

AN UPDATED VIEW ON TRANSLATION STUDIES

Attila Imre

PhD, Sapientia University of Tîrgu Mureş

Abstract: The present article tries to redefine Holmes' 1972 mapping of Translation Studies (TS), focusing on the much changed society characterized by a revolution in IT, triggering globalization, and revolution in translation. As a result, certain categories within TS changed drastically, turning from 'twig' to a large branch. Furthermore, it is worth considering translation as part of a larger localization process, in which language is less important. The map of the 21st century TS makes us realize that the written text is mostly combined with terms, special layout requirements, multimedia and aggressive error-free advertising resulting in mass manipulation. Managing translators and translations today involves both intercultural and interpersonal communication, and translators should make use of recent results in developing IT skills (CAT-tools), but the 'know-how' of financial management and business success connected to E.Q.

Keywords: translator, management, specialization, multimedia, advertising.

1. Introduction

There have been a number of efforts to offer a system of Translation Studies (TS) before and after James Holmes (1972). The majority of descriptions could not disregard the central concept, according to which translation was language oriented and belonged to (applied) linguistics.

A generally acclaimed merit of James Holmes is the term *Translation Studies* itself and his categorization of the components (Holmes, 1972, pp. 172–185). He mentions important issues connected to translation (art, craft, principles, fundamentals, philosophy), then he explains why other terms are less successful, such as *translatology*, *science of translation*, *translation science*, *the theory of translating*, *the theory of translation* or *translation theory*. Nevertheless, these terms are used by other scholars (cf. Snell-Hornby, 1995, p. 1). After excluding these terms, he establishes the categories and two “separate dimensions” presented below:

<p>“Pure”</p> <p>1A. Descriptive TS (DTS)</p> <p>1. product-oriented DTS (existing translations)</p> <p>2. function-oriented DTS (socio-cultural situation, contexts of texts: what, when ,where translated)</p> <p>3. process-oriented DTS (act of translation)</p> <p>2. Applied TS</p> <p>1. foreign language teaching & translator training)</p> <p>2. translation aids for training / requirements of practicing translators (dictionaries, term banks)</p> <p>3. translation policy (task of translation scholar, social and economic position of translation, efficacy, testing, etc.)</p> <p>4. translation criticism</p>	<p>“Pure”</p> <p>1B. Theoretical TS (translation theory, ThTS)</p> <p>General</p> <p>Partial:</p> <p>1. Medium restricted ThTS</p> <p>1.1. Human translation</p> <p>1.1.1. oral translation: interpreting</p> <p>1.1.2. written translation</p> <p>1.2. Computer translation (MT)</p> <p>1.3. Human translation & computer translation (machine-aided translation)</p> <p>2. Area-restricted theories (languages and cultures involved)</p> <p>3. Rank-restricted theories (word, sentence, text level)</p> <p>4. Text-type restricted theories</p> <p>4.1. literary/Bible translations</p>
<p>History of Translation Theory</p> <p>Methodological approaches</p>	

	4.2. specific (scientific text) translations 4.3. theory of types of communication 5. Time-restricted theories (old & contemporary texts) 6. Problem-restricted theories (equivalence, metaphors)
--	--

Table 1. Holmes' view on TS

Although his system was designed almost fifty years ago, it still contains noteworthy elements. For instance, he considered it “bold” to refer to translation as ‘science’, and he was seemingly right. His *descriptive TS* focuses on both the process and the product, not leaving behind the function of the text either, and the *medium restricted theories* is still valid, although *interpreting* grew into a separate branch with different types (consecutive and simultaneous interpreting, community interpreting, court interpreting, etc.). Holmes’ system still occupies a central position in Baker’s *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (Baker, 2001, pp. 277–280), where it is compared to Toury’s map of TS and its applied extensions.

However, in order to drive our attention to facts outside translation, we need to distance ourselves a little from Holmes and embrace Vermeer, who sees “translation as a cultural transfer rather than a linguistic one, language being part of culture” (Snell-Hornby, 2006, p. 54).

Although the definition of *culture*¹ may be problematic, we can accept that human communities are characterized by their specific culture on the one hand, while *communication* among humans is another basic feature. Human communication is typically intended (although there are unintended communication situations), and even if there are many possible forms of communication (including *silence*), a prototypical communication situation (cf. Rosch’s prototype theory) involves *language*. From now on linguists take over and ‘embed’ TS in language studies, concluding that *translation* as such is written language and *interpretation* is spoken language.

Difficult as it may prove, we still tend to completely agree with Justa Holz-Mänttari, as she could approach translation as “integrated into a system of other actions” and controlled by outside factors, leading to “intercultural communication in a social context, and ... reducing the status of the source text and of the entire language component” (Snell-Hornby, 2006, p. 57). In the following we would like to present TS integrated into a larger context.

2. TS in a larger context

If we approach TS in a larger context, the outermost circle may be culture, within which there is *human* communication in various forms, out of which we can distinguish *language-based* communication (written, verbal, non-verbal and other), and their combination as well. Although written and oral language-based communication can have different forms, manifestations and purposes, we would only like to focus on *intended interlingual* translation and interpretation. In our view, this circle may be split into six components.

2.1. Non-specialized translations

This is often referred to as *general* translation, primarily focusing on linguistic issues connected to language skills (phonetics, vocabulary, morphosyntax, semantics, pragmatics, stylistics) combined with socio-cultural and communication skills. As such, vocabulary-related translation issues primarily belong here: phraseology (proverbs, sayings, idioms), slang, taboo words, swear words, but the study of humor, sarcasm, irony and puns (multiple perspectives in a semantic context) in translation, as well as successful and less successful

1 Vermeer defines culture “as a totality of knowledge, proficiency and perception” (Snell-Hornby, 2006, p. 55).

translations may be a topic discussed within this category, although not exclusively. This part of TS is usually considered as a ‘standard’ or ‘basic’ requirement of translators in both the source and the target language.

As “the one and only perfect translation does not exist, any translation is dependent on its skopos and its situation”, non-specialized’ translators must strive for at least an adequate linguistic and cultural knowledge to have a chance to remain on the translation market. Snell-Hornby emphasizes that although many aspects of translation have changed, the translator’s competence “has remained constant”, among which she lists “proficiency in the language(s) concerned”, “cultural competence” and “subject area expertise” (Snell-Hornby, 2006, p. 134), leading us to the next section.

2.2. Specialized translations

Although *literary* translations (poetry, drama, prose) and Bible translations (at least tacitly) used to belong to a separate category, we think that today they have the right to belong to highly specialized translations on at least two accounts. First of all, the entire history of translation proves that very few talented translators can produce high quality literary translations (cf. the question whether translation is possible or untranslatable poems), secondly that the market of literary translations has shrunk so visibly that those who can still make a living out of it are extremely rare and more appreciated.

Yet, when ‘translation’ is mentioned, many might still associate the word with literary translations, even if they have never encountered bilingual parallel literary works. The reason is simple, even if it is controversial: “Within the field of literary translation, more time has been devoted to investigating the problems of translating poetry than any other literary mode” (Bassnett, 2002, p. 86), and André Lefevere alone presents seven different poetry translation strategies (phonemic, literal, metrical, rhymed, blank verse translation, poetry into prose, and interpretation) (Bassnett, 2002, p. 87)

The so-called “technical” translations fall into this category, which can be very diverse. Central types are legal, medical, technical/scientific translations, but economics, business, banking, history, geography, tourism, catering (menus) also belong here. The common thing in all types is the written text combined with specific terms (unusual/rare word in literature, highly specific terms for various fields). Specialized translations are often associated with machine translation (MT), which is not a fortune association unless we have a specific term bank to be used. More typically, computer-assisted translation (CAT) tools should be mentioned here (cf. Holmes’ machine-aided human translation), which can handle both translation memories (TM), which are joined bilingual sentences called segments belonging to a specific field, and term bases (TB), a collection of specific bilingual terms, which can be imported into professional CAT-tools.

2.3. Multimedia translations

The term ‘multimedia’ may be ambiguous, partially due to the fact that it is a very new term.² A possible disambiguation for TS may start from the online dictionary definition: “using a combination of moving and still pictures, sound, music, and words, especially in computers or entertainment” (Cambridge Dictionaries Online).³ This means that the traditional way of looking at translation is extended, and the combination of text with various types of media is on the increase. The reason is simple: our global village (cf. McLuhan’s coinage) enjoys the benefits of the technical revolution at the turn of the century (Gouadec, 2007), which includes new types of entertainment: countless audio and video files, but we can also mention the boom in comic books, where pictures are combined with text, hence the

² For instance, the *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* does not contain the entry (Trumble & Stevenson, 2002).

³ Source: <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/multimedia>, 25.01.2016.

dictionary definition. Although TS labels this category as ‘audiovisual translation’ or AVT for short (Díaz-Cintas, 2003), we do not want to exclude still pictures. When describing this part of TS, we have in mind the combination of written text, specific terminology and ‘something else’. This can be audio-related (lyrics), video-related (subtitles, fan-translations, fansubs), or the combination of text and image (comic strips), but sometimes all of them (video games). Subtitles represent a special type of new, promising entry in the field of translation, as they are subtitles for operas, operettas projected during performance above the scene. Voice-over is a specific category, as it is based on a written text, but synchronized with an audio or video file (documentaries, interviews, reports). We would enlist here transcription translations as well, even if they are not characterized by multimedia support.

2.4. Localization

The advent of GILT (Globalization, Internationalization, Localization, Translation) resulted in software localization, then glocalization of endless websites, which was and is still influenced by English as the *lingua franca* for science, technology, commerce, tourism, etc. (cf. conferences and publications worldwide in English).

This category differs from the previous ones because it combines written text and terminology with specific format/layout (the translator must be able to differentiate source codes from translatable elements). It may be very ample, especially when the website combines text with audiovisual elements. And it does happen, more often than not, resulting in web-translations, bringing together written text, specific terms and multimedia ‘under the same roof’.

2.5. Advertising and error-free translations

It is a good question where to ‘enroll’ translating for the advertising industry. Since Edward Bernays (1891-1995), the “father of public relations”, who combined crowd psychology and his uncle’s (Sigmund Freud) psychoanalytical research results, we are rather reluctant to cheer commercials. However, his actions (cf. the Easter parade in New York City in 1929) convinced many that mass manipulation is a fertile soil and propaganda and advertisements are based on words, texts combined with multimedia in an aggressive international marketing business.

Translating for the advertising industry may have a lot in common with both specialized translations (with specific terms ‘loyal’ to the advertisers) or multimedia translations, making use of all media types. Advertisements coming through all communication channels are considered to be more effective, and possible types of combinations between texts, still pictures (cf. billboards, products), sounds (radio commercials), video (TV commercials), graphic design etc. seem to be thriving. Hardly ever do we think of translators behind these ads, unless something goes wrong (cf. improper brand name translations disregarding the cultural and linguistic associations in the target community).⁴

The concept of *error* in translating advertising is one of the most serious issues. Whatever strategy, method, procedure, technique or transfer operation the translator might use, failure is not permitted, directing our thought towards the need for ‘rebranding’ the translator’s competence. But we can also return to ‘non-specialized’ translations as well, where solid language and cultural competence is the foundation, out of which (bi- or multilingual) creative ideas, humor, wordplay, pun, metaphors, (distorted) idioms may stem. In these cases one letter may take us to ‘heaven or hell’, taken to the extreme when capitalization or the conscious (non)translation or (lack of) explicitation (while interpreting)

4 Cf. <http://www.inc.com/geoffrey-james/the-20-worst-brand-translations-of-all-time.html>, 25.01.2016.

may have devastating effects: *I hate apple. I like Apple (Company)*.⁵ In case we can offer successful translation, the multisemiotic components integrate into a holistic reception characteristic of commercials (cf. Resch's ideas in Snell-Hornby, 2006, p. 138). Translating advertising is hallmarked by a Machiavellian quality assurance, hardly met with other types of translation, except for legal or medical translations. In this respect it is worth reading the story of "the seventy-one-million-dollar word", a price hardly to match in whatever translation.⁶

3. Interpretation

Snell-Hornby has already observed a decade ago that a 'twig' in Holmes' categorization of TS has evolved into a fully-fledged discipline of its own (Snell-Hornby, 2006, p. 122), referring to *interpretation*.

It is clearly different from *translation* as it manifests itself in a spoken environment, focusing on the utterance and speaker, putting an extra pressure on the interpreter, who (ideally) has to combine the 'letter and spirit' (visibly distancing from the word-for-word *or* sense-for-sense debate in translation theory), in a sometimes highly tense socio-cultural communication situation.

A specific field is interpreting for the deaf and hard of hearing, transposing words into signed language, being more and more present in the media. Moreover, experts agree that further emphasis should be given to the cultural awareness of translators and interpreters in our smaller McWorld (Barber, 1992), as efficacy is seriously affected by "cross-cultural unawareness" (Jettmarová, Piotrowska, & Zauberga, 1997, p. 185). Even if they mentioned this in connection with literary translations, cross-cultural communication overall should follow the advice.

Although it is not our aim to enter the details, we have to mention that a segment of this category (court/legal interpreting, conference interpreting, diplomacy) may offer an unusually high job profile for its practitioners, not characteristic for translators.

Interpreting is more connected to psycholinguistics and neurolinguistics than translation, and phonetics, pragmatics, metatextual elements may be more relevant (e.g. impolite remarks, lies, pitch, tone, etc.), especially when combined with the issue of *loyalty* (usually towards the client, reminding us the concept of 'faithfulness'). However, loyalty is arguable, and a good question is whether the interpreter has the right to choose whom to be loyal. After all, there are more parties involved, including the person of the interpreter, and Nord evokes *responsibility* connected to loyalty, a "moral principle indispensable in the relationships between human beings who are partners in a communication process" (Nord, 2005, p. 32); these concepts all point towards the ethics of the profession, discussed in a further section.

The above-mentioned categories form the 'translation proper' part of TS, as translation is also the interpretation of words, whereas we use specific transfer operations (cf. Klaudy, 2003) similar to translation during interpretation. The next three parts come to complete TS, but they are not directly involved in the proper act of translation.

4. Translation theory and criticism

This part of TS may contain the concepts that turned to 'memes' of translation⁷ (cf. Snell-

5 Cf. <http://www.indifferentlanguages.com/words/apple>, 25.01.2016.

6 Cf. <http://mentalfloss.com/article/48795/9-little-translation-mistakes-caused-big-problems>, 25.01.2016.

7 A term coined by Richard Dawkins in his seminal book entitled *The Selfish Gene*, in which he describes and exemplifies *memes*: "Examples of memes are tunes, ideas, catch-phrases, clothes fashions, ways of making pots or of building arches. Just as genes propagate themselves in the gene pool by leaping from body to body via sperms or eggs, so memes propagate themselves in the meme pool by leaping from brain to brain via a process which, in the broad sense, can be called imitation." (Dawkins, 2006, p. 192).

Hornby, 2006, pg. 76), such as *formal and dynamic* equivalence, *skopos* theory, definitions, the importance and nature of translation. According to Louis Kelly, a “complete theory of translation... has three components: specification of function and goal; description and analysis of operations; and critical comment on relationships between goal and operations” (Kelly, 1979, p. 1).

This section is the extremely fertile soil of differentiating methods, procedures, techniques, transfer operations at different linguistic (lexical, grammatical) and non-linguistic levels, as well as criticizing or agreeing with them. In this respect we cannot refrain ourselves from not mentioning Louis Kelly’s sharp and witty remark: “Had translation depended for its survival on theory, it would have died out long before Cicero.” (Kelly, 1979, p. 219). Thus whatever theory of translation may arise, practice may be quite different. In our interpretation, the question of the possibility of poetry translation should not have even been formulated, taking into consideration the impressive number of (re)translations, adaptations, imitations, paraphrases and so on. Kelly ‘dots the i’: “Fortunately, good translation has never depended on adequate theory.” (Kelly, 1979, p. 4).

Thus it is surprising Bassnett’s view on translation theory: “the purpose of translation theory ... to provide a set of norms for effecting the perfect translation” (Bassnett, 1991, p. 37). The problem is that she has previously mentioned that we cannot talk about translation in terms of what a translator should or should not do (Preface, 2nd ed. pg. xviii)⁸, and the idea of ‘perfect’ translation *should* be forgotten. Translations may be good or bad, successful or not, (un)acceptable, (in)adequate, (un)faithful (Kelly, 1979, p. 68), but not *perfect*. In extreme cases, even better than the original, but let us remember that all categories are subjective...

Translation criticism is connected to (a) theory of translation, as it delves into the immense ocean of translated works, trying to offer valuable insights into both positive and negative examples. However, we should not forget an air of subjectivity around it in the absence of a ‘perfect’ translation. Yet, it is interesting – as one of the critics remarked – that lacking clearly objective ways to ‘measure’ the scientific or aesthetic quality of a translation in cases when more parallel translations are compared (based on a single source text), even laymen can differentiate them on a quality scale...

Once criticism is connected to quality assurance, it may refer to both the process and the product as both of them have an end (cf. Kelly’s remark: “critics [are] concerned with ends”, 1979, p. 66).

5. Translation practice & translator training

This area is directly connected to translator training (cf. skills, competences), and it tends to follow the didactics of translation expressed in theory (e.g. norms, ‘best practices’). The reason why we consider it a different field from the previous category is the fact that it may represent the road from an ‘ideal’ theory to ‘proper’ translations.

The memes of translation connected to various methods, techniques or transfer operations (cf. Molina & Hurtado Albir, 2002; Klaudy, 2003) – such as adaptation, calque, modulation, omission, addition, narrowing, broadening, etc. – should be activated during translation practice. The institutionalized form of practice is ‘translation training’ nowadays a soaring field within TS.

The common element on both theory and practice is that they “will change according to needs and ideology” (Kelly, 1979, p. 67).

6. Translation history

The history of translation is/was predominantly connected to literary translations, but more

⁸ Let us remember that Savory set up 12 translation rules in 1957, which are nevertheless fully contradictory to each other in pairs (Gutt, 2000).

recently we have new entries, such as the history of MT after the Second World War, or the history of translation training in different countries. This category includes the present description of TS as well, including ideologies and politics of translation.

There are statements according to which the history of translation dates back from the very beginning of communication, at least in the broader sense of interpretation, but the clashes within translation (cf. word-for-word or sense-for-sense) typically start with Cicero and St. Jerome, and it is always interesting to see how humans involved in TS keep “reinventing the wheel” and “ignoring its own history” (Snell-Hornby, 2006, p. 150).

On the other hand, a once-revolutionary idea may fade over time, and it is not a shame to return to the roots from time to time, similarly to tendencies met in the fashion business. This may be a sign that TS has really grown into a large industry, and history may explain how and why this was possible. Being a flourishing industry in the 21st century, TS cannot be separated from *management* any more, leading us to the last section before drawing the conclusions.

7. Translation and translator management

This category ensures the frame of translation, as it would discuss what happens *before* and *after* the translation (cf. pre-translation, pre-editing, post-editing, post-translation), not forgetting *work discipline* during translation. In our view, this part of TS is getting more and more important, as the age of GILT, IT revolution and multimedia (the Internet) directs the attention of the public to translations.

In this new age of McWorld, McLanguage we are also faced with MacTranslations, thus the skills and competences of translators are vital to secure his/her position on the global market of translation (a special emphasis should be laid on time-management skills in our age of ‘here and now’). The necessity and evolution of modern translation aids as a direct consequence of IT (r)evolution, such as MT, CAT, TM, TB are slowly but surely count as *basic* skills. We can understand Gouadec, who stated a decade ago that the age of pencil and rubber assisted translation is over (PRAT), and the tendency is to switch to CAT-tools (Gouadec, 2007, p. 109).

Further components of this category may be:

- self-advertising;
- contacting clients (direct or cold);
- contracting clients (cf. terms of service in Samuelsson-Brown, 2010; McKay, 2006; Robinson, 1997);
- handling finances (marketing and management of our own translation business);
- professional ethics (another emerging field within TS due to the diversification of contacts between translators and clients, translators and previous translations, various technical, moral, financial and time constraints, norms, tendencies and responsibilities);
- the renewed process of translation, when there are hardly ever ‘simple’ translation jobs, having been replaced by the ‘trendier’ *translation projects*, with various tasks: *project management, terminology research, layout specialist, proofreader* and translator (to get in line...);
- management of membership (translation associations, organizations, training centers, schools, journals, blogs, etc.);
- reshaping the profile and status of translators and interpreters, having in mind both QA and the ever-rising market demands due to the growing market.

An important remark here is that the management should start with the translator (to

be able to obtain translations on an international market), signaling the dethroning of translation. A translator who is a good manager, can successfully manage translations; after all, we have in mind a professional translator. It is time to apply Venuti's foreignizing concept over domestication, together with Justa Holz-Mänttari's *functional* approach to TS.

Conclusions

It is easy to observe that we have many fuzzy categories. For instance, the translation of names and titles may belong to non-specialized or specialized translations (children's literature, TV series, geographical names), while equivalence is a haunting issue in translation practice, interpretation, theory and history as well. Humor may be found in non-specialized translations and specialized ones as well, since it may prove difficult to categorize army jokes.

Communicational, linguistic and cultural connections to TS (together with the concept of *untranslatability*) pervade the entire scene, while the concept of TS seems to be disregarded by practitioners. Toury's norms (1995, p. 199) interpreted as "socio-cultural constraints" may have extreme variants (from absolute rules to pure idiosyncrasies) or "middle-ground" subjective norms, being present in all sub-fields of TS, and even outside of it (intralingual and intersemiotic translation, cf. Jakobson, 2000). For example, Romanian subtitlers kept taboo and swear words for themselves for a very long time (Romania is an essentially subtitling country), although recently we could witness cases when they hit the nail right on the head. Yet we cannot say that this was due to the Iron Curtain, as Romania's neighboring country, Hungary – essentially a dubbing country – is 'famous' for its straightforward style in both dubbing and subtitling (Imre, 2010, p. 115). A good question is whether these unwritten rules, norms, conventions are part of the 'tacit' knowledge of the translator or not.

As a final thought, we can state that it is timely to update Holmes' 1972 map of TS because too many things have happened since, and TS keep stressing the reader how interconnected this field of academic discipline it is with other areas. Without any further ado, here is a bunch of them: cultural studies, cultural theory, cultural history, communication studies, language / linguistics studies, hermeneutics, ethnography, sociology, formal rhetoric, literary studies, literary criticism, literary history, philosophy, philosophical speculation, anthropology, anthropological fieldwork, stylistics, semiotics, aesthetics, experimental studies, administration, international commerce (cf. George Steiner, Venuti, Bassnett, Snell-Hornby and Kelly). Today some of these may be found in different constellations but still in joint ventures.

Interestingly, however *functional* these relationships are, the field of IT and (financial) management related to the status of translator / translation is still highly underdeveloped. We can keep complaining about the low status of translators (and partially of interpreters), but the solution may lie in the fact that the world must associate TS with a cutting edge business as well (translation figures are encouraging), breaking away from the typical linguistic approach.

Today TS is either predominantly part of a larger project (cf. localization) or it is a standalone business with specific resources and *workflow*. During these new working conditions intercultural and other types of communication may take place, as in the case of other jobs as well, thus the proverbial 'solitary confinement' attitude of translators should be forgotten; *human psychology*, *advertising tips*, and the latest results in developing *emotional intelligence* (cf. EQ and IQ researches) may all contribute to a type of success hardly measured a couple of years ago.

Running the risk of failing in creating something "really new" and being among the 99% of publications that do not take us further (cf. Vermeer's complaint in (Snell-Hornby, 2006, p. 151), we try to offer an updated (although not upgraded) and gregarious version of TS.

References

- Baker, M. (2001). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Routledge.
- Barber, B. R. (1992, March). Jihad vs. McWorld. *The Atlantic Monthly*, (3), 53–63.
- Bassnett, S. (1991). *Translation Studies* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Bassnett, S. (2002). *Translation Studies* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Dawkins, R. (2006). *The Selfish Gene: 30th Anniversary Edition--with a new Introduction by the Author* (30th Anniversary edition). Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Díaz-Cintas, J. (2003). Audiovisual Translation in the Third Millennium. In *Translation Today: Trends and Perspectives* (pp. 192–204). Multilingual Matters.
- Gouadec, D. (2007). *Translation as a Profession*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Gutt, E.-A. (2000). Translation as Interlingual Interpretive Use. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (1st ed., pp. 376–396). London and New York: Routledge.
- Holmes, J. S. (1972). The Name and Nature of Translation Studies. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (2000) (1st ed., pp. 172–185). London and New York: Routledge.
- Imre, A. (2010). Translating subtitles with translation environment. In L. Cocârță Andrei, S. Chiper, & A. Sandulovici (Eds.), *Language, Culture and Change. Higher Education between Tradition and Innovation* (Vol. II, pp. 109–116). Iași: Editura Universității „Al. I. Cuza” Iași.
- Jakobson, R. (2000). On Linguistic Aspects of Translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (1st ed., pp. 113–118). London and New York: Routledge.
- Jettmarová, Z., Piotrowska, M., & Zauberga, I. (1997). New advertising markets as target areas for translation. In M. Snell-Hornby, Z. Jettmarová, & K. Kaindl (Eds.), *Translation as Intercultural Communication. Selected Papers from the EST Congress – Prague 1995* (pp. 185–194). Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Kelly, L. G. (1979). *The True Interpreter: A History of Translation Theory and Practice in the West*. Basil Blackwell & Oxford.
- Klaudy, K. (2003). *Languages in Translation*. Budapest: Scholastica.
- McKay, C. (2006). *How to Succeed As a Freelance Translator*. Lulu.com.
- Molina, L., & Hurtado Albir, A. (2002). Translation Techniques Revisited: A Dynamic and Functionalist Approach. *Meta: Translators' Journal*, 47(4), 498–512.
- Nord, C. (2005). *Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology, and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-oriented Text Analysis*. Amsterdam - New York: Rodopi.
- Robinson, D. (1997). *Becoming a Translator: An Accelerated Course*. Psychology Press.
- Samuelsson-Brown, G. (2010). *A Practical Guide for Translators*. Multilingual Matters.
- Snell-Hornby, M. (1995). *Translation Studies: An integrated approach* (2nd ed.). Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Snell-Hornby, M. (2006). *The Turns of Translation Studies: New Paradigms Or Shifting Viewpoints?* John Benjamins Publishing.
- Toury, G. (1995). The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (2000) (1st ed., pp. 198–212). London and New York: Routledge.
- Trumble, W. R., & Stevenson, A. (Eds.). (2002). *The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* (5th ed., Vol. II). Oxford: Oxford University Press.