DOI: 10.23817/strans.17-2

STUDIA TRANSLATORICA
2026 • vol. 17 23–37
ISSN 2084–3321 e-ISSN 2657-4802

Marco Agnetta
University of Innsbruck/ Austria

Rossella Resi
University of Padua/ Italy

Astrid Schmidhofer
University of Innsbruck/ Austria

Two Disciplines – one space of enquiry. Linguistics and Translation Studies in dialogue

ABSTRACT

Two Disciplines – one space of enquiry.
Linguistics and Translation Studies in dialogue

The present volume is dedicated to the interface between linguistics and translation studies. It brings together a series of articles that examine linguistic phenomena through the lenses of both disciplines, demonstrating that such an interdisciplinary perspective makes for rich and multilayered analyses. To this end, the authors draw on translation studies, lexicography, terminology, contrastive linguistics, literary studies and higher education research to examine differences between languages at the levels of *langue* and *parole*. The articles address word formation in different languages and its impact on the search for equivalents in translation; the translation of highly polysemous words and of metaphors; the integration of automation tools into translation processes; the design of audience-specific dictionaries; and pedagogical approaches to literary translation and language learning. The contributions are written versions of selected papers presented at two panels of the Österreichische Linguistiktagung (ÖLT): "New Perspectives on the Relationship between Linguistics and Translation Studies" (2023), convened by Marco Agnetta and Astrid Schmidhofer, and "Linguistics and Translation Studies in Dialogue" (2024), convened by Rossella Resi and Astrid Schmidhofer.

1. Introduction

Translation—leaving aside certain forms of intersemiotic transfer, e.g. between image and music—is always tied to language. Research in translation is

© The author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 license.

therefore inevitably dependent on at least a minimum degree of knowledge about the structure and functioning of languages. Hence, it is hardly surprising that the acquisition of knowledge in linguistics remains a fundamental aspect of translation studies programmes, in order to understand the cognitive processes involved in language use and the nature of communication, and to be able to precisely describe the manipulation of texts in the translation process.

Many representatives of contemporary translation studies, however, regard the linguistic approach that characterised the early phase of this comparatively young discipline (cf. Siever 2010: 46–87) as outdated, on the grounds that it is said to be concerned primarily with a mechanical transcoding from one language into another (cf. also Malmkjær 2011: 61) and that it is, in part, dominated by seemingly outmoded notions of equivalence and invariance (cf. Siever 2010: 36). In Siever's work, whose historiographical study describes old and new scholarly approaches within translation studies since 1960, the linguistic approach constitutes the first of the paradigms outlined in his book (cf. Siever 2010: 46–87). With regard to his presentation of a "succession of different translation theories" (ibid.: 27, translation by the authors) and the paradigm shifts that are said to occur (cf. ibid.: 28), one can easily gain the impression—as with any study that simplistically reduces the real history of the discipline to (humanities-style) turns—that earlier research approaches are to be classified as obsolete today.[1] Can new questions, problems, and aporias, then, no longer be raised from a linguistics perspective in contemporary translation studies?

Such a standpoint can be countered by a disciplinary-historical approach that assumes the coexistence of legitimate approaches to one's own object of study. After all, regardless of the 'end' of the linguistic paradigm, an ongoing series of works in linguistically oriented translation research has continued to be published to this day. It is true that linguistics cannot be the only discipline whose insights enrich the inter- and transdisciplinary field of translation studies. At the same time, however, it is equally legitimate to recognise, even today, the fundamental and unchanged relevance of linguistic impulses for the development of translation studies theory, and to acknowledge that, for certain research questions, a translation-linguistic approach can indeed be described as "translation-adequate" (Siever 2010: 86, following Stein 1980: 11). Given that linguistics has undergone the same turns to which translation studies has likewise been subjected, any artificially created separation between linguistics and translation studies would be the result of a static conception of what constitutes

1| The same applies to Siever's reference to the "necessity of a new paradigmatic foundation for translation studies" (Siever 2010: 27, translation by the authors) and his corresponding proposal for a translation theory grounded in semiotics and interpretation theory.

the two disciplines and their history. This holds all the more true when one considers that, since the turn of the millennium, a translatorial turn is also said to have shaped—or to be shaping—research in the humanities (cf. Bassnett 2003; Bachmann-Medick 2009).

2. On the present-day relationship between linguistics and translation studies

The articles compiled in this issue illustrate that linguistics remains a helpful parent, sister, or co-discipline for translation studies. At the same time, they manifest that translation is not merely a potential object of linguistic description or an application of linguistic knowledge, but can equally serve linguistic research as a heuristic instrument, an empirical data source, and a touchstone for hypotheses and theories. The mutual productivity of the two disciplines forms the central idea of this issue. The translated text can reveal which similarities and differences are so relevant in language practice that they were taken into account by a mediating individual within a particular discursive and historical context. Conversely, linguistics does not merely supply translation studies with language-related and text-related terminology, but also offers a wide range of research methods and language-specific as well as cross-linguistic models of every kind, all of which have always constituted the necessary basis for the scholarly evaluation of translation performance. For this reason, linguistic knowledge as background knowledge remains indispensable in translator training even today, and is gaining renewed significance precisely through advancing automation processes and the newly (re)defined roles of human translators.

Translation studies is an independent field of study whose research questions and applied methods do not fall entirely within the domain of (contrastive) linguistics either. Sinner (2024), for instance, has recently pointed this out, regarding linguists as at times amounting to lay translation scholars. And yet the fields of study of linguistics and translation studies are cognate in nature, which is why actively engaging with the discourses of the respective other discipline can only prove advantageous. Looking to the other discipline broadens one's own object of study and one's own methodological inventory, and yields insights that are beneficial to both fields of research. Linguistics and translation studies then form a shared space of enquiry in which linguistic structures, communicative practices, and translational processes are examined from different perspectives.

Complementing this, ever since the emergence of modern translation research in the mid-twentieth century, the question has arisen as to whether this field might not be better situated within semiotics, i.e. the general theory of

signs (than, for example, within linguistics)—a thesis that Siever appears to endorse by advocating an interpretation-theoretical-semiotic paradigm, and which is featured in the conclusion of his deliberations. This stems from the observation that communication addressed to a particular target audience, based on *gestalt* communicative products, draws on means of expression that are also non-verbal in nature. Semiotic models of translation that explicitly take non-verbal elements into account have, as is well known, been put forward by Jakobson (1959/1974; cf. also Steiner 1975/2014: 279–281) and Gottlieb (2005).

The relationship between linguistics and translation studies can likewise be described from a semiotic point of view. Building on the distinction between *langue* and *parole* introduced by Ferdinand de Saussure, as well as its later extension to include the concept of *norm* (cf. Coseriu 1970), the two disciplines can be related to one another at these levels of linguistic description. At the level of *langue*, it is entire sign systems that are of interest. In linguistics, individual languages are primarily described systematically, whereby Ferdinand de Saussure himself already drew attention to the fact that knowledge of as many languages as possible is indispensable for the linguist:

> […] [428]ce qui nous est donné, ce sont les langues. [429]Le linguiste est obligé d'en connaître le plus grand nombre possible, pour tirer de leur observation et de leur comparaison ce qu'il y a d'universel en elles. (Saussure 1916/2013: 96)

> […] [428]we have to work with languages. The linguist is obliged to acquaint himself with the greatest possible number of languages in order to determine what is universal in them by observing and comparing them. (Translation by Wade Baskin 1959: 23)

It is only by way of comparison that the linguist gains the necessary knowledge of what language in general is capable of achieving and of what turns individual languages into (more or less) closed systems. That individual languages may differ considerably from one another is, in this context, not a lay-linguistic truism, but rather a methodological instrument for mapping out the full range of linguistic dimensions and their relevance within a given speech community. This methodological approach is programmatic for contrastive linguistics, in which two or more language systems are set against one another and, where possible, compared down to the smallest detail. However, the fact that the description of language systems is inconceivable without reference to (paradigmatic, and thus norm-conforming) examples demonstrates the actual interweaving of the dimensions of *langue* and *parole* distinguished by Saussure, and accounts for the ambivalence inherent in the early linguo-semiotic foundations of translation theory—first and foremost the *stylistique comparée* (cf. Malblanc 1944; Vinay/Darbelnet 1958/1968) (cf. also Agnetta 2020: 3f.).

In such theories, which are mostly prescriptive in orientation, translation solutions of validity beyond the individual text are sought. It is precisely here that translation offers a particularly beneficial insight, since linguistic categories can only be precisely determined through the comparison of different language systems. Translation equivalents make visible which means of expression take on comparable functions in different languages and where categorial differences emerge. In this vein, ten Hacken (in this volume) examines composition as a cross-linguistic word-formation process, while Millán Vidal and Schmidhofer take the functional diversity of the German modal verb *sollen* as the starting point for an evaluation of machine translation systems. Clasmeier and Hennecke, by contrast, analyse the translation of complex nominal constructions against the background of different system-conditioned strategies. In these cases, translation serves to test and sharpen linguistic categories through cross-linguistic comparison.

At the level of norm, what is examined are all those linguistic laws, prescriptions, and prohibitions that circulate within a particular speech community—which is not necessarily to be equated with a national culture—and are regarded as appropriate. These include grammatical and stylistic rules just as much as text-type and genre conventions. These language-specific and culture-specific regularities are addressed, among other things, within the framework of a "Contrastive Textology" as outlined by Pöckl (1999). This level constitutes a central point of contact between linguistics and professional translation practice, since translators must regularly mediate between different systems of norms and, at times—as in 'more creative' forms of translation, for instance—also push the boundaries of these. Heinisch and Resi demonstrate this using the example of terminological resources and their integration into AI-assisted translation processes, while Rebosio, drawing on electronic dictionaries, illustrates how linguistic and visual knowledge representations jointly contribute to the codification and conveyance of lexical meaning.

Finally, at the level of *parole*, the focus shifts to specific communicative events and individual language use. Translation and interpreting appear here as linguistic action under specific situational conditions. Geisl analyses the treatment of political metaphors in simultaneous interpreting and shows how interpreters, under time pressure, weigh semantic precision, rhetorical effect, and communicative function against one another. Kubaszczyk examines literary translations as a reconstruction of individual processes of perception and meaning-making, while Seidl locates the acquisition of critical language awareness already within translation-oriented foreign-language teaching. It is at this level that it becomes particularly evident that translatorial action is not based solely on the application of linguistic rules, but always presupposes interpretive, communicative, and situation-bound decisions.

3. On the content of this volume

The texts compiled here comprise the written versions of selected papers presented at two sessions of the *Österreichischen Linguistiktagung* (ÖLT) in 2023 ("New Perspectives on the Relationship between Linguistics and Translation Studies", convened by Marco Agnetta and Astrid Schmidhofer) and 2024 ("Linguistics and Translation Studies in Dialogue", convened by Rossella Resi and Astrid Schmidhofer).

This special volume opens with an article by **Pius ten Hacken** (University of Innsbruck) entitled "Translation as a tool in the cross-linguistic investigation of compounding". The author regards the consideration of common translation equivalents—such as can be presupposed as well known or as found in bilingual dictionaries—as a valid methodological instrument for the cross-linguistic study of the word-formation process of compounding. His corpus-based study focuses on nominal compounds in English, German, and French. Ten Hacken observes that there are no generally valid, cross-linguistic guidelines for defining this word-formation process. After all, German and English, for instance, tend to favour nominal compounds (N+N), whereas French, in the same contexts, favours prepositional forms—that is, multi-word expressions with the prepositions *de*, *à*, or *sur*. In doing so, he draws attention to a circumstance highly relevant to this volume: that many pertinent questions concerning the definition and description of linguistic and translatorial phenomena often only arise within a contrastive-linguistic context. According to the author, compounding is a "general phenomenon"; certain particularities of this phenomenon certainly possess "cross-linguistic validity", and it is this validity that needs to be reconstructed by means of translations. A systematic comparison of several languages is thus what first makes it possible to identify those properties that can be regarded as constitutive of compounding across languages. Here, the collection of prototypical translations of compounds—i.e. those that are closest given the constraints of the respective language system—or, conversely, a set of target-language compounds functioning as interlingual allonyms for source-language (non-)compounds, serves as a heuristic anchor for developing a theory of the word-formation process in question that is valid, and can be validated, beyond the level of the individual language.

In their article "Semantic simplification and structural interference: Complex nominal constructions in Polish original and Czech and French translated texts", **Christina Clasmeier** (University of Münster) and **Inga Hennecke** (University of Tübingen) engage, from a contrastive-linguistic perspective, with complex nominal constructions ("complex nominal constructions", CNC) in the first chapter of a Polish source text (Andrzej Sapkowski: *Krew elfów*, 1994) and its Czech (Stanislav Komárek: *Krev elfů*, 1995) and French translation (Lydia

Waleryszak: *Le sang des elfes*, 2008). In this way, the authors work with actual translations, rather than isolated, a priori assumed ones. In particular, they pursue the following questions arising from research on translation universals: Is it true that translations exhibit a tendency towards semantic simplification? Do target texts display conspicuous traces of their translational character owing to the presence of structural interference? According to Clasmeier and Hennecke, complex nominal constructions (n = 275) proved well suited to answering both questions. Here, the answers may vary across different languages—provided one regards the distributions observed in the analysed corpus as representative, or at least as an indication of corresponding linguistic preferences. The article shows that neither simplification nor interference constitute uniform translation phenomena across languages, but are instead substantially influenced by the typological relationships between the languages involved. Here too, the cross-linguistic approach can lead either to the confirmation, or—probably more interestingly—to the relativisation of overly sweeping theorems concerning the universality of certain tendencies. At the same time, the study illustrates the analytical gain to be obtained from a corpus-based combination of contrastive linguistics and translation studies. Translations are understood as an empirical data basis, on the grounds of which linguistic-structural preferences, translation strategies, and cross-linguistic generalisations can be examined alike.

For **Jesús Millán Vidal** and **Astrid Schmidhofer** (University of Innsbruck) too, (functional) linguistics provides "basic tools for the description and comparability of the linguistic phenomena analysed across language boundaries". In their article "The translation of the German modal verb *sollen* into Spanish with generative AI and machine translation", the authors highlight the fact that humans and machines possess different bodies of knowledge regarding language systems, linguistic norms, and language use, and mobilise these in various ways when 'translating'. As an example, they examine the translation of the German modal verb *sollen* into Spanish by machine translation (MT) systems (Google Translate and DeepL) as well as by generative AI (ChatGPT and Gemini). Their starting point is the particular semantic complexity of this modal verb, which, depending on context, is associated with very different propositional attitudes—such as reporting, believing, or wanting—and which is therefore regarded, from the standpoint of translation (studies), as a demanding unit. Knowledge of the field of modality and the linguistic positioning of the modal verb *sollen* are regarded as a backdrop against which translation solutions can be assessed. The aim of this study is to examine to what extent present-day MT and AI systems are able to adequately capture and render this functional diversity. To this end, German–Spanish examples from the parallel corpus PaGeS were used. The performance of MT and AI systems can be gauged, among

other things, by whether they recognise not only the strongly conventionalised functions of the modal verb, but also its semantically more complex and pragmatically more strongly context-dependent functions, and offer adequate expressions in the target language. Whereas the first two articles understand translation as a tool of insight for linguistic research questions, this article examines how well current MT and AI systems cope with a particularly complex, translation-relevant phenomenon of lexicogrammar. It thereby connects classical, linguistically oriented translation studies with current AI research.

In her article "Leveraging large language models in lexicography, terminology and specialised translation", **Barbara Heinisch** turns her attention to professional practice, which is currently undergoing sweeping changes as a result of the availability of AI systems. The focus is not on the question of whether large language models (LLMs) can 'translate', but on how those working in language professions can integrate LLMs into their working processes in a sensible, responsible, and sustainable manner. The author examines the potential of large language models (LLMs) for three closely interrelated fields of work: lexicography, terminology work, and specialised translation. Her starting point is the observation that the systematic handling of discrete linguistic units constitutes an essential prerequisite for precise specialised communication across national and cultural boundaries. The aim of the article is to provide a systematic overview of how LLMs can support working processes in these fields, what limitations exist, and what ethical questions arise in this context. Key elements of successful collaboration between humans and machines here are the professional design of the prompts to be used and the thorough revision of machine output by the (specialised) translator. A distinct focus of the paper lies on the ethical dimensions of using LLMs. Heinisch discusses environmental sustainability, high energy and resource consumption, biases in training data, a lack of transparency, questions of copyright, as well as possible effects on linguistic diversity and the future of language-related professions. The author argues in favour of always critically weighing up the use of LLMs and, where appropriate, employing smaller language models or classical tools when these are more suitable for a given task or more resource-efficient. The future of language professions therefore lies less in being replaced by AI than in a thoughtful combination of established methods with new AI-assisted tools.

Starting from the assumption that the linguistic analysis of specialised-language domains constitutes an essential component of terminology research, **Rossella Resi** (University of Padua) devotes her article "Terminology work in evolving translation workflows" to the interdependence of these fields. The author outlines the endeavour of those working in this field for the technical optimisation of terminology systems and their availability within the framework

of (necessarily) computer-assisted translation processes. Her starting point is the observation that terminology work has always been closely tied to technological developments. With the transition from rule-based systems through CAT tools and neural machine translation to large language models, however, it is not only the technical implementation that changes, but also, and above all, the role of terminology within the translation process that is fundamentally transformed: many CAT tools continue to reduce terminology to simple term lists and largely dispense with the integration of conceptual relations or extensive metadata. Terminology is predominantly understood as a tool for pre-editing or post-editing and is only integrated into the actual translation process to a limited extent. With the integration of neural machine translation into CAT tools, terminology work is more strongly intertwined with the translation process, yet remains predominantly reactive. The true innovation in the use of large language models lies, according to Resi, in that unlike classical NMT systems, LLMs can take terminology into account flexibly by means of prompts, system instructions, in-context learning, or agent-based approaches. In this manner, terminology is, in most cases, no longer checked retrospectively but already influences the translation while it is being generated and has become an integral component of AI-assisted translation processes. Resi therefore argues in favour of a fundamental reorientation of future translation environments: proven functions of classical CAT tools—such as translation memories, quality control, or document management—should be combined with fully integrated terminology management systems. Terminological metadata should no longer serve merely as an auxiliary resource, but should actively shape the output of large language models as a central source of knowledge. In this way, linguistic and terminological knowledge regains central importance for the development of modern translation technologies, despite increasing automation.

In her article "The presentation of word meaning through ostensive aids in (electronic) dictionaries", **Laura Rebosio** (University of Innsbruck) brings lexicographic knowledge representation itself into focus. Her starting point is the question of how electronic dictionaries can be supplemented with visual elements in order to convey meanings more precisely and to support foreign-language learning and translational decision-making processes. In doing so, the author extends existing linguistic approaches to include a general semiotic perspective. She examines the use of so-called ostensive aids—that is, visual aids such as illustrations, photographs, diagrams, animations, or videos—in electronic (learner's) dictionaries. Rebosio argues that purely linguistic definitions are, in many cases, insufficient to fully capture differences in meaning. Precisely as an aid within the translation process, visual information can make a decisive contribution to highlight semantic differences between languages

and to facilitate the selection of the appropriate target-language expression. For this purpose, Rebosio develops a typology of ostensive aids. She distinguishes, among others, photographs, drawings, diagrams, taxonomic representations, semantic fields, scene depictions, animations, GIFs, and videos, and discusses, for each form of representation, its typical areas of application, advantages, and disadvantages. Among her aims is the development of a systematic set of criteria for the use of visual aids. She devotes particular attention to the phraseological PAD model (Phrase-based Active Dictionary). In contrast to traditional dictionaries, which describe individual lexemes and their meanings, the PAD treats typical patterns of use as the actual lexical units. This allows visual information to be linked far more precisely to concrete contexts of use. Rebosio's article thus makes clear that electronic dictionaries are evolving from text-centred reference works into multimodal knowledge systems that combine linguistic, visual, and cultural information, thereby supporting both translation processes and foreign-language acquisition.

Christiane Geisl takes the inherent figurativeness of language as her starting point in her article "Metaphors we get infected by. Political metaphors in simultaneous interpreting: A German-Spanish corpus analysis". The author examines the processes surrounding the interpreting of political metaphors and combines cognitive metaphor theory with methods of corpus analysis. The central question is how simultaneous interpreters, working under considerable temporal and cognitive pressure, deal with these linguistic-conceptual elements. To this end, she examines political speeches delivered during the COVID-19 pandemic, in which metaphors function as carriers of evaluations, emotions, and ideological framings. The study investigates whether simultaneous interpreters are able to preserve the communicative functions of these metaphors in the target language. Geisl distinguishes five interpreting strategies: retention, omission, de-metaphorisation, explicitation, and intensification. In addition, she assesses whether the communicative function of the metaphor is preserved fully, partially, or not at all. Geisl challenges the assumption, widespread in interpreting research, that metaphors are fundamentally unsuited to simultaneous interpreting; rather, her article shows that, despite considerable difficulties of transfer, interpreters by no means systematically avoid metaphorical structures, but instead—insofar as the processing situation allows—consciously attempt to preserve them. The author therefore argues in favour of integrating metaphorical competence more strongly into interpreter training. She further suggests combining future studies with interviews, think-aloud protocols, or experimental designs in order to investigate interpreters' cognitive decision-making processes directly.

The final two articles, both of which focus on language and translation pedagogy, represent a directly applied domain of linguistically oriented translation

research. In her article "'Let us imagine…' – On literary translation in the light of Roman Ingarden's legacy: Implications for translation teaching", **Joanna Kubaszczyk** (Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań) develops, on the basis of Roman Ingarden's phenomenology, a model that directly connects theoretical reflection with translator education. The paper raises the question under which conditions linguistic communication can achieve that recipients not only understand the same conceptual content, but also activate the same mental images, sensations, and dimensions of meaning. To this end, Kubaszczyk draws on Roman Ingarden's translation theory and systematises his considerations on literary translation for present-day translation studies. The aim of her article is to demonstrate the relevance of Ingarden's phenomenological perspective and to derive from it concrete consequences for translation teaching. She devotes particular attention to Ingarden's model of language functions and shows that the expressive function, the function of affective impact, and representation of images are closely connected with the phonic form of linguistic signs. Since every translation inevitably alters this phonic form, these functions can never be preserved entirely unchanged. This gives rise, for literary translation, to the particular challenge of striving not only for semantic equivalence but also for aesthetic and emotional effects that are as similar as possible. In this paper, the analysis focuses on translations of poems by Jan Twardowski and Stanisław Młodożeniec by Karl Dedecius. The author shows how individual lexical choices can not only alter meanings but also weaken sound symbolism, haptic imagery, or emotional effects. Kubaszczyk's aim is to develop a phenomenological teaching method designed to systematically sensitise students to the imaginative dimension of literary texts. Its core element is a multi-stage perspective-taking exercise in which students first reflect on their own perceptions, mental images, and emotions while reading, then adopt the perspective of the literary character, subsequently identify the linguistic means that evoke these mental images, and finally distinguish between text-driven and subjectively supplemented meanings. The aim of this exercise is to ground translation decisions more firmly in conscious processes of perception and understanding.

In the final article, entitled "On the significance of Critical Language Awareness in Translation-Oriented Language Teaching", **Eva Seidl** (University of Graz) asks how linguistic insights and translation-oriented aims can already be brought together in university language teaching. The author argues that a specific form of linguistic reflective competence should be developed as early as in the first semester of a translation degree programme. Her starting point is the observation that, as translation studies has emancipated itself from linguistics since the 1980s, the role of language teaching within translator training has, as a result, long dropped out of scholarly focus. Against this

background, the author argues in favour of a stronger theoretical grounding of translation-oriented language teaching integrating the concept of Critical Language Awareness (CLA). According to Seidl, language teaching should not be confined to the acquisition of language structures, but should enable students to reflect on language as a social, cultural, and power-related phenomenon. For prospective translators and interpreters, this means not merely using language correctly, but consciously perceiving how it functions, how it can change, and what role it plays in communicative negotiation processes. Critical language awareness thus becomes an essential foundation of professional translatorial competence. For its theoretical grounding, Seidl combines the CLA approach with concepts from translanguaging. From this perspective, languages appear not as rigid, mutually separate systems, but as dynamic resources that speakers employ creatively and situation-sensitively. Hence, language learners are not mere appliers of linguistic norms, but contribute actively to the further development of language. At the same time, this view strengthens the agency of future translators, who do not merely reproduce their first and second language(s) but consciously live in and with them, actively co-shaping communicative processes on a daily basis through this particular competence. The author illustrates, by means of various examples from university teaching, how this competence can be acquired and further developed.

4. Concluding discussion

The contributions presented in this issue show that the close relationship between linguistics and translation studies manifests itself, primarily, in the linguistic phenomena to which both disciplines devote their attention. In many cases, the same linguistic units are examined, though their description serves different epistemological interests. What they have in common is that their analysis presupposes a precise determination of their position within the structure of sentence and text, as well as of their syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic properties. It is precisely these semiotic entities that function as the *tertium comparationis* in cross-linguistic comparison and in the translation process. This applies, for instance, to the study of compounds (ten Hacken), complex nominal constructions (Clasmeier/ Hennecke), modal verbs (Schmidhofer/ Millán Vidal), or metaphors (Geisl). Whereas linguistics describes these phenomena with regard to their systematic properties, translation studies examines how they can be transferred, altered, or realised in a functionally equivalent way under the conditions of interlingual communication.

The methodological approaches of the two disciplines likewise overlap closely. Corpus-linguistic methods today constitute a central methodological

approach both in linguistics and in empirical translation research. (Large) parallel corpora not only allow researcher to formulate well-founded statements about language systems and language use, but also to analyse translational decisions and translation strategies. In addition, there are classical lexicographic resources such as dictionaries and other reference works, which combine statements about the language system (*langue*), norm, and actual language use (*parole*). As Rebosio's contribution shows, this knowledge representation is by no means confined to linguistic signs alone, but increasingly also includes pictorial and other multimodal elements.

In their articles, ten Hacken, Heinisch, Resi, and Rebosio further point out that both disciplines work productively with certain resources, such as dictionaries and other lexicographic tools, parallel and reference corpora, literary texts and their translations, as well as authentic documents from translational working processes. At the same time, more recent lines of research extend this spectrum to include data sources that have so far received less attention, such as teaching situations in translation-oriented language pedagogy (Seidl), digital terminological resources, and documents from computer-assisted translation processes (Heinisch, Resi). It is precisely this diversity of shared objects of study that makes clear how extensively linguistics and translation studies draw on the same empirical foundations, exploring them from different scholarly perspectives.

Although linguistics has, since the beginnings of modern translation studies, ranked among its most important reference disciplines, its significance within the field has certainly been subject to fluctuations. While it temporarily receded behind cultural-studies, sociological, or cognitive-scientific approaches, a renewed and closer convergence currently appears to be emerging once again. Millán Vidal and Schmidhofer surmise that it is, in particular, the rapid developments in the field of neural machine translation and large language models that are reviving interest in contrastive-linguistic research questions and in linguistically grounded methods of analysis. The growing need to describe, compare, and evaluate human and machine translation performance by means of linguistic categories currently provides fresh momentum to a combined perspective between linguistics and translation studies. With Geisl's reflections on the significance of metaphorical competence for interpreter training, together with the decidedly pedagogically oriented contributions by Kubaszczyk and Seidl, the special issue closes with a forward-looking view of the training of the next generation of translators and interpreters, and at the same time underscores the central idea which connects the texts of the entire issue: linguistics and translation studies do not exist in a relationship of competition, but complement one another in manifold ways in research, methodology, and teaching.

References

Agnetta, Marco (2020). "Die Bedeutung der *stylistique comparée* für die Übersetzungsanalyse, dargestellt am Beispiel des Transfers musikgebundener Texte". In: *ATeM – Archiv für Textmusikforschung* 5(1). S. 1–36. DOI: 10.15203/ATeM_2020_1.10.

Bachmann-Medick, Doris (2009). "Introduction: The Translational Turn". In: *Translation Studies* 2(1). S. 2–16. DOI: 10.1080/14781700802496118.

Bassnett, Susan (2003). "The Translation Turn in Cultural Studies". In: Petrilli, S. (ed.) *Translation Translation* (= *Approaches to Translation Studies*, Vol. 21). Leiden. S. 433–449. DOI: 10.1163/9789004490093_028.

Gottlieb, Henrik (2005). "Multidimensional Translation: Semantics turned Semiotics". In: *Proceedings of the Marie Curie Conference Series Multidimensional Translation – MuTra: First Conference: 'Challenges in Multidimensional Translation'. 2.–6. Mai 2005*, Saarbrücken. (https://www.euroconferences.info/proceedings/2005_Proceedings/2005_Gottlieb_Henrik.pdf, accessed: 16.06.2026).

Jakobson, Roman (1959/1974). "Linguistische Aspekte der Übersetzung". In: Jakobson, R. (ed.) *Form und Sinn. Übersetzung von Gabriele Stein*. München. S. 154–161.

Malblanc, Alfred (1944). *Pour une stylistique comparée du français et de l'allemand. Essai de répresentation linguistique comparée*. Paris.

Malmkjær, Kirsten (2011). "Linguistics and Translation". In: Gambier, Y./ Doorslaer, L. van (eds.) *Handbook of Translation Studies*, Vol. 2. Amsterdam / Philadelphia. S. 61–68.

PACTE Group (2015). "PACTE Translation Competence Model: A Holistic, Dynamic Model of Translation Competence". In: Hurtado Albir, A. (ed.) *Researching Translation Competence by PACTE Group*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia. S. 35–41.

Pöckl, Wolfgang (1999). "Kontrastive Textologie". In: Eckkrammer, E.M./ Hödl, N./ Pöckl, W. (eds.) *Kontrastive Textologie*. Wien.

Saussure, Ferdinand de (1959). *Course in General Linguistics*. New York. (trans. Wade Baskin).

Siever, Holger (2010). *Übersetzen und Interpretation. Die Herausbildung der Übersetzungswissenschaft als eigenständige wissenschaftliche Disziplin im deutschen Sprachraum von 1960 bis 2000* (=*Leipziger Studien zur angewandten Linguistik und Translatologie*, Vol. 8). Frankfurt a. M./Berlin u. a.

Sinner, Carsten (2024). "Laientranslatologische Linguistik: Unwissenschaftliche und pseudowissenschaftliche Arbeit mit Übersetzung(en) in der Linguistik". In: Agnetta, M./ Dalkeranidou, S. (eds.) *Übersetzung für/von Laien. Perspektiven auf die Laientranslation und Laientranslatologie in der Romania*. Hildesheim/Baden Baden. S. 87–115.

Stein, Dieter (1980). *Theoretische Grundlagen der Übersetzungswissenschaft*. Tübingen.
Steiner, George (1975/2014). *Nach Babel. Aspekte der Sprache und des Übersetzens*. Frankfurt a. M. (trans. Monika Plessner).
Vinay, Jean-Paul/ Darbelnet, Jean (1958/1968): *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais. Méthode de traduction*. Paris.

Marco Agnetta
Universität Innsbruck
Institut für Translationswissenschaft
Herzog-Siegmund-Ufer 15
6020 Innsbruck
Austria
marco.agnetta@uibk.ac.at
ORCID: 0009-0005-9520-3082

Rossella Resi
Università degli Studi di Padova
Dipartimento di Ingegneria dell'Informazione
Via Gradenigo 6/B
35131 Padova
Italy
rossella.resi@unipd.it
ORCID: 0000-0002-3261-5662

Astrid Schmidhofer
Universität Innsbruck
Institut für Translationswissenschaft
Herzog-Siegmund-Ufer 15
6020 Innsbruck
Austria
astrid.schmidhofer@uibk.ac.at
ORCID: 0000-0001-6287-3032