Benjamins Translation Library (BTL)

The BTL aims to stimulate research and training in translation and interpreting studies. The Library provides a forum for a variety of approaches (which may sometimes be conflicting) in a socio-cultural, historical, theoretical, applied and pedagogical context. The Library includes scholarly works, reference books, post-graduate text books and readers in the English language.

EST Subseries

The European Society for Translation Studies (EST) Subseries is a publication channel within the Library to optimize EST's function as a forum for the translation and interpreting research community. It promotes new trends in research, gives more visibility to young scholars' work, publicizes new research methods, makes available documents from EST, and reissues classical works in translation studies which do not exist in English or which are now out of print.

Constructing a Sociology of Translation

Edited by

Michaela Wolf
University of Graz

Alexandra Fukari
University of Graz

Table of contents

Introduction

The emergence of a sociology of translation

Michaela Wolf
University of Graz, Austria

Any translation, as both an enactment and a product, is necessarily embedded within social contexts. On the one hand, the act of translating, in all its various stages, is undeniably carried out by individuals who belong to a social system; on the other, the translation phenomenon is inevitably implicated in social institutions, which greatly determine the selection, production and distribution of translation and, as a result, the strategies adopted in the translation itself. What is at stake here, therefore, are the various agencies and agents involved in any translation procedure, and more specifically the textual factors operating in the translation process. The interrelational and interactive character of these factors is fundamental to understanding their functioning, and makes up the view of translation as a "socially regulated activity" (Hermans 1997: 10). The social function and the socio-communicative value of a translation can best be located within the contact zone where the translated text and the various socially driven agencies meet. These characteristics of a translation can be revealed through a complex description of the relations that exist between the author of the text, the transfer agencies, the text, and the public in their societal interlacements. Accordingly, the subjectivity of the participants in this "global play" is of paramount importance. Drawing on Anthony Giddens's concept of agency, Venuti argues that this subjectivity is constituted by cultural and social determinations that are diverse and even conflicting:

> Human action is intentional, but determinate, self-reflexively measured against social rules and resources, the heterogeneity of which allows for the possibility of change with every self-reflexive action. (Venuti 1996: 206)

In this context, analysing the social implications of translation helps us to identify the translator and the translation researcher as a constructing and constructed subject in society. This, of course, means we need to conceptualize a methodological framework, a task which has been repeatedly undertaken in the last few

years. In this introduction, the efforts to methodologically frame translation and its contexts as a social practice will be discussed. A more important purpose of this volume, however, is to improve the conjunction of translation studies and sociology and thus foster the development of a methodological basis. The volume intends to further the debate on the role of an emergent sociology of translation within the broader context of translation studies, while taking into account the discourses constructing a "sociology of translation studies". The potential of such a discussion can best be shown by drawing on the concept of interdisciplinarity.

Interdisciplinarity, or: Translation between culture and society

Interdisciplinarity – understood as a differentiated, multidimensional epistemo-logical concept which, according to Roland Barthes, "consists in creating a new object which does not belong to anybody" (Barthes 1984:100, my translation) – has, not surprisingly, been a claim put forward by translation studies more or less from its beginnings. In his detailed discussion of the role of interdisciplinarity in research, Klaus Kaindl argues that the discipline of translation studies must recon-sider its current practice of instrumentalising the research methods of other disci-plines, and instead encourage cooperation on a reciprocal basis (Kaindl 2004:71). The various results of such a move would include the consideration of cultural studies, linguistics, literary studies, historiography, philosophy and sociology within translation studies. To be sure, while interdisciplinarity may offer oppor-tunities for deeper epistemological insights, such collisions always include some form of friction. In particular, the delimitation from other disciplines, and from various special subjects with their origins in the formation of a modern academic system, gives rise to continuous polemics, albeit without seriously prejudicing the production of knowledge and its methodological processing. As a result, the controversial debates and even erroneous ideas resulting from interdisciplinary work cannot be regarded as troublesome or avoidable inconveniences, but are an expression of the differences that exist between scientific disciplines with regard to their structural characteristics.[1]

In the humanities, interdisciplinary projects are an especially important con-tribution to the rise and subsequent establishment of "turns", which question both existing paradigms and allegedly definitive certainties, and additionally offer in-novative potential for productive new research areas and methodologies. As was shown by what has been labelled the "cultural turn" (see Bassnett and Lefevere

1990), translation studies seems particularly inclined towards the shift of para-digms.[2] This results partly from the fact that its subject is by nature located in the contact zones "between cultures", and is therefore exposed to different con-stellations of contextualisation and structures of communication, but also from the make-up of the discipline itself. The multifaceted forms of communication which shape the issues undertaken within translation studies call for us to go be-yond disciplinary boundaries. It cannot be denied that the "cultural turn" brought about a lasting expansion of the frames of research and demanded the elabora-tion of very broad questions. This enabled a thorough discussion of historical perspectives, contextual situations and translation conventions, thus foreground-ing the macro-context of translation and different forms of representation. If as a first step questions of "transfer" were dealt with as culturally specific facets of single phenomena, this dimension was soon extended to the level of discourse (see e.g. Müller-Vollmer 1998) before being reformulated in terms of new ap-proaches drawn primarily from cultural studies. The methodological procedures resulting from these approaches explicitly questioned modes of representation and redefined translations as "inventions" or "constructions" of the "Other" (see Bachmann-Medick 2004:450-451; Wolf 2005b:106-107).

The rupture with exclusively text-bound approaches not only allows transla-tion studies to dislocate fixed entities and reveal asymmetrical transfer condi-tions, but also focuses on those modes of translation which "concretise translation as an interactive social event" (Fuchs 1997:319, my translation). This helps draw attention to the cultural *and* social formations which fundamentally character-ize the translation phenomenon: processes of mediation are thus implicated in frameworks which involve both negotiating cultural differences and exploring the forms of action that belong to the translation process. Consequently, mediating agents operate – in Clifford Geertz' sense – as a sort of "web"[3] that exists between the various cultures. They are bound up in social networks which allow them to be viewed as socially constructed and constructing subjects.

In the wake of the "cultural turn", these observations open up several ques-tions. On the one hand, they shed a radically new light on the notion of "transla-tion", and thus on the discipline's research object. From this perspective, transla-tion is a concept that opposes the view of culture as an agency preserving static views of tradition and identity, and instead highlights the dynamic transforma-

---

1.   See Bourdieu (2004) for the discussion of these structural characteristics in the fields of historiography and sociology and the problems arising from interdisciplinary thinking.

---

2.   See Mary Snell-Hornby's recent book *The Turns of Translation Studies. New Paradigms or Shifting Viewpoints?* (Snell-Hornby 2006) and Doris Bachmann-Medick's seminal study *Cultural Turns. Neuorientierungen in den Kulturwissenschaften* (Bachmann-Medick 2006).

3.   Geertz says, "Believing, with Max Weber, that man is an animal suspended in webs of sig-nificance he himself has spun, I take culture to be those webs [...]" (Geertz 1993:5).

tions resulting from continual confrontations of cultural formations. This change of viewpoint requires us to engage with the potential of a metaphorically conceptualized notion of translation. Such a theory of translation would not only consider the intersecting spaces within the translation process, but would also give voice to the translators and other agents of this process as subjects ensuing from particular cultural dynamics. In addition, it would reveal problems of cultural representation[4] and the contribution made by translation to the construction of cultures. On the other hand, these insights introduce a research area which so far has been touched upon only unsystematically and which, under the label of a "sociology of translation", deals with the issues that arise when viewing translation and interpreting as social practice as well as symbolically transferred interaction. As will be shown, the implications of these interactions are being analysed in an increasingly sophisticated range of issues and methodological refinements.

The process of translation seems, to different degrees, to be conditioned by two levels: the "cultural" and the "social". The first level, a structural one, encompasses influential factors such as power, dominance, national interests, religion or economics. The second level concerns the agents involved in the translation process, who continuously internalize the aforementioned structures and act in correspondence with their culturally connoted value systems and ideologies. There is, however, a danger of dichotomising these two levels. Anthony Pym has recently claimed that "[w]e talk, too readily, about 'sociocultural' or 'social and cultural' approaches, contexts, factors, whatever. [...] No doubt the 'social' is also the 'cultural', in the sense that both are opposed to the 'eternal' or the 'ontological'. But why then do we need the two terms?" (Pym 2006: 14). This question has troubled other disciplines as well. Certainly, society cannot be adequately described without culture nor culture without society. As part of the classical heritage, the Roman terms *cultura* and *societas* survived for several centuries in the common language of education, Latin, without suffering considerable changes in meaning. It was only around 1800, with the rise of radical social changes, that these terms were integrated into the European vernaculars and became key terms in public as well as private discourses. This indicates that the terms "culture" and "society" symbolized radical re-orientations. In their various connotations they not only reflected social transformation over time and space but also encompassed new perceptions by adopting a certain "social vocabulary" as a tool for developing new concepts of society and culture (Tenbruck 1990: 21-22). The subsequent dichotomisation of the two terms denotes that two distinct aspects of "reality" were taking shape.

By way of illustration, a glance at the discussions on the evolution of "cultural sociology" within German speaking academia reveals the dilemma inherent in this dichotomisation – a dilemma which is ultimately reflected in the questions put forth on the subject of a "cultural" and/or "social turn" currently being discussed within translation studies. The founders of German sociology, Max Weber and Georg Simmel, considered that all social action embedded in cultural settings had to be explored both in its historical contexts and in its institutional representations. Subsequently, the concept of culture was denied its analytical potential and was ascribed a notion of value: culture in itself was thus resubstantialized, dismantling the postulate of "freedom of value" within scientific research (Gebhardt 2001). This view survived until the end of the 1970s, when – in the wake of individualising, pluralising and globalising processes – critics of cultural anthropology pointed out the essentialisation of culture operating in dualisms such as "representative" versus "popular" culture or "high" versus "everyday life" culture, and ultimately called for a redefinition of the concepts involved in cultural and social practices (ibid.). These developments were taken up through various initiatives, for example the publication of a thematic volume of the *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* entitled "Kultursoziologie" in 1979 and the publication of a special issue on "Kultur und Gesellschaft" by the same journal in 1986, as well as a conference of sociologists from German-speaking countries, held in 1988 in Zurich and dedicated to the topic (Lichtblau 2003). One of the key questions dealt with in these projects was how "present-day societies constitute themselves as culture" (Rehberg 1986: 106). The discussion mainly focused on how to avoid mutual exclusion when defining the two concepts, and alternatively suggested viewing culture and society as interdependent, a definition which would help to transcend a deterministic view and foster an integrative approach.

Once it becomes obvious that all the elements contributing to the constitution of society are conditioned by specific cultural abilities of language and symbolisation (ibid.: 107), the concepts of "society" and "culture" are both revealed as constructions: culture "creates social structures and is shaped by existing ones" (Neidhardt 1986: 15, my translation). In these construction processes, translation undoubtedly plays a major role. Especially in the translational analysis of recent world-wide developments, such as migration or globalisation, where cultural, social and societal problems in the narrower sense are at stake, it becomes clear on the one hand that there is no benefit in encouraging the elaboration of separate analytical tools (stemming, among other sources, from sociology and cultural studies[5]), and, on the other, that some of the methodologies developed in the

---

4.   For the "crisis of representation" in cultural studies, see Berg and Fuchs (1993) and Chartier (1992).

5.   On this topic, see Heilbron and Sapiro (in this volume).

wake of the "cultural turn" seem to no longer suffice for a thorough analysis of the contribution of translation within these multifaceted processes. An emphasis on the relationship between culture and society would help to avoid dichotomisation and allow us to transcend traditional deterministic views. In institutional terms, the question of whether we are witnessing the emergence of a new "turn" – the "sociological turn" – no longer seems relevant: cultural and social practices – and consequently their theoretical and methodological conceptualization – cannot be regarded as detached from one another. If we focus on "the social" yet neglect the conditions that mould translation as a cultural practice in terms of power, ideology and similar issues, the creation of a new sub-discipline within translation studies called "sociology of translation" would sidestep the problem of methodology. The questions pertinent to translation viewed as a social practice should instead be placed at the core of the discipline. Last but not least, such a position has the potential to better conjoin existing approaches with a "sociology of translation", as well as to discuss more efficiently the interface of methodologies developed in sociology and cultural studies.

First glances at "translation as a social practice"[6]

The question of "the social" within translation had been dealt with throughout the history of translation studies in various forms and from varying perspectives. Here, I will give only an overview of the main considerations arising from such approaches. Although it has been recognized that the translation process is socially conditioned and that "the viability of a translation is established by its relationship to the cultural and social conditions under which it is produced and read" (Venuti 1995: 18), no comprehensive research seems yet to have been conducted with regard to the social implications of translation.

While system-oriented approaches do not insist on the theoretical conceptualization of the social implications of translation, they do – more than any other research designs – offer numerous links to socially oriented questions. Polysystem theory, for instance, has brought about fruitful insights into the functioning of translated literature within broader literary and historical systems of the target culture. This was a decisive move beyond the prescriptive models prevailing at the time when polysystem theory was elaborated, and placed the phenomenon of translation within broader "socio-cultural" contexts. The theory proposes that literature be understood as a dynamic, functional and stratified system; 'system' be-

---

6. For an overview on the "state of the art" of an emerging "sociology of translation" see also Prunč, in this volume.

ing defined as "the network of relations that can be hypothesized for a certain set of assumed observables ([or] 'occurrences'/'phenomena')" (Even-Zohar 1990: 27). In Even-Zohar's view, systems are highly hierarchical and are determined by their struggle for the primary position in the literary canon. Canonical repertoires tend to be consumed and conventionalized through repetition and are gradually driven towards the system's periphery, whereas peripheral repertoires push towards the centre and, in this process, are often used as a means to enrich aesthetic values. Criticisms of polysystem theory emphasize, among other aspects, the dichotomic stance inherent in its "toolbox" of binary oppositions, such as "canonized" versus "non-canonized" literature or "centre" versus "periphery". From a sociological point of view, however, it seems particularly relevant that throughout polysystem theory it is never made clear what driving forces are behind the ongoing dynamics in a system. According to Even-Zohar, it

> suffices to recognize that it is the *interdependencies* between these factors which allow them to function in the first place. Thus, a CONSUMER may "consume" a PRODUCT produced by a PRODUCER, but in order for the "product" (such as "text") to be generated, a common REPERTOIRE must exist, whose usability is determined by some INSTITUTION. A MARKET must exist where such a good can be transmitted. None of the factors enumerated can be described to function in isolation, and the kind of relations that may be detected run across all possible axes of the scheme.   (Even-Zohar 1990: 34, original emphasis)

What seems to be implicitly "meant", but not openly expressed, are the conditions of the social interactions in question. What is the nature of the political and social relationships between the groups involved in these processes? And what are the criteria underlying the "generation" of a product or the "existence" of a market? These and other questions illustrate that Even-Zohar's words remain directly related to the text – as Edwin Gentzler points out: "Even-Zohar seldom relates texts to the 'real conditions' of their production, only to hypothetical structural models and abstract generalizations" (Gentzler 1993: 123). Even-Zohar thus fails to integrate his "factors" (i.e. agents and institutions) into the frameworks of polysystem theory, and prefers to focus on the description of the existing relationships between them.

With regard to the mechanisms underlying the dynamics of the literary polysystem, which are supposed to condition the translation production process, Even-Zohar claims that some of the reasons for the continual shifts between periphery and centre – which, he says, can enable the introduction of translated literature into the system – are found in the "lack of repertoire" in the target literature (Even-Zohar 1990: 47). This seems to be a category of polysystem theory which has the potential to disclose the driving conditions of the literary system.

Even-Zohar defines repertoire as "the aggregate of rules and materials which govern both the making and use of any given product" (ibid.: 39; see also ibid.: 17 and 207ff.) and as "shared knowledge necessary for producing [...] various [...] products for the literary system". He also postulates that there might be a repertoire for "behaving as one should expect from a literary agent" (ibid.: 40).[7] Although the notion of repertoire is often linked to grammar or lexicon, it implicitly bears the social, cultural, economic or other aspects which generate cultural products, among them translations. Even-Zohar, however, never discusses these aspects explicitly, and fails to consider the agents operating at the base of "repertoire".

Within the wider realm of systemic-oriented translation studies, a descriptive, empirical approach was developed which emphasizes a translation's function within the target culture and strongly draws on the concept of translation norms – norms that govern the relations between source and target text. In sociology, norms are a rather disputed category, as they only gain relevance once they have been generally accepted by a given community and can answer the following questions: what norms are applicable to whom and in what context, in what way are norms accepted, and how does a change in norms operate (Bahrdt 2000: 48). However, if we accept the significance of norms in moulding social structures, they become paramount to the discussion of social forces in translation. Norms operate in each phase of the translation process: in the selection of texts, by determining what source languages and what (literary) models should be selected for the target literature, and in the selection of translation strategies that reveal the relationships between the two translation cultures involved. A detailed analysis of all translation norms effective at a specific time within a specific society would ideally enable insights into that society's ideas on translation as a cultural phenomenon.

Toury calls attention to the relevance of norms for translator training institutes, and remarks on the importance of feedback. Translators undergo a socialisation process during which feedback procedures, motivated by norms, are assimilated. This helps them to develop strategies for coping with the various problems they encounter during actual translation, and in some cases translators might even adopt automatized techniques to resolve specific problems. This internalisation

---

7. Rakefet Sheffy, too, recognizes the social potential of "repertoires": "Certainly, such [a repertoire-oriented] approach to systems is amenable to sociological perspectives" (Sheffy 1997: 36). For his part, Theo Hermans denounces the aspect of automatism in these processes of change, which "become self-propelling and cyclical: the canonized centre does what it does, and when it is overrun a new centre repeats the pattern, as if the whole thing were on automatic pilot" (Hermans 1999: 118).

process is reminiscent of the translator's *habitus*, introduced by Bourdieu and is conceptualized by Toury as follows:

> It may also be hypothesized that to the extent that a norm has indeed been internalized and made part of a modified competence, it will also be applied to the production of more spontaneous translated utterances, in situations where no sanctions are likely to be imposed. [The translator's] behavioural varieties [...] may therefore prove a useful tool for checking not only the prevailing norms as such, but also their assimilation by individuals and, in the long run, the universals of the process of assimilation itself.   (Toury 1995: 250)

The "agreements and conventions" underlying the practice of translation are continuously negotiated by the people and institutions involved. When considering translation as a norm-governed activity we must take into account the status held by translators within their specific setting and the references they make to the norms they constantly create, agree upon, maintain and break, applying them to different translation situations (Toury 1999: 20).

In his theoretical work, Toury gives the social role of norms a major position – but without conceptualizing them in terms of their socially conditioned context and of the factors involved. Consequently, a sociological framework based on a concept of norms should include the analysis of both the contingent elements responsible for the reconstruction of norms and the internalisation of norms, which ultimately contribute to a specific "translational behaviour" partly based on the negotiation skills between the various subjects involved in the translation procedure. Most of these elements are pointed out by Toury, but he has not so far linked them to a socially driven methodology. Nevertheless, Toury seems quite aware of the need to accentuate societal questions more strongly:

> I believe it is about time [to supply] better, more comprehensive and more flexible explanations of the translational behaviour of individuals within a social context.
> (Toury 1999: 28–29)

Theo Hermans further develops the norm concept by focusing on its broader, social function, and particularly stresses its relevance in relation to power and ideology. Hermans has, perhaps more explicitly than any other scholar, concentrated on the social constraints by which norms, in turn, shape the translation process and effect. He claims that translation today is seen "as a complex transaction taking place in a communicative, socio-cultural context" (Hermans 1996: 26). This means the agents involved are placed at the fore of these transfer processes, with special attention paid to the "interactive form of social behaviour, involving a degree of 'interpersonal coordination' among those taking part (selecting and attuning an appropriate code, recognising and interpreting the code, paying atten-

tion, eliminating 'noise', etc.)" (ibid.: 29; see also Hermans 1997: 7). In addition, the relative positions and interests of the participants have to be taken into account in order to contextualize the social dimension of the creation and reception of translation.

Hermans finds that empirical studies have yet to elaborate a theoretical framework which encompasses both the social and ideological impact of translation. In his opinion, emphasis on the analysis of norms could be a first step towards such a framework. Norms are, after all, involved in all stages of the translation procedure and thus define "the contours of translation as a recognized, social category" (ibid.: 42). A further step into the conceptualization of "the social" within translation – which would include the concept of norms – could be the elaboration of methodological instruments to help give detailed insight into the social conditions of the translator's and other agents' labour, and into the social forces that drive the translation process. Systemic approaches to translation have taken these questions into account, but have not yet managed to elaborate them within a coherent theoretical framework.

The view of translation as social practice is also central to the work of André Lefevere. In particular, the notion of "rewriting" is one that denotes both the manipulative interventions on the level of the text and the cultural (literary) devices which direct and control the production procedure in the interplay of social forces. The patronage system at work within this interplay embraces individuals, collectives and institutions, which are determined mainly by ideology. Lefevere not only ascribes a social dimension to this notion (Lefevere 1998: 48), but also extends it by means of Bourdieu's concept of "cultural capital", which he sees as the driving force for the distribution of translations within a specific culture, as "cultural capital is transmitted, distributed and regulated by means of translation, among other factors, not only between cultures, but also within one given culture" (ibid.: 41).[8] The rewriting concept also draws on other concepts closely linked to Bourdieusian categories – economic capital as an important contribution to the final shape of a translation, and "status" (viz "social and/or symbolic capital"), which is responsible for positioning the "patrons" in their respective literary system and is vital for the conceptualization of a sociology of translation.

Through their concentration on the role of various participants in the translation enterprise (initiator, commissioner, source and target text producer, user, receiver, etc.) with the aim of accomplishing the declared skopos, a good deal of the functional approaches can be regarded as sociologically motivated, having shifted their main focus from texts to the mediators of these texts. Attempting to

8.   The slightly fuzzy use of the notion "cultural capital" by Lefevere cannot be fully associated with the Bourdieusian notion. See in detail Wolf (2005b: 103).

transcend the equivalence postulate, functionalism-oriented scholars explore the professional domain of translation, which is linked with a view of translation as an intercultural communication act (Nord 1991: 9). For skopos theory in the narrower sense, however, it seems that a vague notion of culture is rather an obstacle to a sociological perspective, because the concept of culture – idio, dia and paraculture (Vermeer 1990: 32) – suggests social restraint yet does not fully consider it as an object of investigation. The social forces behind the communicative acts that select and prepare the skopos-ready cultural product for reception in the target culture are not conceptualized in a discursive net. Doing so, would ultimately allow us to foreground the constraints informing the decisions taken in favour (or against) a declared skopos.

Justa Holz-Mänttäri's "translational action model" might a priori serve as a better basis for a sociologically driven translation analysis. Her model seeks to develop a framework that would allow for the cooperation of the subjects participating in the social make-up of translation. The model poses as its parameters the specific qualification of the persons involved, the necessity of cooperation, and the agents' professionalism resulting from these requirements. All these factors enforce the idea of translation as social practice. Yet when Holz-Mänttäri claims that a translation – at least ideally – is produced according to prior agreement of all subjects involved, we are reminded of Hans Hönig, who argues that this kind of notion is based on a horizontally conceptualized model of society, one which in fact does not correspond to the hierarchical relationships that exist between the agents in Holz-Mänttäri's model (Hönig 1992: 3; see also Wolf 1999). These hierarchies could be revealed by studying both the connections existing between the various agents and the conditions underlying their relationships.

The category of the power relationships operating in translation has become an important research topic over the last few decades. Apart from certain informative articles, such as Peter Fawcett's "Translation and Power Play" (1995), which can be regarded as one of the first systematic investigations into the implications of power and translation, the collection of essays edited by Román Álvarez and Carmen-África Vidal (1996) set the course for a more detailed examination of translation viewed as a politically motivated activity. Álvarez and Vidal seek to analyze the relationship between the production of knowledge in a given culture and its transfer, as well as the location of knowledge within the target culture. They concentrate on the figure of the translator, "who can be the authority who manipulates the culture, politics, literature, and their acceptance (or lack thereof) in the target culture" (ibid.: 2). As for Lawrence Venuti, the central value he gives to the question of power relations in translation is already revealed in his view of translation itself. He conceives of translation as "cultural political practice, constructing or critiquing ideology-stamped identities for foreign cultures, affirming

or transgressing discursive values and institutional limits in the target-language culture" (Venuti 1995: 19), and articulates the implications of these limits for the translator's position in society alongside the social implicatedness of translation (Venuti 1998: 3).[9] The link between the manifestation of power and domination in the creation of a translation and the phenomenon of the translator's "invisibility" seems obvious. Once we acknowledge that this invisibility has been (and still is) an essential requirement of acceptability, there are undoubtedly aspects of power at work as long as the translator's presence in the target text is masked by "fluent" strategies, or so Venuti would argue (1995: 22). The more visible the translator is within the text, the less likely it is that he or she can be ignored, marginalized or insufficiently rewarded (Arrojo 1997: 130).

"Power" is thus not only – as stated by Edwin Gentzler and Maria Tymoczko – "the key topic that has provided the impetus for the new directions that translation studies have taken since the cultural turn" (Gentzler and Tymoczko 2002: XVI), but also one of the driving forces of a social view of the translation process, and as such a key issue to be analysed in what has been labelled "sociology of translation". As will be shown, Pierre Bourdieu offered one of the most influential frameworks for studying of the factors which condition the power relations inherent in both the practice and theory of translation. Those factors help to shed light on questions such as the impact that translation can have or actually has on social change, or the relation of social factors of dominance to the selection and ultimately the shaping of translations.

To sum up this short survey, the assertion of Gentzler and Tymoczko that translation is "a deliberate and conscious act of selection, assemblage, structuration, and fabrication" (ibid.: XXI) hints at the paramount importance of analysing social aspects in translation and calls for discussion of both the translator's task creating knowledge and his/her contribution to the shaping of culture *and* society. In addition, poststructuralist concepts produce deeper insights into these procedures, as they tend to question basic categories of social sciences such as action, subject, society or social structure (Stäheli 2000). This opens up new perspectives on the functioning of translation and interpreting as a social practice, including self-reflexivity as a crucial issue in the development of the analytical instruments of a sociology of translation. The next section will explore the major questions that have so far been asked concerning the development of a sociology

of translation, and will look at the sociological methods that have been adopted to deal with these questions within a translational context.

The methodological framing of a sociology of translation

Traditional approaches to translation studies have shown a certain awareness of socially driven questions in translation. They have not, however, coherently synthesized the various issues raised, and little work has been done on the theorisation of these questions. Obviously, there is quite a difference between a more or less vague consciousness of research deficits and systematic research on social aspects of translation.

In a recently published paper "Translation and Society: The Emergence of a Conceptual Relationship", Daniel Simeoni (2005) aims to disclose the reasons for the delayed attention given to social issues in translation studies. He states that although, over the centuries, discourses characterising the practice of translation have always been fundamentally social in nature, the observations remained mostly limited to the particular text under discussion. Even in the 1980s, with an increasing emphasis on the environment of translation, the major contributions "remained attached to a primarily formal, and only secondarily social, worldview" (ibid.: 4). One of Simeoni's major arguments is that a "sociological eye" was regarded as secondary in the establishment of the academic field, which in the course of a more "contextualising" comprehension of translation rather accentuated the culturalist paradigm; he argues that this has to be seen in the broader context of scientific conceptions which traditionally have been nationalistically induced (ibid.: 12).[10]

Nevertheless, the "sociological eye" has been sharpened in the last few years. This section will look into these developments which can be discussed under the umbrella notion of a "sociology of translation". It seems as though several different "sociologies" can be identified so far: one which, in the classical sociological tradition, focuses on the agents active in translation production, another which emphasizes the "translation process", while a "sociology of the cultural product" scrutinizes the construction of social identities. A cluster of approaches delivers the theoretical and methodological groundwork for a view of translation and interpreting as a social practice, drawing on the works of various sociologists, and,

---

9.   See also Venuti (1992: 10). The association of "power" and the social implications of translation is also discussed by Erich Prunč. As he points out in this volume, a social practice approach to translation calls attention to the process of negotiation based on agencies of power, since the differentials between cultures in terms of power and prestige correlate with the prestige and social position of the agents involved in the translation process.

---

10.   Simeoni also argues that on the institutional level, academic tradition in Europe has been influenced by a "proverbial provincialism of research in national institutions" which, for a long time, did not consider acceptable the entire cultural-studies paradigm as developed in North America (Simeoni 2005: 7).

very recently, some articles have also engaged in what can be subsumed under the label of a "sociology of translation studies".[11]

Sociology of agents

Theories that bring social action to the fore conceive of social life from the perspective of individually acting persons who are involved in social processes. In such a context, agents participating in the translation procedure are highlighted from various aspects. Their activity is, for example, discussed in light of the sociology of profession and the sociology of literature (Silbermann and Hänseroth 1985) or in their role in the constitution of a unified Europe (Barret-Ducrocq 1992). Cornelia Lauber (1996) attempts to reconstruct self-portraits of French translators by evaluating their sociological profiles through gender, labour, and source-text specific questions, an approach which can also be applied to other geographical or cultural contexts. Gender-specific issues in the area of sociological frameworks are dealt with in detail by Wolf (2006) in her study on women translators working in German-speaking countries for women publishers or women's book series. This study, on the opinions of translators and publishers and on pertinent editorial policies, is supplemented by a historical dimension in a volume edited by Grbić and Wolf (2002), which examines the practice of translation by female translators from the point of view of their social networks, thus revealing their positions in society and the struggle for social recognition.

Individual figures of translators have frequently been investigated in historically oriented works. To begin with, the influential volume *Translators Through History* edited by Delisle and Woodsworth (1995)[12] examines the role of translators in the formation of national literatures, the transfer of knowledge, and the dissemination of religion, giving detailed information on their social and cultural contexts. With his innovative work *Method in Translation History*, Anthony Pym (1998) fills a long-felt need to conceptualize historical studies on translation within a methodological framework. Pym calls for a shift of emphasis from texts and contexts to the individual figures of translators as central objects of research, and aims to reconstruct the domain of socially conditioned subjectivity as a basis for understanding the translators' history. His three-stage model includes a "translation archaeology", a set of discourses which single out the fundamental sociological facts; a "historical critique", which examines the role of translations in their

---

11. Given the flourishing state of the art of the subject in question, in the context of this survey only the key works can be taken into account.

12. See also Delisle (1999, 2002).

ideological dimension; and the "explanation", which discusses the causation of how translations come into being. In this last step, translators are self-reflexively called upon as agents whose subjectivity is socially conditioned – as indeed is that of the researchers (Pym 1998: 5–6).

Some works address the agents in the translation process by theoretically modelling them on some of Pierre Bourdieu's main categories. An outline of the "mediation space" for the translation of *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone* into German, for example, attempts to unravel the power relations inherent in the translational production process by identifying the massive capitals invested in the "Harry Potter" field (Wolf 2002). In another study, Wolf discusses the constraints that prevailed in the translation domain during the Nazi regime, where the role of translators in translation production and the translation phenomenon was instrumentalized in order to foster the regime's ideology (Wolf 2003). Similarly, Jean-Marc Gouanvic draws on Bourdieusian concepts in order to shed light on the agents' activities in the translation field. In his various studies on the importation of US-American science fiction literature into France between 1945 and 1960 (see e.g. Gouanvic 1997, 1999), he claims that a translation is basically exposed to the same logics as an original and that, in the case of his empirical studies, the stakes (*enjeux*) of the agents involved (critics, editors, publishers, translators) enabled the establishment of a new literary field of science fiction in France. This field was created as a sort of compromise between the US-American field's structures and part of the corresponding French tradition. Gouanvic explores in detail the power struggles in the field conditioned by the differing interests of the various social agents, and their impact on the textual form of the translations. He also takes into account the mechanisms of legitimation to which the social groups were exposed in the course of their struggle for symbolic, economic and political power.

Sociology of the translation process

As has already been shown, descriptive approaches offer particularly fertile ground for the development of a "sociology of the translation process". Calling for a more coherent consideration of historical and cultural factors and the processes of identity formation through translation, Clem Robyns's paper "Towards a Sociosemiotics of Translation" (1992) reveals its connections with systemic approaches. Robyns views both source and target texts as constructions embedded in social discourses, and develops a translation model with three interactive aspects. First, the metadiscourse on translation poses questions such as what type of discourse exists in political or other debates. A second aspect deals with the selection and distribution of the elements imported through translation, thus

indirectly evoking the concept of norms: which mechanisms do these elements follow, and what is their status? In which discursive formations are they located, and what is their particular function? Finally, the "integration and transformation of those elements" affects the adoption of concrete translation strategies which depend on the envisaged position in the target system and are submitted to doctrine, taboo, political pressure or explicit censorship (ibid.: 220). Despite its lack of reflection on the agents participating actively and discursively in the interaction of the various spheres of action, this dynamic model – not least through its attempt to reconstruct translation as "social discourse" – represents a decisive step towards the conceptualization of a sociology of translation.

Translation viewed as a set of discourses is also studied by Annie Brisset. *Sociocritique de la traduction* (Brisset 1990), a study on theatre translation in Quebec, pursues the idea that literature is per se a discursive act and a representation of other discourses. The question resulting from this insight is "how and under what conditions the 'discourse' of the foreign text becomes an integral part of the 'discourse' of the target society" (Brisset 1996: 4). In the discussion of this question, Brisset claims that like any other discursive practice, translation is governed by norms. She investigates institutionally relevant norms and tries to find regularities in certain translators' decisions, which lay bare the "discursive make-up" of the relevant institutions of the target literature.

Translation as a socially driven process is central to Klaus Kaindl's study on the introduction of comics into the literary field of German-speaking countries (Kaindl 2004). To develop a theoretical framework for a sociologically relevant study of the translation of comics, Kaindl systematically adopts Bourdieu's main concepts and comes to the conclusion that the failure of an elaborated field of comics to come about is due both to the lack of adequate parameters for translators to draw on and to the low symbolic capital of comics in the German-speaking cultural space. This confirms Bourdieu's assertion that the position of a certain cultural product and its relative value in a given society are responsible for the product's "success".

Sociology of the cultural product

The majority of the approaches discussed so far cannot be exclusively ascribed to only one of the categories of "sociology", but should rather be located in some overlapping spaces. This is particularly true for the publications I will now discuss, which emphasize not only the agents in the production and reception of translation, but also their shaping role in the respective power relations and the relevance of the translation as a cultural product which circulates in inter- and transnational transfer. The works pertinent to this section discuss translation – more or less explicitly – by highlighting its contribution to the construction of social identity, image, social roles, or ideology. The factors which operate in these construction processes are, to a large degree, socially driven and re-organised within social networks that condition the very specific interplay of the different mediation agencies. Two volumes will be discussed here in detail: the special issue "Traduction: Les Échanges littéraires internationaux" of *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales*, edited by Johan Heilbron and Gisèle Sapiro (2002), and the thematic issue "Soziologie der literarischen Übersetzung" of *Internationales Archiv für Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Literatur*, edited by Norbert Bachleitner and Michaela Wolf (2004). Both volumes include studies based on comprehensive corpora, adopting the analytical tools offered by Pierre Bourdieu to inspect the translation flows on the global translation market and the conditions of production and distribution with the aim of analysing the various transfer mechanisms.

In a first step, Heilbron and Sapiro argue that inspecting the practice of translation implies a double rupture: with hermeneutical methods on the one hand – since these neglect the analysis of social conditions in the production process as well as the plurality of the agents involved – and with strictly economically oriented views of international transactions on the other. Sociological approaches, in contrast, can shed light on the logics which determine the circulation of symbolic goods. One such logic operates within the political relationships between the countries involved, another within the international book market, and yet another within the domains of cultural exchange. The conceptualization of this international space of translation exchange, along with the discussion of its various constituents, is understood as the basis of the volume's articles. These discuss transfers between various geographical spaces, both in the nineteenth century and in a contemporary context. Two shortcomings might diminish the informative value of the volume: first, the failure to acknowledge translation studies as an autonomous discipline,[13] which might explain the hesitant inclusion of translation studies approaches in the various papers, and second, the concentration on translation phenomena on an extra-textual level without taking into consideration text structures or translation strategies. In fact Bourdieu himself stressed the necessity of combining these two levels, a methodological move which enables a comprehensive explanation of the functional logics in the field (Bourdieu 1999: 326).[14]

---

13. It is seen as a "research domain in search of academic legitimacy" (Heilbron and Sapiro 2002: 4).

14. The works by Johan Heilbron cannot be discussed in detail here. He elucidates the international flow of translation between "centre" and "periphery" focusing on translations to and

The editors of the second volume (Bachleitner and Wolf 2004) could also be reproached for their lack of integration between textual and extra-textual analyses. In their introduction they assert, however, that their intention to elaborate the first stage of a programme for the development of a "sociology of literary translation" deliberately does not include text-level analyses. A sociological theory of translation is seen as an essential device for the international transfer of knowledge. The conceptualization of a translation market that is hierarchically structured according to the weight of the various languages, a view substantiated by data on translated works in the international market, is complemented by illustrations of the forces operating on this market and contributing to the promotion, prevention and manipulation of translations. In the "field", for instance, centres generated by power relations are created around agents who dispose of massive capitals. Not only do these centres have ideological and aesthetic interests, but they also engage in the struggle for acceptance of translation products, for example if translators attempt to anticipate the ideas of critics and the reading public, or if they change their publishing house for a new book in order to increase their economic and symbolic capital. The contributions in this special issue focus on the study of these questions in the literary translation domain in the German-speaking countries.

Sociological contributions to a sociology of translation

This section will look into those theoretical and methodological approaches coming from the discipline of sociology which in the last few years have been progressively adopted by translation studies scholars for the discussion of translation and interpreting as a social practice. The sociologists whose work could form the basis of a theoretical framework for a sociology of translation are Pierre Bourdieu, Bernard Lahire, Bruno Latour and Niklas Luhmann.

Jean-Marc Gouanvic points out that Pierre Bourdieu's theory of cultural action can be widely applied to translation studies, as it is a "sociology of the text as a production in the process of being carried out, of the product itself and of its consumption in the social fields, the whole seen in a relational manner" (Gouanvic 2005:148). I have already discussed several works which employ Bourdieu's

---

from Dutch and views these translation flows as part of an ample globalisation process. With a critical eye on Even-Zohar's *polysystem theory*, he stresses that target cultures have to be considered as part of a global constellation of national and supranational cultures. As a result, "a more complete sociological analysis may therefore seek to connect the dynamics of the international translation system with the actual working of the book market and its various segments" (Heilbron 1999:441).

key concepts to conduct specific translation analyses; this section deals with the explicit efforts by translation studies scholars to include Bourdieu's theory of cultural production in their elaboration of a sociology of translation.

One of the first scholars who attempted to highlight Bourdieu's importance for the study of translation was Jean-Marc Gouanvic. He claims that Bourdieu does not include translations in his field theory because "far from constituting a field of their own, translated texts are submitted to the same objective logic as the indigenous texts of the target space" (Gouanvic 2002:160). This homology[15] is also apparent between the position of the translating agent within a field and his or her concrete way of translating (ibid.:162), both being equally subject to the power play of the field. In his various studies, Gouanvic gives a detailed account of the factors and agents responsible for the production of translation in specific institutions (critics, translators, publishing houses, etc.) and comes to the conclusion that the stakes of translation are strongly legitimised practices, endowed with power on the basis of which the terms of translation operating between the various social spaces are continually renegotiated (ibid.:167; Gouanvic 1997:146). Gouanvic stresses that there is an aesthetic pleasure in playing this game, which Bourdieu calls *illusio*. *Illusio* is viewed as the object of the translator's work. During the translation process, a (literary) text reinvents the rules of the literary genre to which it belongs, and subsequently is reinterpreted, according to its own logic, by the agents involved (Gouanvic 2005:163). Gouanvic claims that adept readers adhere to the idea of *illusio* and the specific stakes in the field by internalising them for the duration of the reading (ibid.:164). He stresses that the principle of *illusio* is primarily actualised through the agents' *habitus*, another Bourdieusian concept already mentioned. During the translation procedure, the act of translating is incorporated through, and at the same time influenced by, the translator's *habitus*, which can be identified by reconstructing the translator's social trajectory. In his contribution to the present volume, Gouanvic distinguishes between the translator's *habitus* as a result of his or her practice, and a specific *habitus* which is constructed while the cultures involved encounter one another during the transfer process (Gouanvic, in this volume). Consequently, translation strategies, according to Gouanvic, are generally not to be understood as deliberate choices conforming to or breaking norms, but rather as the translator's *habitus*, which, together with that of other agents, structures the respective field and, in turn, is structured by the field itself (Gouanvic 2005:157–158).

In his regularly quoted article "The Pivotal Status of the Translator's Habitus" (1998) Daniel Simeoni gives the notion of *habitus* another role. Simeoni claims

---

15.   For the discussion of this homology as illustrated by Gouanvic, see Wolf's contribution in this volume.

that over the centuries the translatorial *habitus* has contributed to the internalisation of a submissive behaviour, thus generating low social prestige for translators. As a result of the continuous, historically conditioned acceptance of norms by translators, Simeoni argues, the translators' willingness to accept these norms has significantly contributed to the secondariness of their activity (ibid.: 6). He stresses the key role of this internalized position in the "field of translation". Simeoni tries to integrate the category of the translatorial *habitus* into systemic translation models, not least by reframing Toury's concept of norms "on the assumption of a translating *habitus* understood as: (culturally) pre-structured and structuring agents mediating cultural artefacts in the course of transfer" (ibid.: 1). Ultimately, a *habitus*-led consideration of translation practices would encourage more finely-grained analyses of the "socio-cognitive emergence of translating skills and their outcome".

The question of the translator's alleged subservience is also discussed by Moira Inghilleri. On the basis of Bourdieu's concepts of field and *habitus*, as well as Basil Bernstein's theory of pedagogic discourse, Inghilleri elaborates a theoretical framework for the analysis of community interpreting as a norm-driven activity (Inghilleri 2003). With this framework Inghilleri proposes not only to reveal the constructivist nature of norms, but also to analyse the principles which generate the practice of public service interpreting in its various contexts. She pays special attention to reconstructing the interpreters' *habitus*, which Inghilleri is not willing to locate within the subordination of the translators' and interpreters' activity under norm systems. She points instead to the interplay of the distinctive, conflictual and contradictory *habitus* of the agents participating in the process of community interpreting, which eventually make up the dynamics of the interpreting situation and have the potential to change existing social relationships and social practices. In another paper, Inghilleri further explores the interpreting *habitus*. She first investigates the phenomenon of interpreting in the political asylum application procedure adopting ethnographic questions which address the "representation of the other"[16] in interpreting. She then stresses Bourdieu's idea of the "zones of uncertainty in social space" where problematic gaps are opened up between individual expectation and actual experience (Inghilleri 2005a: 70). The discordance evident within these zones, however, creates the potential for agents to redefine their role, thus enabling a change "from within". This also entails a change of the interpreting *habitus*, generating new forms of interpreting practices. In her introduction to the special issue of *The Translator* "Bourdieu and the Sociology of Translation and Interpreting", Inghilleri discusses the ethnographic

dimension in translation and the relationship between Bourdieu's reflexive sociology and ethnographic approaches relevant for the practice of translation; she is particularly interested in Clifford Geertz's work on interpretive anthropology. Inghilleri argues that the major insights to be gained from Bourdieu's cultural sociology for the study of translation can be found in his theorisation of "the social". This suggests that the acts of translating and interpreting should be understood through the social practices in the fields where they are generated. Of particular relevance are the translators and interpreters as agents who are involved in the forms of practice in which they operate and yet also capable of transforming these practices through the working of their *habitus* (Inghilleri 2005b: 143).

Another scholar who draws on the *habitus* is Rakefet Sela-Sheffy. She critically takes up Simeoni's arguments on the relatedness of *habitus* and norms, and argues for a re-examination of these two notions, calling attention to the principles of divergence and conformity as constructed entities and their relevance for the practice of translation in the translation field. Sela-Sheffy views this field as a space of stratified positions, regulated by its own internal repertoires and competitions and equipped with an exclusive symbolic capital. The translation field's dynamics can be detected in the "potential for perceiving the tension between the predictability and versatility of translators' preferences and choices, as determined by their group affiliation" (Sela-Sheffy 2005: 19).

The possibility of reconstructing a translation field is viewed rather sceptically by Michaela Wolf. It seems that the fundamental differences between the functional mechanisms operating in the production processes of "originals" and "translations" respectively do not enable the formation of a field in Bourdieu's sense.[17] On the one hand, the agents involved cannot create enduring positions in the "field" due to the temporary character of their contacts so that the transfer conditions necessary for translation production need to be constantly re-constituted. On the other hand, the various instruments for the consecration of translators and their products are much less established than those of "original" writers and their works; this results in a generally lower share of symbolic capital. Consequently, Wolf attempts to broaden Bourdieu's notion of field through Homi Bhabha's theorem of the *Third Space*. This theorem corresponds more closely to the requirements of continuous re-negotiations and accentuates the dynamics of

---

16. For the relationship between "representation techniques" in translation and ethnographic methodologies, see also Agorni, in this volume.

---

17. According to Jean-Marc Gouanvic (in this volume), it seems difficult to conceptualize a "translation field", because translated texts are inscribed by various configurations which make them belong to different specific fields, such as the economic, the judicial, etc.

of the transfer aspect, which are particularly relevant for translation production (Wolf, in this volume).[18]

Pierre Bourdieu's sociology of the production of cultural goods seems particularly fertile for deepening understanding of the social relevance and responsibility of the translation process. For the conceptualization of a sociology of translation, important insights have already been gained from the reflection and adoption of these methodological tools. It now, however, seems time to go beyond a predominantly heuristic employment of Bourdieu's social theory, and to look more closely into the theorising potential of his framework for a more comprehensive understanding of translation. This will involve critical questioning of the limits of his theoretical and analytical work for the development of a sociologically oriented translation studies.

One of Bourdieu's major critics in France is Bernard Lahire. In the introductory article of his seminal volume *Le travail sociologique de Pierre Bourdieu* (2001), Lahire asserts that respectful use of a work and its author resides in a methodical discussion and evaluation, and not in an endless repetition of his concepts and prefabricated arguments (ibid.: 18). Lahire invites a number of scholars from various disciplines to critically re-discuss Bourdieu's work by entering into a constructive dialogue with the sociologist. In his most recent book, *La culture des individus* (Lahire 2004), the author takes up his own invitation to re-read Bourdieu and, on the basis of more than one hundred interviews presented in the form of portraits, scrutinizes several of Bourdieu's concepts, among them the *habitus*. For Lahire, the individual is not trapped in the tight web of the *habitus*, as Bourdieu suggests, but determined by multiple social experiences which influence him or her during a whole lifetime.[19] He particularly criticizes the universalist stance of the notion and claims that individuals can draw on a vast array of dispositions which allow for a more differentiated view of their socialisation. Consequently, when Lahire argues for a sociology "at the level of the individual" (Lahire 2003), he is seeking to foreground the plurality of the individual's dispositions – for example, dispositions vary in stability and strength (ibid.: 339) – and the multiplicity of different situations in which the agents interact. The focus on the diverse modalities which prompt the *habitus* could provide a better route to explain the conditions underlying translation strategies, and reconstruct the unconscious and conscious motives which trigger specific translation situations. Lahire's assertion that "dispositions

---

18. For the problematic reconstruction of a "translation field" see also Wolf (2005a); in Wolf (2005b) these observations are demonstrated by using the functioning of translation processes in the domain of production and reception in the late Habsburg Empire.

19. There has not yet been any discussion of the distinction made by Lahire concerning Bourdieu's notion of *habitus* and its validity in the translation procedure.

become active *under specific conditions* only" (ibid.: 342, original emphasis), can help reveal the manifold character of the discursive practices operating in translation, both on the level of the adoption of specific translation methods in time and space based on "tradition", and on the level of the constraints which – sometimes temporarily – effect the translator's decisions. Despite its high degree of dynamism, however, it seems clear that Lahire's "sociology of dispositions" puts too much emphasis on the individual's subjectivity.[20] Applied to translation studies contexts, this theory neglects the powerful circumstances in which agents interact among one another, shaping, in our case, the emerging translation product.

Social studies as developed in France seem to be particularly pertinent when reflecting upon translation as a social practice. Another theorist who has recently been mentioned by several scholars in light of his applicability to translation studies is Bruno Latour. His Actor-Network Theory (ANT), an interdisciplinary approach to the social sciences and technology studies, describes the progressive constitution of a network of both human and non-human "actants" whose identities and qualities are defined according to prevailing strategies of interaction. Constantly redefining each other, actor and network are mutually constitutive and are not to be equated with individual and society, but should be considered as two faces of the same phenomenon. One of the main elements in the formation of an actor-network is "translation", a process in which actors construct common meanings and need continuous negotiation to achieve individual and collective objectives by means of the driving force of "interessement" (Bardini 2003). New networks emerge out of already existing ones, and their dynamics are revealed as "negotiation",[21] which works to counteract what Latour, referring to the size of networks, calls the "tyranny of distance" and has the potential to change the network's structure. The "two extremes, local and global, are much less interesting than the intermediary arrangements that we are calling networks" (Stalder 1997).

---

20. Regarding the over-estimation of the individual, Lahire argues that today's societies are strongly characterized by individualisation, and that therefore a sociology needs to reflect on "what is social in a [given] society" (Lahire 2003: 352).

21. The notion of "negotiation" has been conceptualized by Homi Bhabha within the framework of his hybridity theory (Bhabha 1994). To my knowledge, the interface of the notion used respectively by the two scholars has not yet been discussed. Such an interface could prove particularly informative in the perspective of its value for the translation process.
"Negotiation" is also highlighted by Lieven Tack in his attempt to conceptualize the distinctions and borders in gender relations, generation ties, oppositional social classes, competing professional groupings, etc., by which translation is fundamentally structured (Tack 2000).

The common goal of the "actants" who make up the network might, for instance, be the development of a (cultural) product, such as a translation in the traditional sense of the word. When Latour describes the nature of the actants, it becomes clear that the individual is no longer at the centre of this theoretical conception:

> The distinction between humans and non-humans, embodied or disembodied skills, impersonation or "machination", are less interesting than the complete chain along which competences and actions are distributed.
>
> (Latour and Cussins 1992: 243)

Instead, the accent is on a process-oriented research, as underlined recently by Hélène Buzelin (2005). According to Buzelin, such studies of translation "in the making" (see Buzelin, in this volume), could usefully generate data that tends to be hidden when the translation process is examined retrospectively. This can disclose the various stages of translation production, for instance the specific consultations or debates between the agents involved, the respective strategies of persuasion and dissuasion, and so on. The potential of such an approach using ethnological methodology is obvious: it brings to the fore those moments of the translation's "genesis" that document "from within" the selection and promotion of a foreign text as well as the translation and editing procedures.

Quite different perspectives on translation within a societal context than those discussed so far are introduced with Niklas Luhmann's social theory. Theo Hermans states that in light of Luhmann's theory, translation can be conceptualized as an autonomous and heteronomous category; he draws attention to those theorems which improve awareness of the internal organisation and development of the social and intellectual space of translation (Hermans 1999: 138).[22] Luhmann conceives of social organisation as self-producing, self-regulating systems, which operate according to functional differentiation. Literature, in such a perspective, is constituted by polycontextural systems which permanently re-produce the elements they consist of. These elements are understood as communicative acts whose "sense" is made up of the "code" of communication (Luhmann 1987: 197) and the criteria of selection. This also applies to translation: its "sense" is based on the principle of selectivity and its circumstances, as well as on the "translational mode" selected for a specific translation situation (Hermans 1997: 12). Another important aspect of Luhmann's social theory with some relevance for a socially driven understanding of translation is the complex of "expectations". Luhmann describes social structures as "structures of expectation" (Luhmann 1987: 362–

22. See also Hermans' contribution in this volume, where he takes up the issue of Luhmann's relevance for the understanding of translation as a social system.

364), and such expectations are fundamental to the structure of the "translation system". As, according to Luhmann, the various formations of expectations and "expectations of expectations" are permanently re-negotiated (ibid.: 364), translation can be seen as located within such a set of expectations which try to re-define themselves through continuous "translatorial" discourses: conversations in everyday life, in the scientific community, in translators' training institutions, or in critiques and paratexts. By taking into consideration the category of continually operating expectations in the "translation system", a Luhmannian approach to an emerging sociology of translation can thus disclose the dynamics of the changes experienced by a given translation phenomenon in its initiating stage and in its context of reception.[23]

The construction of a "sociology of translation studies"

A type of "sociology" that has recently been taking shape, and that is particularly present in various contributions of this volume, is the "sociology of translation studies". To start in more general terms it is paramount to mention that in the sociology of science, science is conceived of as a social system which, in respecting its own rules and norms, regulates the activities of the individual; simultaneously, scientific reflection operating "from within" determines social structures (Knoblauch 2005: 237). Claiming to unveil the relationship of science to society, the sociology of science distinguishes between "institutional" aspects that include the cluster of interactions stemming from the embeddedness of science in economic, political, ideological or religious configurations and from "historical" aspects. This historical perspective follows Thomas Kuhn's *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962) in addressing the progressive expansion of certain scientific branches; it leads to a history of science which proceeds in various phases of

23. Luhmann's key concept "system", is also central to Anthony Giddens's social theory, though from a different perspective. With the exception of Venuti's brief remarks on Giddens's concept of agency (see Venuti 1996: 210), his sociology has so far not been explored in translation studies. Giddens's structuration theory (Giddens 1979: 59–60) – especially its claim to transcend dualisms which essentialize cultural practices – could foreground the mechanisms underlying the relatedness between the translator's individual decisions and the constraints conditioning them. For the purpose of conceptualizing the translation activity within a sociological framework, Giddens's view of how human action is generated not only could help us understand the principles that drive translational behaviour in specific contexts and induce the translator to adopt certain translation strategies over others, but also indicates the historical, political or ideological patterns which condition or restrain the translation activity over long periods of time, forming the groundwork of "translation norms".

development, each representing a particular "paradigm".[24] Emphasising the role played by social factors in scientific development has thus accentuated both the close relationship of science with society and the history of scientific disciplines.

In translation studies, recent works have asserted the necessity of reflecting on the discipline's mapping from a historical and institutional perspective. They discuss both the emergence of various sub-fields and their position in the scientific community, foregrounding the social conditions that underlie the relation of translation studies to other disciplines. These explorations have extended into a further reflection on translation studies as an area of research, beginning to analyse the paradigms that have determined the discipline's paths since its establishment (see, e.g., Snell-Hornby 2006 and Bachmann-Medick 2006). Recently, Daniel Simeoni (2005) has discussed the reasons for the delay in dealing with socially inspired questions of translation. His sketch of the discipline's multifaceted history calls for the investigation of socially relevant factors conditioning the discipline's constitution over the decades. In his contribution to this volume, Simeoni takes up that thread. He distinguishes between the various traditions underlying the discipline's formation in Europe, in North America, and in other areas where "world Englishes prevail", and stresses that the institutional map being reconstructed does not coincide with the complex positions of scholars active in these institutions. He tries to avoid essentialism by questioning the way that differences among scholars have been classified in terms of aggregates and by adopting a comparative analysis in the hope of achieving "a kind of *Homo academicus* of translation studies" (Simeoni, in this volume). In order to re-enact the intellectual processes conditioning the establishment of translation studies, he proposes to think in terms of "scholarly localisms", a notion which unveils the decentredness and multiplicity of the factors shaping a scientific community and its objects of investigation.

The conceptualization of a "field of translation studies" has been pivotal to Jean-Marc Gouanvic's research interests. Drawing on Bourdieu's methodology, Gouanvic suggests that the constitution of a specific field of translation studies with its own structures, rules and stakes is only feasible through the work of those agents who have a symbolic or material interest in positioning themselves in this field, investing their "*libido sciendi*", their *habitus* and their scientific *illusio*. For Gouanvic, conceptualizing a sociology of translation will require reinforcement of the field's legitimation, by continuing to promote the institutionalising processes that enable the discipline to gain an autonomous status in Bourdieu's sense. The

foundation and consolidation of translation studies programmes, the formation of scholarly associations, journals and book series, and the organisation of international conferences and workshops create the premises for questioning and, at the same time, directing the discourse on translation that dominates the scientific community (Gouanvic, in this volume, and 1999: 146).

Similarly, Yves Gambier is concerned with questions regarding the institutionalisation of translation studies. He analyses the sociological dynamics contributing to the constitution and practice of the discipline and particularly deplores the lack of a historiography of translation studies that would take account of the scholars' representation in the field and investigate the archaeology of the discourses which have made up the discipline during its constitution process (Gambier, in this volume).

To sum up, it seems that the self-reflexive inspection of the social moves moulding the history of science has also been taking ground in translation studies, thus contributing not only to the shape of the discipline and of its objects "from within", but also of the discourses on the field. One must therefore agree with Raymond Aron when he says that "science is inseparable from the republic of scholars".

The show goes on

The various thoughts, approaches and elements of theoretical groundwork presented in this introduction are both divergent and competing. However, they all, from varying perspectives and with different methods, aim to foreground the relevance of translation as social practice functioning in a social field or social system, and constituting an operative force within it. Embracing methodologies from sociology and integrating them into our discipline does, of course, question some of the established categories of translation studies, and calls for a thorough re-definition and re-constitution of long-assumed principles and values inscribed in these conceptions. The text-bound paradigm which began to be transcended in the approaches that followed the "cultural turn" seems, in the course of an evolving sociology of translation, to have slipped out of sight of the translation researcher, bringing about the danger of a sociology of translation existing without translation.[25] The complexity of the societal "realities" of the practice of translation and its implications for translational decisions mean we must address macro clusters, such as the politics of media concerns, the publishing industry, or insti-

---

24. In the last few decades, Kuhn's model of historical paradigms was severely criticized (see, e.g., Hess 1997), particularly its presumption of a closed view of scientific community as well as its lack to take into account the processal character of any type of development.

---

25. For this discussion see also Buzelin, in this volume.

tutional principles of the translation profession, which cannot be dismissed as single phenomena specific to individual transfer situations. A systematic identification of the problems that condition and influence the selection, production and reception of translation seems to be underway – involving both questions about the integration of translational action with all its agencies into the broad societal context and questions that, in a narrower sense, concern the functional mechanisms of translation markets or the socially relevant character of translation strategies. However, the impact of this on concrete translation practice should not be ignored. It is also vital to discuss the interactional relations that exist between the external conditions of a text's creation and the adoption of the various translation strategies, not least so that we can challenge those approaches claiming to hold a monopoly on text comprehension and those sustaining a sociologistic reduction to external factors.

The papers included in this volume reveal the potential for responding to some of the questions illustrated above. Several of these papers were read and discussed at the conference *Translating and Interpreting as a Social Practice*, held at the University of Graz in May 2005. They show that to further develop and refine the outlined approaches, several directions seem appropriate.

The first section, *The Debate on the Translator's Position in an Emerging Sociology of Translation*, is opened by **Erich Prunč**. At the centre of his article "Priests, Princes and Pariahs. Constructing the Professional Field of Translation" is the figure of the translator in the course of history to the present day. He retraces in great detail the importance that has been attributed to the translator in translation theory and practice. Prunč analyses the historical, social and cultural reasons underlying the image of the translator either as a "genius" or as a self-sacrificing, anonymous figure. Additionally focusing on the translator's image as created in numerous works in translation studies, the author shows the researchers' responsibility for creating and perpetuating these misleading, but nevertheless enduring conceptions.

In his contribution "Translation, Irritation and Resonance", **Theo Hermans** "abolishes" the figure of the translator. Hermans brings the text as translation product back to the core of the debate and thoroughly discusses the role of translation within society, drawing both on recent research in translation studies and on the works of Niklas Luhmann. According to Hermans, the view of translation as a social system in Luhmann's sense – a system seen as both autonomous and heteronomous – seems to offer fertile ground for further methodological developments in translation studies and therefore needs more attention in current research. Hermans insists in particular upon the importance of what Luhmann calls "second-order observation", which reveals the way in which the observer observes: in the translation context, translators engage in this sort of observa-

tion when they comment upon other translations through the form of their own translations.

With his paper "Objectivation, réflexivité et traduction. Pour une re-lecture bourdiesienne de la traduction" **Jean-Marc Gouanvic** opens the second section, *Bourdieu's Influence in Conceptualising a Sociology of Translation*. According to Gouanvic, one of the central questions in the analysis of translation as social practice is "quelles sont les conditions d'une réflexion sur la traduction en tant que pratique sociale". By linking up this question with Bourdieu's concept of "double reflexivity" – which, for Gouanvic, should be a *conditio sine qua non* for all researchers in translation studies – and by also integrating the notion of *illusio* in his reflections, Gouanvic considerably enlarges the field of Bourdieu-based translation research.

The main categories of Pierre Bourdieu's field theory are also the basis of the article by **Johan Heilbron** and **Gisèle Sapiro**, "Outline for a Sociology of Translation. Current Issues and Future Prospects". They discuss the contribution of the discipline of sociology to social questions in translation studies, and claim to provide a systematic overview and a programmatic discussion of recent Bourdieu-inspired sociological contributions to the discipline of translation studies. Against the background of the social practice of literary translation, the authors give insights into the power relations between language groups and the international hierarchy of languages, adopting, among other ideas, Pascale Casanova's concept of "literary capital". They deliver specific parameters allowing for the detailed analysis of the field of reception and take particular account of the various agents and institutions which shape this field.

With her paper "The Location of the 'Translation Field'. Negotiating Borderlines between Pierre Bourdieu and Homi Bhabha", **Michaela Wolf** meets a need which has recently been felt in sociologically oriented research in translation studies. Although insisting upon the outstanding relevance and importance of Bourdieu's work for an emerging sociology of translation, she draws attention to some of the major weaknesses which appear in the application of his concepts to translation as a social practice, especially with regard to the specific characteristics of translation. She argues that Homi Bhabha's notion of *Third Space* might be one of the elements which allow for better analysis, particularly of the processual character of translation, whatever its stakes and functioning might be in a given society and culture at a certain time.

The section *Mapping the Field: Issues of Method and Translation Practice* begins with **Mirella Agorni**'s paper "Locating Systems and Individuals in Translation Studies". Agorni points out an important direction for further research in sociologically oriented translation studies. Her major tool is localism, a concept that, in her words, mediates "between systems and individuals", which are no lon-

ger considered as two opposing poles. An approach to translation research based on the notion of localism yields a view of translation in its specific environment, accentuating its connections with other translation or translation-like phenomena. Such a view not only makes judgments like "correct" or "faulty" translation practice superfluous, but also, on a methodological level, breaks up dichotomies like descriptive versus explanatory or quantitative versus qualitative approaches.

Hélène Buzelin's contribution "Translations 'in the Making'" is mainly inspired by the Actor-Network Theory developed by the French philosopher and anthropologist Bruno Latour. Arguing for a process-oriented view of translation, Buzelin claims that this would highlight the numerous stages of the translation process, including documents of correspondence between the various agents involved and also oral negotiation. In her paper, she demonstrates this approach by sketching out an ongoing project which retraces some literary translation projects 'in the making', launched by publishing houses in Paris and Montréal. Methodologically, Buzelin's combination of Latour's Actor-Network Theory and various ethnographic methods allows her to follow each step in the translation process very closely.

In view of the multiple approaches to the conceptualization of a sociology of translation, the need for "bridge concepts" to link them up is urgently felt. **Andrew Chesterman** ("Bridge Concepts in Translation Sociology") identifies this need on a more general level as well, where the discipline of translation studies has passed through a series of paradigms – linguistic, cultural, cognitive and, more recently, social. The author focuses on notions like *habitus*, translation practice and causality, and discusses Edward O. Wilson's term "conscilience", used in the sense of the unity of all knowledge. This issue seems to be of particular relevance for translation studies which is still struggling to find a way to better analyse the relations between texts, languages, cultures, societies and individuals.

In the concluding section *Constructing a Sociology of Translation Studies: Overview and Perspectives*, the two contributions focus on a sociologically oriented meta-discussion of translation studies. **Daniel Simeoni** ("Between Sociology and History. Method in Context and in Practice") reflects upon methods in translation studies in the light of some precedents in the social and human sciences, particularly sociology and history. Linking up the developments of history and sociology with the respective evolutions within translation studies, he adds to our understanding of questions such as why it took so long to pay attention to the "social" in translation. With regard to the discussion of the first translation of Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* into Italian (1756) by Domenico Valentini, Simeoni advocates a view of translation which no longer prioritizes the macro-contextual impact in the adoption of norms (institutions, ideology, patronage), but instead

a micro-contextual level, where agents act through their socialisation and their *habitus*.

The volume is concluded by **Yves Gambier**'s programmatic question "Y a-t-il place pour une socio-traductologie?". With regard to his aim of sketching the prerequisites for the development of what he calls "socio-translation studies", understood as a kind of sociology of translation studies, the author identifies the lack not only of a detailed historiography of translation studies, but also of a kind of self-analysis of translation researchers, an issue already stressed by Jean-Marc Gouanvic. Structuring his paper as a series of questions, Gambier suggests future domains of research and particularly highlights the need to thoroughly explore the institutions as well as the various kinds of publications which have allowed for the modelling of the discipline of translation studies.

The majority of the contributions included in this volume adopt the notion of "sociology of translation". Most papers conceive of this notion as an umbrella term for the issues that arise when viewing translation as a social practice and as symbolically transferred interaction. A "social perspective" on translation concepts in general, and on the translation process in particular, is reflected in the term "socio-translation studies" proposed by Daniel Simeoni. He sheds light on the background of sociological orientations in translation studies by comparing the evolution of history and sociology with that of recent translation studies. Yves Gambier, on the other hand, introduces the term "socio-traductologie", which indicates a sociologically driven reflection on the historical development of translation studies and an analysis of the discipline's field. As can be seen, the terminology is quite inconsistent, and, accordingly, the research area itself happens to be still "in the making". It seems likely that only further insights into the socially conditioned workings of translation and translation studies will be able to specify both the terminology and the research area of a "sociology of translation" and a "sociology of translation studies".

In a broader context, the sociology of translation may well become "a new branch of the sociology of culture and a promising domain for the study of the cultural world-system" (Heilbron 1999: 440). However, the social constraints and dynamics which are inscribed in the materiality of the translated text and in its discursive strategies mean that in order to examine Heilbron's claims, we need, first and foremost, to refine our methodologies. Looking at the questions raised and discussed in this volume not only reveals translation's processual character, but also allows us to conceptualize the agencies and agents involved in an open system that depends on the negotiation of symbolic forms in a world of global societal changes. This book aims to show that even if the domain of "translation as a social practice" is still under construction, its outlines are most certainly beginning to come into view.

References

Álvarez, Román and Vidal, M. Carmen-África (eds). 1996. *Translation, Power, Subversion*. Clevedon and Philadelphia etc.: Multilingual Matters.

Arrojo, Rosemary. 1997. "Die Endfassung der Übersetzung und die Sichtbarkeit des Übersetzers". Trans. Helga Ahrens. In *Übersetzungswissenschaft in Brasilien. Beiträge zum Status von „Original" und Übersetzung*, M. Wolf (ed). Tübingen: Stauffenburg. 117–132.

Bachleitner, Norbert and Wolf, Michaela (eds). 2004. *Internationales Archiv für Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Literatur* 29 (2). Special Issue "Soziologie der literarischen Übersetzung".

Bachmann-Medick, Doris. 2004. "Übersetzung als Medium interkultureller Kommunikation und Auseinandersetzung". In *Handbuch der Kulturwissenschaften. Band 2. Paradigmen und Disziplinen*, F. Jaeger, B. Liebsch, J. Rüsen and J. Straub (eds). Stuttgart and Weimar: Metzler. 449–465.

Bachmann-Medick, Doris. 2006. *Cultural Turns. Neuorientierungen in den Kulturwissenschaften*. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt.

Bahrdt, Hans Paul. [8]2000. *Schlüsselbegriffe der Soziologie*. München: Beck.

Bardini, Thierry. 2003. "What is Actor-Network Theory?". M. Ryder (ed). http://carbon.cudenver.edu/~mryder/itc_data/ant_dff.html. Visited May 2007.

Barret-Ducrocq, Françoise (ed). 1992. *Traduire l'Europe*. Paris: Payot.

Barthes, Roland. 1984. *Le bruissement de la langue*. Paris: Seuil.

Bassnett, Susan and Lefevere, André. 1990. "Introduction: Proust's Grandmother and the Thousand and One Nights: The 'Cultural Turn' in Translation Studies". In *Translation, History and Culture*, S. Bassnett and A. Lefevere (eds). London and New York: Pinter. 1–13.

Berg, Eberhard and Fuchs, Martin (eds). 1993. *Kultur, soziale Praxis, Text. Die Krise der ethnographischen Repräsentation*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Bhabha, Homi K. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1999. *Die Regeln der Kunst. Genese und Struktur des literarischen Feldes*. Trans. Bernd Schwibs and Achim Russer. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 2004. *Schwierige Interdisziplinarität. Zum Verhältnis von Soziologie und Geschichtswissenschaft*. E. Ohnacker and F. Schultheis (eds). Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot.

Brisset, Annie. 1990. *Sociocritique de la traduction: théâtre et altérité au Québec (1968–1988)*. Montréal: Les Éditions du Préambule.

Brisset, Annie. 1996. *A Sociocritique of Translation: Theatre and Alterity in Quebec, 1968–1988*. Trans. Rosalind Gill and Roger Gannon. Toronto and Buffalo etc.: University of Toronto Press.

Buzelin, Hélène. 2005. "Unexpected Allies: How Latour's Network Theory Could Complement Bourdieusian Analyses in Translation Studies". *The Translator* 11 (2): 193–218.

Chartier, Roger. 1992. *Die unvollendete Vergangenheit. Geschichte und die Macht der Weltauslegung*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.

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

Delisle, Jean (ed). 2002. *Portraits de traductrices*. Ottawa: Les Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa.

Delisle, Jean and Woodsworth, Judith (eds). 1995. *Translators through History*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. 1990. *Poetics Today* 11 (1). Special Issue "Polysystem Studies".

Fawcett, Peter. 1995. "Translation and Power Play". *The Translator* 1 (2): 177–192.

Fuchs, Martin. 1997. "Übersetzen und Übersetzt-Werden: Plädoyer für eine interaktionsanalytische Reflexion". In *Übersetzung als Repräsentation fremder Kulturen*, D. Bachmann-Medick (ed). Berlin: Schmidt. 308–328.

Gebhardt, Winfried. 2001. "Vielfältiges Bemühen. Zum Stand kultursoziologischer Forschung im deutschsprachigen Raum". http://www.uni-koblenz.de/~instso/kuso-dgs/debatte/gebhardt.htm. Visited May 2007.

Geertz, Clifford. 1993. *The Interpretation of Cultures. Selected Essays*. Hammersmith and London: FontanaPress.

Gentzler, Edwin. 1993. *Contemporary Translation Theories*. London and New York: Routledge.

Gentzler, Edwin and Tymoczko, Maria. 2002. "Introduction". In *Translation and Power*, M. Tymoczko and E. Gentzler (eds). Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press. XI–XXVIII.

Giddens, Anthony. 1979. *Central Problems in Social Theory. Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis*. London: Macmillan.

Gouanvic, Jean-Marc. 1997. "Translation and the Shape of Things to Come. The Emergence of American Science Fiction in Post-War France". *The Translator* 3 (2): 125–152.

Gouanvic, Jean-Marc. 1999. *Sociologie de la traduction. La science-fiction américaine dans l'espace culturel français des années 1950*. Arras: Artois Presses Université.

Gouanvic, Jean-Marc. 2002. "The Stakes of Translation in Literary Fields". *Across Languages and Cultures* 3 (2): 159–168.

Gouanvic, Jean-Marc. 2005. "A Bourdieusian Theory of Translation, or the Coincidence of Practical Instances: Field, 'Habitus', Capital and 'Illusio'". *The Translator* 11 (2): 147–166.

Grbić, Nadja and Wolf, Michaela (eds). 2002. *Grenzgängerinnen. Zur Geschlechterdifferenz in der Übersetzung*. Graz: Institut für Translationswissenschaft.

Heilbron, Johan. 1999. "Towards a Sociology of Translation. Book Translations as a Cultural World-System". *European Journal of Social Theory* 2 (4): 429–444.

Heilbron, Johan and Sapiro, Gisèle (eds). 2002. *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 144. "Les échanges littéraires internationaux".

Hermans, Theo. 1996. "Norms and the Determination of Translation: A Theoretical Framework". In *Translation, Power, Subversion*, R. Álvarez and M. C.-Á. Vidal (eds). Clevedon and Philadelphia etc.: Multilingual Matters. 25–51.

Hermans, Theo. 1997. "Translation as institution". In *Translation as Intercultural Communication. Selected Papers from the EST Congress Prague 1995*, M. Snell-Hornby, Z. Jettmarová and K. Kaindl (eds). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 3–20.

Hermans, Theo. 1999. *Translation in Systems. Descriptive and System-oriented Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.

Hess, David J. 1997. *Science Studies. An Advanced Introduction*. New York: New York University Press.

Hönig, Hans. 1992. "Von der erzwungenen Selbstentfremdung des Übersetzers – Ein offener Brief an Justa Holz-Mänttäri". *TextConText* 7 (1): 1–14.

Inghilleri, Moira. 2003. "Habitus, field and discourse. Interpreting as a socially situated activity". *Target* 15 (2): 243–268.

Inghilleri, Moira. 2005a. "Mediating Zones of Uncertainty. Interpreter Agency, the Interpreting Habitus and Political Asylum Adjudication". *The Translator* 11 (1): 69–85.

Inghilleri, Moira. 2005b. "The Sociology of Bourdieu and the Construction of the 'Object' in Translation and Interpreting Studies". *The Translator* 11 (2): 125–145.

Kaindl, Klaus. 2004. *Übersetzungswissenschaft im interdisziplinären Dialog. Am Beispiel der Comicübersetzung.* Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Katschuba, Wolfgang. 1995. "Kulturalismus: Kultur statt Gesellschaft?". *Geschichte und Gesellschaft. Zeitschrift für Historische Sozialwissenschaft* 21 (1): 80–95.

Knoblauch, Hubert. 2005. *Wissenssoziologie.* Konstanz: UVK Verlagsgesellschaft.

Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie. 1979. Special Issue "Kultursoziologie" 31 (3).

Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie. 1986. Special Issue "Kultur und Gesellschaft" 27.

Lahire, Bernard (ed). 2001. *Le travail sociologique de Pierre Bourdieu. Dettes et critiques.* Édition revue et augmentée. Paris: La Découverte.

Lahire, Bernard. 2003. "From the habitus to an individual heritage of dispositions. Towards a sociology at the level of the individual". *Poetics* 31: 329–355.

Lahire, Bernard. 2004. *La culture des individus. Dissonances culturelles et distinction de soi.* Paris: La Découverte.

Latour, Bruno and Cussins, Adrian. 1992. *Registration marks: metaphors for subobjectivity.* London: Pomeroy Purdy Gallery.

Lauber, Cornelia. 1996. *Selbstporträts. Zum soziologischen Profil von Literaturübersetzern aus dem Französischen.* Tübingen: Narr.

Lefevere, André. 1998. "Translation Practice(s) and the Circulation of Cultural Capital: Some Aeneids in English". In *Constructing Cultures. Essays on Literary Translation*, S. Bassnett and A. Lefevere. Clevedon and Philadelphia etc.: Multilingual Matters. 41–56.

Lichtblau, Klaus. 2001. "Soziologie als Kulturwissenschaft? Zur Rolle des Kulturbegriffs in der Selbstreflexion der deutschsprachigen Soziologie (1)". http://www.uni-koblenz.de/~instso/kuso-dgs/debatte/lichtblau.htm. Visited May 2007.

Luhmann, Niklas. 1987. *Soziale Systeme. Grundriß einer allgemeinen Theorie.* Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Müller-Vollmer, Kurt. 1998. "Übersetzen – Wohin? Zum Problem der Diskursformierung bei Frau von Staël und im amerikanischen Transzendentalismus". In *Übersetzung als kultureller Prozeß. Rezeption, Projektion und Konstruktion des Fremden*, B. Hammerschmid and H. Krapoth (eds). Berlin: Schmidt. 11–31.

Neidhardt, Friedhelm. 1986. "Kultur und Gesellschaft. Einige Anmerkungen zum Sonderheft". *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 27: 10–18.

Nord, Christiane. 1991. *Text Analysis in Translation. Theory, Methodology, and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis.* Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi.

Pym, Anthony. 1998. *Method in Translation History.* Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.

Pym, Anthony. 2006. "On the social and cultural in Translation Studies". In *Sociocultural aspects of translating and interpreting*, A.Pym, M. Shlesinger and Z. Jettmarová (eds). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 1–25.

Rehberg, Karl-Siegbert. 1986. "Kultur versus Gesellschaft". *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 27: 92–115.

Robyns, Clem. 1992. "Towards a Sociosemiotics of Translation". *Romanistische Zeitschrift für Literaturgeschichte. Cahiers d'Histoire des Littératures Romanes* 16: 211–226.

Sela-Sheffy, Rakefet. 2005. "How to be a (recognized) translator. Rethinking habitus, norms, and the field of translation". *Target* 17 (1): 1–26.

Sheffy, Rakefet. 1997. "Models and Habituses: Problems in the Idea of Cultural Repertoires". *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature* 24 (1): 35–47.

Silbermann, Alphons and Hänseroth, Albin. 1985. *Der Übersetzer. Eine berufs- und literatursoziologische Untersuchung.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Simeoni, Daniel. 1998. "The Pivotal Status of the Translator's Habitus". *Target* 10 (1): 1–39.

Simeoni, Daniel. 2005. "Translation and Society: The Emergence of a Conceptual Relationship". In *In Translation. Reflections, Refractions, Transformations*, P. St-Pierre and P.C. Kar (eds). Delhi: Pencraft International. 3–14. Also published as: Simeoni, Daniel. 2007. "Translation and Society: The Emergence of a Conceptual Relationship". In *In Translation. Reflections, Refractions, Transformations*, P. St-Pierre and P.C. Kar (eds). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 13–26.

Snell-Hornby, Mary. 2006. *The Turns of Translation Studies. New Paradigms or Shifting Viewpoints?* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Stäheli, Urs. 2000. *Poststrukturalistische Soziologien.* Bielefeld: transcript.

Stalder, Felix. 1997. "More on Bruno Latour". http://amsterdam.nettime.org/Lists-Archives/nettime-1-9709/msg00012.html. Visited May 2007.

Tack, Lieven. 2000. "Translation and the Dialectics of Difference and Equivalence: Some Theoretical Propositions for a Redefinition of the Source-target Text Relation". *Meta* XLV (2): 210–227.

Tenbruck, Friedrich H. 1990. "Repräsentative Kultur". In *Sozialstruktur und Kultur*, H. Haferkamp (ed). Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp. 20–53.

Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Toury, Gideon. 1999. "A Handful of Paragraphs on 'Translation' and 'Norms'". In *Translation and Norms*, C. Schäffner (ed). Clevedon and Philadelphia etc.: Multilingual Matters. 9–32.

Venuti, Lawrence. 1992. "Introduction". In *Rethinking Translation. Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*, L. Venuti (ed). London and New York: Routledge. 1–17.

Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility. A history of translation.* London and New York: Routledge.

Venuti, Lawrence. 1996. "Translation as a Social Practice: or, The Violence of Translation". *Translation Perspectives* IX: 195–213.

Venuti, Lawrence. 1998. *The Scandals of Translation. Towards an ethics of difference.* London and New York: Routledge.

Vermeer, Hans J. 1990. *Skopos und Translationsauftrag – Aufsätze.* Frankfurt am Main: IKO Verlag für Interkulturelle Kommunikation.

Wägenbaur, Thomas. 1999. "Beobachter beim Zähneputzen. Niklas Luhmann, Pierre Bourdieu, Anthony Giddens und die Leitdifferenzen ihrer Kulturtheorien". In *Interkulturalität. Zwischen Inszenierung und Archiv*, S. Rieger, S. Schamma, Schahadat and M. Weinberg (eds). Tübingen: Narr. 29–45.

Wolf, Michaela. 1999. "Zum 'sozialen Sinn' in der Translation. Translationssoziologische Implikationen von Pierre Bourdieus Kultursoziologie". *Arcadia* 34 (2): 262–275.

Wolf, Michaela. 2002. "Translation Activity between Culture, Society and the Individual: Towards a Sociology of Translation". In *CTIS Occasional Papers* 2, K. Harvey (ed.). Manchester: UMIST. 33–43.

Wolf, Michaela. 2003. „ÜbersetzerInnen – verfangen im sozialen Netzwerk? Zu gesellschaftlichen Implikationen des Übersetzens". *Studia Germanica Posnaniensia* XXIX: 105–119.

Wolf, Michaela. 2005a. "'Der Kritiker muß ein Verwandlungsmensch sein, ein ... Schlangenmensch des Geistes'. Ein Beitrag zur Dynamisierung der Feldtheorie von Pierre Bourdieu

am Beispiel von Hermann Bahr". In *Entgrenzte Räume. Kulturelle Transfers um 1900 und in der Gegenwart*, H. Mitterbauer and K. Scherke (eds). Wien: Passagen. 157–171.

Wolf, Michaela. 2005b. *Die vielsprachige Seele Kakaniens. Translation als soziale und kulturelle Praxis in der Habsburgermonarchie 1848 bis 1918*. Graz: Habilitationsschrift.

Wolf, Michaela. 2006. "The female state of the art: Women in the 'translation field'". In *Sociocultural aspects of translating and interpreting*, A. Pym, M. Shlesinger and Z. Jettmarová (eds). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 129–141.

PART I

The debate on the translator's position in an emerging sociology of translation