Wang, J. & Zhu, Z. (2024). Review of [Franco Aixelá, J., & Olalla-Soler, C. (Eds.). (2022). 50 Years Later. What Have We Learnt after Holmes (1972) and Where Are We Now?. Las Palmas de Gran Canarias: Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Servicio de Publicaciones y Difusión Científica.]. – Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series: Themes in Translation Studies, 23, 264–267.

**Franco Aixelá, J., & Olalla-Soler, C. (Eds.). (2022).** *50 Years Later. What Have We Learnt after Holmes (1972) and Where Are We Now?***. Las Palmas de Gran Canarias: Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Servicio de Publicaciones y Difusión Científica. https://doi.org/10.20420/1699.2022.646 (pp.190)**

James S. Holmes' seminal paper "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies" in 1972, envisaging what translation studies (TS) covers, is generally acknowledged as the founding statement of TS. But to date, a mass of brand-new research orientations and technologies have enriched the landscape of TS, bringing the shift of the definition of subfields within TS (Zanettin, Saldanha & Harding, 2015). Against the backdrop, *50 Years Later. What Have We Learnt after Holmes (1972) and Where Are We Now?* edited by Javier Franco Aixelá and Christian Olalla-Soler comes out, which expounds upon the remarkable influence of Holmes on TS development by making a comparison between the past and the present.

The book comprises an introduction and seven chapters. In the introductory chapter authored by the two editors, the book briefly reviews the overall framework of TS structured by Holmes, which has undergone certain revisions and extensions. This chapter also sketches out subsequent chapters. Chapter 1, contributed by the two editors and Sara Rovira-Estevac, uncovers the variations in TS from a macroscopic perspective. Specifically, it expatiates on a diachronic study drawing on a systematic comparison of TS before and after Holmes, with its content ranging from thematic evolution, publication languages, journals, authorship to the most-cited scholars. All these rely on databases of *Bibliography of Interpreting and Translation* (BITRA), *Repertorio Electrónico de Traducción e Interpretación* (RETI) as well as *Translation Studies Bibliography,* among which the first two boast active and extinct TS journals. The data indicate that positive changes have taken place in every aspect of TS the chapter mentions, and this signals TS is by no means an academic void but a prosperous discipline.

Chapter 2 authored by José Lambert concentrates on the positionality of Holmes in TS. The recognition of TS goes back to 1972 when Holmes' scheme led contemporary scholars to clear up the confusion around the explicit goals and functions of TS. Lambert stresses that Holmes' historiography in his scheme reflects a panoramic view on translation, which indeed rid TS of the linguistic monopoly and brought it into a burgeoning interdiscipline drawing on the strengths of psychology, sociology and so forth. Unfortunately, not until 1990s was the confusion resolved well, and before this time extensive work by other scholars played an essential role in this respect. Therefore, Lambert expands on what happened between 1972 and 1990, especially how the peers put forward novel theories under the influence of Holmes to tackle the issue. The chapter summarizes that Holmes prepared other talents for institutionalizing TS and TS has achieved a leap forward owing to the very continuity between Holmes and the talents.

Wang, J. & Zhu, Z. (2024). Review of [Franco Aixelá, J., & Olalla-Soler, C. (Eds.). (2022). 50 Years Later. What Have We Learnt after Holmes (1972) and Where Are We Now?. Las Palmas de Gran Canarias: Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Servicio de Publicaciones y Difusión Científica.]. — Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series: Themes in Translation Studies, 23, 264–267.

In Chapter 3, Ricardo Muńoz Martín and Álvaro García zoom in on the evolution of cognitive translation and interpreting studies (CTIS), a term referring to status quo of Holmes' translation process research (TPR) in descriptive TS (DTS). TS was initially an independent research program within Artificial Intelligence and psycholinguistics in universities but the failure of early machine translation researches made the situation replaced by linguists dominating the discipline. Up to the moment, there had been partial overlapping between TS and cognitive approaches. After Holmes put forward his scheme, TS (CTIS as well) benefited from other social science perspectives though comparative literature momentarily relegated them to an ancillary position afterwards. In this whole process, CTIS has developed a wealth of empirical methodologies such as eye tracking and think-aloud protocols. The chapter concludes that CTIS has outgrown TPR but this field still falls within DTS as the newly-utilized methodologies are used for describing the translation process in essence.

In Chapter 4, Sharon O'Brien turns to the repositioning of translation technology, particularly machine translation (MT) that has considerably reshaped TS. In Holmes' scheme, MT was explicitly placed within the scope of pure TS. However, the placement has incurred criticisms and counter-proposals since some argue that MT also belongs to translation aids under the umbrella of applied TS, and the separation between MT and applied TS reflects an inconsistence between pure TS and applied TS. Although numerous attempts have been made to reposition MT, the chapter points out the problem remains unsolved and the situation has been worse off as MT becomes ubiquitous. The phenomenon even triggers a tricky question: Should translation technology be placed on the map of TS or treated as an independent discipline? It is finally claimed that it never pays off to dispute where technology should sit and what makes sense is to recognize technology as a key component of translation.

Chapter 5 by Gary Massey leads readers into the progression of translation didactics (TD) over the last half century, revealing its major development trends and the gaps awaiting to be filled. The chapter firstly presents a chronological development of translation education paradigm, of which pedagogies and models for profiling and assessing translator competence are underlined. Massey then shifts focus to what the changes of human and technological environment have brought to requirements for translator training. To be precise, due consideration should also be given to foster translator educators. Only by keeping pace with the times can they educate students who are well-aligned with market demands. The chapter also concerns the gap between professional TD and additional language learning (ALL), which impedes the sustainable development of TD. In conclusion, the chapter holds a mixed attitude towards TD considering there has been evident progress in teaching methods, testing techniques and curriculum planning while the jury is still out on whether educating educators and the collaboration between TD and ALL will bear fruit.

Chapter 6, contributed by Ineke Crezee, concentrates on the proliferation of researches and paradigms within interpreting studies (IS). The chapter provides a representation of IS by

imitating the map of TS. All subfields mentioned in Holmes' overall framework are discussed, but as applied to IS. Crezee deems it arguable that IS has found its way into the central position of Holmes' map from a marginal role. Besides, the fact that acronym TS evolves into translation and interpreting studies in extensive literature proves IS is now an autonomous and diversified field. To justify the autonomy of IS, the chapter traces the history of interpreting theories as well as interpreting methodologies, thus showing their sharp distinction from the theories and methodologies of TS. For instance, source texts used for theoretical analysis of IS are troublesome to trace than those for TS due to the confidentiality of conference interpretation. The chapter ultimately elaborates the role and expectation of signed language and non-professional interpreting.

Chapter 7, by Leona Van Vaerenbergh, explores to what extent functionalism is a general theory within TS. Holmes proposed in 1972 that the description of translation phenomena and the establishment of general theories to explain and predict such phenomena are the main objectives of "pure" areas of TS. Since then, some scholars have brought forward general theories, among which Skopos Theory and Theory of Translatorial Action stood out. Based on the historical observation, the chapter details the evolution of the two theories, which are the foundation of functionalism. After that, there is an investigation provided on how they form the basis for subsequent development of functionalism in partial theories and applied studies. Through the illustration by some examples, Vaerenbergh concludes that despite criticisms, functionalism has been empirically tested in its applicability and relevance to partial theories and applied research.

As such, the major merits of the book can be summarized as follows. In the first place, it charts a panoramic picture of how TS has developed into an institutionalized discipline and reveals the latest development trend in the field. Such a timely traceback is conducive to revealing the disciplinary history of TS and brings previously underappreciated areas into notice. The contributors not only offer a retrospect but also put forward their prospect of TS, for example, bridging the divide between TD and ALL. These efforts bring out uncharted research directions and ensure the prosperous development of TS. Secondly, the methodologies in some chapters well conform to the emerging trend of "technological turn" in TS. The databases that the book bases its analysis on, especially BITRA and RETI, contain a wealth of inaccessible documents such as extinct journals. This provides the academia a better understanding of what had shaped Holmes' origin and to what extent he had influenced succeeding progression of TS. Meanwhile, it takes technological advantage of visualization tools including VOSviewer to display illustrative and eye-catching figures, thereby ensuring the analysis to be directly perceived while upgrading reading experience.

However, the international reach of the discipline has expanded enormously, with research and training in China in particular (Munday *et al.*, 2022), but bibliographical publications in Chinese are rarely indexed in databases such as BITRA that the book resorts to, which reduces

Wang, J. & Zhu, Z. (2024). Review of [Franco Aixelá, J., & Olalla-Soler, C. (Eds.). (2022). 50 Years Later. What Have We Learnt after Holmes (1972) and Where Are We Now?. Las Palmas de Gran Canarias: Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Servicio de Publicaciones y Difusión Científica.]. – Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series: Themes in Translation Studies, 23, 264–267.

it to incomprehensiveness. Additionally, each chapter centers around particular themes but occasionally the contents in different chapters overlap slightly, with a lack of integration that ties them together cohesively. This fragmentation may hinder readers from gaining a holistic understanding of the discipline. Had the inadequacies been noted, the book would be more appealing.

In short, this book showcases an overview of waxing and waning of TS over the intervening 50 years. Its great value as a historical literature makes it worth a read for practitioners and researchers in TS.

## Acknowledgement

## References

Zanettin, F., Saldanha, G., & Harding, S. A. (2015). Sketching Landscapes in Translation Studies: A Bibliographic Study. *Perspectives, 23, 161-182.* https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2015.1010551

Munday, J., Pinto, S. R., & Blakesley, J. (2022). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications (Fifth Edition).* London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429352461

## Authors

**Yanmeng Wang**
Huazhong University of Science and Technology, China
wangyanmeng1992@163.com

**Zhiqiang Zhu**
Huazhong University of Science and Technology, China
763219496@qq.com