary translation Studies. Furthermore, they set out the need to evaluate the relevance of the models applied in the study of translation.

A Reader, appropriately designed, will help students and researchers to grasp the variety and complexity of the study of the history of translation. Besides, such a volume will give its readership access to the wide range of theoretical approaches adopted in the investigation of the past, which, precisely due to their diversity, place the historian in a privileged and decisive position (cf. Hermans 1999: 101).

## 2. Translation Studies and Translation Anthologies. Towards a Reader

Translation anthologies play a fundamental role in the study and reconstruction of the history of reflection and discourse on translation. They contain a collection of theoretical texts, generally accompanied by an extensive preface in which the selection criteria are explained. Translation anthologies aim to compile the most representative contributions throughout history and to make them accessible to readers. The majority of the texts are of a secondary and very diverse nature, e.g. letters, prefaces, forewords and introductions, which would otherwise be difficult to access.

Just as literary anthologies are the result of a specific vision of literary history, similarly, translation anthologies are influenced by an underlying vision of the history of translation. In addition to the features already mentioned, anthologies play a key role in the creation, shaping and development of the canon. Not only is the selection of texts by the anthologist a consequence of his/her intention to capture a fragment of the past, but also, as pointed out by Guillén ([1985] 2005: 378) with reference to the study of literature, the resulting selection 'conveys a certain vision of literarity, defining genres, outlining models, thereby affecting the present of the reader and, above all, orienting him/her towards the future'. The selection of texts by the anthologist thus has an underlying double intentionality, interconnecting past, present and future, which makes anthologies 'authorities capable of shaping the canon'<sup>3</sup> (Enríquez Aranda 2007: 123).

Within historical translation studies, since the first translation anthology published by Störig in 1963, a growing interest in the genre of anthologies can be observed, particularly for some

---

<sup>3</sup> Our translation.

cultural contexts, such as the Iberian Peninsula, where fifteen anthologies have been published between 1987 and 2011 (cf. Sabio Pinilla & Ordóñez López 2012). This shows that advances have been made in the selection process of classic texts, both in a chronological and descriptive sense, many of which deal with issues very similar to those currently discussed in Translation Studies, though these issues are generally approached from different perspectives by a very heterogeneous group of authors who had a connection with translation either because they translated or because they read translations.

Whilst anthologies focusing on texts about translation through history are experiencing a moment of popularity in Translation Studies, especially in the Iberian Peninsula, the *reader*, a format commonly found in the English-speaking world, has not yet been explored within this context.

### 2.1. *The Reader: A format typical of the English-speaking world*

When discussing translation anthologies, *readers* must also be taken into consideration. A *reader* is defined as “a book of collected or assorted writings, esp. when related in theme, authorship, or instructive purpose; anthology”.<sup>4</sup> *Anthology* and *Reader* can be considered to be synonyms<sup>5</sup>; *readers*, including variants, such as *readings* and *critical readings*, are more common in the English-speaking world. All the previous terms underline their pedagogical function which, as in the case of anthologies (cf. Sabio Pinilla & Ordóñez López 2012: 98), is also one of the key motivations for the compilation of these works.

Essentially, readers share the defining features of anthologies, but within the field of Translation Studies, the reader also presents some specific characteristics: (a) more emphasis is placed on its pedagogical function, with the consequence that (b) explanatory elements are more extensive than in the anthologies, (c) the vast majority of the texts selected are written by contemporary authors, and (d) texts are normally reproduced in their totality.

Similar to the increasing popularity of anthologies in general, there has also been an increase in the publication of readers in the last decade. Apart from Chesterman (1989), the proliferation of readers within the field of Translation Studies did not really begin until the 21st century, as shown by the following bibliographical inventory.

- Chesterman, Andrew (ed.) (1989) *Readings in Translation Theory*. Helsinki: Oy Finn Lectura Ab.
- Venuti, Lawrence (ed.) (2000) *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Venuti, Lawrence (ed.) (2004) *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge [2nd revised edition].
- Weissbort, Daniel & Astradur Eysteinnsson (eds.) (2006) *Translation. Theory and Practice. A Historical Reader*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Baker, Mona (ed.) (2009) *Critical Readings in Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.

All of these readers have been published within the Anglo-American tradition and the majority focus on contemporary texts. In this sense, readers can be considered complementary works to anthologies; anthologies aim to study the discourse(s) about translation through history and readers compile texts which, from a different perspective, illustrate the evolution of Translation Studies as a discipline. With regard to the context or tradition in which the work appears, anthologies tend to be more common outside the Anglo-American tradition<sup>6</sup>, whilst the format of the reader is more frequently found in the English-speaking world. It should be noted that among the readers listed above, there is only one historical reader (Weissbort & Eysteinnsson 2006), which comprises historical as well as contemporary texts.

<sup>4</sup> <http://dictionary.reference.com>

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.britannica.com>

<sup>6</sup> See Sabio Pinilla & Ordóñez López (2012: 102-109) for a complete inventory of translation anthologies.

## 2.2. Characteristics of the reader

*Readers* and anthologies undoubtedly have a lot in common; the defining features of anthologies identified in Sabio Pinilla and Ordóñez López (2012: 94-97), based on the proposals put forward by Guillén ([1985] 2005) and Fraisse (1997), are also characteristic of *readers*. Within the context of Translation Studies, it can be observed that readers and anthologies share the purpose of gathering and making accessible to the readership a collection of texts which are considered representative or influential within a specific period, approach or tradition.

In what follows, the most characteristic features of both anthological formats (anthology and reader) are reviewed, based on the analysis carried out by Sabio Pinilla and Ordóñez López (2012: 110-117).

### 2.2.1. Rewriting and selection

Any anthology implies rewriting existing texts. Though the concept of rewriting<sup>7</sup> will not be expanded here, it must be kept in mind that there is inevitably a close link between the genre of anthology and the concepts of rewriting, ideology and manipulation. This implies an unavoidable presence of the anthologist's specific theoretical position or intention, which conditions the selection of texts as well as the way in which the selected texts are presented, contextualised and arranged.

In the case of the *reader*, the author's motivations are of a very varied nature, and we can observe a trend favouring the incorporation of a wider variety of thematic topics and multidisciplinary approaches, in line with the development of Translation Studies in general. This, in turn, has made it possible to include issues such as ideology, genre and the relation between translation and power, as well as issues that have their origin in other academic disciplines such as literature, sociology and linguistics.

For instance, Chesterman (1989) aims 'to illustrate something of the general development of translation theory towards an increasing concern with textual and pragmatic issues, the potential of machine translation, and cognitive aspects of translation' (Chesterman 1989: 6), and Venuti (2000) states that his motivations include 'to challenge any disciplinary complacency, to produce a consolidation that interrogates the ways in which translation is currently researched and taught [...], to show what translation studies have been and to suggest what they might be' (Venuti 2000: 1-2).

Baker, on the other hand, claims that the discipline has already reached a stage of consolidation from which we can move on, with confidence, towards more innovative approaches. Thus, she adopts a perspective which is far from dichotomies and taxonomies, and tackles rewriting from a 'deliberately prospective rather than retrospective' (Baker 2009: 1) point of view, in order 'to move, to explore new ground, rather than pay tribute to and consolidate past achievements' (2009: 1). At the same time, she aims to incorporate work from other areas that have a longer tradition, such as anthropology, literature and sociology (ibid.: 2).

Weissbort and Eysteinsson (2006) focus their rewriting '[on illuminating] the essential activity of translation from a number of perspectives: historical and contemporary, theoretical and practical' (Weissbort & Eysteinsson 2006: v). Besides, these authors intend to reinforce the link between the theory and practice of translation, which, as it is well-known, is one of the most frequent criticism of the education of translator, thereby rejecting limiting their selection to a group of canonized theoretical texts, on the grounds that 'it is [...] the practice of translation, which opens the gateway between the present and history' (ibid.: v). Thus, the authors aim 'to bring across to [their] readers how valuable reflections about translation took form in contexts of actual translation practice' (ibid.: v), which leads them to emphasise this connection, more or less explicitly throughout their selection.

---

<sup>7</sup> The concept of *rewriting* have been analysed within the field of Translation Studies by scholars such as Lefevere (1992) and Vidal Claramonte (1998).

The selection of the texts, closely linked with the motivations that trigger rewriting, plays a fundamental role within the creation of a reader. As a general rule, the most frequent selection criterion is the representativeness of the texts (cf. Chesterman 1989), which should be understood in relative terms, i.e., depending on the author's perspective or orientation. For instance, in the selection made by Baker (2009), the emphasis lies on texts produced not only within the context of Translation Studies, but within other areas, which are considered relevant to explore a number of issues that are, according to her, essential for the development of the discipline (Baker 2009: 1). In diachronic terms, most readers focus on contemporary texts, but Weissbort and Eysteinsson (2006) choose to offer a historical perspective, including classical texts (compiled in the first section of the volume, which covers historical periods from Antiquity to the 20<sup>th</sup> century), and Venuti (2004) includes a section dedicated to what he calls 'Foundational Statements', dealing with texts that were written before the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

The number of texts selected varies considerably between readers, but they generally tend to contain a smaller number of texts than anthologies. All readers in the field of Translation Studies are monolingual, with all selected texts in English; texts originally written in other languages appear as translations.

The fact that the purposes and motivations of the authors are heterogeneous makes it difficult to identify a general canon as far as the choice of texts and authors is concerned; a feature they tend to share, however, is that the vast majority of texts and authors form part of the Western tradition. Within the classical or foundational period, authors such as Dryden and Benjamin are present in the readers which include historical texts (cf. Chesterman 1989; Venuti 2004; Weissbort & Eysteinsson 2006). On the other hand, Vinay and Darbelnet, Jakobson, Nida and Reiss seem to be indispensable in the readers aimed at providing a general and representative picture of contemporary translation discourse (cf. Chesterman 1989; Venuti 2000 2004; Weissbort & Eysteinsson 2006).

### *2.2.2. The reader as a book to be read*

Just like anthologies, readers are the result of a process of rewriting pre-existing texts, a process by which a new work, a volume of guided readings, is produced. As is the case with anthologies, readers are written by academics working in Translation Studies or related areas. The reader constitutes a useful tool to help students become familiar with the most influential texts of contemporary translation literature or, as mentioned in the previous section, with emerging trends in the study of translation.

One of the most characteristic features of the reader are its paratextual elements, which, as observed by Ruiz Casanova (2007: 162), give definition to the anthologist's authorship and to the construction of a new book in its own right. Paratextual elements include a preface, the arrangements of the texts, notes and comments, suggestion of complementary readings, a bibliography and index(es), as well as acknowledgements.

The preface usually contains an explanation of the motivation and purposes of the volume, a description of the selection criteria, justification for any omission, a presentation of the compilation and the rationale for its structure, and, in some cases, even suggestions with regard to the potential pedagogical applications of the reader (cf. Venuti 2000, 2004). Another key paratextual component, which further highlights the pedagogical function of this type of work, is the contextualization or introduction provided for each of the texts selected (cf. Chesterman 1989), or for each thematic (cf. Baker 2009) or chronological section (cf. Venuti 2000, 2004; Weissbort & Eysteinsson 2006). The contextualisation of a text usually contains a brief introduction of the author and a summary of the main ideas of the respective texts, thereby establishing a relationship to other authors and texts from the corresponding period. Such a contextualisation is only rarely included in traditional anthologies; indeed, the lack of contextualization is one of the most common criticism of anthologies, as the absence of a context can lead to a merely cumulative and linear historiography (cf. D'hulst 1991, 1995; Pym 1992, 1998; Lépinette 1997, 2006).

The pedagogical function of the reader is, moreover, reinforced by the suggestions for further or complementary reading (cf. Chesterman 1989; Venuti 2000, 2004; Baker 2009),

which tend to appear either at the end of the introduction of each section or text; this type of bibliographical information is not provided in other translation anthologies.

Regarding the arrangement of the texts, Baker (2009) presents them in thematic sections, whilst the majority of readers apply purely chronological criteria, very much like most other anthologies (cf. Sabio Pinilla & Ordóñez López 2012: 114-115). In Weissbort and Eysteinnsson (2006), there are different sections for particular translation approaches and specific periods, and in addition, other representative works are mentioned and briefly presented in order to mitigate the fact that they do not appear in full.

Bibliographical details of the selected texts and of works cited in the introductory sections are usually provided in a reference section at the end of the volume. Furthermore, except for Chesterman (1989), subject (cf. Baker 2009) and name indexes (cf. Weissbort & Eysteinnsson 2006; Baker 2009) are provided, or both are combined within a general index (cf. Venuti 2000, 2004).

All in all, the most distinctive feature of readers is their distinctly pedagogical function, as shown by the inclusion of introductory sections, the contextualization of the texts selected, and the suggestion of further or complementary reading. In the following section, a proposal for a translation historiography reader, inspired by the format described here, is presented.

### **3. Proposal for a translation historiography reader**

In accordance with the features described above, the proposed reader will consist of a corpus of historiographical texts, rather than historical texts as such. In line with the conventions of this format, the volume will have a distinctly pedagogical function and will include a representative selection of the historical research carried out in the last four decades. It is intended as an analytic tool for the study of the discipline as a whole, and, in contrast to anthologies, selected texts will be contextualised, providing information about contemporary historiographical research, as one of the functions of the reader is to provide students with a different type of resource that can help to raise their awareness of the relevance of theory in their education as translators. At the same time, the reader is intended as a resource for teachers; in addition the theoretical content, learning materials and activities will therefore be included, to help teachers use the texts in the classroom and to help students develop critical thinking.

In the proposed work, a historiographical perspective will be adopted, in which historiography is understood as the discipline that studies the development of historical investigation. In the reader, the focus thus lies on the discourse about historical research in Translation Studies, which will be compiled with pedagogical and academic purposes in mind. The purpose of the reader is thus to provide a panoramic overview of historical investigation in Translation Studies, showing its evolution from a traditional historiography of a positivist nature, to a postmodern (or 'postpositivist', cf. Tymoczko 2007) historiography. This perspective will help to reconstruct, in a selective manner, the inventory of historiographical knowledge that is relevant in contemporary approaches to Translation Studies.

The reader will be compiled by a group of academics, coordinated by the authors of this article; the compilation process can be subdivided into the following stages: compilation of bibliographical material, selection of texts, translation of texts (as an added value to the pedagogical function of the reader), review of the selected texts, elaboration of the entries and selection and preparation of complementary materials. Texts will, preferably, be included in their entirety; in cases where this is not possible, every care will be taken to avoid distorting their content in the abridged version.

As a starting point, the reader must necessarily include a selection of texts by the most representative contemporary researchers, which illustrate the development of historiographical research and the wide range of traditions from which the study of the theory and history of translation is approached. Texts considered to be representative are, for instance, those that have led us to question previous approaches in a critical manner and that have encouraged debate, incorporating new perspectives from other disciplines and developing novel approaches. It should be noted that theoretical positions do not have exact boundaries; therefore, many authors and texts may be classified in more than just one paradigm, school or model, given the



multidisciplinary nature of Translation Studies. However, the emphasis in the proposed reader will be placed on theoretical and historiographical issues, rather than subscribing to a specific school, model, etc. Taking all this into consideration, the proposed reader will include many of the authors cited in this article, such as D'hulst (cf. 1991, 1995, 2001, 2010), Lambert (cf. 1993) and Hermans (cf. 2004), who have established the methodological basis as far as concepts and methods are concerned. Contributions within philological Studies, such as Lépinette (cf. 1997), and scholars whose contributions have proved to be fundamental in drawing attention to the relevance of historical methodology in the study of translation, such as Delisle (cf. 1997-98) and Pym (cf. 1992, 1998) will also be included, as one of the reader's aims is to promote a dialogue with historical sciences, given that, as stated by a number of researchers, historical investigation in translation and interpreting can also benefit the study of history (cf. Payás 2006), of globalisation issues (cf. Cronin 2003), of identity (cf. Cronin 2006), of power (cf. Tymoczko & Gentzler 2002), and of conflict (cf. Baker 2002), and it can serve to apply historical studies to new areas, such as China (cf. Cheung 2009) and Hispanic America (cf. Bastin 2010-11). Attention will also be paid to translation researchers who have carried out multidisciplinary investigation, bringing together historiography and sociology (cf. Gouanvic 2006). In short, the reader will aim to gather the most influential texts representing the different approaches to Translation Studies and theories adopted in the study of the historical investigation of the past.

The reader will be structured as follows: An index and a brief presentation section will be followed by an introductory chapter in which a general analysis of the selected texts will be presented. As no criteria for the order of the texts have been established as yet, they will be arranged in chronological order, according to their publication date. Each text will be accompanied by biographical information about the authors, in order to contextualise them within their approach or tradition, internal notes where appropriate, as well as a general analysis and teaching materials. The reader will also include a general bibliography, a glossary of basic terms, and a name and subject index.

The reader is intended to promote a non-Eurocentric view of the historical study of translation through a compilation of representative and relevant texts which cover a broad canon. In addition, the suggestions for further reading will make it possible to cover texts and authors that have not been selected but are nevertheless considered complementary or important to develop a specific issue further. The teaching materials will be addressed to lecturers and will include activities to implement the theoretical content of the texts, questions to encourage discussion in the classroom and/or suggestions for essays to expand the issues discussed in the texts, with the aim of reinforcing the link between the theory and the practice of translation, as well as a glossary with the key terms in historiography and translation studies.

Ultimately, the proposed reader should provide a selective and, at the same time, diverse view of the historical study of translation, including authors and texts from a wide range of backgrounds and covering approaches and trends which have contributed to the consolidation of this area from the 1970s to the present day.

## References

- BAKER, Mona. (2002) *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account*. London & New York: Routledge.
- BAKER, Mona (ed.) (2009) *Critical Readings in Translation Studies*. London & New York: Routledge.
- BANDIA, Paul. (2006) 'The Impact of Postmodern Discourse on the History of Translation'. In: Bastin, George L. & Paul F. Bandia (eds.) (2006) *Charting the Future of Translation History*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press. pp. 45-58.
- BASTIN, George L. & Paul F. Bandia (eds.) (2006) *Charting the Future of Translation History*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- BASTIN, George L. (2010-2011) "La pertinencia de los estudios históricos sobre traducción en Hispanoamérica". *Estudios Interdisciplinarios de América Latina y el Caribe* 21:1.
- CHESTERMAN, Andrew (ed.) (1989) *Readings in Translation Theory*. Helsinki: Oy Finn Lectura Ab.

- CHEUNG, Martha. (2009) 'Introduction. Chinese Discourse on Translation. Positions and Perspectives.' *The Translator* 15:2 (Special Issue. *Chinese Discourses on Translation*). pp. 223-278.
- CRONIN, Michael. (2003) *Translation and Globalization*. London & New York: Routledge.
- CRONIN, Michael. (2006) *Translation and Identity*. London & New York: Routledge.
- DELISLE, Jean. (1997-98) "Réflexions sur l'historiographie de la traduction et ses exigences scientifiques." *Équivalences* 26:2 and 27:1. pp. 21-43. [French version of (1996) "Reflexión sobre as esixencias científicas da historia da traducción." *Viceversa* 2. pp. 37-56].
- DELISLE, Jean. (2008) "Historiographie, notions, sens, citations, CD-ROM." *Mutatis, Mutandis* 1:1. pp. 81-96.
- D'HULST, Lieven. (1991) "Pourquoi et comment écrire l'histoire des théories de la traduction?" *Actes du XII<sup>e</sup> Congrès mondial de la FIT*. Belgrado: Prevodilac. pp. 57-62.
- D'HULST, Lieven. (1995) "Pour une historiographie des théories de la traduction: questions de méthode." *TTR* 8:1. pp. 13-33.
- D'HULST, Lieven. (2001) 'Why and How to Write Translation Histories?' In: Milton, John (ed.) 2001. *Emerging Views on Translation History in Brazil*. São Paulo: Crop. pp. 21-32.
- D'HULST, Lieven. (2010) 'Translation History.' In: Gambier, Yves & Luc van Doorslaer (eds.) 2010. *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. pp. 397-405.
- D'HULST, Lieven. (2011) *Historiografía de la Traducción*. M.Res. Course, School of Translation and Interpreting, University of Granada, 25-28th March.
- ENRÍQUEZ ARANDA, María M. (2007) "La creación del canon a través de la retraducción en antologías: imagen romántica en el siglo XX." In: Zaro Vera, Juan Jesús & Francisco Ruiz Noguera (eds.) 2007. *Retraducir: una nueva mirada. La retraducción de textos literarios y audiovisuales*. Málaga: Gómez y Navarro Comunicación. pp. 117-134.
- FERNÁNDEZ SÁNCHEZ, María Manuela. (2010) "Sobre el tratamiento de las fuentes en la historiografía posmoderna: archivos, fotografías y memorias de intérpretes en la Guerra Fría." In: Rabadán, Rosa; Trinidad Guzmán & Marisa Fernández (eds.) 2010. *Lengua, traducción, recepción en honor de Julio César Santoyo. Language, Translation, Reception to Honor Julio César Santoyo*. León: Universidad de León, Área de Publicaciones, vol. I. pp. 231-246.
- FERNÁNDEZ SÁNCHEZ, María Manuela. (2012) "¿Por qué resulta tan prescindible el estudio de las teorías de la traducción? Una reflexión sobre los docentes como historiadores de la ciencia." In: Basich Peralta, Kora Evangelina; Sonia Acosta Domínguez; Ana Gabriela Guajardo Martínez Sotomayor; Miguel Ángel Lemus Cárdenas & Ana Gabriela Rubio Moreno (Coordinadores) 2012. *Traduciendo culturas: más que un desafío*. V Congreso Internacional de Traducción e Interpretación. Mexicali: Universidad Autónoma de Baja California. pp. 73-94.
- FRAISSE, Emmanuel. (1997) *Les anthologies en France*. Paris: P.U.F.
- GOUANVIC, Jean-Marc. (2006) "Au-delà de la pensée binaire en traductologie: esquisse d'une analyse sociologique des positions traductives en traduction littéraire." *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction* 19:1. pp. 123-134.
- GUILLÉN, Claudio. [1985] (2005) *Entre lo uno y lo diverso. Introducción a la Literatura Comparada (Ayer y hoy)*. Barcelona: Tusquets Editores (Marginales, 229).
- HERMANS, Theo. (1994) *Translation in Systems. Descriptive and Systemic Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- HERMANS, Theo. (2004) 'Metaphor and Image in the Discourse on Translation. A Historical Survey'. In: Kittel, Harald; Armin Paul Frank; Norbert Greiner; Theo Hermans; Werner Koller; Jose Lambert & Fritz Paul (eds.) 2004. *Übersetzung. Translation. Traduction. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung. An International Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. Encyclopédie internationale de la recherche sur la traduction*. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter, vol. 1. pp. 118-128.
- HOLMES, James. (1972) 'The Name and Nature of Translation Studies'. In: Ovistgaard, Jacques; and Others (eds.) 1972. *International Congress of Applied Linguistics: Congress Abstracts*

- (3<sup>d</sup>, Copenhagen, 21-26 August 1972). Copenhagen: Ehrverskøkonomisk Forlag, <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED074796.pdf>
- HOLMES, James. (1988) *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- LAMBERT, Jose. (1993) 'History, Historiography and the Discipline. A Programme.' In: Gambier, Yves & Jorma Tommola (eds.) 1993. *Translation and Knowledge*. Turku: University of Turku. pp. 3-25.
- LAMBERT, Jose. (1995) 'Translation, Systems and Research: The Contribution of Polysystem Studies to Translation Studies.' *TTR*8:1. pp. 105-152.
- LEFEVERE, André. (1992) *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London & New York: Routledge.
- LÉPINETTE, Brigitte. (1997) *La historia de la traducción – Metodología. Apuntes bibliográficos*. València: Universitat de València, Centro de Estudios sobre Comunicación Interlingüística e Intercultural (LynX Documentos de Trabajo, vol. 14).
- LÉPINETTE, Brigitte. (2006) "García Garrosa, María José & Francisco Lafarga, *El discurso sobre la traducción en la España del siglo XVIII. Estudio y antología*." *Target* 18:2. pp. 373-380.
- LÓPEZ GARCÍA, Dámaso. (2011) "Twitter-traducción". In: Sáez, Daniel; Jorge Braga; Marta Abuín; Marta Guirao; Beatriz Soto & Nava Maroto (eds.) 2011. *Últimas tendencias en traducción e interpretación*. Madrid: Iberoamericana. pp. 79-98.
- MUNDAY, Jeremy. (2012) *Introducing Translation Studies*. London & New York: Routledge (3<sup>rd</sup> edition).
- PAYÁS, Gertrudis. (2006) "Lorsque l'histoire de la traduction sert à réviser l'histoire." *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction* 19:2. pp. 15-36.
- PYM, Anthony. (1992) "Shortcomings in the Historiography of Translation." *Babel* 38:4. pp. 221-235.
- PYM, Anthony. (1998) *Method in Translation History*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- PYM, Anthony. (2010) *Exploring Translation Theories*. London & New York: Routledge.
- RUIZ CASANOVA, José Francisco. (2007) *Anthologos, poética de la antología poética*. Madrid: Cátedra.
- SABIO PINILLA, José Antonio & Pilar Ordóñez López. (2012) *Las antologías sobre la traducción en el ámbito peninsular. Análisis y estudio*. Bern: Peter Lang (Col. Relaciones literarias en el ámbito hispánico: traducción, literatura y cultura, 6).
- SANTOYO, Julio-César. (2009) *La traducción medieval en la Península Ibérica (siglos III-XV)*. León: Universidad de León.
- STÖRIG, Hans J. (1963) *Das Problem des Übersetzens*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- TYMOCZKO, Maria & Edwin Gentzler (eds.) (2002) *Translation and Power*. Amherst/Boston: University of Massachusetts Press.
- TYMOCZKO, Maria. (2007) *Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- VENUTI, Lawrence (ed.) (2000) *The Translation Studies Reader*. London & New York: Routledge.
- VENUTI, Lawrence (ed.) (2004) *The Translation Studies Reader*. London & New York: Routledge [2<sup>nd</sup> revised edition].
- VIDAL CLARAMONTE, M<sup>a</sup> Carmen África. (1998) *El futuro de la traducción: Últimas teorías, nuevas aplicaciones*. Valencia: Institució Alfons el Magnànim.
- WEISSBORT, Daniel & Astradur Eysteinnsson (eds.) (2006) *Translation. Theory and Practice. A Historical Reader*. New York: Oxford University Press.

## **NOTAS BIOGRÁFICAS/ BIONOTES**

### **Pilar Ordóñez López**

Pilar Ordóñez López es actualmente profesora contratada doctora en el Departamento de Traducción y Comunicación en la Universitat Jaume I y ha trabajado en diferentes universidades en el Reino Unido y Estados Unidos. Entre sus líneas de investigación se encuentra la historia y la teoría de la traducción, así como su didáctica a nivel universitario, y ha publicado diversos trabajos en estos ámbitos.

Pilar Ordóñez López is Lecturer in Translation Studies at the Universitat Jaume I in Castellón de la Plana, having previously taught at several universities in the United States and the United Kingdom. Her research areas include translation history and theory as well as translator training, and she has published extensively in those fields.

### **José Antonio Sabio Pinilla**

José Antonio Sabio Pinilla es profesor titular de Traducción e Interpretación de la Universidad de Granada. Se dedica al estudio de las relaciones literarias entre España y Portugal desde la perspectiva de la historia y teoría de la traducción. Es autor o coautor de distintos volúmenes monográficos y ha editado diversas obras colectivas. Ha sido decano de la Facultad de Traducción e Interpretación de la Universidad de Granada.

José Antonio Sabio Pinilla is Senior Lecturer in Translation and Interpreting at the University of Granada. His research focuses mainly on the literary relations between Spain and Portugal from the perspective of the history and theory of translation. He has published and co-published several monographs and has edited various collective publications. He has been Dean of the Faculty of Translation and Interpreting of the University of Granada.