

EDITORIAL

LSP AND TRANSLATION

Translation studies (TS) and Languages for Specific Purposes (LSP) are two currently prominent areas of Applied Linguistics that, from an insider's view, seem to share areas of interest, research and methodologies. Both can now boast specialised journals and conferences after having developed relatively independently. Their sisterly relationship, however, has not been explored as much as it deserves. This topical issue aims at bridging this gap.

UNESCO recognises Translation as sub-discipline part of Applied Linguistics discipline under the code 570112. LSP, however, does not appear as part of UNESCO nomenclature, which must be largely because "LSP field is vast and diverse" (Gollin-Kies et al., 2015). Upton (2012) refers to LSP as "a field of applied linguistics" and *The Concise Encyclopaedia of Applied Linguistics* (to be published in 2020) dedicates a specific thematic section to LSP with sub-sections like: English for Academic Purposes, English for Business, English for Occupational Purposes, Genre and Discourse Analysis in LSP, Needs Analysis and Syllabus Design for LSP, Theses and Dissertations in English for Specific Purposes, Vocabulary and Language for Specific Purposes as well as Writing and Language for Specific Purposes. The corresponding thematic section of this volume dedicated to Translation is similar in size, with subsections like Audiovisual Translation, Cognitive Approaches to Translation, Cultural Approaches to Translation, Functional Approaches to Translation, History of Translation and Translation Theory.

While in 1983 Swales was already speaking about "LSP and allied fields such as technical translation, terminology and lexicology", later he was questioning its "rather peculiar relationship with other branches of applied linguistics" (Swales, 1983, 2000). To understand the relationship between the TS and LSP, let's retrocede three decades to the time when both have already established themselves as research areas. Hoffmann (1979) proposed a theory of LSP and described it as "means of communication" between specialists. Reiss, a renowned translation theorist, described translation as "bilingual mediated process of communication" (Reiss, 1981: 121). While Languages for Specific Purposes are understood to be "means of communication", Translation guarantees that such communication is achieved despite language barrier. Thus, for LSP and specialised translation we come up with two modes of communication, direct (a) and mediated (b):

Specialist L1 - [direct communication] - specialist L2 (to communicate, they use the language they share, which may be L1, L2 or L3/interlingua)

Specialist L1 - [mediated communication] - specialist L2 (they do not have a good command of a common language and prefer mediated communication instead; their communication is mediated by a third person who has a command of both L1 and L2)

It looks like there are especially close and old links between LSP and TS in German-speaking scholarly circles: already in 1979 Wilss wrote about “Fachsprache und Übersetzung” (“LSP and Translation”) in a volume dedicated to terminology (Wilss, 1979). Since then, more volumes on terminology and specialised lexicography appeared, among them “Terminology, LSP and Translation” (Somers, 1996). Sometimes LSP and translation define each other, especially when “LSP translation” is used as a synonym for “specialised translation”, as in “LSP translation scenarios” (Gerzymisch-Arbogast et al., 2008).

LSP also keeps links with Translation through domain and genre-specific texts, as we can see from the contents of the volumes like “Text Typology and Translation” (Trosborg, 1997). This kind of link can be found in Pisanski Peterlin’s article (this issue) entitled “Languages for Academic Purposes and Specialized Translation: Exploring the Commonalities”. It focuses on LSP pedagogy, specifically, pedagogy of academic discourse. The author is working with a small Slovene-English corpus of Slovene research papers on Slovene geography translated into English. The author observes that while Slovene texts are addressed at a small number of researchers well familiar with Slovene geography, English texts appeal to a wider international audience less familiar with Slovenia. In this study, the elements under scrutiny are references “Slovene”, “Slovenia” and “Slovenian”, which are found to be more abundant in the target text (TT) than in the source text (ST). In contrast, the TT loses references like “our territory” that form part of “shared background or experience”, an important element of academic writing according to Hyland (2001).

Pisanski Peterlin suggests incorporation of translation into LSP pedagogical context, in line with Colina and Lafford (2017), who propose to add it as a “fifth skill” alongside reading, writing, speaking and listening. If translation is to get back to LSP classroom, it cannot limit itself to old grammar-translation method of language learning making use of “semantic translation” (Newmark, 1981) only. LSP students should be open to using, when needed, “communicative translation” (ibid.) techniques and conceive the possibility of changing the type of audience in translation.

The cultural differences between the two audiences (those of ST and TT) has been accounted for by translation scholars at least half a century ago, as reflected in Nida’s (1969) definition of dynamic or functional equivalence. Some LSP scholars’ concerns about the audience appeared to be close to those of translation scholars, which is the case of Hyland (2001) who highlights “the importance of building a relationship with the audience”. When speaking about changing the relationship between the author and the audience in translation, Pisanski Peterlin uses the term “revoicing” (Nelson & Castelló, 2012). The use of this term is logical if one thinks of discourse as possessing its “voice”. LSP training generally prepares students for discourse construction from a scratch rather than for reproducing already existing discourse. The latter is more characteristic of translators, whose function is mediating between specialists, as was pointed out earlier. Thus, the perspectives adopted by LSP and translation scholars differ, which leads to the emergence of the translation concept going beyond the communicative paradigm and therefore falling out of LSP didactics: that of translation purpose. Until 1984, it was taken for granted that the function of the ST and TT was the same, while today, after Reiss and Vermeer (1984) envisaged the possibility of changing skopos, it is generally accepted that translation brief and the type of audience to be addressed in TT can change the function of the ST completely. For translation scholars, it is thus logical to evaluate the differences (for

example, additions or omissions) between the ST and TT in terms of translator's purpose. For LSP scholars, these differences are accounted for as part of "revoicing" the original discourse thanks to their training in "genre and rhetorical scaffolding" (Pisanski Peterlin, this issue).

The article by Marczak and Krajka entitled "A tale of two cities: Approaches to specialised language competence development in the areas of law and economics at university level" (Marczak and Krajka, this issue) focuses on training specialised translators in Poland. Like in many other countries, Poland has a highly complicated system of translator training, where translators can be educated within dedicated specialisations within English (French/Russian/Spanish/German) BA/MA study programmes, Applied Linguistics double-language BA/MA study programmes, Translation/Interpretation single-language MA programmes and most probably a few other contexts. Due to this complexity, a comparison of different paths to translator development with the elaboration on guidelines for most successful translator competence buildup is essential for educating better skilled professionals. For this reason, specialised translation courses taught by the staff belonging to the Chair for Translation Studies and Intercultural Communication (Jagiellonian University in Kraków) and Applied Linguistics Department (Maria Curie-Skłodowska University) are reported in the article. The authors trace and report on the differences observed between the two courses taught in each of the two universities, with the ultimate objective to relate them to the most relevant models of translation competence. A detailed overview of this competence, both general and domain-specific, is found at the beginning of the article.

The syllabi analysed are directly related to specialised translation: two translation workshops (one on legal texts and another on economic texts) in the MA program and two courses dealing with specialised texts (one on their translation and another on their analysis) in the BA program. Judging by the titles of the courses, in the MA program the focus is on translation, while in BA program the focus is on specialized texts. The question that arises here is the way the mastery in specialised translation is being achieved. Provided that specialized translation requires both domain-specific knowledge and general translation skills, it doesn't matter, in theory, which of them comes first. However, the type of courses and students' previous training do affect the attention focus in classes and the quality of the expected translation product.

We also learn about how translation students deal with terminology from Dobnik's article entitled "Didactics of specialized translation – Experiences and observations on student translation errors in the case of a wine-related document" (Dobnik, this issue). Unlike in Poland, in Slovenia there is such degree as BA in Translation. The author analyses 196 translations of the same text by 13 generations of students pursuing this degree between the years 2004 and 2019. For these students, the task under consideration is the first specialized text they translate in class and, although they have already worked with specialised vocabulary, their knowledge of translation is fragmentary and domain knowledge (in this case, on vines) is almost inexistent. They are still discovering the role of translator as "an intermediary between two parties, who often have specific and rather different expectations and demands" (ibid.).

Both Dobnik and Pisanski-Peterlin (this issue) refer to the role of translator of specialised texts. This role, understood as that of mediator between specialists, needs to be further clarified in the light of the findings reported in these two articles. Since the type of audience plays a crucial role, we should envisage a possibility of translator mediating between specialised

and non-specialised audience. The fact that one of the parties does not possess detailed knowledge of the domain field makes the mission of the translator even more difficult. The translator should not only possess this domain knowledge but also be ready to reduce its degree of speciality or maintain it while keeping additional needs of the addressee in mind.

Another common topic in this issue is LSP and translation didactics at the tertiary level, while the authors' methodological approaches to students' training seem to differ. Dobnik puts an emphasis on the notion of "translation error" classifying translation solutions into acceptable and non-acceptable, and the other two articles refer to "the ongoing training and awareness". Still, if we consider that "genre familiarity triggers awareness of potential translation problems" (Hvelplund & Dragsted, 2018: 71), these are not but two different perspectives on the same phenomena.

Inna Kozlova

Guest Editor

Autonomous University of Barcelona, Spain

References:

- Chapelle, C. (Ed.). (to be published in January 2020). *Concise Encyclopaedia of Applied Linguistics*. Malden: Wiley Blackwell.
- Colina, S. & B. Lafford (2017). "Translation in Spanish Language Teaching: the integration of a "Fifth Skill" in the Second Language Curriculum". *Journal of Spanish Language Teaching* 4(2), 110-123.
- Gerzymisch-Arbogast, H., Budin, G. & Hofer, G. (Eds.). (2008). *LSP Translation Scenarios*. Norderstedt: ATRC Group.
- Gollin-Kies, S., Hall, D. & Moore, S. (2015). *Language for specific purposes*. Research and Practice in Applied Linguistics series. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hoffmann, L. (1979). Toward a Theory of LSP. *Fachsprache. Internationale Zeitschrift für Fachsprachenforschung, -didaktik und Terminologie Wien*, 1(1), 12-16.
- Hvelplund, K. & Dragsted, B. (2018). Genre familiarity and translation processing: differences and similarities between literary and LSP translators. In I. Lacruz & R. Jääskeläinen (Eds.), *Innovation and expansion in translation process research* (pp. 55-76). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hyland, K. (2001). Bringing in the Reader Addressee Features in Academic Writing. *Written Communication* 18, 549-574.
- Nelson, N. & Castelló, M. (2012). Academic writing and authorial voice. In M. Castelló & Ch. Donahue (Eds.), *University writing: Selves and texts in academic societies* (pp. 33-51). Studies in Writing series. Bingley: Emerald.
- Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford/New York: Pergamon Press.

- Reiss, K. & Vermeer, H. (1984). *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Reiss, K. (1981). Type, Kind and Individuality of Text. Decision Making in Translation. *Poetics Today* 2(4), 121-131.
- Somers, H. (Ed.). (1996). *Terminology, LSP and Translation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Swales, J. (1983). Developing materials for writing scholarly introductions. In R. Jordan (Ed.), *Case studies in ELT* (pp. 188-200). London: Collins ELT.
- Swales, J. (2000) Languages for Specific Purposes. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 20, 59-76.
- Trosborg, A. (Ed.) (1997). *Text Typology and Translation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Upton, T. (2012). Looking back, looking forward: LSP at 50. *Ibérica: Revista de la Asociación Europea de Lenguas para Fines Específicos (AELFE)* 23, 9-28.
- Wilss, W. (1979). Fachsprache und Übersetzen. In H. Felber, F. Lang & G. Wersig (Eds.), *Terminologie als angewandte Sprachwissenschaft* (pp. 177-191). München: Saur.