Applied Linguistics 2020: 41/1: 10–29
doi:10.1093/applin/amz007 Advance Access published on 28 February 2019

Translation as a Prime Player in Intercultural Communication

*JULIANE HOUSE

Hamburg University
*E-mail: jhouse@fastmail.fm

TRANSLATION AND INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION

Translation has existed as a mediating practice since earliest times. Translation is both an interlingual and an intercultural process and a product of mediation. It facilitates intercultural communication between individuals or groups who do not share, or do not choose to use the same language(s). Translation can be seen as a replacement of something that pre-existed it, such that ideas are always represented in a translation at second hand, so to speak. Translation is then often described as merely something that is 'second best', never the real thing, often leading to distortions and losses of the original text's 'meaning'. In general, we can say that translation is a secondary communicative event. As a rule, communicative events happen once. In translation, they are repeated for persons otherwise prevented from appreciating the original communicative event. Therefore, translation fulfils an important service mediating between different languages and helping to overcome linguistic and cultural barriers.

For the purpose of this article, intercultural communication is defined as communication between members of different cultures with their presumably differing socio-cultural rules for behaviour. Intercultural communication research has in the past often examined intercultural communicative failure. The reasons for this failure were often related to cultural differences in terms of values, beliefs, and behaviours (cf. e.g. Gumperz 1982; Thomas 1983; Tannen 1986; Blum-Kulka *et al.* 1989; Scollon and Scollon 1994; Spencer-Oatey 2000)

At present, the focus of interest seems to have moved to how members of different linguacultures go about achieving intercultural understanding (cf. e.g. Sarangi 1994; Bührig and ten Thije 2006). Intercultural understanding is important for a crucial concept in translation theory: functional equivalence. This type of equivalence is essential for a translated text to embody a function which is comparable to the function the original text has (had) in another linguacultural context. We will look in more detail below at how translation and intercultural communication are related and at their common concern with intercultural understanding.

THEORIZING TRANSLATION AS COMMUNICATION ACROSS LANGUAGES AND CULTURES

Culture has long been regarded as closely connected with language in use. Prague school linguists, Hallidayan functional-systemic scholars as well as sociolinguists, discourse analysts, and pragmaticians have looked at language as a primarily socio-cultural phenomenon. In these approaches, language is regarded as inextricably linked with culture such that the meaning of any linguistic item can only be properly understood when the socio-cultural context enveloping it is considered.

Culture is today often seen as something one *does* as opposed to something that one *has* (Piller 2012: 15), and culture is 'a verb' (Street 1993). The idea of culture as practice and as constructed is very different from regarding culture as a fixed system of symbols and meanings (Dervin 2011), and it is often related to power and domination (cf. Kubota 2012). Similarly, Clifford (1988: 274) has suggested that, following Foucault, culture might be regarded as powerful discursive formations globally and strategically deployed.

And there is also another level to culture: the level of imagination through language, because language, as Kramsch has suggested, 'is intimately linked not only to the culture that is, and the culture that was, but also to the culture of the imagination that governs people's decisions and actions far more than we may think' (Kramsch 1898: 8).

Culture as a concept allows us to understand how people manage to make sense of their lives, and such sense-making needs to be understood, as Pennycook remarks, 'in terms of productive signifying practices that are organized in various conventionalized ways' (Pennycook 2017: 66). With regard to conventionalization, it is important to bear in mind that judgments of 'conventionalisation in actual spontaneous communicative acts on which people rely, are themselves intuitive and comparative rather than consciously calculated and absolute' (Bond *et al.* 2000: 69).

One approach that seems to have high explanatory value for providing an answer to the age-old issue of generalization versus individualization of cultures is the one put forward by Sperber (1996). In his view culture consists of different types of 'representations', first of all in the form of individual 'mental

representations'. Some of these mental representations are expressed in language by individuals, such that they then turn into 'public representations' which can be talked about with other members of a social group, the result being similar mental representations in others. Whenever certain public representations are expressed often enough in a social group, they tend to become firmly entrenched in that group and eventually turn into 'cultural representations'.

A similar conception of 'culture' as an abstract representation is also reflected in the following statement by Baumann: 'Culture can thus not be regarded as ''a real thing,'' but an abstract and purely analytical notion. It does not cause behaviour, but summarizes an abstraction from it, and is thus neither normative nor prescriptive' (Baumann 1996: 11).

Individual members of any culture are continuously influenced by their society's public and cultural representations (with regard to values, norms, traditions) through the medium of language. Language is therefore the most important part of culture. But language is also an instrument used by its speakers to categorize their cultural experience, thinking, and behaviour. Language and culture are therefore closely connected on the levels of semantics, where a language's vocabulary is a reflection of its speakers' shared culture.

Given today's increasing flows of migration, it is clearly necessary to abandon the idea of any stable socio-cultural group immune to outside influences and internal upheaval. Linking 'culture' to a concept such as 'discourse' is one way of minimizing the risk of ethnic and national stereotyping because the focus in a discourse-related approach is on social groups that enact patterned, cohesive, varied, negotiable, and ever-changing verbal actions (cf. the critical account of discourse by Blommaert 2005, 2012; Piller 2012).

In view of the current doubts about any 'essentialist' conception of culture, it may be advisable to look at culture as a highly diversified entity that is dynamic, fluid, and hybrid with cultural borders being increasingly difficult to determine in a globalized world. So the assumption of smaller units than 'culture' such as for example 'small cultures' (Holliday 1999, 2012) and 'Communities of Practice' (Wenger 1989) as well as considerations of cultures as being characterized by 'superdiversity' (Blommaert 2013) may be more realistic and useful today.

As this brief review has shown, there are many different views of culture. For my concerns here with translation as a prime player in intercultural communication, I define culture as the way of life in a certain linguaculture embodying values, preferences, and expectations that are salient in a given context.

Context is also a critical notion in translation (see here House 2018) such that translation can be considered to be an act of re-contextualization. And, as mentioned above, translation can also be regarded as a particular kind of intercultural communication (often, though not always) aimed at achieving intercultural understanding, with intercultural understanding being closely related to a central concept in translation theory: functional equivalence.

I define the function of a text as the application of the text in a particular situational context (cf. Lyons 1969). Functional equivalence is achieved when a translation is designed to have a function in the new, or 'target' cultural context—a function that is comparable to the function its original text has in its lingua-cultural context.

The connection between functional equivalence (crucial for translation) and intercultural understanding (crucial in intercultural communication) becomes clear when we relate it to notion of the 'dilated speech situation' (Ehlich 1984) holding in any act of writing and translating. Texts function as agents for transmitting information thus 'building bridges' between speakers and hearers who are not at the same place at the same time. Through such an act of 'transmission' by a text, the original speech situation becomes 'dilated'. But in translation we not only find a dilated speech situation, we are additionally confronted with a 'rupture' of the original speech situation resulting from the linguistic-cultural barrier between speaker (member of linguaculture (1) and hearer (member of linguaculture (2) that needs to be bridged by translation. Another important feature of translation is that it is a much more reflective action compared to 'normal' monolingual communicative actions. Reflection is here necessary for the translator to achieve functional equivalence of the translated text. Because of its inherent reflective nature, translation is optimally geared towards establishing intercultural communication and intercultural understanding.

In translation, intercultural understanding can be achieved along two very different recontextualization paths**: overt** and **covert** translation (House 1977, 1997, 2015). These types of translation resemble Schleiermacher's (1813) suggestion of a basic difference between what he called 'verfremdende' (alienating) and 'einbürgernde' (integrative) translation'. Similar terms have been used by several translation scholars over the years. Since the present author has been specifically asked by the editors of this special issue to introduce her own terms 'overt' and 'covert' translation in order to provide some sort of common nomenclature for all the articles in this issue, they will here be used. It is also a fact that most translation scholars have accepted these terms as belonging to the repertoire of important concepts in translation theory, witness their inclusion in many translation related encyclopedias and dictionaries.

As the very name suggests, an **overt** translation is overtly recognizable as a translation, that is, it is not a text that impersonates a second original. This means that the addressees in the target linguaculture tend to know quite well that they themselves are NOT the ones addressed by the translated text. Original texts that need to be translated overtly are in some way important in the original linguaculture. They are often literary texts and as such reflect a particular historical, geographical or social variety of the linguaculture in which they are embedded. Texts produced by well-known persons at a particular place and time in the source linguaculture, such as speeches delivered in front of members of a particular group also call for an overt translation. An example is a speech given by Winston Churchill on 5 December 1942 to the

people of Bradford from the steps of the Town Hall. When this speech was later translated into German, it was translated overtly, that is, as closely resembling the original as possible, with no changes made by the translator. The German readers know what they read is a translation, and they know that they are not the original addressees.

An overt translation is at the same time a target culture event, and it sets up connections to its original text. We can therefore say that overt translations are cases of 'language mention' resembling quotations. Because of their very nature, overt translations are on principle unable to reach proper functional equivalence. Rather, the type of equivalence achievable is somewhat 'removed'. It merely aims at giving target readers access to the function the original has in its original discourse world and frame. This access is provided by a target language text, which operates in its own frame and discourse world. So we have here a co-activation of original and target discourse worlds and frames enabling readers of the translation to appreciate the function of the original text, but of course at a linguacultural distance. Overt translations can be characterized as embodying genuine cultural transfer in the sense of Weinreich (1953). They result from linguacultural contact situations and often show deviations from target linguacultural norms caused by interference from source linguacultural norms. In overt translations, such interference is therefore often noticeable as a (deliberately) jarring difference (in Benjamin's 1972 sense).

Covert translations are completely different. They act like original texts in the target linguaculture. They are often not recognizable as translations, that is, they may well have been produced as original texts. The source texts of covert translations are not particularly culture-specific, rather they are potentially of equal concern for members of different linguacultures. Text types such as instructions, commercial circulars, advertisements, and other 'pragmatic texts' such as journalistic and scientific texts normally call for a covert translation. Covert translations tend to present more delicate cultural translation problems than overt translation because the translator needs to consider potentially differing presuppositions in the old and the new context in order to meet the needs of the new addressees in their linguacultural context.

In covert translation an equivalent speech event needs to be created. The translator has to reproduce in her translation the function which the original has had in its linguacultural context. This means that in covert translation, unlike its overt *pendant*, genuine functional equivalence is the goal. As opposed to overt translations which co-activate the discourse world in which the source text unfolded, covert translations are meant to function explicitly and exclusively in the new target context. Due to this unidirectionality, covert translations can be said to be psycholinguistically less complex than overt translation, but they are at the same time more deceptive. Covert translations frequently embody real cultural distance from their source texts, because the translator hides the fact that his product comes from somewhere else. Because genuine functional equivalence is to be achieved in covert translation, often drastic changes on various linguistic levels are undertaken, such that the translation

often appears as a completely different text. This is why covert translations are often received like original texts. Examples of covert translations are translations of advertisements whose function it is to appeal to the target addressees in the same way as the original advertisements appealed to the original addressees, making both keen to buy the products advertised. Consider an original advertisement for Coca-Cola that effectively stresses the coldness of the drink in a perpetually hot context, whereas its covert translation would emphasize the fact that the drink is refreshing in a more heat-neutral environment.

In covert translation it is necessary for the translator to adapt her translation to the (assumed) expectations of her envisaged addressees. To do this, the translator will use what House (1977) has called a **cultural filter**. In employing such a filter, the translator takes into account culture-specific target norms such as conventions of text production and communicative preferences in certain genres. A cultural filter is an instrument which the translat*or* uses in order to compensate for a source text's inherent culture specificity. In the next section we will take a closer look at an example of a cultural filter.

The nature of the 'cultural filter' in covert translation

House (1977) conducted a series of analyses on the basis of a corpus of original texts and their translations involving the languages English and German. On the basis of this empirical work, House discovered that some of the translated texts she had analysed were apparently needlessly different from their originals, that is, the translations evidently did not present problems caused by typological differences between the source and the target languages, Rather, they seemed to have been a matter of choice on the part of the translators who had viewed the source texts, as it were, through the glasses of members of the target linguaculture. In these cases, the translators took account of relevant cultural presuppositions in the two linguacultures in their translations so as to meet the expectations of target culture's addressees, and to achieve an effect equivalent to the one the original had had in its linguacultural environment. Differently put, in order to achieve functional equivalence between the original and the translation, the translator used a cultural filter. The employment of such a filter should ideally not be left entirely to the individual translators' intuition, rather it should be based on existent empirical cross-cultural research. The next section provides an example of such research (see also House 2006 a,b).

Examples of a 'cultural filter'

A series of German-English contrastive pragmatic analyses conducted by the present author over several decades from the1980s to the 2000s may serve as an example of the type of empirical work necessary to substantiate the

construct of a cultural filter for a given language pair. Anglophone and German speakers in various professional contexts and genres were compared. The data consisted of role-plays, discourse completion tests, naturalistic interactions between German and English speakers, contrastive analyses of original texts and their translations, field notes, interviews, diary studies, and the examination of relevant background documents. The analyses focused on speech acts, discourse strategies, the realization of discourse phases, pragmatic and modality markers in the two languages English and German. The results of these analyses were interpreted as providing converging evidence for a hypothesis about the general nature of German-English pragmatic-discourse differences: German subjects tend to interact in a variety of discourse types in ways that are more direct, more explicit, more self-referenced, more content-oriented, and they were found to be more likely to use fewer verbal routines than Anglophone speakers.

This pattern of German-English preferences in discursive orientations emerging from many contrastive-pragmatic analyses can be displayed along the following five dimensions:

Directness	↔	Indirectness
Orientation towards Self	↔	Orientation towards Other
Orientation towards Content	↔	Orientation towards Persons
Explicitness	↔	Implicitness
Ad-hoc-Formulation	↔	Use of Verbal Routines

German speakers were found to give preferences to positions on the left side, Anglophone speakers tended to give preference to positions on the right-hand side. The dimensions are to be understood as clines rather than dichotomies, and these clines need to be seen as reflecting tendencies rather than categorical distinctions.

German speakers often prefer a type of 'transactional' communicative style focussing on the content of a message, whereas Anglophone speakers tend to prefer an 'interactional', addressee-focussed style. Further, the hypothesis may be put forward that German speakers tend to interpret the Gricean Maxims of 'Quantity' (Make your contribution as informative as required) and Manner (Be brief) rather differently from Anglophone speakers, such that Grice's (implicit) claims of universality for these Maxims, which has been heavily attacked by Japanese scholars (cf. in particular Ide 1989), can also be relativized if we consider German discourse.

The suggested differences in discourse orientations in two linguacultures implies that language use is linked to culture and mentality, and that linguistic differences in the realization of discourse phenomena may be taken to reflect deeper differences in cultural preferences at both emotive and conceptual-cognitive levels.

The above hypothesis of intercultural German-English differences is supported by many comparable results from other contrastive German-English research in different communities of practice (see here in particular Byrnes 1986; Kotthoff 1989; Clyne 1994). The attempted generalizations can be seen as in line with work by Lakoff (1990), Slobin (1996), Gumperz (1982), and Gumperz and Levinson (1996) and others, all of whom have provided ample evidence that speech communities have developed over centuries certain preferred discourse patterns that reflect deep epistemological habitus and are highly conventionalized. For a deeper explanation of why the dimensional preferences described above have come to be operative, we need to link differences in discourse styles with a richer macro-context of historical, political, philosophical, and ideological developments, with legal systems, educational and other cultural practices in order to examine how discourse preferences derive from traditions of shared cultural experiences.

The contrastive pragmatic work referred to above started from a multitude of detailed pragma-linguistic analyses of spoken and written German and English discourse specimens and translations in both directions. These analyses led to the hypothesis of certain German and English discoursal preferences, from which House then hypothesized differences in cultural conventions thus implicitly supporting the view that language use is linked to culture and 'thinking for speaking'—a weak version of the linguistic relativity hypothesis in the sense of Slobin (1996). Tentative explanations of the roots of some of the German cultural preferences mentioned above may point, inter alia, to an educational system that has traditionally placed greater emphasis on the transmission of content than on interpersonal social skills. The result of this might be a conventionalized dispreference of 'impression management' and the particular brand of an Anglo-American 'etiquette of simulation', where rules of conventionalized verbal behaviour—'one must sound as if one meant it' when expressing concern about the other in 'How-are-you' enquiries, thanking, apologizing, complimenting, and other 'facelifts'—are implicitly passed on from generation to generation. Other sources of discourse preferences include the legal systems, that is, negotiable case law versus explicitly prefixed statutes (cf. here the brilliant analysis by Legrand 1996, who links legal systems with cultural behaviour in Anglo-Saxon and Continental European countries) and predominant ideologies, which, as van Dijk has stressed, tend to 'allow people, as group members, to organize the multitude of social beliefs. . ..and act accordingly' (1998: 8).

In what follows, two examples of translations are given to illustrate cultural filtering along the dimensions of discoursal preferences.

Two examples of the use of a cultural filter in translation

The examples are taken from a corpus of German signs and their English translations in different environments.

Example (1)

Sign at Frankfurt Airport on display at a building site; original German, English gloss here and the ensuing examples in square brackets []

> Damit die Zukunft schneller kommt! [Such that the future comes more quickly!]

vs

> We apologize for any inconvenience work on our building site is causing you!

Note the focus on content in German versus an interpersonal focus in the English translation.

Example (2)

Sign in a hotel bathroom; original German:

> Lieber Gast! Weniger Wäsche und weniger Waschmittel schützen unsere Umwelt. Bitte entscheiden Sie selbst, ob Ihre Handtücher gewaschen werden sollen. Nochmals benutzen: Handtücher bitte hängen lassen. Neue Handtücher: Handtücher auf den Boden legen. [Dear Guest! Less Laundry and less washing powder protect our environment. Please decide for yourself, whether your towels should be washed. Use again: please leave towels hanging. New towels: put towels on the floor]

vs

> Dear guests, will you please decide for yourself, whether your towels shall be washed. Use again: please leave your towels on the towel rack. Clean towels: please put your towels on the floor.

Example (2) shows that German hotel guests unlike Anglophone ones are given a general reason for the ensuing request for their decision.

Many more examples of German and English originals and translated texts in different genres are presented in House (2016) indicating cultural filtering in covert translation, all of which show how translators take account of different cultural expectation norms.

GLOBALIZATION AND TRANSLATION AS INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION

Along with growing processes of globalization in economics, science, politics, and culture, we also find a steadily rising demand for texts that are simultaneously addressed to recipients in different linguacultural contexts. Today more and more texts are needed which are either translated covertly or produced immediately as 'parallel texts' in many different languages. In these cases,

cultural filtering was routinely used. However, due to the current dominance of English as a lingua franca, a tendency to abstain from cultural filtering and veer instead towards 'culturally universal' or 'culturally neutral' texts—which in reality incorporate Anglo-American norms—has now been set into motion because it is less costly and less time-consuming to produce such uniform texts. This trend will eventually lead to a slow demise of the classic type of covert translation described above, and to the rise of an entirely new type of covert-overt translation, which results from the socio-political and cultural dominance of English as a global language. In the future, the conflict between cultural universalism/neutrality and culture specificity fuelled by demands on speedy text production by global enterprises on the one hand and local, indigenous textualization conventions on the other hand, will become ever more marked as English continues to invade domains of public life in non-Anglophone communities. While cultural filtering was common in the past, in the not too distant future a new type of culturally neutral covert-overt translation texts may well be routinely churned out as hidden carriers of Anglophone cultural norms.

The impact of English lexical items on other languages has been well-known for a long time, but its influence on other languages at the levels of pragmatics and discourse has been all but neglected. One exception is the project 'Covert Translation - Verdecktes Übersetzen' (PI Juliane House), funded by the German Science Foundation (DFG) for its 'Research Centre on Multilingualism' ('Sonderforschungsbereich Mehrsprachigkeit') at the University of Hamburg from 1999–2011. This project examined the influence of English as a global lingua franca on German, French and Spanish texts (cf. e.g. Becher *et al.* 2009; Kranich *et al.* 2012).

In this project, we assumed that due to its dominant status, English as a global language will influence other languages and eventually lead to variation and change of communicative norms not only in translations from English into German and other languages but gradually also in comparable original, non-translated texts. An adaptation to Anglophone norms will then result, with Anglophone norms 'shining through' (Teich 2003). Shining through is a cover term for various interference phenomena relating to the transmission of source language features into target texts in the process of translation. These features can either be typological features (i.e. structures not typical of the target language are taken over from the source language) or registerial features (i.e. structures or overall frequencies of constructions characteristic of a certain register in the source, but not the target language are adopted in the translated text).

Adaptation to Anglophone norms in German texts was assumed to occur along the dimensions of empirically established communicative preferences (see above). English impact on German translated and comparable original texts would be detected in quantitative and qualitative variation and change of specifiable linguistic items and structures in genres where Anglophone dominance is particularly noticeable, such as popular science and economic texts.

To test these assumptions, a multilingual special-domain corpus of roughly one million words was set up covering two time frames (1978–1982 and 1999–2002, 1999-/2006 for the economic part of the corpus) comprising some 650 English-German originals and their translations as well as a number of French and Spanish control texts. With the exception of a few studies by individual project researchers (cf. e.g. Küppers 2008; Kranich and Gonzalez Diaz 2010; Kranich 2011) which compared English, French, and Spanish data, the bulk of the project studies focused on the influence of English discourse norms on German norms.

The popular science texts amounted to some 700,000 words. They were chosen from the journals *Scientific American, New Scientist* and their daughter journals in other languages. The economic texts amounted to about 300,000 words. They were taken from annual reports published by globally operating companies, including letters to shareholders, missions and visions.

In the qualitative part of this longitudinal project, the present author's translation evaluation model (1997; 2015) was used for textual comparison and assessment. The results of these analyses clearly showed that in the English popular science and economic texts, interactions between author and reader were frequently simulated. Readers were quite often directly addressed, 'drawn into' the text, as it were, and 'invited' to identify themselves with the persons depicted in the text through various linguistic means, such as personal pronouns and mood switches from statements to commands or questions.

Here is one of the most telling examples of cultural filtering in one of the textual pairs in the popular science corpus resulting in the cancelling of the simulation of an interaction between writer and reader in the German translation:

> Example (3)
>
> English Original: Suppose YOU are a doctor in an emergency room and a patient tells YOU she was raped two hours earlier. She is afraid she may have been exposed to HIV, the virus that causes AIDS but has heard that there is a 'morning-after pill' to prevent HIV infection. Can YOU in fact do anything to block the virus from replicating and establishing infection?

This opening passage of an article on HIV-infections is translated into German for the German daughter publication *Spektrum der Wissenschaft* as follows:

German Translation: In der Notfallaufnahme eines Krankenhauses berichtet eine Patientin, sie sei vor zwei Stunden vergewaltigt worden und nun in Sorge, AIDS-Erregern ausgesetzt zu sein, sie habe gehört, es gebe eine 'Pille danach', die eine HIV-Infektion verhüte. Kann der Arzt überhaupt etwas tun, was eventuell vorhandene Viren hindern würde, sich zu vermehren und sich dauerhaft im Körper einzunisten? [In the emergency room of a hospital a

patient reports that she had been raped two hours ago and was now worrying that she had been exposed to the AIDS-Virus. She said she had heard that there was an 'After-Pill', which might prevent an HIV-infection. Can THE DOCTOR in fact do anything which might prevent potentially existing viruses from replicating and establishing themselves permanently in the body?]

This German translation is clearly culturally filtered, that is, the American English original is adapted to the expectation norms of the German target readership. Note that changes have been made in particular concerning the degree of addressee-involvement: The German reader is no longer asked to imagine herself as one of the actors in the scene narrated. Instead, the scene in the hospital is presented in the German translation as it were viewed 'from the outside', and the addressees are never asked to actively engage with what is presented to them.

In general, the German translations and comparable texts were shown in the qualitative analyses to differ in terms of the expression of what we came to call 'subjectivity' and 'addressee orientation' across the two time frames examined in the project.

In the quantitative part of the project, the results of the qualitative studies were tested highlighting preferred usage patterns of linguistic items expressing 'subjectivity' and 'addressee orientation', together with collocation and co-occurrence patterns. The linguistic means established to express 'subjectivity' and 'addressee orientation' in English and German included: expression of modality, mental processes, deixis, connective particles, mood, framing, and commenting parentheses. Given limitations of time and manpower, our work eventually focused on the use of connectivity, deixis and epistemic modality in the English originals and the German translated and original texts.

Here are some figures from the quantitative analyses of the use of the sentence initial connective markers *And* and *Und*, as well as *But* and *Aber* in our corpus across the two time frames examined. The use of these sentence-initial connectives can be interpreted as simulating an interaction between author and reader (for details see Baumgarten 2007; Becher *et al.* 2009; Kranich *et al.* 2012) (Tables 1 and 2).

The project works on the use of sentence-initial additive and concessive conjunctions (*but, und, aber*, *doch*) seem to support the overall project hypothesis. In these cases, the translations seem to lead the way for variation and change in original German conventionalized writing of popular scientific articles now featuring greater interactionality. The situation appears to be more complicated in the case of the diachronic use of *we* and *wir* in the two temporal frames examined in the project:

Table 3 shows that in both time frames there is a greater frequency of the use of *wir* in the German original texts than in the translations, and in the second time frame there is an even bigger incidence of *wir* in the German originals than the use of *we* in the English original texts. To explain this rather puzzling (and unexpected) finding, Baumgarten (2008) has argued that the textual functions of German *wir* do in fact differ substantially from the functions of

Table 1: Frequency of sentence-initial and and und (normalized on the basis of 10,000 words), adapted from Kranich et al. (2012): 324

	1978–1982	1999–2002
English originals (*And*)	3.1	4.5
German translations (*Und*)	2.3	6.3
German originals (*Und*)	0.9	3.1

Table 2: Frequency of sentence-initial But, Aber, and Doch (normalized on the basis of 1,000 sentences), adapted from Kranich et al. (2012): 325

	1978–1982	1999–2002
English originals (*But*)	32.6	32.6
German translations (*Aber, Doch*)	22.7	30.1
German originals (*Aber, Doch*)	9.0	19.8

Table 3: Frequency of we and wir (normalized on the basis of 10,000 words). Adapted from Kranich et al. (2012): 328

	1978–1982	1999–2002
English originals (*we*)	27.5	33.8
German translations (*wir*)	13.2	31.0
German originals (*wir*)	17.7	36.3

English *we* in their respective reader-exclusive and reader-inclusive uses of these pronouns. The difference in the *we/wir* usage between the German originals on the one hand and the English originals and their German translations on the other hand is that the former tend to feature reader-exclusive uses of *wir*, and the latter favouring reader-inclusive uses. Given this difference, German authors of the non-translated texts were unlikely to be influenced by either the translations or the English originals.

As far as the diachronic use of epistemic modal markers is concerned, our analyses revealed that Anglophone norms are not adopted in the English-German translations and the German original texts. The reason for this resistance can be found in the marked difference between the English and German

systems of expressing modality. In German there is, for instance, a much greater reliance on using modal adverbs for expressing modality than in English.

Overall, the evidence to support the project's main hypothesis, namely that German translations and comparable texts in the popular science genre increasingly adopt Anglophone conventions is rather mixed. Another type of influence might explain the project results: Over the last few decades, Anglophone texts have become notably more informal and more colloquial (cf. for instance Mair 2006), and thus more interactional. This tendency follows general cultural processes such as a growing global trend towards informality and orality spearheaded by the increasing use of social media, as well as a general democratization of knowledge facilitated by the revolution in information and communication technologies. So the growing interactional nature of German translated and non-translated texts in our corpus may not be the result of any direct influence of English texts in processes of translation. Rather a more forceful, indirect influence may have been operative, one that is much more difficult to trace.

A recent study conducted in the framework of this project analyzed the behaviour of linking constructions in translations from English into German (House 2017). The procedure pursued in this study involved the following steps:

1 Extraction of all occurrences of English linking constructions, their translational German structures, and their occurrence in German comparable texts
2 Frequency counts in the original, translation and comparable corpora
3 Discourse analysis: Are equivalent items used for the same communicative purpose in the different corpora?

Linking constructions are multiple-word lexico-grammatical patterns used to indicate a relationship between some portion of prior and/or ensuing discourse. They can be defined as unembedded 'orphan constructions' that are unattached in the syntax of the clause they introduce. Linking constructions fulfill several different discourse functions and thus resemble the multi-functionality of classical discourse markers such as *well, okay, you know, I mean.* They negotiate information between a writer and a reader. They mimic orality and interactivity in written discourse and support a writer's strategy of identifying a Theme in her discourse by reinforcing or foregrounding it. Among more specific functions that linking constructions fulfill in discourse are: exemplification, addition, contrast, temporal sequencing. Examples are: *After all, In particular, On the other hand, In fact, In contrast, In addition, In short*, *In sum.*

The common denominator of all those functions which linking construction fulfill is their basic introductory character: They either introduce or re-introduce a referent into the discourse which is judged by writers in the on-going writing process as not being presently in the foreground of readers' consciousness (Chafe 1994).

The hypothesis underlying the analysis of the behaviour of Linking Constructions in the project popular science corpus seems to mirror the general project hypothesis and can be formulated as follows:

From time frame 1 to time frame 2 there is an increase in linking constructions in the German texts reflecting the impact of English discourse norms on German ones, their occurrence being in consonance with the generally more interactional and reader-friendly nature of English texts.

Findings of the study show that linking constructions seem to be typical of English, but not of German texts. Over the two time frames investigated in the project these preferences did *not* change as a consequence of direct (translation-mediated) and ubiquitous indirect contact with global English. This means that the type of framing in discourse achieved by the use of linking constructions in English discourse is not superimposed on German texts. German texts still prefer syntactic integration of all units in a clause over the use of extraposed linking constructions. In other words, neither the translated German texts nor the German originals feature equivalent linking constructions at the beginning of clauses. Rather, the particularly German composite deictics (Zusammengesetzte Verweiswörter) *dazu, davon, hierbei* etc. are found to act as functionally equivalent items integrated in the clause.

The use of linking construction and syntactic integration make very different demands on readers' attention, awareness and cognitive processing. The way readers of German texts process incoming information tends to be more abstract, concept-related and complex than seems to be the case in the 'simpler' linear arrangements in English via the habitual extraposition of elements.

Using linking constructions seems to be beneficial for readers' processing: The syntactic detachment from the host clause provides readers with smaller chunks for processing that are generally more reader-oriented. In German, verb-second requirement—decisive in licensing syntactic integration and blocking extraposition—can be interpreted as in essence less reader-friendly. The German preference for syntactic integration helps writers to organize their text tying together bits of knowledge discussed so far. In English, which lacks verb-second requirement, the integrated counterparts of linking constructions in canonical positions, while certainly possible, seem to be dispreferred in the corpus here examined. And, as was the case with the different English and German modality systems described above, this difference may also explain why Anglophone influence on German discourse norms is effectively blocked, and indigenous norms are maintained.

Finally, three other recent studies that are related to the role of globalization in translation will be discussed. They all showcase the close relationship between translation, sociocultural context, and intercultural communication today. The first study (Kaniklidou and House 2013) examined news headlines translated from English into Greek and published in the Greek newspaper *I Kathimerini*. Headlines were conceived as 'framing devices' in the sense of Bateson (1972) and Goffman (1974). Frames operate as 'windows' through which press headlines are seen. In today's globalized news industry, translation plays a key role. We were interested in how the notions of 'austerity' and

'crisis' in relation to post-2010 Greece were handled in translated headlines. To this end, we collated a corpus of 50 headlines translated from English published since 2010 when austerity hit Greece hard.

Our analysis revealed that the translated headlines could be classified as covert translations in that they constructed different frames of representation in Greek as schemata for interpreting austerity more strongly exposing the Greek crisis in its naked brutality. The translated news headlines were interpreted as practices of cultural filtering through re-framing, re-capturing and re-narrating news stories. Our analysis revealed a number of dominant re-framings, among them the following: Greek crisis as contamination with Greece viewed as a sick person; Game-frame perspectivization of the era of austerity, that is, narrating the crisis as a game; Greece as victim in need of rescue; Greece as key-player in the EU. These re-framings resulted in the translated headlines showing an increase in dramatized news making the crisis even worse than it already is. Here are two examples of the English originals and the covert Greek translations (backtranslated here into English):

> Example (4)
>
> English Original: Economic Meltdown! (The Economist)
>
> Greek Translation (Backtranslated into English): 'Junk' is what they made of the Greek economy! (I Kathimerini)
>
> Greek: Η *ελληνική οικονομία υποβαθμίστηκε σε σκουπίδι*
>
> Example (5)
>
> English Original: Merkel pledges faster Greek aid as pain spreads to Spain (Reuters, AP, AFP)
>
> Greek Translation (Backtranslated into English): Athens is setting the Euro on fire! (I Kathimerini)
>
> Greek: *Η Αθήνα βάζει φωτιά στο ευρώ*

A second study (Kaniklidou and House forthcoming) looks at populist discourse in translation as a world-wide phenomenon. Translations of Greek left-wing popular discourse into English were compared with translations of right-wing populist discourse into English. The analysis again focused on framing, this time based on metaphors used to manipulate original texts in the translation. Our corpus consists of four speeches by Greek politicians, two from the left-wing populist party Syriza and two from the right-wing populist party Golden Dawn. Our preliminary findings show that in the translations of left-wing populist speeches, cultural filtering generally led to a de-escalation of tensions, with the translations losing much of the emotive force of the populist message. The translations of the right-wing populist speeches also featured the application of a cultural filer in that here too tensions got de-escalated with emotive language being downplayed. The translations were found to lose their

specificity, that is, there is increased use of more generic terms, for example, ancestors instead of fathers/grandfathers.

Finally, a recent study investigated how ideological manipulations of original English children's books lead to covert translations in different languages (Kaniklidou and House 2018). This research is based on a multilingual corpus of English children's books and their translations into German, Greek, Korean, Spanish, and Arabic. The original English children's books included such classic texts as *A bear called Paddington, Winnie the Pooh*, and *Little Lord Fauntleroy*. We originally concentrated on translations from English into German and Greek but following presentations of our work at international translation conferences, we were encouraged to widen our scope to include other languages with the help of colleagues. This is ongoing work.

Our findings so far show distinctive cultural filtering in the process of translating that point to deep-seated cross-cultural differences in discourse preferences while also revealing ideological manipulations on the part of individual translators. We identified the following six dimensions along which the translations were shown to be culturally filtered: (1) Sentimentalization and/or infantilization, (2) Manipulation of politeness along a cline of directness/indirectness, (3) Content explication, (4) Variations in rendering humor, (5) Manipulations of social identity, (6) Cultural filtering longitudinally.

While the dimensions 1 to 5 clearly document the nature of the translation of English children's books into German, Greek, Spanish, Korean and Arabic as covert translations, a glance at dimension 5 with its diachronic perspective revealed that in the German, the Spanish and the Korean translations there is a move towards overt translation, that is, the translations shy away from cultural filtering following the English originals more closely. The situation is different in the Arabic translations, for example, of the Paddington books, where the tradition of translating covertly is consistently upheld.

In sum, our comparative discourse analysis of English original children's books and their translations into different languages showed that with the exception of the Arabic translations earlier tendencies to manipulate the originals via cultural filtering into covert translations seems today to be replaced in newer translations by a trend towards producing overt translations. This trend might be explained by the increasing influence of English as a global language on other languages, which seems to be reflected in the decreasing need for culture-specificity in translations from English. The findings that translations into Arabic do not follow this trend might be either interpreted as a resistance to Anglophone impact or as covert translations that insidiously makes the English discourse masquerade as Arabic discourse.

CONCLUSION

This article has looked at translation as an important part of intercultural communication. A theory of translation as communication across languages and cultures was presented that included a crucial difference between two different

types of re-contextualization in translation: overt and covert translation. The former translation type involves cultural transfer, while the latter needs the use of a cultural filter with which the translation is made to incorporate the cultural norms of the new target context. Only covert translation can achieve functional equivalence, overt translation reaches at best a kind of removed, secondary equivalence. Given today's dominance of English as a global lingua franca in many domains of public life, translations are under pressure to forego time-consuming and costly cultural filtering in the interest of optimally marketable cultural universality or cultural neutrality, a euphemism for Anglophone textualization conventions. This means that cultural filtering in translations of Anglophone originals would no longer be used, rather Anglophone norms will 'shine through' such that a new type of overt translation may result. Little research on exactly how English influences communicative norms in other languages via translation has been done to date. One exception is a longitudinal project tackling this issue on the basis of a diachronic multilingual special-domain corpus holding popular science and economic texts, mostly in English and German. The results of this research show that while variation and change in expressing subjectivity and addressee orientation can be documented even in non-translated, original German texts, it remains ultimately unclear exactly which role translation has in this process. So the assumption that a direct influence of Anglophone norms via translation will lead to a loss of cultural filtering and the concomitant rise of a new overt translation type has as yet not been verified. What seems to be more important are global linguacultural trends rendering texts more addressee-oriented and interactional. But these are exactly the features identified as more characteristic of Anglophone texts than of texts produced in languages such as German.

Several newer corpus-based studies related to the role of globalization in translation point to the resilience of manipulating original texts into target-culture specific covert translations. In the case of news-headlines such manipulation resulted in more forceful dramatization of events, and in the translations of populist speeches a systematic de-escalation of the emotive content was noticeable. With the exception of Arabic, the translations of English children's books into a variety of different languages presented a different picture: here we saw a tendency away from cultural filtering in covert translation over time towards leaving originals as intact as possible. Such new forms of overt translation can be interpreted as strengthening the hegemony of global English and the rise of a global culture whose values and norms tend to become ever more accepted—even in the guise of other languages. That there are exceptions to this trend shows that Anglophone impact on other languages is not a universal phenomenon.

REFERENCES

Bateson, G. 1972. *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. Chicago University Press.

Baumann, G. 1996. *Contesting Culture: Discourses of Identity in Multi-Ethnic London*. Cambridge University Press.

Baumgarten, N. 2007. 'Converging conventions? Macrosyntactic constructions with English *and* and German *und*,' *Text & Talk* 27: 409–38.

Baumgarten, N. 2008. 'Writer construction in English and German popularized academic discourse: The uses of we and wir,' *Multilingua* 27: 409–38.

Becher, V., J. House, and S. Kranich. 2009. 'Convergence and divergence of communication norms through language contact in translation' in K. Braunmüller and J. House (eds): *Convergence and Divergence in Language Contact Situations*. Benjamins, pp. 125–52.

Blommaert, J. 2005. *Discourse: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge University Press.

Blommaert, J. 2012. *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. Cambridge University Press.

Blommaert, J. 2013. *Ethnography, Superdiversity and Linguistic Landscaping*. Multilingual Matters.

Blum-Kulka, S., J. House, and G. Kasper (eds). 1989. *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics. Requests and Apologies*. Ablex.

Bond, M. H., V. Zegarac, and H. Spencer-Oatey. 2000. 'Culture as an explanatory variable: problems and possibilities,' in H. Spencer-Oatey (ed.): *Culturally Speaking*. Continuum, pp. 47–74.

Bührig, K. and J. ten Thije. 2006. *Beyond Misunderstanding*. Benjamins.

Byrnes, H. 1986. 'Interactional style in German and English conversations,' *Text* 6: 89–206.

Chafe, W. 1994. *Discourse, Consciousness and Time*. University of Chicago Press.

Clifford, J. 1988. *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth Century Ethnography, literature and Art*. Harvard University Press.

Clyne, M. 1994. *Intercultural Communication at Work. Cultural Values in Discourse*. Cambridge University Press.

Dervin, F. 2011. 'A plea for change in research on intercultural discourses: A ''Liquid'' approach to the acculturation of Chinese students,' *Journal of Multicultural Discourses* 6: 37–52.

Ehlich, K., 1984. 'Zum Textbegriff,' in A. Rothkegel and B. Sandig (eds): *Text-Textsorten- Semantik*. Buske, pp. 9–25.

Goffman, E. 1974. *Frame Analysis*. Harper & Row.

Gumperz, J. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J., and S. Levinson (eds). 1996. *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity*. Cambridge University Press.

Holliday, A. 1999. 'Small cultures,' *Applied Linguistics* 20: 237–64.

Holliday, A. 2012. *Intercultural Communication*. Routledge.

House, J. 1977. *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment*. Narr.

House, J. 1997. *Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited*. Narr.

House, J. 2006a. 'Text and context in translation,' *Journal of Pragmatics* 38: 338–58.

House, J. 2006b. 'Communicative styles in English and German,' *European Journal of English Studies*. 10: 249–67.

House, J. 2015. *Translation Quality Assessment. Past and Present*. Routledge.

House, J. 2016. *Translation as Communication across Languages and Cultures*. Routledge.

House, J. 2017. 'Global English, discourse and translation: Linking constructions in English and German popular science texts', in J. Munday and M. Zhang (eds): *Discourse Analysis in Translation Studies*. Benjamins, pp. 47–63.

House, J. 2018. 'Translation studies and pragmatics', in C. Ilie and N. Norrick (eds): *Pragmatics and its Interfaces*. Benjamins, pp. 143–63.

Ide, S. 1989. 'Formal forms and discernment. Two neglected aspects of linguistic politeness,' *Multilingua* 8: 223–38.

Kaniklidou, T. and J. House. 2013. 'Framing austerity in Greek translated press-headlines,' *mTm* 5: 80–104.

Kaniklidou, T. and J. House. 2018. 'Discourse and ideology in translated children's literature: A comparative study,' *Perspectives* 26/2: 232–45.

Kaniklidou, T. and J. House. forthcoming. *Populist Discourses in Translation*.

Kotthoff, H. 1989. *Pro und Kontra in der Fremdsprache*. Lang.

Kramsch, C. 1898. *Language and Culture*. Oxford University Press.

Kranich, S. 2011. 'L'emploi des expressions épistémiques dans les lettres aux actionnaires en

France, aux Etats Unis et en Allemagne,' *Langage et Societé* 137: 115–34.

Kranich, S. and V. Gonzalez Diaz. 2010. *Good, Great or Remarkable: Evaluation in English, German and Spanish Letters to Shareholders*. Ms, Hamburg University.

Kranich, S., J. House, and V. Becher. 2012. 'Changing conventions in English and German translations of popular science texts,' in K. Braunmüller and C. Gabriel (eds): *Multilingual Individuals and Multilingual Societies*. Benjamins, pp. 315–35.

Kubota, R. 2012. 'Critical approaches to intercultural discourse and communication,' in C. Bratt-Paulston, S. F. Kiesling, and E. Rangel (eds): *The Handbook of Intercultural Discourse and Communication*. Wiley, pp. 90–109.

Küppers, A. 2008. *Sprecherdeiktika in Deutschen und Französischen Aktionärsbriefen, vol.* 87. Arbeiten zur Mehrsprachigkeit.

Lakoff, R. 1990. *Talking Power*. Basic Books.

Legrand, P. 1996. 'European legal systems are not converging,' *International and Comparative Law Quarterly* 45: 52–81.

Lyons, J. 1969. *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.

Mair, C. 2006. *Twentieth Century English: History, Variation and Standardization*. Cambridge University Press.

Pennycook, A. 2017. *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*. Routledge.

Piller, I. 2012. *Intercultural Communication. A Critical Introduction*. Edinburgh University Press.

Sarangi, S. 1994. 'Intercultural or not beyond celebration of cultural differences in miscommunication analysis *Pragmatics* 4: 209–27.

Schleiermacher, F. 1813. 'Über die verschiedenen Methoden des Übersetzens,' Reprinted in H. J. Störig (ed.): *Das Problem des Übersetzens*. Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, pp. 38–70.

Scollon, R. and S. W. Scollon. 1994. *Intercultural Communication. A Discourse Approach*. Blackwell.

Slobin, D. 1996. 'From ''thought and language'' to ''thinking for speaking''', in J. Gumperz and S. Levinson (eds): *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 70–96.

Spencer-Oatey, H. (ed.). 2000. *Culturally Speaking. Manging Rapport through Talk Across Cultures*. Continuum.

Sperber, D. 1996. *Culture: A Naturalistic Approach*. Blackwell.

Street, B. 1993. 'Culture is a verb: anthropological aspects of language and cultural process,' in D. Graddol , L. Thompson, and M. Byram (eds): *Language and Culture*. Multilingual Matters, pp. 23–43.

Tannen, D. 1986. *That's Not What I Meant! How Conversational Style Makes or Breaks Your Relations with Others*. Morrow.

Teich, E. 2003. *Cross-Linguistic Variation in System and Text*. Mouton de Gruyter.

Thomas, J. 1983. 'Cross-cultural pragmatic failure,' *Applied Linguistics* 4: 91–112.

Van Dijk, T. 1998. *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. Sage.

Weinreich, U. 1953. *Languages in Contact.* Linguistic Circle of New York.

Wenger, E. 1989. *Communities of Practice*. Cambridge University Press.