

Bührig, K., House, J. & Thije, J.D. ten (2009). *Translatory Action and Intercultural Communication. An Introduction.* In K. Bührig, J. House & J.D. ten Thije (Eds.), *Translatory Action and Intercultural Communication* (pp. 1-6). Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Introduction: Translatory Action and Intercultural Communication:

KRISTIN BÜHRIG, JULIANE HOUSE, JAN D. TEN THIJE
(Hamburg, Utrecht)

The aim of this volume is to investigate the relation between intercultural communication and translatory action, and to provide a theoretically and methodologically sound basis for research into this relation. Although there have been previous attempts to provide such a link (Schäffner and Adab, 1995; Snell-Hornby et al 1995; Katan, 2004), we believe that, given the growing importance of the two fields, it is essential to develop a more explicitly integrative and interdisciplinary theoretical framework.

In the past, approaches to combine the fields of 'translation studies' and 'intercultural communication studies' have unfortunately failed to place this linkage on a firm linguistic basis. To provide such a basis is therefore what the contributions in this volume try to do. Further, intercultural communication research has in the past been mainly concerned with cases in which participants fail to understand one another. In our view, the more important issue is however to reconstruct linguistic structures that enable understanding (cf. Bührig and ten Thije 2006). Therefore, it is a focus on understanding in intercultural communication which characterizes the approach taken here. As it happens, intercultural understanding is also the basis for the single most important concept underlying translation theory: namely functional equivalence. We regard functional equivalence as the presupposition for achieving a comparable function of a text or discourse in another cultural context. Consequently, intercultural understanding can be considered as the success with which the linguistic-cultural transposition has been undertaken, measurable by the degree to which functional equivalence is achieved, i.e., whether and to which degree concrete text/discourse functions in a concrete situation are fulfilled reciprocally (cf. House 1977; 1997, 2006a,b). On this (integrative) view, then, intercultural misunderstanding can be regarded as simply a failure to realize functional equivalence.

The connection between functional equivalence and intercultural understanding can further be accounted for with reference to the concept of the 'dilated speech situation' ('die zerdehnte Sprechsituation') (Ehlich 1983, 1984). According to Ehlich, the prime characteristic of a 'text' is that it is an 'agent of transmission', which derives from the fact that speaker and hearer are not at the same place at the same time. And it is a text's functioning as a sort of 'messenger' which then enables the hearer to receive the speaker's linguistic action, although the production situation and the reception situation diverge in terms of time and place. Through such a 'transmission' undertaken by a text, the original speech situation becomes 'dilated'. Since the speaker knows that his utterances will be 'passed on', he adapts his formulations accordingly, i.e., he or she makes a 'text' out of his or her linguistic action. Texts are therefore not limited to the written medium, but can also exist in oral form.

The concept of the 'dilated speech situation' is relevant for intercultural communication research and translation theory in both oral and written communication: Both interpreting and translation are characterized by a specific rupture of the original speech situation, which results from the linguistic barrier between speaker and hearer or between author and his or her readers. And it is only with the help of an interpreting or translating person that this linguistic barrier between speaker (member of culture 1) and hearer (member of culture 2) or author and reader can be bridged. For the case of interpreting, Bührig and Rehbein (2000)

assume the existence of what they call an ‚internally dilated speech situation’, a situation where the primary communication partners are co-present, but are unable to communicate without the translatory action of the interpreter, who manages to bridge the linguistically conditioned rupture.

The person doing the translating thus passes on the linguistic action in L1 (Situation 1) to the L2 addressees (Situation 2). This procedure is not without consequence for the transmitted linguistic action. While already monolingual texts show signs of being prepared for transmission, this is particularly true of translated texts, because they are exposed to a double transmission process. The linguistic action in the L2 in the interpreting process is also subject to this translation-specific text construction. For instance, homileic (‘phatic’) discourse such as small talk often shows a distinct transition from discursive L1 action to a more textual L2 action. Institutional communication, on the other hand, is characterized by the fact that the L1 action realized by representatives of the institution is often already marked as an oral text, which can be dissolved in the interpreting act (Bührig 2001, Bührig and Meyer 2004).

Along with the dilation of the speech situation as a prime feature of translation and interpreting, these two activities are also characterized by a process of linguistic-cultural reflection geared towards the L2 recipient. On account of this inherent target-oriented reflective feature, all translatory constellations can also be said to have a potential for intercultural communication and intercultural understanding related to processes of reflection upon functional equivalence. This will be described in greater detail in the various discursive and textual structures presented in the analyses in this volume.

The three key concepts "functional equivalence", "dilated speech situation" and "intercultural understanding" mentioned above constitute a framework in which to discuss the linkage between the two disciplines translation studies and intercultural communication aimed for by and through the papers in this volume. In what follows, we will select from each of the six contributions to this volume relevant theoretical notions that can help concretize the three key concepts underlying this volume.

For **Juliane House** it is the concepts ‚cultural filter’, ‚overt translation’ and ‚covert translation’ which are of fundamental importance both for the work she presents and for the key concepts of this volume. If we connect the concept of a ‚cultural filter’ with the notion of the ‚dilated speech situation’, we realize that the ‚cultural filter’ refers in fact to a means of text production with which cultural standards and expectation norms holding in speech situation 1 in culture 1 and speech situation 2 in culture 2 are systematically taken account of. An example of such a means of text production would be the parameter of content-orientation versus addressee-orientation that can be interpreted as facilitating understanding via either explicating knowledge for the reader or leaving the reader to infer knowledge on his own.

The production process in the case of an ‚overt translation’ is a particularly good example of the double dilation of the speech situation: here the reader simultaneously resorts to his or her knowledge about culture 1 and his or her knowledge about culture 2. We can thus say that the distinction ‚overt’/ ‚covert’ refers basically back to in principle of different text production mechanisms via different backward linkages to the original text in speech situation 1 and the type of knowledge presupposed in this situation (culture 1). In the case of a ‚covert translation’ the reader does not know that he or she is reading a translated text. This effect is achieved through the use of special text production mechanisms, i.e., through a cultural filter, with which the dilation of speech situation 1 to speech situation 2 can be overcome, such that it is no longer so perceived by the reader, who, in trying to understand the text, now merely resorts to his knowledge of culture 2.

Heidrun Gerzymisch-Arbogast takes up the dimension „orientation towards content versus orientation towards addressees“, which is part of the (German-English) ‚cultural filter’ sug-

gested by House (1997; 2006c). She does this with reference to an analysis of German scientific introductions and their English counterparts. The different text production mechanisms which she describes on the basis of her contrastive English-German analysis can clearly also be related to the concept of the dilated speech situation. Concretely, Gerzymisch-Arbogast uses topic-maps to show how addressee orientation and content-orientation are achieved via filling, or leaving empty, connections between the topics handled in the texts. The different topic structures which she reconstructs are used to measure the degree to which topic connectivity as a component of functional equivalence is achieved. The reconstructed topic structures also show that different, culturally conditioned demands are made on recipients' processes of text understanding and interpretation.

Alexandra Kallia uses a discourse completion test (DCT) for measuring cultural differences in the realization of two speech acts: Requests and suggestions in a number of different communicative situations (cf. Blum-Kulka, House Kasper 1989). In this research design it is first of all the researcher who establishes functional equivalence between the speech act realizations in the different languages. Subjects are supposed to fill in blanks provided in the DCT, which were anticipated to involve the employment of a 'cultural filter'. As opposed to how a text traditionally overcomes the dilated speech situation, reception and production roles which a subject adopts, overlap in this research. The analysis of the speech act realization in the different languages involved reveals which conventions are followed through the use of a cultural filter.

Antje Wilton investigates oral data in a non-professional homileic ('phatic') interpreting situation: humorous small talk occurring at the dinner table. This constellation of translatory action can be described –in the sense of Bührig and Rehbein (2000) - as an internally dilated speech situation. Another characteristic of the data examined by Wilton is the fact that the multilingual participants take over the task of interpreting without previous agreement or any previous brief. They are therefore both primary interactants and interpreters. In their role as interpreters they move outside of the interaction situation. The analysis shows that the creation of functional equivalence leads to a sort oscillation between these different speech roles and creates a role conflict for participants. Further, the reconstructed difficulties in transferring humour can be interpreted as resulting from the internally dilated speech situation.

Jan D. ten Thije also reconstructs the internal dilation of the speech situation. In his case, a non-professional interpreter helps overcome the linguistic barrier (English and Russian) which arises during interpreting humorous teasing in toasting situations at an international research meeting. Ten Thije focuses on the self-retreat of the interpreter. The self-retreat is an extreme result of the discursive handling of the interpreter's role conflict which stems from the fact that he transmits the utterances of the original speakers and at the same time is an autonomous participant of the interaction. Proposals are discussed that assign translatory actions of the interpreter to the continuum depending on his action space. At one end of the continuum the interpreter is regarded as a so-called *translation machine*; at the other end he is considered to be an equal participant in the interaction. The constellation of the self-retreat of the interpreter has not been extensively addressed before in the research literature, but can be reconstructed with respect to this continuum. The analysis also reveals how interpreters reflect on and act upon the achievement of functional equivalence in the tripartite discourse structure. The author concludes that the distinction between 'professional' and 'non-professional' interpreters is actually questionable.

Kristin Bührig investigates discourse in hospitals in which *ad hoc* interpreters are employed in order to enable communication and understanding between (German speaking) doctors and

(Portuguese and Turkish speaking) patients. In her analysis, Bührig investigates how the ‚cultural apparatus‘ (Rehbein 2006) emerges step by step. She investigates which speech acts inside the internally dilated speech situation are starting points for a reflection of participants‘ actions and how this reflection process is being communicated. Further, she examines which strategies are used to render these reflections functionally equivalent in the target language. Such a procedure illuminates instances of cultural action which can point to possibilities of optimizing institutional communication..

In summary and to conclude, the individual contributions in this volume based as they are on the notions of ‘functional equivalence’ and the ‘dilated speech situation’ all point to certain concepts essential for the reflection process inherent in intercultural understanding: ‘Cultural filters’ exhibit the degree of explicitness with which the transfer of knowledge is conducted for intercultural understanding; the gaps and/or the gap-filling in the topic maps show the degree to which coherence and cohesion is achieved for intercultural understanding; the ‘perspectivizing apparatus’ and the ‘cultural apparatus’ are different discursive realizations of the reflection process characterizing intercultural understanding.

This conceptual summary shows how productive an interdisciplinary theoretical discussion between translation studies and intercultural communication research can be, and how the development of a joint integrative framework can open up many new perspectives for future transdisciplinary research.

References

- Blum-Kulka, S., J. House and G. Kasper (eds.) *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*, Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Bührig, K. (2001) ‘Interpreting in hospitals’, in Cigada, S., S. Gilardoni and M. Matthey (eds.) (2001) *Comunicare in Ambiente Professionale Plurilingue*, Lugano: USI, 107-119.
- and B. Meyer, (2004) ‘Ad-hoc interpreting and achievement of communicative purposes in doctor-patient-communication’, in House, J. and J. Rehbein (eds.) *Multilingual Communication*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins, 43-62.
- and J. Rehbein (2000) *Reproduzierendes Handeln. Übersetzen, simultanes und konsekutives Dolmetschen im diskursanalytischen Vergleich*. Arbeiten zur Mehrsprachigkeit • Reihe B • 6 (2000)
- and J.D. ten Thije. (eds.) (2006) *Beyond Misunderstanding. Linguistic analyses of intercultural communication*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Ehlich, K. (1983) ‘Text und sprachliches Handeln. Die Entstehung von Texten aus dem Bedürfnis nach Überlieferung’, in Assmann, J., A. Assman, and C. Hardmeier (eds.) (1983) *Schrift und Gedächtnis. Beiträge zur Archäologie der literarischen Kommunikation*. München: Fink, 24-43.
- (1984) *Zum Textbegriff*, in Rothkegel A. and B. Sandig Text - Textsorten - Semantik, *Linguistische Modelle und maschinelle Verfahren*, Hamburg: Helmut Buske, 9-25.
- House, J. (1977/1981, 2nd. ed.) *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment*, Tübingen: Narr.
- (1997) *Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Re-visited*, Tübingen: Narr.
- (2006a) ‘Deutsch und Englisch als Wissenschaftssprachen’, in Collinader, P. and D. Hansen (eds.) *Übersetzer und Übersetzerkulturen*, München: Meidenbauer, 91-122.
- (2006b) ‘Text and Context in Translation’, *Journal of Pragmatics* 38(3): 338-358.
- (2006c) ‘Communicative Styles in English and German’, *European Journal of English Studies* 10(3): 249-267.

- Katan, D. (2004) *Translating Cultures. An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and Mediators*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Schäffner, C. and B. Adab (1995) 'Translation as intercultural communication - Contact as conflict', in Snell-Hornby, M., Z. Jettmarová and K. Kaindl (eds.) *Translation as Intercultural Communication. Selected Papers from the EST Congress - Prague 1995*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 325-339.
- Thije, Jan D. ten (2006) 'The notion of *perspective* and *perspectising* in intercultural communication research', in Bührig, K. and Jan D. ten Thije (eds.) *Beyond Misunderstanding. Linguistic analyses of intercultural communication*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 97-153.