Future directions in socio-narrative research in translation

Narrative research in translation studies has come a long way in the years since the publication of 'Ethics of Renarration: Mona Baker is interviewed by Andrew Chesterman' in Cultus in 2008. I strive here, to do three things. First, I look back on that interview and assess its ongoing significance for translation studies today, arguing that some of the questions Chesterman raised should still be at the forefront of our minds. Second, I explore developments to Baker's approach by other translation scholars, mapping the various ways that it has been extended in the close to two decades since it was first introduced. Third, I identify major avenues for future research and development of narrative theory for translation scholars, giving a programmatic sketch of how the approach might develop in the coming years.

Since the publication of Baker's *Translation and Conflict* in 2006, socio-narrative[1] approaches in Translation Studies have moved from the margins to being accepted as a mainstream strand of translation research – as this special issue attests. Almost as significant is 'Ethics of Renarration: Mona Baker is interviewed by Andrew Chesterman' published in the very first issue of Cultus in 2008. At the time it served as an important statement of socio-narrative theory's position in relation to the central concerns of translation studies during that period. It continues to be an excellent introduction to Baker's approach, especially for students, providing a relatively short and accessible way to understand her key ideas with the additional clarity that the interview format provides – as attested by its republication in the collection of Baker's most influential work *Researching Translation in the Age of Technology and Global Conflict* (Kim and Zhu 2019). These qualities, coupled with the fact that I am currently writing for Cultus, make it an ideal place to begin in exploring how socio-narrative approaches to translation have evolved and considering where they might, and should, go in the future.

Some of Chesterman's questions now seem remarkably dated. He begins by linking Baker's approach to the now seldom mentioned 'Manipulation School' of the 1980s; this is quickly followed by a question on equivalence, treated as an issue of central importance; he advances an idea of mediation grounded in the conduit perspective, just about daring to ask 'are we witnessing a kind of farewell to the idea of translation as mediation? Or would you say that although mediation is often an appropriate goal, it is not always enough: translators should sometimes do more than merely mediate?' (Baker 2008: 15). Presumably few in the discipline today would rush to return to the obsession with equivalence from 20 years ago. Seeing intervention in translation as avoidable now seems simply naïve and surely a question of degree rather than a binary. Rather than suggesting that Chesterman was anything but a careful reader of Baker's work or somehow behind the times, these questions show just how different those times were and how radical Baker's work still seemed in 2008.

[1] For the purposes of this article, I am focusing only on 'socio-narrative' research, rather than that from the perspective of literary narrative. For an excellent overview of both traditions in the context of translation studies, see Jones (2020).

If some of Chesterman's questions no longer seem very important, others continue to be extremely valuable in asking how useful a concept narrative is for understanding translation. He emphasises the ethical difficulties of thinking about translators as re-narrators rather than as conduits, expressing unease with the practical implications of this idea for professional practice. He astutely raises the issue that while such a stance may be theoretically valuable, it threatens 'the trust given by society and clients to translators' since this trust 'surely rests on the necessary suspension of this belief that such neutrality is impossible' (Baker 2008: 19). He queries whether making the concept of narrative 'do a great deal of work' leaves it 'so wide that it explains everything – and therefore nothing' (Baker 2008: 21). In this regard Chesterman mirrors (albeit without explicitly acknowledging) wider concerns about 'narrative imperialism' (Phelan 2005; Strawson 2004), understood as 'the impulse by students of narrative to claim more and more territory', a practice which he argues 'can stretch the concept of narrative to the point that we lose sight of what is distinctive about it' (Phelan 2005: 206). He highlights the difficulties of thinking of narratives as both ontological and representational without fully exploring the relationship between these two functions. Raising the issue of Baker's suggestion that translators must translate texts that 'do good' leads to the question of how translators are to determine the 'good' in the context of their practical work and decision making.

Each of these questions has important implications for how far we can expect the socio-narrative perspective to take us in thinking about translation: societal and professional expectations remain radically opposed to the notion of seeing translators as active re-narrators; worries about 'asking too much of narrative' (c.f. Lamarque 2004) demand serious consideration; if narrative is to be understood as both representational and ontological, the relationship between these two rather different functions must be carefully worked out; if translators are to be expected to do good, solid frameworks need to be provided for identifying the good. Baker provides initial, and often convincing, answers to these queries in the interview itself. Nonetheless, she has quite reasonably not responded to them in depth elsewhere in her work which has been largely concerned with other matters – after her foundational work in *Translation and Conflict*, her approach has remained largely unchanged on the theoretical level and has been principally concerned with using socio-narrative theory to understand the role of translation within various activist and conflict situations (e.g. Baker 2010b; 2014; 2010a).

The rest of this piece, then, is concerned with finding satisfying responses to the problems that Chesterman raises. It does this in two ways: first, it explores contributions from scholars other than Baker to the socio-narrative literature in Translation Studies that have built on and extended her approach. Second, it suggests further avenues for building stronger versions of socio-narrative theory for translation scholars and proposes methods for tackling unresolved issues in the approach.

Developments in narrative theory

My intention here is not to give a comprehensive literature review[2] of socio-narrative work in translation studies. Much of the narrative-inspired work published by translation scholars other than Baker has directly followed her approach, including work on: the paratextual framing of Edward Said's writing in Arabic (Al-Herthani 2009), the alter globalisation movement (Boéri 2009), literary translation (Baldo 2008), Wikipedia (Jones 2018) and a cluster of work examining media representation (e.g. Luo 2015; Saleh Elimam 2019; Boéri and Fattah 2020; Jaber 2016; Qin and Zhang 2018). My aim instead is to offer a broadly chronological account of work in the discipline that has sought to extend, rather than simply apply, Baker's approach.

[2] See Jones (2020) for an excellent overview.

The most significant and sustained contribution in this regard has been made by Sue-Ann Harding (Harding 2012a; 2012c; 2012b; 2018; Harding and Ralarala 2017). In her early work,[3] she extended Baker's model in two major respects. The first was to revise Baker's typology of narratives to recognise that public, conceptual and metanarratives are all, ultimately, subcategories within public narratives. The second was to integrate of ideas from literary narratology – something that Baker explicitly rejects in *Translation and Conflict* (2006: 3–4). In doing this, Harding goes well beyond borrowing the narratological concept of 'paratext' to enrich the notion of 'framing' as seen in al-Herthani (2009) or the excellent application of postmodern narratology in analysed translated literary texts seen in Baldo (2008). Rather, Harding uses narratological concepts to offer a powerful rejoinder to Chesterman's question about the range of work that the concept of the narrative is made to do by Baker and the difficulties of defining narrative.

As Harding (2012b: 295) puts it:

> While sociological approaches to narrative expand the definition, nature, and consequence of the object(s) of our investigation — from discrete, if broadly defined, "texts" to "diffuse, amorphous configurations…that cut across time and texts" (Baker 2006, 4), narratology can provide a rigorous, explicit lexicon and a rich conceptual toolkit with which to pursue and communicate such investigations.

Systematically applying concepts from literary narratology such as character, diachrony and the distinction between text (the signs themselves), sjuzhet (the way a story is told), and fabula (the underlying chronology of events themselves) provides a powerful means to concretize narrative analysis. By breaking otherwise diffuse socio-narratives into these components (while recognising that to do so means drawing analytical distinctions rather reductively identifying pre-existing, constituent elements), they can be brought more clearly into view. This brings with it two very significant advantages: 1) on a methodological level it makes things more nuanced and fine-grained and allows for more systematic analysis. 2) Equally significantly, it renders the analytical procedure followed more transparent; while work in the narrative tradition rarely (if ever) aims at scientific replicability, Harding's approach greatly facilitates scholarly scrutiny. This approach also allows relatively clear distinctions to be drawn between narrative and non-narrative. This greatly blunts Chesterman's criticism about the vagueness of the term by establishing clear boundaries, for analytical purposes at least, of what will and will not be considered a narrative. As Harding (2012a) shows, this is valuable not only in terms of setting the limits of narrative inquiry but to further sharpen narrative analysis itself, by enabling exploration of the interplay between narrative and non-narrative elements.

Although no other translation scholar has engaged with narrative theory to the same level of depth as Harding, there have been a number of other notable attempts to extend the approach. In an early appropriation of socio-narrative theory, Marais (2009) makes intriguing connections between Baker's approach to narrative and the notion of wisdom as presented in the work of Paul Baltes. Marais helpfully contends that wisdom, one aspect of which is a capacity to entertain multiple conflicting paradigms, offers a useful supplement to Baker's account of narrative assessment: 'a wise

[3] In later work Harding has continued to make use of narrative theory but without the emphasis on extending the theory itself seen in her earlier work. Her book chapter 'Resonances Between Socio Narrative Theory and Complexity Theory' (Harding 2018), for instance, identifies points of connection between the complexity and narrative approaches but aims only at providing 'a starting point for further theorizing of narratives as complex systems and for using narrative to empirically describe the trajectories of complex systems' (Harding 2018: 47) rather than directly attempting to synthesise elements of the two approaches.

person should thus be able to function or act within a situation in which competing narratives operate' (Marais 2009: 229). We might see the development of wisdom, then, as essential in both training translators about the complex pressures they face and in enabling clients and the wider public to better understand what translation can and cannot do. In this sense, the notion of wisdom offers a response to Chesterman's rather unsatisfactory suggestion that translators maintain the fiction of providing value-free non-intervention even knowing that this is impossible. Marais' argument, furthermore, is likewise appealing in how it handles the question of the common good. Rather than assuming that translators (or anyone) can simply intuit what is good, 'what the common good is has to be decided wisely in each case' (Marais 2009: 229), making the development of wisdom in translators a key requirement. The notion that narrative is a way to develop wisdom, meanwhile, points to a possible role for stories *of* and *about* translators in developing a wiser approach to translation, pointing to extensions of the ideas in Baker (2005). While these ideas are intriguing, they are nonetheless developed only briefly and Marais has not returned to them since in his published work.

Robinson, on the other hand, dedicates the whole final chapter of his *Translation and the Problem of Sway* (Robinson 2011) to Baker's socio-narrative theory, offering the most theoretically sophisticated critique and extension of her approach in the literature. Robinson enriches Baker's approaches in three important ways. The first, presented relatively briefly, is to both accept a key role for storytelling at the same time as arguing for the importance of other modes alongside including 'dialogue', 'rhetorical identification', 'performance', 'kinesthetic metaphorization' and 'the network' (Robinson 2011). The second is to argue for the central importance of the 'somatic' (bodily and affective dimensions of communication) alongside the verbal in terms of both giving narratives their force, and accounting for their reception (including the likelihood of their acceptance or rejection). The third is to establish extensive links with rhetorical theory, picking up on the grounding of Fisher's *Human Communication as Narration* (1987) – a key reference in *Translation and Conflict* – in Toulmin's *The Uses of Argument* (1958) and Aristotle's *Rhetoric.*

Robinson's critique points the way to a richer version of socio-narrative theory. It accepts many of Baker's fundamental arguments about the importance of narrative and shows how adding tools from other traditions can help in firming up its theoretical foundations and plugging some of the remaining gaps on both the theoretical and methodological levels. Nonetheless, as Robinson (2011: 162) acknowledges:

> This chapter on Baker's discussion of narrativity will… be little more than a preliminary and provisional theoretical response to her richly productive introduction – and will leave the testing of her application of narrative theory to translation to other scholars.

Not tying his critique to the analysis of any specific empirical context leaves it somewhat meandering – an issue exemplified in the way that the chapter simply breaks off rather than concluding. Robinson's lack of familiarity with the wider narrative theory literature is also apparent as he makes no reference to existing work on narrative and rhetoric (Phelan 1996; Levine 1998; Booth 1961) or narrative and the body, as in narrative work in medical humanities (Greenhalgh and Hurwitz 1998; Franke 1995; Charon 2008).

Guldin (2013), meanwhile, uses metaphor theory, particularly Hanne (1999), to draw out connections between the narrative approach and other work within Translation Studies, notably Tymoczko's (2013: 25) 'metaphorical readings of translation'. He argues for the central importance of spatial metaphors within both traditions, which serves as a valuable counterweight to the emphasis on

temporality which characterises much work on narrative theory. We see this, for instance, with the notion of narrative layering intrinsic to the key concept of relationality – both elements of stories and whole narratives derive their relational meaning through their being positioned within and in relation to other narratives. These positions are more spatial than temporal and more amenable to analysis in terms of 'where' than 'when' or 'in what order'. In contrast to Baker's conflation of theory and narrative (Baker 2008: 22), Guldin (2013: 29) emphasises that 'all theories are built from narrative and metaphorical elements which are irreducible to one another'. This preserves the possibility of a difference between narrative and theory and emphasises that, although we can make narratives from narrative elements, both whole stories and narrative elements can also play a role in the construction of non-narratives. It also usefully preserves a role for metaphorical elements that are not narratives, showing that neither theory nor theory production can be wholly explained through reference to storytelling alone. Most metaphors, understood as seeing one thing in terms of another, are not spatially and temporally specific like the narratives emphasised by Baker. This is precisely where their power lies by allowing us to 'create links between *categories* that normally are not associated with another' (Guldin 2013: 30, my emphasis) – the notion of the 'category' running somewhat at odds to the emphasis on individuality and specificity seen with the concept of the narrative.[4]

In examining the interplay between narrative and metaphor, Guldin shows how the narrative and non-narrative intertwine and interact with one another: 'new metaphors are created through narratives and category-shifts within the narrative realm can be seen as imaginative connections or metaphorical leaps. Narrative processes lead us sequentially from one metaphorical cluster to another' (Guldin 2013: 31). Unfortunately, this relationship is only sketched out in broad terms in a manner just as evocative as frustrating. The suggestion that 'it is through metaphors and not narratives that we arrive at new fresh conceptions of familiar phenomena by developing new models or paradigms', for instance, ignores narrative's capacity to be 'revealing, in the sense that it brings features to light that were concealed and yet already sketched out at the heart of our experience, our praxis' (Ricoeur 1988: 158). Guldin (2013: 31) leaves the reader with the undeniable but frustrating conclusion that 'Hanne's illuminating description of the relationship of metaphor and narrative would have to be worked out more thoroughly'.

Boéri and Fattah (2020) attempt a similar move to Harding in their use of appraisal theory to supplement the core assumptions and analytical categories of narrative theory. The approaches, they argue, are supplementary since 'by adopting a dual framework to analyse journalistic news reporting discourse, we are seeking to achieve an analysis that is both granular and fluid' (Boéri and Fattah 2020). Yet, for our present purposes, their emphasis on their framework as 'dual' is significant. Rather than using one approach to enrich the other in the manner of synthesis, a metonymic relation of contiguity is established between them – an analysis of the source data from a socio-narrative perspective is followed by a second grounded in appraisal theory. In the latter 'analysis and discussion' section, insights from both approaches are skilfully interwoven without their being brought into genuine dialogue. What we see, then, is effective collaboration by two scholars working from different research traditions to provide compelling answers to the questions guiding their inquiry. What we do not see is serious engagement with the theoretical deficiencies of the socio-narrative approach as canonically understood within Translation Studies.

Strowe (2021), meanwhile, makes intriguing use of Baker's approach to conceptualise archives. This clearly extends Baker's approach in the sense of applying it in a substantially different context to

[4] C.f. Mink's separation of the 'categoreal' mode from the 'configurational' mode which defines narrative. (1970: 550–51)

that for which it was developed. Strowe (2021: 186) usefully acknowledges the possibility of different versions of narrative theory, referring to 'strong' versions which contend that 'all experience is constructed through narrative, and nothing can be experienced that is not narrative' and 'weak' versions which see narrative as one discursive mode among others. The challenge of taking and justifying a stance in relation to these poles, however, is adroitly sidestepped:

> I would argue that the strong version does not need to be true in order for narrative to be a useful framework, or for the tools and categories of narrative theory to be useful in exploring a topic. At the same time, however, I am referring to "narrative" in the broader way that it is used in social theory rather than as a genre of writing or utterances (Strowe 2021: 186)

Furthermore, her engagement with narrative is relatively brief (appropriately enough given the aims of the piece) and aimed principally at highlighting and beginning to explore the possible value of such an approach, rather than working it out in detail. Narrative theory is used to better understand the archive, rather than the archive being used to better understand narrative.

Pasmatzi (2022), finally, seeks to integrate insights from Baker's narrative theory with concepts from Bourdieusian sociology in a study aimed at understanding literary translation in contexts of 'repatriation'. She offers an intriguing perspective, drawing parallels between narratives and physical objects in national identity, arguing that 'collective foundational narratives bear as much value in nation-making as cultural artefacts' (Pasmatzi 2022: 40). The integration of key concepts of Baker's approach, including her typology of narratives, with the nuanced understanding of the social in Bourdieu – characterised by interactions and conflicts within and between different fields – results in a compelling analysis. Rather than simply using elements of one theoretical approach alongside those of the other, they are effectively integrated to mutually buttress one another: thinking in terms of narrative provides a concrete way to link literary production with wider processes of collective identity formation and maintenance while embedding the analysis in Bourdieu's ideas provides a means to effectively analyse both the implications of narrative interactions for the social and the complex constraints influencing their production and circulation. As she argues: 'narrative theory … allows for an operationalised approach to how social forces are articulated in the field of power, symbolically permeate further social fields, and, with reference to translation, manifest within the product and its context of transfer' (Pasmatzi 2022: 46). She offers, then, a very promising development of the socio-narrative approach, albeit one which remains, at the time of writing, embryonic.

What, then, can we conclude from this brief review? Scholarly work must be assessed on its own merits. Apart from Harding and Pasmatzi, all the work discussed here is presented as making use of socio-narrative theory rather than specifically seeking to expand or refine it – an objective which is successfully achieved in each case. Reading this work together, there is little sense that it constitutes a coherent body of literature centred around the idea of the socio-narrative. Baker remains by far the most important reference point throughout. Citations between other scholars working with the narrative approach, for example to Harding's socio-narratological approach, on the other hand, remain infrequent. Rather than a productive 'meshwork' (to borrow a term from Ingold via Harding 2021) of overlapping thinking, it more closely resembles a series of linear responses to Baker's work which function largely in parallel with one another. The responses themselves also tend not to be extensively developed and, with the exception of Harding, we do not see extended engagement with the key concepts of narrative over multiple articles or the chapters of a monograph-scale work. For present purposes, it is notable that we do not find engagement with or strong answers to most of the issues raised by Chesterman.

Future directions

Much excellent translation studies research has drawn on the socio-narrative approach, then, but important gaps and challenges with the approach remain. In this final section, I will highlight ways that these issues might be tackled.

I

Most obviously, it would help to see more work using the concepts and categories of narrative theory. This is not something that can be taken for granted: the number of narrative-inspired publications in translation studies does not appear to be growing (Wang, Ang, and Halim 2020). Greater use of the approach alone, however, is not sufficient. We also need greater reflection on socio-narrative theory itself (as seen with Harding), rather than the straightforward acceptance of Baker's assumptions, summaries of her work, seen in so much of this literature. Greater dialogue between translation scholars working from the narrative perspective would be very useful in this regard: it is not difficult to imagine productive points of connection, for instance, between Marais' notion of wisdom and Strowe's thinking on the archive; Guldin's work on metaphor and Pasmatzi's linking of narratives and physical artefacts.

II

The avenues for further exploration identified in the existing literature would benefit greatly from that further exploration actually taking place. Existing work already points to interesting directions for theory building: Pasmatzi's article is extremely compelling; Guldin offers tantalizing glimpses as to how the relationship between metaphor and narrative could be more satisfactorily worked out; Strowe's piece highlights how thinking in terms of the archive can enrich our understanding of narrative. Having identified these avenues, we must now walk down them. This work will necessarily be difficult and theoretically dense. It is certainly useful to establish links between an approach such as that of Bourdieu and Baker's socio-narrative approach, highlighting points of connection between them to show how they enrich one another. It is also necessary, nonetheless, to address the theoretical discontinuities between the approaches, regarding, for instance, the relative importance of structure, the nature of social change, and the interplay between narrative and non-narrative more broadly in human activity and understanding.

III

A necessary condition for the first two points is that socio-narrative approaches in translation studies must be less deferential to the work of Mona Baker. It is clear that, in much of the literature, Baker's work remains by far the most important reference in narrative theory – a point Harding also emphasises in her conversation with Theo Hermans and Julie Boéri in this special issue. This is by no means because Baker's work is bad – on the contrary, it opened a major new perspective in the discipline, challenged established orthodoxies in highly valuable ways and is employed extremely effectively in both her own work and that of others. As the work reviewed in the previous section demonstrates, a number of scholars have either drawn links between narrative theory and ideas from other approaches or applied Baker's ideas in a range of contexts other than that of conflict seen in her work. I wholeheartedly agree with Hermans when he says 'I certainly don't hold it against Mona Baker that she focussed on social scientists rather than historians in writing her Translation and Conflict book. She made choices, and these choices proved very productive' (Hermans xx). It is clear, nonetheless, that advocates of narrative theory are often reluctant to critique her work. Open revision of Baker's approach or challenges to its key ideas are rare and the understanding of narrative and narrativity (in the socio-narrative sense at least) that typically we see in the discipline today remains much the same as when it was first introduced by Baker in 2006. While not a problem in any individual piece of research, this tendency is not good for building good

theory or for the robustness of the discipline as a whole.[5] As Baker puts it, 'controversy is healthy, and… it is productive for the discipline to engage with issues that give rise to disagreement, even passionate disagreement' (Baker 2008: 11). While Baker is referring primarily to the empirical contexts we study, the same also obtains for the theoretical tools which underpin our analyses. Narrative approaches to translation cannot genuinely thrive and take on a productive life of their own until they are able to step out of her shadow.

When scholars do venture past Baker's publications, it is frequently to explore the major sources upon which she drew in building her approach: notably Somers and Gibson (1994) and, to a lesser extent, Bruner (1991) and parts of Fisher (1987). Again, the issue here is not that these sources are bad; all are, in my view, very good. But to rely on them excessively – and beyond that to rely on Baker's legitimate (but not uniquely valid) reading of these sources – is simply to maintain too narrow a focus. There is a wealth of other work in narrative theory which has much to offer translation scholars. I would like to briefly highlight three of these traditions that I have found particularly helpful in my own work on narrative (Sadler 2018; 2019; 2021).

First, there is excellent work on narrative within philosophy. Of these, perhaps the most significant are the three volumes of Ricoeur's *Time and Narrative* (1984; 1985; 1988) and Macintyre's *After Virtue* (Macintyre 2007). Ricoeur situates his analysis in the gap between lived, phenomenological time and cosmic time, arguing that narrative is a human response for mediating between and connecting between these two irreducibly different, but nonetheless connected, forms of temporality. In so doing he draws on a wide of thinkers including Augustine, Aristotle, Husserl, Kant and Heidegger to situate temporality, and ultimately narrative, on the ontological level while examining the rather different epistemological operations of historiography and literary fiction in responding to what he terms the 'aporias of time'. Macintyre, on the other hand, argues that the abandonment of Aristotelian morality centred around teloi from the Enlightenment has resulted in a moral crisis. In this context, he sees the sense of wholeness that narratives can afford our lives as essential since 'the unity of a virtue in someone's life is intelligible only as a characteristic of a unitary life, a life that can be conceived and evaluated as a whole' (Macintyre 2007: 205). Both offer nuanced and carefully thought through accounts of narrative that situate it at the fundamental levels of temporal human existence and the living of a virtuous life respectively. As such, they offer much of value in understanding the relation of narrative to ontology and representation and the ethical and moral implications of thinking translators as re-narrators with an imperative to do good.

Second, there is a highly developed tradition of narrative theory within historiography. Of particular relevance here are long standing discussions as to the extent to the relationship between narrative and other modes of understanding the past (Mink 1968; Danto 1985), the relationship of historical narrative to historical reality and truth (Ricoeur 1988; Norman 1991; White 2001), exactly when it is that narrative comes into play in history (White 1980; Carr 1986; Dray 1971), and the position of narrative in the methods and epistemology of history (Ricoeur 1988; Danto 1985; Dray 1971; Collingwood 1994; Dray 1985; White 1980; Croce 1921). This work has much to offer us as translation scholars: it can help us to think in more nuanced ways about the extent to which narrative is an inescapable mode in both comprehending, representing and constructing the past and reality itself (therefore helping us to respond to one of Chesterman's most important questions), not least because of the extensive attempts made within historiography specifically to

[5] I am not suggesting that we need more of the kind of facetious criticism seen in Pym (2016). The kind of critical distance adopted by Robinson, Harding and Chesterman offer better models.

avoid narrative form in favour of more 'scientific' models, or to favour 'plain' narrative forms which simply list events rather than 'significant' narratives which explain their significance (Walsh 1958).

Third, there is much excellent work within literary narrative theory. This includes classic works such as Booth's *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (1961), which brought the invaluable concept of the 'implied author', and Kermode's *The Sense of an Ending* (1967), which argues for the central importance of eschatological thinking in western narrative. Narratology, on the other hand, brings with it a highly nuanced toolkit for describing, analysing and interpreting narrative form. This is true of the kind of classical, structuralist narratology used so effectively by Harding. It is also true of the 'post-classical' narratology that has emerged and matured since the 1980s, making use of formalist tools to explore wider issues including gender (Young 2018; Lanser 1986; Page 2006) and cognition (Herman 2013; Jahn 1997), along with detailed exploration of the distinct characteristics of storytelling on contexts such as 'transmedia storytelling' (Wolf 2011; Ryan and Thon 2014) and video games (Ryan 2006; Juul 2005). This body of literature provides a detailed toolkit for conducting narrative analysis in a host of different environments, recognising the elements that are common to all storytelling while also paying close attention to the distinctive characteristics of different types of narrative. The discussions of the notion of narrativity seem to me particularly useful in allowing us to recognise the possibility of varying degrees of narrativity, understanding it as a cline or 'protoypical' phenomenon rather than a binary distinction (Wolf 2003; Sternberg 2010). This body of literature, then, provides many of the ingredients for responding to concerns as to how the boundaries between narrative and non-narrative are to be drawn and conceptualised.

IV

Beyond the links already established with other disciplines, opportunities remain to establish other connections.[6] For me, two in particular stand out. The first is with Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). There are obviously significant conceptual and terminological differences between the two approaches in terms of issues such as the relationship between individual statements and wider structures, the importance of ideology and institutions, and the emphasis on synchronic vs diachronic analysis (c.f. Baker 2017a). Perhaps even more significantly, they have evolved from almost entirely separate scholarly traditions. Yet they have clear potential to complement one another. There is no reason not to see narratives as one major discursive form – understanding discourse in the CDA sense of the term as incorporating language and social practice. Thinking in terms of narrative can re-introduce an emphasis on temporality and change that is sometimes lacking in CDA. The interplay of power, institutions and ideology emphasised in CDA can help to explain the factors that condition narrative production and acceptance. Narrative, in its turn, can be seen as perhaps the single most powerful discursive intervention capable of altering these structures.

The second is to make greater use of computational techniques and corpora. Methodological hurdles immediately present themselves: corpus-based approaches typically lead to the analysis of text separated from all but its immediate co-text. This prevents the kind of close and holistic reading which characterises much narrative analysis. Nonetheless, there is much to be gained from the scale that corpus-based approaches can offer. Constantinou (2017) provides a rare example of this, in using corpus-based methods situated within a theoretical perspective informed by narrative theory

[6] I would also like to note two forthcoming examples of this type of work. Boéri, in her conversation with Harding and Hermans in this special issue, refers to fascinating forthcoming work on ethnographic approaches to narrative analysis. Katan's forthcoming article 'Tools for transforming translators into homo narrans or "what machines can't do"', meanwhile, brings the narrative approach to bear on machine translation for the first time, with very interesting results.

and CDA to analyse over 85,000 words drawn from Greek newspapers. Following manual analysis of headlines, she analyses keywords from the whole dataset to make inferences about the stories being told and the stances taken. While there is clearly a price to pay in terms of the confidence about how individual lexical choices are interpreted, she is able to study a much larger dataset than we typically see with traditional narrative approaches. As a consequence, she is able to make more confident, and less impressionistic, statements about narrative patterns in the media than would otherwise be possible.[7] Without replacing close reading, corpus-based approaches can provide a valuable complement analogous to the significant contribution of Corpus-Based Critical Discourse Analysis.

Concluding remarks

I set out to do three things in this article: to look back on the discussion of narrative theory between Mona Baker and Andrew Chesterman from the first issue of Cultus in 2008; to examine developments in narrative theory since that time; and to suggest some future directions to further develop translation scholarship from a narrative perspective. Re-reading that interview now suggests that narrative approaches in translation studies have, in certain respects, come a long way. Few would now dispute that narrative is a valuable concept for thinking about translation or feel a need to assess its usefulness in terms of equivalence. Looking at some of the work published since 2008 shows that there have been numerous attempts to extend Baker's initial formulation of narrative theory through the integration of insights from other research traditions. Nonetheless, it also suggests a degree of theoretical timidity and the absence of the kind of sustained engagement with the approach needed to really drive it forward. In the final section I identified what I see as four major routes to building stronger narrative approaches in translation studies: 1) more work from the narrative perspective; 2) more sustained theoretical engagement to make more of the possibilities revealed in the existing, largely exploratory, literature; 3) use of a wider range of sources in narrative theory; 4) establishing further links with other disciplines. It now falls to us as translation scholars, including myself, to go forward and do this work.

References

Al-Herthani, Mahmoud Muhammad. 2009. "Edward Said in Arabic: Narrativity and Paratextual Framing."

Baker, Mona. 2005. "Narratives in and of Translation." *SKASE Journal of Translation and Interpretation* 1: 4–13.

———. 2006. *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account*. London & New York: Routledge.

———. 2008. "Ethics of Renarration: Mona Baker Is Interviewed by Andrew Chesterman." *Cultus* 1 (1): 10–33.

———. 2010a. "Interpreters and Translators in the War Zone." *The Translator* 16 (2): 197–222.

———. 2010b. "Narratives of Terrorism and Security: 'Accurate' Translations, Suspicious Frames." *Critical Studies on Terrorism* 3 (3): 347–64.

———. 2014. "Translation as Renarration." In *Translation: A Multidisciplinary Approach*, edited by Juliane House, 158–77. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

———. 2017. "Narrative Analysis and Translation." In *Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies*

[7] Bosseaux's *Point of View in Translation* (2007) is an excellent example of corpus-based narratology applied to the study of translation.

and Linguistics, edited by Kirsten Malmkjær, 179–93. London & New York: Routledge.

Baldo, Michela. 2008. "Translation as Re-Narration in Italian-Canadian Writing: Codeswitching, Focalisation, Voice and Plot in Nino Ricci's Trilogy and Its Italian Translation." University of Manchester.

Boéri, Julie. 2009. "Babels, the Social Forum and the Conference Interpreting Community: Overlapping and Competing Narratives on Activism and Interpreting in the Era of Globalisation." University of Manchester.

Boéri, Julie, and Ashraf Fattah. 2020. "Manipulation of Translation in Hard News Reporting on the Gulf Crisis: Combining Narrative and Appraisal." *Meta (Canada)* 65 (1): 73–99.

Booth, Wayne C. 1961. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago & London: Chicago University Press.

Bosseaux, Charlotte. 2007. *How Does It Feel? Point of View in Translation: The Case of Virginia Woolf into French*. Amsterdam & New York: Rodopi.

Bruner, Jerome. 1991. "The Narrative Construction of Reality." *Critical Inquiry* 18 (1): 1–21.

Carr, David. 1986. *Time, Narrative and History*. Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Charon, Rita. 2008. *Narrative Medicine: Honoring the Stories of Illness*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Collingwood, R.G. 1994. *The Idea of History*. Revised ed. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Constantinou, Maria. 2017. "Mediating Terror through Narratives A Corpus-Based Approach to Media Translation." *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics* 13 (1): 25–63.

Croce, Benedetto. 1921. *Theory & History of Historiography*. Translated by Douglas Ainslie. London: George G. Harrap & Co Ltd.

Danto, Arthur. 1985. *Narration and Knowledge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dray, W. H. 1971. "On the Nature and Role of Narrative in Historiography." *History and Theory* 10 (2): 153–71.

———. 1985. "Narrative versus Analysis in History." *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 15 (2): 125–45.

Fisher, Walter R. 1987. *Human Communication as Narration: Toward a Philosophy of Reason, Value, and Action*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.

Franke, Arthur W. 1995. *The Wounded Storyteller*. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.

Greenhalgh, Trish, and Brian Hurwitz, eds. 1998. *Narrative Based Medicine: Dialogue and Discourse in Clinical Practice*. London: BMJ Books.

Guldin, Rainer. 2013. "Meeting in Between: On Spatial Conceptualizations within Narrative and Metaphor Theory and Their Relevance for Translation Studies." *Passagens* 4 (2): 24–37.

Hanne, Michael. 1999. "Getting to Know the Neighbours: When Plot Meets Knot." *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature* 26 (1): 35–50.

Harding, Sue-Ann. 2012a. *Beslan: Six Stories of the Siege*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

———. 2012b. "'How Do I Apply Narrative Theory?' Socio-Narrative Theory in Translation Studies." *Target* 24 (2): 286–309.

———. 2012c. "Translating Eyewitness Accounts." *Journal of Language and Politics* 11 (2): 229–49.

———. 2018. “Resonances between Social Narrative Theory and Complexity Theory: A Potentially Rich Methodology for Translation Studies.” In *Complexity Thinking in Translation Studies: Methodological Considerations*, edited by Kobus Marais and Reine Meylaerts, 33–52. New York: Routledge.

Harding, Sue-Ann, and Monwabisi K. Ralarala. 2017. “Tell Me the Story Is and Do Not Leave out Anything. Social Responsibility and Ethical Practices in the Translation of Complainants’ Narratives: The Potential for Change.” *The Translator* 23 (2): 158–76.

Herman, David. 2013. *Storytelling and the Sciences of Mind*. Cambridge, MA & London: MIT Press.

Jaber, Fadi. 2016. “Representing, Narrating and Translating the Syrian Humanitarian Disaster in The Guardian and The New York Times.” *Global Media Journal - Canadian Edition* 9 (2): 65–81.

Jahn, Manfred. 1997. “Frames, Preferences, and the Reading of Third-Person Narratives: Towards a Cognitive Narratology.” *Poetics Today* 18 (4): 441.

Jones, Henry. 2018. “Wikipedia, Translation, and the Collaborative Production of Spatial Knowledge.” *ALIF* 38: 264–97.

———. 2020. “Narrative.” In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, edited by Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha, 356–61. London & New York: Routledge.

Juul, Jesper. 2005. *Half-Real: Video Games between Real Rules and Fictional Worlds*. Cambridge, MA & London: MIT Press.

Katan, David. 2022. "Tools for transforming translatorsinto *homo narrans* or 'what machines can’t do'". In *The Human Translator in the 2020s*, edited by Gary Massey, Elsa Huertas-Barros and David Katan, 63-80. London & New York: Routledge.

Kermode, Frank. 1967. *The Sense of an Ending: Studies in the Theory of Fiction*. Oxford, London & New York: Oxford University Press.

Kim, Kyung Hye, and Yifan Zhu, eds. 2019. *Reseraching Translation in the Age of Technology and Global Conflict*. London: Routledge.

Lamarque, Peter. 2004. “On Not Expecting Too Much from Narrative.” *Mind and Language* 19 (4): 393–408.

Lanser, Susan. 1986. “Toward a Feminist Narratology.” *Style* 20: 341–63.

Levine, Peter. 1998. *Living Without Philosophy: On Narrative, Rhetoric, and Morality*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Luo, Yongzhou. 2015. “News Translation as a Site of Framing Chinese Identity: The Case of Yeeyan Sport.” *Ethnicities* 15 (6): 829–47.

Macintyre, Alasdair. 2007. *After Virtue*. 3rd ed. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Marais, Kobus. 2009. “Wisdom and Narrative: Dealing with Complexity and Judgement in Translator Education.” *Acta Theologica* 29 (Supplementum 12): 219–33.

Mink, Louis O. 1968. “Philosophical Analysis and Historical Understanding.” *The Review of Metaphysics* 21 (4): 667–98.

———. 1970. “History and Fiction as Modes of Comprehension.” *New Literary History* 1 (3): 541–58.

Norman, Andrew. 1991. “Telling It Like It Was: Historical Narratives on Their Own Terms.” *History and Theory* 30 (2): 119–35.

Page, Ruth. 2006. *Literary and Linguistic Approaches to Feminist Narratology*. Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pasmatzi, Kalliopi. 2022. "Theorising Translation as a Process of 'Cultural Repatriation.'" *Target* 34 (1): 37–66.

Phelan, James. 1996. *Narrative as Rhetoric: Techniques, Audiences, Ethics, Ideology*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.

———. 2005. "Editor's Column: Who's Here? Thoughts on Narrative Identity and Narrative Imperialism." *Narrative* 13 (3): 205–10.

Qin, Binjian, and Meifang Zhang. 2018. "Reframing Translated News for Target Readers: A Narrative Account of News Translation in Snowden's Discourses." *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 26 (2): 261–76.

Ricoeur, Paul. 1984. *Time and Narrative: Volume 1*. Translated by Kathleen McGlaughlin and David Pellauer. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.

———. 1985. *Time and Narrative: Volume 2*. Translated by Kathleen McLaughlin and David Pellauer. Chicago & London: Chicago University Press.

———. 1988. *Time and Narrative: Volume 3*. Translated by Katherine Blamey and David Pellauer. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.

Robinson, Douglas. 2011. *Translation and the Problem of Sway*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Ryan, Marie-Laure. 2006. *Avatars of Story*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Ryan, Marie-Laure, and Jan-Noël Thon, eds. 2014. *Storyworlds Across Media: Toward a Media-Conscious Narratology*. Lincoln & London: University of Nebraska Press.

Sadler, Neil. 2018. "Narrative and Interpretation on Twitter: Reading Tweets by Telling Stories." *New Media & Society* 20 (9): 3266–82.

———. 2019. "Myths , Masterplots and Sexual Harassment in Egypt." *The Journal of North African Studies* 24 (2): 247–70.

———. 2021. *Fragmented Narrative: Telling and Interpreting Stories in the Twitter Age*. London & New York: Routledge.

Saleh Elimam, Dr Ahmed. 2019. "Media, Translation and the Construction of the Muslim Image: A Narrative Perspective." *International Journal of Comparative Literature and Translation Studies* 7 (2): 24.

Somers, Margaret. R., and Gloria Gibson. 1994. "Reclaiming the Epistemological 'Other': Narrative and the Social Constitution of Identity'." In *Social Theory and the Politics of Identity*, edited by Craig Calhoun, 37–100. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sternberg, Meir. 2010. "Narrativity: From Objectivist to Functional Paradigm." *Poetics Today* 31 (3): 507–659.

Strawson, Galen. 2004. "Against Narrativity." *Ratio* 17 (December): 428–52.

Strowe, Anna. 2021. "Archive, Narrative, and Loss." *Meta* 66 (1): 178–91.

Toulmin, Stephen. 1958. *The Uses of Argument*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.

Walsh, W.H. 1958. "'Plain' and 'Significant' Narrative in History." *The Journal of Philosophy* 55 (11):

479–84.

Wang, Li, Lay Hoon Ang, and Hazlina Abdul Halim. 2020. “A Systematic Literature Review of Narrative Analysis in Recent Translation Studies.” *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities* 28 (1): 1–16.

White, Hayden. 1980. “The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality.” *Critical Inquiry* 7 (1): 5.

———. 2001. “Historical Emplotment and the Problem of Truth.” In *The History and Narrative Reader*, edited by Geoffrey Roberts, 375–89. London & New York: Routledge.

Wolf, Werner. 2003. “Narrative and Narrativity: A Narratological Reconceptualization and Its Applicability to the Visual Arts.” *Word & Image: A Journal of Verbal/Visual Enquiry* 19 (3): 180–97.

———. 2011. “Narratology and Media(Lity): The Transmedial Expansion of a Literary Discipline and Possible Consequence.” In *Current Trends in Narratology*, edited by Greta Olson, 145–80. Berlin & New York: De Gruyter.

Young, Tory. 2018. “Futures for Feminist and Queer Narratology.” *Textual Practice* 32 (6): 913–21.