Towards the history of indirect translation research: main trends, pending questions and possible lines of future enquiry

Hanna Pięta
University of Lisbon Centre for English Studies

Rita Bueno Maia
Universidade Católica Portuguesa
Research Centre for Communication and Culture

Abstract This article concerns indirect translation (ITr), understood broadly as translation of translation (Gambier 1994). ITr is an age-old phenomenon (e.g. the *Bible*, *I Ching*, Shakespeare translation or the activity of the so-called Toledo School), with widespread use in various areas of today's society (e.g., audiovisual, institutional, literary and news translation; localization; conference and community interpreting) and positive prospects for the foreseeable future (e.g., due to the globalization and the growing need to edit texts via lingua francae, e.g. in international organizations). Despite the traditional neglect in Translation Studies, the phenomenon has been attracting increasing scholarly attention (especially for the past twenty years, cf. Pięta 2017) and begins to establish itself as a subarea of research within Translation Studies.

Time has possibly come to 'take the temperature' of ITr research and survey the emergence and development of this subfield of enquiry (thereby contributing to the writing of the history of ITr research). With this in mind, the article will provide an overview of some of the main patterns, unanswered queries in ITr research and explores suggestions for future studies in the field. The overview will follow the 'Five W's and One H' approach. The *what* question explores the relevance of systematic studies on ITr. The *who* question considers the profile of ITr researchers. The *where* question relates to the geographic spread of ITr research. The *when* question regards the diachronic evolution of ITr studies. The *why* questions looks into the reasons behind the traditional neglect of ITr in Translation Studies discipline. Finally, the *how* question considers selected details of ITr processes as well as methods used in identifying most probable mediating texts and languages. The article will end by considering prospects for (research on) ITr training.

1. Introduction

This article is about the history of indirect translation (ITr) research. ITr will be taken broadly, as a translation of a translation (Gambier 1994), encompassing also relay interpreting. As such definition does not impose restrictions with regard to the number of intervening languages, texts or cultures, it is particularly apt to allow for the inclusive, exploratory approach adapted by this study. History, in turn, will be understood as *historia rerum*

gestarum, i.e., "an oral or written mode of presentation of [...] facts, events, etc" (D'hulst 2010: 397). This broad definition of history is particularly convenient as it allows to combine historical concepts and methods with the specific expertise that belongs to the intellectual domain under study — in this case, the discipline of Translation Studies.

Our rationale behind combining these two large conceptual categories (ITr and history) is twofold. On the one hand, it seems that despite a rather difficult start (see section 'Cur') ITr has been attracting increasing scholarly attention and is now beginning to establish itself as a subarea worthy of systematic research within Translation Studies. We therefore believe that time has come to survey the emergence and development of ITr *research*, to "take its temperature" and contribute to the writing of the history of this subfield of enquiry. In so doing, we intend to complement and extend the scope of the joint project, currently underway at the University of Lisbon Centre for English Studies and the Research Centre for Communication and Culture (Universidade Católica Portuguesa), which mainly aims at mapping the historical development of ITr *practice* (see, e.g., Assis Rosa, Pięta, and Bueno Maia 2017; Pięta 2019; Pięta 2014).

Another (equally important yet much more personal) motivation for combining these two concepts is the willingness to gratefully acknowledge our debt to Professor Teresa Seruya, a role model and a leader to so many of Portuguese scholars working in the History of Translation, who perhaps more than anyone else has been concerned with the systematic writing of the history of translation in Portugal, thereby drawing our attention to the need of systematic studies on ITr in Portugal and beyond.

Since the writing of the history of ITr research is still in its very early stages, this article will not provide definitive answers. Rather, it will provide an overview of some of the main patterns, focus on unanswered queries related to the history of ITr research and discuss possible ways in which these queries can be answered by future studies in the field.

Following D'hulst (2010), the article will be structured around an oratorical technique often used to generate and cluster ideas. Typically, the technique boils down to eight opening questions (*quis*, *quid*, *ubi*, *quibus auxiliis*, *cur*, *quomodo*, *quando*, *cui bono*?) but for reasons to do with the current stage of our project only six of them will be addressed here. Each of the six questions lead to more specific queries and, subsequently, to the discussion of research avenues worthy of systematic exploration in the future. Importantly, since the 'quid' question is the most pressing one (as will become clear in Section 2), it will be developed in greater detail.

2. *Quid?*

In D'hulst's text, the 'quid' (i.e., 'what') question comes second in the list, following Cicero, Quintilian and Matthew of Vendôm. And this is so despite the fact that in most research project in Translation History one typically starts by asking "what has been translated? And what not?" (D'hulst 2010: 4). If we bear in mind the primary aim of the '5 Ws and one H' approach, historically used to explore and (notably) present the circumstances that could mitigate or aggravate a case in a trial (Francozi 2012: 76), it seems reasonable to suggest that D'hulst's (2010) sequence (where the 'quis?' comes before the 'quid?') is more adequate to the narrative of the results of research projects in Translation History (e.g., this translator authored this translation) and less adequate to the rendering of the story of such research projects (e.g., what translations were published in a given context?), at least as far as the past and present of the discipline in Translation Studies is concerned.

In other words, if we take into consideration the invisibility in which translators have been kept throughout cultural history (Venuti 1995) and the low prestige of translation as a cultural object in both past and present times (Maia, Pinto, and Pinto 2014b, xvi), leading to a longstanding silence of Cultural History about translation, it seems licit to argue that much more projects in Translation History need to begin by the 'quid?' question before they can address other questions, such as 'quis?'. Professor Teresa Seruya's experience in Portuguese academia as a coordinator of projects (both individual and collective) in Translation History is a case in point. Since this article also aims to pay tribute to her scientific legacy, we find it only fitting to zoom in on the relevant highlights of this experience before we proceed further with our main argumentation.

2.1. The 'quid' question viewed through the lens of Teresa Seruya's scientific legacy

According to her personal website (https://www.teresaseruya.com.pt), Teresa Seruya has successfully supervised five PhD theses in Translation History. Three of them aimed at answering a 'quid?' question, thus firstly pursuing a much-needed task of offering a panoramic view of what has (not) been translated in Portugal. The concrete primary questions these projects sought to answer may be rephrased as follows:

(i) 'which World War narratives were translated into Portuguese?' (Moniz 2006);

(ii) 'what literary works were translated from Czech into Portuguese?' (Špirk 2011);
(iii) 'what literary works were translated from Polish into Portuguese?' (Pięta 2013).

The most recent PhD thesis concluded under Teresa Seruya's supervision aimed at exploring a 'quomodo' question, specifically, 'how was Polish literature translated into Portuguese?' (Swiatkiewicz 2017). It is thus telling that such a research project follows (and not proceeds) Pięta's project (2013) addressing the 'quid' query. A particular case is Lopes's PhD thesis, also supervised by Teresa Seruya (Lopes 2010). This project had as its central research question 'quis?', notably, 'how was authorship constructed in the Portuguese translations of Walter Scott's historical novels?', it nevertheless began with the archaeological endeavour of discovering which Scott's novels were translated into Portuguese and, only then proceeded to document Scott's translators (Lopes 2010: i).

The collective research projects Teresa Seruya has coordinated also seem to point to the precedence of the 'quis?' question over the remaining queries. That is to say, they stress the need to firstly delineate a comprehensive panorama of what was translated and what was not in a particular context, before focusing on the agents, strategies or literary fashions, to name but a few relevant issues. The first collective project is presented as follows:

> [T]he research project *Literary History and Translations. Representations of the Other in the Portuguese Culture*, that underwent between 1998 and 2005 at the CLCPB — Centre of Portuguese and Brazilian Literature and Culture (Universidade Católica Portuguesa), aimed at studying the presence of translation in the Portuguese culture, by looking for mentions to translation in Histories of Portuguese Literature. The expectations laid out in similar studies that had been conducted on foreign Literary Histories. However, this project's results informed of an extremely reduced acknowledgement of translations' role by the Portuguese Literary Historiography. The second part of this project was dedicated to case studies, the privileged form of accessing the reality of the field, i.e., to the existing translations and their various contexts. (Seruya 2018: 14)

Hence, this first research project led by Teresa Seruya diagnosed the need to identify first and foremost (and from scratch) the existing translations of literature in the Portuguese culture. To put it differently, the researcher who wishes to (re)write the history of Portuguese original writing has at his/her disposal a series of previous historical works that have been establishing and rescuing from oblivion a bibliography of published works. And this holds true

despite the (key) fact that these works tend to perpetuate a rather small portion of the vaster reality of original writing, selected by specific historical criteria, namely, poetics and ideology, as emphasized, for instance, by Bassnett-McGuire and Lefevere (1990). As far as writing the History of Translation in Portugal is concerned, Teresa Seruya understood in 2005 that it was necessary to begin asking what has (not) been translated in Portugal or, differently put, that historical research should begin by asking the 'quid?' query.

To address the 'quid? query', understood as the first step towards Teresa Seruya's long-standing *desideratum* of writing a History of Translation in Portugal (Seruya 2018: 7), a new collective research project was designed and put forward. *Intercultural Literature in Portugal 1930-2000: a Critical Bibliography* [henceforward referred to as Intercultural Literature] is a joint venture of CECC (Research Centre for Communication and Culture) and ULICES (University of Lisbon Centre for English Studies) and lead to the creation of an online database of Portuguese-language translations of literature published in book form in Portugal between 1930 and 2000. This time span covers the period left out by Gonçalves Rodrigues' seminal work — *A tradução em Portugal* [*Translation in Portugal*], a catalogue of translations into European Portuguese published between 1495 and 1930.

The conceptual and methodological choices put forward in this project are presented on the project website (www.translatedliteratureportugal.org/eng). Here we will be focusing mainly on three sections therein: *a*) "Description of the project" (which contains a list of nine steps followed by the research team in the designing of the project as well as the actual putting together of the bibliography; *b*) "Key concepts and sources" (which discusses the project's theoretical framework and the bibliography; and *c*) "Checking data" (which discusses the methodological framework of the project).

As the webpage informs, the first step in the development of Intercultural Literature consisted of "[an] initial reflection about the concepts of translation and literature." To tackle the complex task of adopting an operative definition of both literature and translation, project coordinators chose to privilege the social and intersubjective notions of these complex concepts:

> For one, translation is a problematic concept, which lacks consensual definition. In the field of literary translation, we find works labelled as "versions", "free versions", "adaptations" etc., as well as (many) cases of ITr, and, above all, pseudotranslation or fictitious translations — that is, texts that are presented as translations but which do not have any original behind them. This research project, which was inspired by the work of Israeli professor and researcher and internationally recognized pioneer of Descriptive Translation Studies, Gideon

> Toury (1942-2016), uses the concept of "assumed translations"; that is to say, it considers translations to be any literary works that were introduced into the Portuguese market as translations and are thus **considered to be such by readers**. (CECC and CEAUL 2010, emphasis added)

It goes without saying that the adoption of such functional concept of translation in the Intercultural Literature project — a translation is what readers consider as a translation — depends on the existence of a generalized awareness of the existence of a particular literary object called translation. And this holds true, even if the majority of readers remains ignorant of what translating a foreign literary text actually entails.

Pseudotranslation is here a telling case in point. Such literary ruse stems from an exploitation of the readers' shared knowledge and ignorance vis-à-vis translation. Specifically, readers display both a solid awareness of what a translation looks like and, at the same time, a disregard for the process by which a translation (any translation) comes into being. This argument brings us close to Ferreira Duarte's work on the importance of trust in translators, literary agents and training institutions (rather than any knowledge of translation *per se* form the part of the consumers) for the functioning of translation.

> [What makes translation possible?] Rather, my question takes translation to be, first and foremost, a social fact, involving production, transmission and consumption under specific circumstances and by specific agents. It could thus be more precisely and extensively rephrased as follows: translation is part of our daily lives; we are unable to imagine the world as we know it properly functioning in the absence of translations, yet the exact nature of the relationship between source text and target text appears to be opaque, even mysterious. (Duarte 2012: 19)

Moving back to the consideration of how this argument informs the theoretical framework of Intercultural Literature, it becomes clear that this historical project, which aims at exploring the initial question 'quid?' in Translation History, rely on the existence of a describable collective pact on what is considered as a translation in society. This collective pact, based on the belief that any target text renders its source text in an accurate and faithful manner is what, according to Ferreira Duarte, makes translation possible.

The methodology adopted within Intercultural Literature was, logically, informed by this project's conceptual framework, particularly, the concept of translation discussed above. With the aim of exploring what has been translated into Portuguese between 1930 and 2000, the research team has taken the following steps: "creation of preliminary lists of literary texts translated into

Portuguese and published in book form in Portugal; location of each volume in order to check the data, correct it and/or add to the record" (CECC and CEAUL 2010). Hence, a first step consisted of putting together a preliminary list of translated items from catalogues. The different entries in this list would be/were afterwards revised, corrected and/or completed by the examination of the actual volumes. About this examination, the section "Checking data" clarifies: "All volumes of translation recorded in this database were consulted physically. These then became the **definite** sources for the data supplied (as regards dates, titles, etc." (CECC and CEAUL 2010, emphasis added).

From the above, it becomes clear that data collecting within the framework of Intercultural Literature relies on the examination of paratexts, including both epitexts (paratextual information which accompany the literary text from a distance, such as catalogues) and peritexts (paratextual information which shares the space of the volume with the literary text, such as dates and titles on the cover, etc.) (Genette 1991).

In order to understand how this methodology is in line with the concept of translation adopted within the Intercultural Literature project — a translation is a literary text the readers consider as a translation — it is beneficial to import João Ferreira Duarte's reading of Gideon Toury in the previously cited article. To explore the way how a literary object is considered as a translation by readers who lack knowledge about the process behind translation, Ferreira Duarte argues:

> In his book, *Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond*, Gideon Toury pointed out that 'when a text is offered as a translation, it is quite readily accepted bona fide as one, no further questions asked. (26) From the ordinary reader's point of view, this may sound trivial, like stating the obvious [...]. (Duarte 2012: 20)

The way a literary text is offered as a translation for lay readers is through paratext. Traditionally, a target text is firstly presented as a translation in its peritext and this peritextual information is, then, retrieved in different epitexts.

Last but not least, it should be rendered explicit that the inference of the role played by paratexts in the social functioning of translation informed the methodology of research projects in Translation History other than Intercultural Literature. For instance, Pym (1998) suggests a working definition aimed at assisting the researcher to classify cultural objects as translations. As it is clear by the following quotation, this working definition is based on the examination of target texts' paratexts: "[if] a paratext allows different discursive slots for an author and a translator, then the text may be said to be a translation" (Pym 1998: 62).

2.2. The 'quid' question viewed through the lens of indirect translation research

Shifting our attention back to the history of ITr research, the following arguments will be discussed in the remainder of this section:

(i) Due to the marginalization of translations by national(istic) historiography, projects in Translation History must begin by exploring from scratch the 'quid?' question, which is to say, they have to seek to delineate a comprehensive panorama of what was translated and what was not in a given context.

(ii) Research projects in Translation History, such as Intercultural Literature or Pym (1998), tend to adopt a functional concept of translation which stems from the existence of both a generalized awareness of what a translation product or object is and readers' disregard for all elements, stages or materials that take part in the process of translation.

(iii) Following (i) and (ii), collecting data so as to explore the 'quid?' relies mainly on the examination of paratexts, since it is through paratextual presentation that the translation pact is activated.

The above argument for the primary status of the 'quid?' question in Translation History research is relevant for the evaluation of the history of ITr research, because it paves the way to understand why ITr history is still a dream far from coming true. In other words (and leaning onto Teresa Seruya's example), if every research project in Translation History should begin by examining what has been translated and what has not, history of ITr should begin with the construction of database of what has been indirectly translated and what has not. And this will be impossible until a consensual operative definition of ITr is reached.

In other words, researchers still lack a definition that may serve the primary research task of identifying an ITr, namely, vis-à-vis non-ITrs (be it a direct translation or other non-ITr types). Every definition that is put forward for ITr either expands the notion to a point where it coincides with translation *tout court* or it limits ITr to very specific text types thus leaving out neighboring phenomena.

Let us read one the most quoted definitions of ITr so as to assess the questions that it raises and the limits it imposes. Kittel and Frank (1991: 3) defined ITr as "[a translation] based on a source (or sources) which is itself a translation into a language other than the language of the original, or the target language." Immediate questions pop up into our minds that have to do

with this tripartite definition of ITr: at least three (even though there can be more) texts (two translated and one original) and at least three languages (it is unclear whether or not there can be more). Regarding the number of texts, do these include translation drafts or is it mandatory that these three (or more) texts are published? As to the notion of 'sources', if ITr is based on one or several (translated) sources, does this mean that direct translations have only one source which is the 'original'? What about the sources used in the production of that 'original'? Concerning languages, when is it safe to state that a language is other than the language of the original and that of the target text? Is a tripartite translation Middle English — Modern English — Portuguese an ITr? And how to deal with the fact that Jack Kerouac's *On the Road* opening lines were originally written in (Québécois) French and, afterwards, self-translated into English and that it was the (complete) English text that was translated as the original? Does this make Margarida Vale de Gato, who recently translated Kerouac's book into European Portuguese from English, an indirect translator (so a relay taker)?

Questions and borderline cases abound, due to the complexity of the concept of ITr. At the same time, it could be argued that the concept of translation is equally challenging and that this did not prevent historical research projects, like Intercultural Literature, to come forward and build a catalogue of translations published in book form in Portugal. As previously said, this project adopted a functional concept of translation: a translation is what readers consider to be a translation.

However, it is still unclear whether or not readers are aware of the existence of a particular type of translation called ITr. Even though we do not yet have data to confirm our suspicion, we are convinced that ITr remains unknown for the majority of literary consumers outside academia. And the reasons for this suspicion are twofold. On the one hand, in different disseminating activities led under the IndirecTrans project, we were able to begin assessing (rather randomly), the information and/or preconceived ideas readers shared about ITr. For example, in 2015 the IndirecTrans project was invited to take part in the literary seminar *Entrelinhas*, organized by the association Youth4Tomorrow. When asked about what ITr was and what it entailed in terms of faithfulness to the original work, the audience, composed mainly of young students interested in literature, provided two types of answers. The majority of the public had never heard of ITr and did not know what it consisted of. One (older) reader who presented herself as a Murakami's enthusiast, was aware that Murakami's novels had been translated into Portuguese *via* English and considered this fact of "no importance".

On the other hand, and more importantly, Ferreira Duarte's description of the functioning of the collective pact that enables translation suggests that

lay readers are most probably not aware of ITr. As mentioned before, Ferreira Duarte argues that readers trust all literary translations to offer a transparent equivalent of the original piece. This is what sustains the collective illusion that reading a translation is reading the exact text the original author would have written if he had written his/her work in the target language. What is more, this trust both depends on and leads to a concealment of the mediating process that bridges between the author of the original and the reader of the translation. The anecdotical example Ferreira Duarte gives is telling: "I am reading Pamuk, so I say, but not a single word that I am reading was written by him" (2012: 21). This sentence denotes readers' disregard for all processual elements translating a foreign text entails, which includes the use of one or many sources. At the same time, if readers trust that an English or a Portuguese translation of a Pamuk's novel offers the experience of reading Pamuk's writing in English or in Portuguese, then translating directly or indirectly may be, indeed, 'of no importance'.

Our argument should begin to be clearer by now. It is our contention that a comprehensive catalogue of ITrs in Portugal, which would constitute the necessary first step in the writing of a history of ITr in Portugal, is currently not feasible due to the lack of an established consensual definition of ITr. While translation history projects, e.g. Intercultural Literature, have the choice of adopting a functional concept of translation, generalized social construct of what ITr is for/according to readers seems to be non-existent.

To make matters worse, not only the theoretical framework adopted within Intercultural Literature project is not fitted to our object of inquiry, but also methodological choices for collecting and checking data cannot be imported from this project or the one developed by Pym (1998). This is due to the fact that the indirectness of literary exchanges is frequently omitted or covert by the paratextual apparatus of the target text. This fact, according to Ringmar , hinders the possibilities of using paratexts as the main source of information in the research on history of ITr:

> The fact that a book has been indirectly translated cannot always be easily arrived at. The information in catalogues and bibliographies is mostly based on paratexts on title-pages and is consequently as reliable as its sources, which means that it is not always to be trusted. (Ringmar 2007: 7)

All this is means that one cannot fully answer other historical questions outlined below without first tackling the 'quid' query. It also explains why despite years of collective efforts, the writing of a history of ITr research is still in its early stages.

3. *Quis?*

The 'quis' question relates to those doing research on ITr. Pięta's (2017: 200) bibliometric research covering scientific publications specifically dedicated to ITr shows that the overwhelming majority of authors are represented by just one publication and that only very recently (from the late 2000s onwards) a few researchers here and there started to give a certain degree of priority to ITr in their research agenda. Differently put, it seems safe to suggest that from the standpoint of scholarly commitment, ITr had traditionally been an incidental field of study, into which authors had occasional forays, typically within their wider areas of specialization. Pięta (*ibidem*: 200) also shows that the overwhelming majority of publications are one-author publications, which may suggest that team efforts are very few and far between. Finally, MA and PhD theses on ITr seem to be becoming more common, thus supporting the characterisation of ITr as an emerging research trend: scholars seem to be increasingly embarking on large scale projects, and more early-stage researchers appear to have found an interest in this niche topic (witness, e.g., the QuantiQual project recently launched at the Trinity College Dublin and Dublin City University; or Cheng Guanyu's ongoing doctoral project about Portuguese ITrs from Chinese, developed at Universidade Católica Portuguesa).

More in-depth studies are clearly needed to allow for the evolving profile of ITr researchers to be fully understood. For example, new techniques such as online surveys, interviews, web logs and the like may become equally instrumental in describing the role specific scholars have played in the evolution of this subfield of research. What is more, a bibliometric study on keywords used in publications on ITr could also be useful in checking which wider areas of specialization lead to scientific interest in the practice discussed here.

4. *Quibus auxiliis?*

The 'quibus auxiliis' question encourages us to look more closely at various types of instances that offer various forms of support to ITr research, as well as at the various effects of such support. One way of answering this question could consist in exploring which theoretical and/or methodological framework provides a fruitful ground for scholarly enquiries into ITr. An answer to this question is far from simple but could certainly include the target-oriented frame of reference for the study of translation, as it makes it more than legitimate to engage in Translation Studies without the existence not only of a mediating

text, but also of a source text (e.g. the already mentioned pseudotranslation) or a target text (e.g. non-translation).

Another way of addressing the 'quibus auxiliis' query involves looking into the evolution of more or less formal network structures existing between ITr researchers, their institutions and funding bodies. It would be particularly relevant to see to what extent and how exactly these structures condition the generation of new knowledge on ITr and the securing of funding for dedicated research.

5. *Cur?*

To raise the 'cur' question about ITr research implies the search for the conditions under which a given type or angle of research happened to develop and eventually become successful. For instance, it may be interesting to enquire into why research on ITr has focused mainly on literature (and, to a lesser extent, interpreting) rather than other text types (e.g. scientific, technical, religious, machine, audiovisual, community — to name but a few domains where indirect translation is far from rare). It may also seem productive to verify why ITr researchers whose research focuses on central languages are hardly ever interested in the mediating role of these languages. Witness, for instance, the somewhat surprising lack of systematic research by German scholars on the mediating role of Middle Low German in the Hanseatic League, roughly 14th - 17th centuries.

The 'cur' question may also explore reasons why ITr has never been a hot topic in translation research. Perhaps the most frequent justification for this is that ITr is heavily loaded with pejorative connotations, in that it reportedly leads to poor results (Dollerup 2014; Landers 2001; Ringmar 2012; Sin-Way 2004; St. André 2009). As stressed in Pięta (2019), although definitely significant, this justification cannot have been absolutely determining: various professional and scientific contexts show that a practice does not need to provoke positive connotations to be amply researched (e. g., a translation has low symbolic capital when compared to an original text, but this has not prevented translation from becoming the object of research in what is now a successful scientific discipline, cf. Maia, Pinto, and Pinto 2014a, 320). Another, according to Pięta (2019) far more determining justification, has to do with the fact that translation research in general has been influenced by reductionist, or even imperialistic approaches (Cronin forthcoming). It mostly concerns translations between the so-called (hyper)central (Heilbron 1999) languages, while ITr is typically studied in

relation to peripheral languages (*ibidem*); that is, a much less commonly studied linguistic combination.

6. *Quomodo?*

The 'quomodo' question provides an excellent opportunity to look into how exactly researchers in different branches of Translation Studies have studied ITr. One way of approaching this question is to focus on methods used in the identification of intervening languages and texts or, to put it differently, in diachronic reconstructions of where specific ITrs really come from. At a core, all these methods aim to overcome obstacles like:

(i) the uniformity of textual-linguistic make-up of translations from different languages (Toury 1995);
(ii) the fact that translators, interpreters and other translation agents tend to be reluctant to let researchers look over their shoulders and monitor their work procedures (for psychological, commercial, institutional or other reasons);
(iii) the fact that for older texts, and often even for more recent ones, the basic documentation (drafts, templates, working notes, manuscripts, etc.) is simply not available;
(iv) the fact that databases and bibliographies of translations are often unreliable in that they camouflage the indirectness of translations (Ivaska and Huuhtanen forthcoming).

One noteworthy conclusion of such an approach to the 'quomodo' question is that, irrespective of the type of text (scientific, literary, etc.), product-oriented methods (e.g., frame analysis, discourse analysis, corpus comparison, recourse to stylometry or linguistic forensics) have by and large proven insufficient and are now increasingly combined with process- and/or participant-oriented approaches (such as eye-tracking, keystroke logging, interviews, non-participant observations).

7. *Cui bono?*

The 'cui bono' query invites us to consider the impact of translation research. Since systematic research on ITr is still relatively recent, it seems too early to pinpoint specific palpable accomplishments with this respect. It thus makes much more sense to focus on the proven potential of this research. With

this in mind, it seems particularly interesting to ponder how this still niche subfield can contribute to the development of Translation Studies in general.

First, as mentioned in Maia, Pięta and Assis Rosa (2018), while looking into the complex source-mediating-target text/language/culture situations, ITr research stresses the complex tripartite nature of many translation processes (Ivaska and Huuhtanen forthcoming), thus debunking the binary relationship between source text and target text that underpins the Western notion of translation (Delabastita 2008: 239).

Second, since ITr research inquiries into issues like the probabilistic genealogies of texts, the circulation of texts and ideas, power struggles among dominant and dominated cultures and groups, or the implications of central language/culture mediation (to mention just a few key issues, Assis Rosa, Pięta, and Bueno Maia 2019), it may lead to a stimulating interaction with other disciplines that are also interested in these matters.

Third, by doing all this, ITr research could also help in mitigating the cultural and linguistic imbalance of Translation Studies discipline, where niche, globally peripheral spaces are said to rarely generate new theoretical insights and are rather limited to testing theories generated by central, mainstream zones (Chang 2018). Last but not least, research on ITr may add a new twist to Translation Studies debates related to some of the main concerns of the world we live in — such as language domination, migration crisis — as they often imply or employ ITr (Pięta 2019).

What is more, as translators are assumed to be among those who benefit most from translation research, one could also try to explore how research on ITr can enrich translator training. For instance, as suggested by Maia, Pięta, and Assis Rosa (2018); Maia, Pięta, and Torres Simón 2018; and Pięta, Maia, and Torres Simón (2019), ITr may prove to be a powerful pedagogical tool in the increasingly common multi and/or plurilingual translation classrooms, where the teacher wants to make full use of the linguistic diversity (e.g., Multilingual Translation Workshops). It may also be beneficial to translators who are already in the market, work with languages of lower diffusion and want to refresh their skills (e.g., video game localisers, subtitlers, audiovisual translators or translators working in international organizations). Even more importantly, research on ITr can provide useful insights for translators producing mediating texts, whose copyrights are more often than not disregarded by subsequent translators and/or the publishers they work with, as they are not credited nor paid for the use of their translated versions (as implied by Maia's ongoing research).

There are questions galore. It is therefore urgent that research — hopefully also the one developed in Professor Teresa Seruya's home universities (i.e., University of Lisbon and Universidade Católica Portuguesa), building on her scientific legacy — will yield quality answers.

References

Assis Rosa, Alexandra, Hanna Pięta, and Rita Bueno Maia. 2017. "Theoretical, Methodological and Terminological Issues Regarding Indirect Translation: An Overview." *Translation Studies* 10 (2): 113-132.

Assis Rosa, Alexandra, Hanna Pięta, and Rita Bueno Maia, eds. 2019. *Indirect Translation: Theoretical, Methodological and Terminological Issues*. London: Routledge.

Bassnett-McGuire, Susan, and André Lefevere. 1990. *Translation, history and culture*. London: Pinter.

CECC and CEAUL. 2010. "Intercultural Literature in Portugal 1930- 2000: A Critical Bibliography." Accessed January 2016. http://www.translatedliteratureportugal.org.

Chang, Nam Fung. 2018. "Voices from the periphery: further reflections on relativism in translation studies." *Perspectives* 26 (4): 463-477. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2018.1443731.

Chesterman, Andrew. 2017. *Reflections on Translation Theory: Selected Papers 1993-2014*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Cronin, Michael. submitted. "Interview by Rita Bueno Maia."

D'hulst, Lieven. 2010. "Translation history." In *Handbook of Translation Studies* vol. 1, edited by Yves Gambier and Luc Van Doorslaer, 397-405. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Delabastita, Dirk. 2008. "Status, origin, features: Translation and beyond." In *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies. Investigations in homage to Gideon Toury*, edited by Anthony Pym, Miriam Shlesinger and Daniel Simeoni, 233-247. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Dollerup, Cay. 2014. "Relay in Translation." In *Cross-linguistic Interaction: Translation, Contrastive and Cognitive Studies*, edited by Diana Yankova, 21-32. Sofia: St. Kliminent Ohridski University Press. Original edition, http://cay-dollerup. dk/publications.asp.

Duarte, João Ferreira. 2012. "Trusting translation." *Anglo-Saxonica, III Série* 3: 17-38.

Francozi, Roberto. 2012. "On quantitative narrative analysis." In *Variety of narrative analysis*, edited by J. A. Holstein and J. F. Gubrium. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Gambier, Yves. 1994. "La retraduction, retour et détour." *Meta: Journal des traducteurs* 39 (3): 413-417. https://doi.org/10.7202/002799ar.

Genette, Gérard. 1991. "Introduction to the Paratext." *New Literary History* 22 (2): 261-272. https://doi.org/10.2307/469037.

Heilbron, Johan. 1999. "Towards a Sociology of Translation: Book Translations as a Cultural World-System." *European Journal of Social Theory* 2 (4): 429-444. https://doi.org/10.1177/136843199002004002.

Ivaska, Laura, and Suvi Huuhtanen. forthcoming. "Beware the source text: Five (re)translations of the same work, but from different source texts."

Kittel, Harald, and Armin Paul Frank. 1991. *Interculturality and the historical study of literary translations*. Vol. Bd 4. *Göttinger Beiträge zur internationalen Übersetzungsforschung*. Berlin: E. Schmidt.

Landers, Clifford E. 2001. "Indirect Translation." In *Literary Translation: A Practical Guide*, 130-131. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Lopes, Alexandra. 2010. "Poéticas da Imperfeição. Autores e tradautores na primeira metade de Oitocentos: Walter Scott e André Joaquim Ramalho e Sousa." Unpublished PhD Thesis, Universidade Católica Portuguesa.

Maia, Rita Bueno, Hanna Pięta, and Alexandra Assis Rosa. 2018. "Unleashing the potential of indirect translation." International Conference "CETRA Publishing in Translation Studies", Antwerp.

Maia, Rita Bueno, Hanna Pięta, and Ester Torres Simón. 2018. "Bringing indirect translation into translation curriculum." Salamanca, November.

Maia, Rita Bueno, Marta Pacheco Pinto, and Sara Ramos Pinto, eds. 2014a. *How Peripheral Is the Periphery?* Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars.

Maia, Rita Bueno, Marta Pacheco Pinto, and Sara Ramos Pinto, eds. 2014b. "Introduction: Portugal and Translation between Centre and Periphery." In *How Peripheral is the Periphery: Translating Portugal Back and Forth: Essays in Honour of João Ferreira Duarte*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars.

Moniz, Maria Lin. 2006. "Das Narrativas da Grande Guerra em Traduções Portuguesas". Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Lisbon.

Pięta, Hanna. 2013. "Entre Periferias: Contributo para a história externa da tradução da literatura polaca em Portugal (1855-2010)." Unpulished PhD thesis, Univ. Lisbon. http://repositorio.ul.pt/handle/10451/9763.

Pięta, Hanna. 2014. "What Do (We Think) We Know about Indirectness in Literary Translation? A Tentative Review of the State-of-the-art and Possible Research Avenues." In *Traducció indirecta en la literature catalana*, edited by Ivan Garcia Sala, Diana Sanz Roig and Bożena Zaboklicka, 15-34. Lleida: Punctum.

Pięta, Hanna. 2017. "Theoretical, methodological and terminological issues in researching indirect translation: A critical annotated bibliography." *Translation Studies* 10 (2): 198-216.

Pięta, Hanna. 2019. "Indirect translation: Main trends in practice and research." *Slovo.ru: baltijskij accent*. 10 (1): 21. https://journals.kantiana.ru/upload/iblock/324/4-Пиета_21-36.pdf.

Pięta, Hanna, Rita Bueno Maia, and Ester Torres Simón. 2019. "Translating for/from translation, reducing inequalities." Ciência 2019, Lisbon, July.

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

Ringmar, Martin. 2007. "Roundabout Routes: Some Remarks on Indirect Translations." *Selected Papers of the CETRA Research Seminar in Translation Studies 2006*, edited by Francis Mus. Leuven: CETRA. http://www.arts.kuleuven.be/cetra/papers/files/ringmar.pdf.

Ringmar, Martin. 2012. "Relay Translation." In *Handbook of Translation Studies*, edited by Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer, 141-144. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Seruya, Teresa. 2018. *Misérias e esplendores da tradução no Portugal do Estado Novo*. Lisboa: Universidade Católica Editora.

Sin-Way, Chan. 2004. "Indirect Translation." In *A Dictionary of Translation Technology*. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.

Špirk, Jaroslav. 2011. "Ideology, Censorship, Indirect Translations and Non-translation: Czech Literature in 20th Century Portugal." Unpublished PhD thesis, Univerzita Karlova.

St. André, James. 2009. "Relay." In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies,* 2nd ed., edited by Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha, 230-232. London: Routledge.

Swiatkiewicz, Teresa. 2017. "Normas, estratégias e técnicas na tradução literária direta do polaco para o português europeu (1990-2010)." University of Lisbon.

Toury, Gideon. 1995. "A Lesson from Indirect Translation." In *Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond*, 129-146. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility*.