

Mehrnaz PIROUZNİK

Independent Scholar

A Cognitivist Risk-Management
Approach to Steiner's
Hermeneutic Motion

**Cognition and Hermeneutics:
Convergences in the Study
of Translation**

Douglas Robinson
[ed.]

2/2022

**Yearbook of Translational Hermeneutics
Jahrbuch für Übersetzungshermeneutik**

Journal of the Research Center
Zeitschrift des Forschungszentrums



Hermeneutics and Creativity, University of Leipzig
Hermeneutik und Kreativität, Universität Leipzig

DOI: 10.52116/yth.vi2.45



Cite this article:

Pirouznik, Mehrnaz (2022): „A Cognitivist Risk-Management Approach to Steiner's Hermeneutic Motion“. In: *Yearbook of Translational Hermeneutics* 2, pp. 181–206.

DOI: <10.52116/yth.vi2.45>.

A Cognitivist Risk-Management Approach to Steiner's Hermeneutic Motion

Mehrnaz PIROUZNIK
Independent Scholar

Abstract: This paper combines Cognitive Translation Studies (CTS) under the specific rubric of Risk-Management (RM), which is closely connected with 4EA cognition, and the magisterial Translational Hermeneutics (TH) of George Steiner's four-stage hermeneutic motion (HM), asking what the risks are that a translator will be cognitively processing (recognising, testing, avoiding, etc.) in regard to each of the motions: trust, aggression, assimilation (appropriation) and restitution. In this spirit, a new reading of Steiner's hermeneutic motion will be offered whereby the model is treated as an idealised model of a single act of translation in order to explore the implicit RM in it. According to Robinson (2015: 45), in the post-Kantian world "Everything we take to be reality is culturally constructed: we have no access to 'objective' reality". This is equally true of risk-management, where the entire process, although culture-driven, emerges in and through and out of personal experiencing and feeling, namely fearing and daring. This paper also explores the RM implied in Steiner's HM as the affective-becoming-conative formation of person-centred norms (a felt pressure to conform) out of perceived repetitions.

Keywords: Hermeneutic Motion, Risk-management, Affective-becoming-conative, Affective-becoming-conative-becoming-cognitive, 4EA Cognitive science.

1 Introduction

As is apparent from the title, the thematic basis of this essay is rooted in George Steiner's theory of the Hermeneutic Motion (HM), introduced in *After Babel* (1975) (see Agnetta et al. 2021, especially Robinson in that volume), but with a focus not merely on the Translational Hermeneutics (TH) that Steiner explicitly mines but on the convergence between TH and Cognitive Translation Studies (CTS) within the framework of Risk-Management (RM). If we take RM to be an important subdiscipline of CTS, what cognitivist light can it shed on the hermeneutics of Steiner's HM?

Other scholars have of course noted an uncertainty in Steiner's Hermeneutic Motion. It is not clear whether it is a four-stage account of a single idealised act of translation or a series of historical "epochs" of translation, as it was for the German Romantics (Goethe, Novalis). If we read it as the latter, it may just be a convenient way to organise a series of theoretical approaches to translation; for the purpose of using RM to explore the convergences between CTS and TH, I propose to read it in the former way, asking in each of the four stages as it "moves" what the translator's perception or projection of risks might be.

Risk-management as a translator's orientation to a translation task is typically understood cognitively, through the lens of cognitive psychology: how do translators *think and feel* about the risks involved in translating? How do they mobilise various cognitive strategies to manage those risks? Cognitive psychology was also the research methodology I adopted in my PhD research (see Pirouznik 2019). The main question

driving this essay, however, is how those cognitive strategies organise and power the hermeneutics of translation, in the specific context of Steiner's Hermeneutic Motion.

Risk-management can be explained as strategies adopted by translators to solve problems they encounter in the process of translation and/or a method of tolerating cognitive and perceptual ambiguities in the process of translation in their encounter with the unknown, namely unknown information or new knowledge. Therefore, following in the footsteps of Anthony Pym (2015: 1) and bearing on the secondary findings of my own PhD research (see Pirouznik 2019), I see risk-management as translators' response to a problem driven by some type of translation-specific credibility loss. In this spirit, risk-management is the act of mobilising problem-solving efforts by translators to minimise perceived dangers to which their credibility is subject. The notion of risk-management can also be seen as an affective-becoming-conative (pressure emerging out of feeling) means of coping with emotional stress. The question that arises here is: what risks may translators experience and/or construct affectively-becoming-cognitively (feeling moving through conformational pressure to conscious thought) in their process of translation?

RM can, therefore, be defined as a response to the risk(s) of translation the translator experiences in time and space in a body that cannot be in two places or two times at once (i.e., in a single situated body that s/he inhabits, as an individual).

I have borrowed here from Robinson (2020) when describing risk-management as an "affective-becoming-conative-becoming-cognitive" process, where affect refers to feelings and conation is motivation, including the pressure to act in normative ways. If we feel that something is risky, that feeling will motivate our response. Finally, RM can lead to norm-formation in the sense that the repeat experience of risks and

specific management strategies come to feel like professional norms. Norms formed in this manner, however, are less universal and more local than norms as theorised by Toury (1995/2012: 63), which are taken to be “performance instructions” that “specify what is prescribed and forbidden, as well as what is tolerated and permitted in a certain behavioural dimension”. This is, as Robinson (2020: 124) puts it, “a theory of the norm-formations of translators as humans”.

Having explained all of the above, in order to investigate the question underlying this paper, I will initially ask myself about the risks that the translator is cognitively processing in every stage of Steiner’s Hermeneutic Motion: trust, aggression, assimilation (appropriation) and restitution.

The present study could be seen as yet another step forward in the shift from the study of the product of translation to the study of the individual who creates the translation. This would be the study of the translator, or in simple terms: translator studies.

2 What is translatorial risk and how is it formed and managed?

Translatorial risks are perceived threats to a translator’s face and credibility. They show themselves as a translator’s construct in response to a perceived threat, which may be something unknown or it may be an anticipated challenge from target readers. The translator fears that the translation’s purpose will not be fulfilled. As such, looking at risks through the lens of translational hermeneutics (TH) or simply through the eyes of a human translator, *translatorial risk is the translator’s counterfactual fear that the translation’s purpose will not be fulfilled*. However, the definition thus offered for translatorial risk alludes to Kahneman’s “counterfactual affects” as well, where

he and Miller state that orientations to action are guided by counterfactual affect (see Kahneman/Miller 1986). Counterfactual affect can be defined as affect prompted by an imagined future consequence of actions being contemplated in the present. In this sense, much translatorial behaviour is guided by counterfactual affect; the translator's counterfactual affect of fear or anxiety about fulfillment drives him or her to act in proactive ways (conation), that would lead to risk-management in affective-becoming-conative terms. In Robinson's terms (2020: 124), all this represents the "convergence of affect-oriented phenomenology with cognitive science."

Therefore, the modality of translatorial risk-generation or risk-identification in the process of translation may be a "pattern of associated ideas [that] comes to represent the structure of events in [his or her] life," as suggested by Robinson (2020: 125) when reframing translational norm theory through 4EA cognition. The reason I am applying this statement to translatorial-risk-generation and/or -identification is that norms emerge out of the process of risk-management following the translator's re-experiencing and co-experiencing and the repetition of these experience-driven conations, a notion that also draws on Robinson's 2020 article on reframing norms.

When the translator senses a threat to his/her credibility, a counterfactual fear takes shape in the translator's mind about the possibility that a collapse of credibility will undermine or undo his or her reputation for reliability.

In the long run, patterns resulting from attempts at responding to similar perceived risks in the process of translation could help replace the panic and fear experienced by the translator with flexibility in risk-identification and risk-management. Repetition of this type, as mentioned above, will lead to norm formation by the translator, a subject we will

come back to later in this paper with a view to Steiner's Hermeneutic Motion (HM).

It might be useful to explain at this stage that in general, risk-management (RM) is studied in a vast array of disciplines. Additionally, beyond its scientific and academic scope, RM can be seen as a 'life hack' aimed among other things at promoting the quality of life.

In general, approaching RM within the convergence of CTS and TH entails the initial assumption that the risks that translators manage in translating begin as projections of their own fears. With any new translation comes new fears, new risks and new management strategies for and by the translator.

According to a text posted on the Internet by the Lucid Content Team (2021), any risk-management process is a five-stage or a five-phase procedure, comprising "risk identification, risk analysis, risk prioritisation, risk treatment and risk monitoring". In this paper my main concern will be with the way the five stages defined for risk-management can be related to translation within the framework of Steiner's hermeneutic motion, if at all.

In the CTS/TH model promoted in this paper, risk-identification would have to begin with a feeling (what Kahneman calls a counterfactual affect – say, fear or anxiety or concern) that conatively pushes the translator into taking the next steps (analysis, prioritisation, treatment, monitoring, which will typically also involve normativisation). The risk-analysis stage would be the most important stage where the translator makes an effort to analyse the problem type and/or risk(s) s/he believes s/he is facing. Stage three, risk-prioritisation, may be a game of choice for the translator, where s/he decides which risks to tackle and hence prioritise. At this stage the choice a translator makes might be based on what

triggers the greatest fear in the translator or his or her fear, timidity or daring. As such, the prioritisation process would be mainly feeling-based. Stage four, risk-treatment, could deal with the translator's identification of solution type and subsequently affective-becoming-cognitive risk removal and/or risk dismissal. And finally stage five, risk-monitoring, could trigger an inner dialogue in the translator's mind regarding the impact of risk-treatment on the final product of translation from the viewpoint of the end-user: i.e., target reader/receiver and/or receiving culture.

The understanding that risks do not have an objective nature, which is to say they do not exist objectively for translators to identify, is essential to our embrace of the CTS/TH/RM convergence.

3 What is translational hermeneutics?

Translational hermeneutics is a discipline that seeks, among others, to study the influence of the modality of the translator's affective-becoming-conative-becoming-cognitive thoughts, feelings and/or behaviours on translation. In simple words, it can be the feeling-based study of translation that focuses on translator studies to study how translations are formed.

Douglas Robinson has traced the emergence of 4EA cognitive science out of hermeneutics in the Introduction to this volume, with a focus first on the feeling-based hermeneutics of Herder and Schleiermacher and then on the gradual transformation of Dilthey's theory of the *Zusammenhang des Lebens* (nexus of life) into Husserl's *Lebenswelt* (life-world) and ultimately into the situated embeddedness and extended enactivity (mutual constitutivity) of embodiment in 4EA cognitive science. In this essay I accept the broad outlines of that historical emergence but focus specifically on the conver-

gence between CTS/TH/RM and Steiner's Hermeneutic Motion.

Bernd Stefanink and Ioana Bălăcescu (2017) make implicit reference to that link through the explanation that "to understand the text, translators unavoidably project some fore-understanding on the text [...] and for the hermeneutic translator the translation is complete when the target text corresponds to the mental representation of the meaning in the translator's brain". This fore-understanding is based on the human translator's experience. As they further put it:

this hermeneutical conception is supported by cognitivist research as, for instance Fillmore's (1976: 61) description of the process of understanding shows [...] "what happens when one comprehends a text is that one mentally creates a kind of world; the properties of this world may depend quite a bit on the individual interpreter's private experiences a reality which should account for part of the fact that different people construct different interpretations of the same text." (Fillmore 1976: 61, quoted in Stefanink/Bălăcescu 2017: 25)

In view of the above, the hermeneutical approach in translation can be seen as one that easily shifts the focus from the product of translation to the person who produces it. In other words, translational hermeneutics is not about transfer at all – of meanings or words. It is about the human act and experience of interpreting and understanding. As such, it is no accident that hermeneutics was the foundation for phenomenology and 4EA cognitive science, both of which are about the experience of being human, of being alive in a human body.

The 4EA (embodied, embedded, enacted, extended and affective) aspects of cognition, an inseparable part of translation, especially of translational hermeneutics, may well be regarded as realms of co-experiencing. This point is quite relevant to my suggestion that TH/RM as 4EA co-experiencing tends to give rise to translational norms. What stands out at

this stage is the convergence of cognitive science with phenomenology, an approach that concentrates on the study of consciousness and the objects of direct experience. With this background information in place, I will move on to the main focus of this paper, Steiner's Hermeneutic Motion.

4 Steiner's Hermeneutic Motion

Steiner (1975: 331) defines his Hermeneutic Motion (HM) as “the act of elicitation and appropriative transfer of meaning” and explains it as being “fourfold”. The four stages, moves or motions are: trust, aggression, assimilation (appropriation) and restitution. As Elizabeth Marie Young (1997: 240) notes, George Steiner was “one of the scholars who inaugurated the current interest in the ethics of translation”, (quoted in Robinson 2021: 103), especially through his “multi-step interpretive process”: the Hermeneutic Motion.

Not for nothing is Steiner's model named the *Hermeneutic Motion*: it is of course steeped in German Romantic hermeneutics. Its grounding in cognitive science—especially 4EA cognitive science, which was still two decades in the future when Steiner wrote—is, however, rather thin and weak, and I propose here to offer risk management as a cognitivist clarification of Steiner's vague model. This will be done by integrating cognitivist risk management into Steiner's model, asking in each of the four stages or motions or moves what a translator's perception or projection of risks might be. In other words, I will be asking in every motion what the risks are that a translator may process (recognise, test, avert, transfer, etc.).

Looking at risk-management from Steiner's perspective or in the framework of his fourfold motion, and bearing on the cognitivist approach to risk-management as simply being

an approach to problem-solving that aids interlinguistic and intercultural dialogue and understanding or even a rhetoric of translatorial reassurance, we can isolate RM as the element that conditions and guides the two acts of “elicitation” and “appropriative” transfer as affective-becoming-conative-becoming-cognitive orientations to those two tasks. Why is this? Because risk-management is a translator’s tool for drawing out meaning where the translator is fearful of being derailed from the purpose of the translation and hence risking his/her credibility and reliability. Where meaning is felt to be difficult to grasp or where the translator faces the fear of untranslatability, the translator will choose to resort to “elicitation”. And when facing the fear of transferring the unintelligible, the translator ponders among others the choice of localising the drawn-out sense for better grasp in the target culture (i.e., appropriation and restitution).

5 Steiner’s hermeneutic motion and RM norms

As I earlier explained, my understanding is that translational norms are in principle self-styled by the translator, through the repetition of risk-management strategies. In other words, an interesting aspect of Steiner’s HM from the point of view of risk-management, and also in respect of the cognitive aspect of the cognitive science of norm-formation, is what I would propose as risk-management norms (RM norms). From a human perspective, norms are affective-becoming-conative-becoming-cognitive patterns shaped in response to a translator’s personal construction of counterfactual affects like regret and shame as guides to normative risk management. To put that differently, what counts here, and what helps form the norms in stages two (aggression) and three

(appropriation) of Steiner's motion, is the translator's counterfactual affect.

In the next four sections I will be analysing the risks perceived by translators in each stage of the hermeneutic motion. We will read and see that the second and third stages of Steiner's hermeneutic motion are typically taken to be the most risk-prone because translators tend to experience the most cultural and linguistic differences in these two stages. Translators' RM experiences in these two stages give conative impulse to counterfactual affects, leading to norm-formation through repeat experiences of similar affective-becoming-conative situations.

In risk-management, the cognitive tension is between the perceived risk and the self-protective measure(s) a translator takes in response. In this sense, the RM norm represents the relation or relationality between the risk and its avoidance and/or management strategy.

For Kahneman (2014), the experience of a single repetition is enough to set a norm. In risk-management that would suggest that when a translator perceives a risky situation and has to respond in a way that seems to protect her or him against that risk, at first this is just an experience, but when it happens a second time it generates (the imagination and projection of) a norm. However, if the same or a similar relation/tension occurs over and over, eventually that comes to seem not just like a translational norm but like "translation." This becomes the whole proposed landscape of translation, and therefore it can be considered as the whole normative scope or range of (acceptable) translation. These norms can be considered counterfactual orientations to action guided conatively by social expectations. In Robinson's terms (2020: 125), they are based on that "pattern of associated ideas [that] comes to represent the structure of events in [the translator's]

life”. Thus, these norms can be seen differently from the self-styled norms coming through immediate experience and problem-solving strategies adopted by the translator in the transition from stage two to stage - three, which Steiner tends to treat as separately embodied in individual translations - In Robinson’s terms (ibid.: 127), “this sort of norm-based guidance is *habit-as-instinct* ... [the norm] has been habitualized and automated as System-1¹ ‘instinct’”. In other words, as Robinson puts it (ibid.), “you know how to proceed without thinking about it”.

RM norms are closely connected with 4EA (embodied, embedded, enactive, extended, and affective) cognition: “notably they give affective response a key role in marking not only the intensity but the cognitive load of norm-formative decision-making” (Robinson 2020: 122). RM norms are thus experience-driven. From a 4EA perspective, starting from the translator’s experiential perspective, norms are not existing laws merely *recognised* by translators but rather idiosyncratic orientations developed in practice by translators based on the strategy/strategies they adopt to manage risks in their process of translation. In this sense, translators develop their own norms based on the strategy/strategies they adopt to manage risks in their process of translation.

It is interesting to note here that as Kahneman explains it, norms are constructed by what Kahneman refers to as *System 1*, the brain module for “thinking fast.” (The other is *System 2*, the brain module for “thinking slowly and analytically.”)

The main function of System 1 is to maintain and update a model of your personal world, which represents what is normal to it. The model is constructed by associations that link ideas of circumstances, events, actions and outcomes that co-occur with some regularity, either at the same time or at a relatively short interval. As these links

1 In Kahneman (2014), fast automated thinking.

are formed and strengthened, the pattern of associated ideas comes to represent the structure of events in your life, and it determines your interpretation of the present as well as your expectations of the future. (Kahneman 2014: 71; quoted in Robinson 2020: 125)

6 Viewing the Hermeneutic Motion through the lens of risk-management

For the purpose of this analysis, each stage of the hermeneutic motion will be considered under a separate sub-heading. The greatest risks are to be sought in stages two and three of the Hermeneutic Motion, namely, aggression and assimilation. This is due to the fact that it is in these two stages that the translator experiences the greatest cultural and linguistic differences.

6.1 First motion: trust

The first stage of the Hermeneutic Motion is trust, which is the basis of any act of translation. The translator initially confides in the text and in the author and tests this trust against the measure of his or her experience. The translator's measure of experience is of a complex nature. It is an affective and at the same time an operational dimension of the translator's mental processing of the text, which as Steiner (1975: 298) puts it "derives from a sequence of phenomenological assumptions about the coherence of the world, about the presence of meaning in very different, perhaps formally antithetical semantic systems, about the validity of analogy and parallel". "All understanding, and the demonstrative statement of understanding which is translation, starts with the act of trust", says Steiner (*ibid.*).

This untried trust of the "other" by the translator, the belief that something is there that is meaningful and can be

translated and transferred, is yet in itself subject to risk. Instances of concepts and notions that are difficult to transfer or are culturally untranslatable and non-communicative and unable to be grasped by the target receivers are challenges to the translator's initial and unbiased trust. Steiner himself refers to this phenomenon by stating that "trust can never be final. It is betrayed, trivially, by nonsense, by the discovery that there is nothing there to elicit and translate" (Steiner 1975: 298).

In this sense, the first move or stage of the Hermeneutic Motion runs the risk of the translator's confrontation with counteridiomatic or counternormative usage and the untranslatable, or the absence of meaning in the mindset of the target receiver as opposed to the trusted source "other". Here, the mindset of the "target receiver" is the translator's projection and is presented through the translator's perspective. Additionally, "the trusted source 'other'" could be either the source author or the source text, but in either case as experienced by the translator.

The questions the translator might ask himself/herself at this stage could include: What do I risk in trusting this text? How might my trust leave me vulnerable? What mistakes might my trust lead me to make? How might my trust leave me open to attack? How can I transfer this trust to the target reader? How can I manage the risk of a trust backlash (the betrayal of trust)?

Of course, many more questions can be posed by the translator on the matter of trust. The posing of these affective questions by the translator accounts for risk-identification. The next stages to be followed by the translator as a conative response to risk-identification are risk-analysis, -prioritisation, -treatment and -monitoring, among which risk-treatment and/or -management will be explained in the following para-

graphs. Finally, risk-normativisation may also exist as a last and additional stage for some translators, namely those who have experienced repeat RM engagements.

Risk-identification in the first stage of the hermeneutic motion begins with fear of trust. Prioritisation and analysis of the risks perceived are choice- and affectively-oriented. However, to treat the risks a translator perceives at the stage of trust, based on the driving force felt to be triggering this risk—be it the target receiver, the translator himself/herself, or even the translation as a product—the measures adopted by the translator to manage them will differ based on the translator's life experience and mental construct and the possibly multiple responses the translator may project in his/her mind to answer these risky questions. On the issue of mental experience as a measure of managing risks in translation, some translators might be timid and others might be bold. Based on experience, the timid translator will tend to lean toward a risk-avoiding or risk-averting management strategy, whereas the bold translator is more likely to opt for a risk-taking measure.

For example, in response to the question of *what do I risk in trusting this text?* the timid translator may opt for the least face-threatening strategy, which might even lead to sacrificing meaning in the transfer from the ST to the TT. This is a strategy that the translator takes to involve the least possible loss of face. Conversely, the bold translator may gravitate towards transferring the enigmatic instead of choosing to save his/her credibility by producing an easy-to-grasp text. Bold translators dare to transfer ambiguities from the ST to the TT. In other words, the timid translator will choose not to risk the purpose of the transfer to save his/her credibility, whereas the bold translator even risks the purpose of the translation, most likely in response to an initial trust in the author.

Thus, cognitive RM strategies for the counterfactual affective-becoming-conative perception of untranslatability or ST incoherence can include risk-aversion and risk-transfer for instance. In risk-aversion the translator tends to avert or avoid the perceived risk by different strategies such as deletion, elicitation, etc. In risk-transfer the translator transfers the risk to the target receiver as explained above. In this sense, not resolving the risk is a mode of risk-management (see Pirouznik 2019).

6.2 Second motion: aggression

To manage the risk of untranslatability, the translator will need to delve deep into the text. The second move in Steiner's model is therefore "aggression". This stage embodies comprehension in the form of violent penetration into and opening up of the source text. Steiner (1975: 228) thus believes that "comprehension, as its etymology shows, 'comprehends' not only cognitively but by encirclement and ingestion". "Encirclement" and "ingestion" are both obviously metaphors. I assume "encirclement" involves something like circling the wagons, throwing up a barricade around something, so that it remains trapped inside the circle; ingestion is obviously eating. The idea is that you make something alien your own by taking it into yourself. Obviously, by "cognitive" Steiner does not mean everything studied by 4EA cognitive science, which in 1975 was still a quarter of a century in the future. But what else could comprehension be? Comprehension is the ability to understand something. This ability is most importantly based on experiencing. However, when the translator's life experience does not possess those instances of experience that foster cognition and comprehension, that is when the translator resorts to Steiner's "encirclement" and

“ingestion” out of a desire for understanding. Although Steiner talks about “comprehension” as cognition, encirclement and ingestion, “encirclement” and “ingestion” in my view might also be the means of moving beyond the realm of comprehension, where encirclement can serve as the gateway to enslavement in the same manner as Steiner’s military metaphor of invading the source culture and taking some part of it home as slave, functions. When the wagons are circled and a barricade is thrown up against the unintelligible there is also the possibility of enslaving it for better understanding when ingestion is not possible. Again, for Steiner (1975: 299), “in the event of interlingual translation this manoeuvre of comprehension is explicitly invasive and exhaustive”.

This second stage of Steiner’s model is one of the two moves that translators are most likely to experience as risky. Steiner’s metaphorical description of the diverse modes of aggression towards the “other” in the second stage of his model opens up new metaphorical possibilities of risk, such as enslavement of the “other” in the process of understanding, resistance of the “other” to violence in understanding it, etc. Sometimes this penetration and violence is such that the target text can become cognitively more accessible and pleasing for its readers than the source text from which it was translated. In Steiner’s own words:

But again, as in the case of the translator’s trust, there are genuine borderline cases. Certain texts or genres have been exhausted by translation. Far more interestingly, others have been negated by transfiguration, by an act of appropriative penetration and transfer in excess of the original, more ordered, more aesthetically pleasing. There are originals we no longer turn to because the translation is of a higher magnitude. (Steiner 1975: 299)

In this second stage the translator is thus imagined as an invader who wishes to crush opposition, or inexcusably penetrate the unknown.

Examples of questions translators might ask themselves about possible risks at this stage of the hermeneutic motion could include: what opposition or resistance may I meet? What risks does invasion of the source pose for me, in general? How does this aggression make me vulnerable? At this stage, while invading and seizing, the translator might also begin to anticipate, beforehand, the risks of those activities in the third move as well and ask himself/herself questions that seem to be pointing to the third motion such as: How can I integrate the enslaved notion into the target culture? How will I be treated by the target readers when – they encounter and engage the enslaved concept/notion? Should I tolerate the ambiguity of the source text and transfer this ambiguity into the target text as well or should I compensate for the ambiguity of the source text by avoiding it in the target text?

To manage the risks perceived in this manner, the translator may once again choose based on experience and the degree of counterfactual fear s/he feels: fear of the loss of his/her credibility possibly faced in and through attempts to avert or avoid information that is unknown to him/her; or attempts to transfer the unknown, ambiguous parts of the ST to the target reader in its more or less rough or problematic state; or attempts to dress it up in the manner of the target culture, making it easily accessible for the target reader.

In the second move, therefore, the risk encountered by the translator is triggered by the fear of conveying ambiguities to the target reader/receiver wrongly or badly, because of the presence of an inaccessible element/feature in the source text.

6.3 Third motion: assimilation (appropriation)

To meet the demand of comprehension in the target culture, the translator seeks to reproduce an adapted version of the source text in the target language, and a translator's endeavours and/or experiences in this regard form Steiner's third motion: assimilation or appropriation.

Appropriation follows a stage which Steiner refers to as "aggressive decipherment" (1975: 299). The third stage of the Hermeneutic Motion is incorporative. This incorporation comes from the need to enter and/or include parts of the source culture, semantic and stylistic formulations of the other, into the receiving and/or target culture. The necessity for this blending and/or importation is felt by the translator because the translator has experienced the cultural and linguistic differences and constructs this task as one of overcoming those differences, smoothing them out, smuggling the other into the self, difference into sameness. The import takes on different shapes and formations. In the convergence between cognitive and hermeneutical approaches, the translator reconstructs, appropriates or adapts the foreign text cognitively and affectively as an import that s/he can shape in various ways. If the translator leans more towards the source culture, the result would be "foreignization" or "literalism" and if the translator leans more towards the target culture, the result would be "domestication" or "fluency". The latter approach is characterised by Steiner as "appropriation".

In the process of importation, the translator actually plans and imposes an affective-becoming-cognitive transformation of the source text, which also requires that s/he transform the target language. The risk at this stage, however, is a separate affective-becoming-cognitive construct that brings the following questions to the translator's mind: what if it

does not work? What if the transformation I engineered is not accepted? What if adaptation of the source text is such that the translation reads very differently from the source text? Would the importation of the ambiguities from the source into the target overshadow my creativity? Would the transfer of ambiguities help to enrich the target text? How can I most influentially bridge the gap between the minds of the source author and the target reader? Am I doing the ethical thing? How can I do the ethical thing? Also, returning to Steiner's scenario of bringing meaning home captive, and drawing on Goodwin (2010: 33), other questions that might arise for the translator in the appropriation stage include: "Is the captive going to be dressed in the manner of her new home, or left in her own costume? To what extent is she to be taught the customs of her new home?"

Of the perceived risks and their formulated questions, the question of "what if it does not work?" may be the one that the translator is most fearful of. The translator imagines incorporation of the target text into the target culture, and translates so as to expedite that incorporation--but what if the target readership does not actually incorporate it? The translator is in fact imagining uptake here and has no idea of whether that imagined outcome will come true. So, what could the counterfactual affect of this risk be? What conditions will be triggered by this cognition? My view is that the translator may wish to narrow the risk gap by adopting a risk-taking strategy, namely, deleting part of the source text that is key to its understanding and or replacing it with an-easy-to-grasp notion in the target text or localising it in accordance with target experiences, hence domesticating the concept that is beyond his/her but mostly beyond the target reader's experience.

A different kind of risk that relates to the undesirable results of assimilating too much at this stage is what provokes the translator to project a question regarding the degree of assimilation in the process of translation: *What if adaptation of the source text levels up to a source text that reads very differently from the target text?* The counterfactual affect of this could be the translator's fear of producing a target text that is different from its source text, in terms of its comprehensibility, rendering the ST thereby less credible than it originally was—credibility in this case being calibrated to the fluency metric. And this is because in such cases sometimes even the source reader would choose to read the translation of the source text, which reads more fluently and is more comprehensible than its original and is thus more accessible. A second fear is that in such cases, the translator may be considered to have rewritten the source text and not translated it. A question that may well rise at this stage concerns the readers. Readers are not only the target readers but the end-users of the product, who may also include cosmopolitan polyglot intellectuals. Or these readers can come from the same linguistic nationality/origin as the source text -and yet may find the target text so much more comprehensible than the source text that they choose to read it first and then go back to the source text for better understanding. Examples are prevalent among scholars, especially in the olden times, when the language of science or literature differed from people's standard speech.

To manage this risk in favour of the source text, the translator may mainly adopt the strategies of transliteration, foreignisation, and/or literal translation, in which cases s/he would be avoiding risk or transferring it. In the event of adopting transliteration and/or literal translation strategies, the translator would be transferring the piece(s) of unknown information, without clarification (roughly in the same man-

ner as they are for the translator), to the target reader (cf. Pirouznik 2019).

6.4 Fourth motion: restitution

The aggression in the second and third stages of the hermeneutic motion is likely to violate the harmony of the source text in its transition to the target culture. This is referred to by Steiner (1975: 301) as “imbalance”. “The translator has taken too much—he has padded, embroidered, ‘read into’—or too little—he has skimmed, elided, cut out awkward corners” (ibid.). It is at this stage that Steiner introduces his fourth stage, i.e., Restitution, which above all signifies Steiner’s desire for the ethical in translation. In his own words:

The a-prioristic movement of trust puts us off balance. We “lean towards” the confronting text (every translator has experienced this palpable bending towards and launching at his target). We encircle and invade cognitively. We come home laden, thus again off-balance, having caused disequilibrium throughout the system by taking away from “the other” and by adding, though possibly with ambiguous consequence, to our own. The system is now off-tilt. The hermeneutic act must compensate. If it is to be authentic it must mediate into exchange and restored parity. (Steiner 1975: 300)

In this sense, stage four of Steiner’s Hermeneutic Motion, restitution, is a utopian experience and serves to narrow the expanded risk gap introduced in the transition from stage two to stage three. This utopian idealisation of restitution, collectively internalised as normative “translation” through repetition on a massive scale, is partly to blame for the translator’s sense of risk in the second and third moves.

Nevertheless, the very imagination of restitution as a narrowing of the risk gap will carry the risk of failure for the translator. Steiner does not really theorise from the translator’s perspective at this stage; the imbalance is simply righted;

what was disrupted is restored to normalcy, etc. So, what risks might the attempt to restore balance pose for the translator?

From Steiner's own perspective this risk can be managed by denial and repression, but what would the counterfactual affects of this risk be for the translator? At this stage, similar to the third motion, the translator might ask himself/herself whether s/he has done the ethical thing or would be doing the ethical thing by this restitution. Is doing the ethical thing worth the unfulfillment of the translation's purpose at all? Or in the case of producing a target text that reads quite differently from the source text due to over-assimilation, would the translator need to re-do the action of translation in order to do the ethical thing? Other questions that the translator might ask of himself/herself are: Ideally, I would balance everything out, but what if I fail? What would be my punishment if I failed? Should I sacrifice fluency for the ethical course of action?

This fourth motion is the stage of great emotional interplay for the translator who has now completed the task of translation. At this stage, the translator may experience mixed feelings as a result of the complexity of the perceived risks. The translator fears that the restitution move might fail. Now the bold translator may opt for keeping the imbalance, while the timid translator will most likely aim at restoring normalcy.

Steiner also sees this last stage of restoration as the embodiment of fidelity to the source text, a phenomenon he defines as "not literalism or any technical device for rendering 'spirit'... Fidelity is ethical, but also in a full sense, economic" (Steiner 1975: 301). This last stage is therefore one of a translator's affective-becoming-cognitive responses to the normative requirements not only of the target readers but also of the translation profession.

It is interesting to note that when running the risk-management model through Steiner's Hermeneutic Motion, it is easy to see how the first stage (trust) and the last stage (restitution) obviously follow an idealised normativity, ideal possibly in the sense that all thought of being subject to risk from the side of the receiver is apparently banished. But the second and third stages, aggression and appropriation, are the stages where the translator would have to expand the gap between the risk projected onto the receiver and its amelioration strategy. The gap is extended to the extent that the 'fear' perceived becomes a counterfactual affect—*narrativising* translation in aggressive military terms would tend to make the translator project/pose an intensified risk. Similarly, *narrativizing* translation in the utopian terms of the first and fourth stages, which supposedly resolve and banish risk, actually intensifies the risk of failure. What translator has ever achieved the mythical goal of perfect restitution?

What is meant by the gap is the relationship between the intensity of the perceived risk and the resulting risk-intensity of the translator's response. If it is a small risk and a small response, the gap is small. The bigger the risk, and the more boldly the translator is willing to engage that risk with an innovative and perhaps even transgressive translation strategy, the wider the gap, and the more capacious the translator's resulting concept of translation.

7 Conclusion and outlines for future projects

RM is more human-centered than text-centered, and running RM through Steiner's model clarifies the human-centeredness of HM. Managing risks is a mode of experience-based and creative norm-formation that may in the long run, through repetition, generate a normative understanding of

“translation itself”. A deeper look at the RM norms may trigger and facilitate discourse on what in Robinson’s terms is a “human norm theory of translation” (2020: 131). This approach also gives greater prominence to the rhetoric of the translator as a human whose work is driven by his/her individuality and experience, and who is not so much shaped passively by socio-cultural expectations and/or norms but rather gives direction and meaning to these socially, culturally and historically shaped expectations through personal experience and creative self-styling.

For further reflection on the translator’s feelings, emotions, mindset and methods of risk-management, preparation of a translatorial analysisstructure (i.e., a project-by-project risk log/register for translation) can prove helpful.

Another interesting subject to pursue in future reflections is the influence of different cultures on decision-making for RM and RM norm formations. The focus in such a study would be on the role of cultures and the diversity of cultures in the shaping of a translator’s life-experiences that will impact on translators’ decision-making for RM, the basis of RM norm-formation.

8 References

- AGNETTA, Marco / CERCEL, Larisa / O’KEEFFE, Brian [eds.] (2021): *Yearbook of Translational Hermeneutics*, vol. 1: *Engaging with Translation: New Readings of George Steiner’s After Babel*. DOI: <<https://doi.org/10.52116/yth.vi1>>.
- FILLMORE, Charles (1976): “Scenes-and-frames Semantics”. In: ZAMPOLLI, Antonio [ed.]: *Linguistic Structures Processing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 55–88.
- GOODWIN, Phil (2010): “Ethical Problems in Translation: Why We Might Need Steiner After All”. In: *The Translator* 16/1, pp. 19–42.

- KAHNEMAN, Daniel (2014): *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- KAHNEMAN, Daniel / MILLER, Dale T. (1986): "Norm Theory: Comparing Reality to its Alternatives". In: *Psychological Review* 93, pp. 136–153. URL: <<https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.93.2.136>> (November 13, 2021).
- LUCID CONTENT TEAM (2021): URL: <<https://www.lucidchart.com/blog/risk-management-process>> (November 13, 2021).
- PIROUZNİK, Mehnaz (2019): "Personification in Translators' Performances". Ph.D. thesis. Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Tarragona.
- PYM, Anthony (2015): "Translating as Risk Management". In: *Journal of Pragmatics* 85, pp. 67–80.
- ROBINSON, Douglas (2015): "Fourteen Principles of Translational Hermeneutics". In: STOLZE, Rade Gundis / STANLEY, John / CERCEL, Larisa [eds.]: *Translation and Hermeneutics: The First Symposium*. Bucharest: Zetabooks, pp. 41–54.
- ROBINSON, Douglas (2020): "Reframing Translational Norm Theory through 4EA Cognition". In: *Translation, Cognition & Behavior* 3.1, pp. 122–42.
- ROBINSON, Douglas (2021): "George Steiner's Hermeneutic Motion and the Ontology, Ethics, and Epistemology of Translation". In: AGNETTA, Marco / CERCEL, Larisa / O'KEEFFE, Brian [eds.]: *Engaging with Translation: New Readings of George Steiner's After Babel*. (= *Yearbook of Translational Hermeneutics* 1), pp. 103–138.
- ROBINSON, Douglas (2022): *Priming Translation: Cognitive, Affective and Social Factors*. London / New York: Routledge.
- STEFANINK, Bernd / BĂLĂCESCU, Ioana (2017): "The Hermeneutical Approach in Translation Studies". In: *Cadernos de Tradução* 37/3, pp. 21–52.
- STEINER, George (1975): *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press.
- TOURY, Gideon (1995/2012): *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- YOUNG, Elizabeth Marie (1997): "The Mediated Muse: Catullan Lyricism and Roman Translation". Ph.D. thesis, University of California, Berkeley.