Editors’ Introduction

The latest issue of New Voices in Translation Studies contains new research on translation history, reviews of two new books on Bourdiesuan approaches to TIS, and abstracts of recently completed PhD theses. Three articles consider ‘grammatical complexity’ in translations of the Platform Sutra; a new kind of translator visibility through the paratexts of La Fontaine’s Fables in translation; and translator obituaries as a fascinating source of contextual information about ‘ordinary’ translators in Ohio.

We received a lot of promising submissions this year but many were not yet ready for publication. Our positioning as a double peer-reviewed international journal necessitates a balancing act: warmly encouraging researchers to publish their work (often for the first time) alongside our unswerving commitment to academic rigour. All prospective authors need to consult the Style Guides in the Submissions section of our website and look at previous issues of NV (www.newvoices.iatis.org) to gauge the style and standard required. Papers should have a clear argument, refer to recent theoretical and methodological work while presenting data from new research likely to interest other researchers in the many fields (and sub-fields) of Translating, Interpreting and Intercultural Studies.

Many of you will have seen the promotional postcards for New Voices at various academic conferences. We reiterate now what you see on the cards: we welcome new submissions of articles, PhD abstracts and proposals for book reviews, submitted using the style guide available as detailed above. As many of you know, New Voices is managed by a small team of volunteer co-editors who always give feedback on individual queries and submissions as soon as we can. We maintain the level of academic rigour required for this journal via ongoing communication with scholarly experts in the field, who kindly act as our blind peer reviewers alongside their many other responsibilities. For this reason, we thank you once more for your patience if responses to individual submissions may not always be as fast as everyone would like. That said, we are very happy to present to you in this issue the submissions we have seen develop and now become published scholarly articles as a result of unstinting commitment from their authors, our esteemed blind peer reviewers and the New Voices editor team.

Articles

Hailing Yu’s paper, ‘How should Huineng Speak? Text Complexity in Translations of the Platform Sutra’ compares four English translations of an ancient Chan Buddhist text, the Platform Sutra, which is a record of the public sermons and personal conversations of the Chan master Huineng. The article focuses on text complexity, which, according to Halliday, can be measured in two dimensions: grammatical intricacy (number of ranking clauses per sentence) and lexical density (number of
content words per ranking clause). The analysis shows that while two of the four translations are complex in one dimension (lexical density and grammatical intricacy respectively), one translation is simple in both dimensions, and one is complex, in both dimensions. These findings are interpreted by taking the context of translation, especially the intended readership and translating strategies, into consideration.

Anne Neveu’s paper focuses on how translator visibility appears to change over time in the paratexts serving as “pre-text” for the French-English translations of La Fontaine’s *Fables* published in three volumes, in 1668, 1678–79 and 1694. Neveu’s paper titled ‘How Paratexts Influence the Reader’s Experience of English Translations of La Fontaine’s *Fables*’ critically analyses how different micro- and macro-functions of *peri-texts* (e.g.: book covers, prefaces) have framed the content of this iconic work over time and facilitated the reader’s access to it (Genette 1997). Drawing from a corpus of 25 translations of La Fontaine’s *Fables* into English, Neveu interrogates how translator visibility in four translations of this iconic work is emphasized in different ways to showcase the artistic and/or the academic value of the original work for its changing audiences over time. Her analysis of earlier versions of this work in French-English translation shows a high peritextual visibility suggesting a particular ‘status’ accorded to translators in the mid-nineteenth century. She argues that the more contemporary versions offer a new perspective on the visibility of para/translator in the twenty-first century and open the way for further study of peritexts and the role of “paratranslation” (Garrido 2005; Frías 2012) of this particular work. By theoretically situating paratexts as critical site of translator-reader encounter, Neveu’s paper demonstrates how the analysis of the nuanced changes to translator visibility in the re-translations of iconic works serves as a clear methodological purpose for the study of translator status at particular junctures in translation history. In this way, Neveu highlights translator visibility as a crucial factor in the changing mediations of La Fontaine over the centuries, and thus offers a unique insight into why this seventeenth century writer has always been “the fabulist he is, still present today.”

Hannelore Gomez’ paper ‘A Closer Look into the Life of Ordinary Translators through Unordinary Sources: The Use of Obituaries as a Microhistory Tool to Study Translators and Translation in Ohio’ examines the validity of obituaries as potential extra-textual source of information which can provide a unique perspective for studying the social and cultural history of translators and translation. For translation historians interested in the translator as an individual, the use of obituaries harmonizes with the general objectives of micro-historical inquiry which “concentrates on the intensive study of particular lives to reveal the fundamental experiences and mentalities of ordinary people” (Lepore 2001: 131). The paper provides a quantitative analysis of translator obituaries from the US State of Ohio between 2000 and 2015 and shows personal information about translators (age, gender, place of
birth), type of service and career field, source of income, languages spoken and translated, domain and membership of translation associations. An additionally, comparative analysis identifies patterns and trends such as prevalent gender of translators, most frequent language-pairs used and immigration trends. The paper convincingly demonstrates that the study of obituaries can contribute to the micro-analysis of the sociocultural history of translators by showing how the subjective accounts of “ordinary people” portray the task of translation and the role of “ordinary” translators in a specific community.

Abstracts
Issue 16 also features three abstracts of recent PhD theses. First, we must warmly congratulate the authors on achieving their new academic status and completing this valuable new research. The three abstracts are entitled: ‘Collaborative Translation in Online Communities of Practice: An Ethnographic Study of Yeeyan’ by Chuan Yu of Hong Kong Baptist University; ‘A Literary Translation in the Making: An In-depth Investigation into the Process of a Literary Translation from French into Maltese’ by Claudine Borg of University of Malta; and ‘The Clash of Articulations: Aesthetic Shock, Multivalent Narratives and Islam in the Post-9/11 Era’ by Rebecca Johnson of University of Manchester.

Book Reviews
In this issue, we publish reviews of two books addressing the Bourdieusian approach in research: Remapping Habitus in Translation Studies edited by Gisella M. Vorderobermeier (Brill/Rodopi 2014), and Bourdieu in Translation Studies: The socio-cultural dynamics of Shakespeare translation in Egypt by Sameh Hanna (Routledge 2016). In her review of the collection edited by Vorderobermeier, Ruth Abou Rached critically evaluates which insights we (as new and experienced scholars) can draw from the essays' critical explorations of habitus and how it is used as a conceptual tool in Translation and Interpreting Studies. David Charlston, an enthusiastic researcher on the sociology of translation, gives a focused discussion of Hanna’s monograph which provides a thorough examination and illustration of the set of theoretical concepts coined by the theorist.