

HISTORY AS TRANSLATION: A COMMON THEORETICAL SPACE

Luigi Alonzi*

University of Palermo

ABSTRACT: I am a historian by training. Most of my reading over the past thirty years has been in history and history-related topics. One could therefore say that I am expressing the historians' point of view on this topic. However, things are not so simple as they seem. The concept of 'History as Translation' calls into question what it means, today, to be a historian and a translation scholar and implies the creation of a common space in which History and Translation coexist on the same level; this common space is a polyphonic space, for a polyphonic history and polyphonic translations, where the historian is a translator, moving between different times and places, and the translator works as a historian, abandoning traditional ways of conducting research and opening up to new perspectives in the study of history and translation studies.

KEYWORDS: History, Translation, Epistemology, Cognition, Temporality

1. Translation history: between two disciplines

The publication of *Charting the Future of Translation History* in 2006 represented an important step towards attempting at defining a developing disciplinary field. The editors of the volume, Georges L. Bastin and Paul F. Bandia, argued that it was "an attempt to point at blanks, at shortcomings which have prevented translation history from reaching its full disciplinary status among scientific fields and discovering the proper way to guarantee its own future" (2006, p. 1); they outlined that "from microhistory, archaeology, and periodization to subjectivity and postmodernism, methodological 'blank spaces' are being filled," giving insights for answering to questions such as "should history of translation draw much more on history and historiography?" and 'should the field develop its own methodology and research techniques?' (2006, p. 2). The book was divided in two main blocks on methodology and history, which aimed at shedding new light on the different ways of practicing translation in different times and places; thanks to recent innovations in historiography (the editors claimed), it would be possible for translation historians to better understand the role of translators and the different functions performed by translations.

What is important to emphasize here is that the object of analysis was still the history of translation, i.e. how translations have been practiced over the centuries and what was the role and the social-ideological background of translators. In this endeavour, the editors of the volume believed that it was necessary to pay attention to recent contributions coming from new historiographical currents, to the extent that Paul Bandia went so far as to observe that "translation historians should overcome the false perception of their status as mere archivists or translation scholars or practitioners 'masquerading' as historians" (2006, p. 3). Clearly, a ghost in the machine runs through this entire discussion. Why should translation scholars, even though they are engaged in translation history, behave like historians? Does not this mean betraying their own tradition of scholarship and stepping

* luigi.alonzi@unipa.it

outside their own disciplinary field? Would not it be more appropriate to leave this task to professional historians?

A few years later, Chris Rundle (2011) addressed the issue head-on, contending that scholars in translation history should exactly behave as historians. Rundle's statement was fraught with serious consequences, which the discipline has not yet fully digested. Indeed, in subsequent years he had to return to the topic repeatedly to clarify his position and his proposal for theoretical change. This implied, and still implies, that translation historians should focus not so much on the history of translations and translators, but rather on how translations and translators can help us understand specific historical periods and phenomena. It was a radical change in perspective, a true paradigm shift. To the question "In short, is translation the object of our research, or it is the lens through which we research our historical object?" (2011, p.1), Rundle explicitly responded: "you either choose to contribute to a *history of translation* or to *translation in history*" (2011, p. 3). Thus, not only did the perspective change, but also the object of analysis. Translation was no longer to be the end of research, but the means to achieve another goal: the understanding of historical phenomena through the study of translations. In a subsequent article, an expansion of the one just cited, Rundle (2012) focused on the difference between a perspective like that of Hayden White and Paul Veyne, concerned with historically grasping the specificity of historical phenomena, and the perspective of Descriptive Translation Studies, concerned instead with gaining an understanding of the universal dimension of translations. The article also allowed Rundle to clarify the difference between his perspective and that previously outlined by Paul Bandia, which can be summarized in the distinction between 'history of translation' and 'translation in history'.

Again, in his contribution to the special issue of *The Translator* (2014), Chris Rundle emphasised that "some forms of interdisciplinary engagement with historical studies [was] desirable for those of us who work on translation history" (p. 2); and once again he took the opportunity to clarify his position with respect to Bandia's: this "is desirable not in order to appease a sense of epistemological inferiority or to acquire greater institutional status (motives which Bandia attributes to me [...]) but because engaging with like-minded researchers who have different approaches to a shared subject is a potentially enriching experience" (p. 2). Therefore, it was not so much a question "of importing the theoretical insights of historical studies into translation studies" (Rundle, 2014, p. 3), as advocated (among others) by Bastin and Bandia, or of "coaxing other historians to view translation history as a legitimate academic discipline" (p. 4), but rather it was essentially an issue of expertise, of sharing with historians a common knowledge about an established historical subject. Ultimately, Rundle disagreed with "Bandia's idea that a translation historian's primary purpose must be that of 'facilitating translation practice and enhance knowledge in translation studies'" (2014, p. 4).

Recently, Chris Rundle has returned to the issue in an interesting dialogue with Theo Hermans published in *Chronotopos: A Journal of Translation History* (Hermans & Rundle, 2021). Not by chance, two topics were highlighted: the definition of the disciplinary

boundaries between History and TS, and the distinction between research aimed at finding universal categories and research focused on historical specificity. In one of the most intense moments of the exchange between the two scholars, Theo Hermans contended: “I don’t think of myself as an historian, I think of myself as somebody working on translation but with an active interest in the environment of translation and the way that translation interacts with this environment” (2021, p. 21). At which point Rundle retorted: “Wouldn’t you say that when you do this work [the history of translation in the Low Countries] you are acting as a historian? Even if your primary concern during your career has been translation, when you take up that task, then you are taking on the task of an historian. Is that not a fair comment?” (2021, p. 21)

Evidently, it was a fair comment but, as said by Hermans, “up to a point” (2021, p. 21); in the sense that many translation scholars, Hermans included, did not feel entirely comfortable in the historian’s shoes and felt all the problems of this change of perspective. It should be noted that Chris Rundle is among the founders of the History & Translation Network (HTN), which has as first objective “to enhance the visibility of translation and interpreting history both in translation studies and in other disciplinary areas, especially history”¹; the HTN organized two international conferences, the first in Tallinn in 2022 and the second in Graz in 2024, as well as promoting numerous cultural events. This is a very important initiative that has successfully engaged many scholars. However, it cannot go unnoticed that the vast majority of HTN members are translation scholars.

2. Historians and translation: insights and pitfalls

What is historians’ perspective on translation?

We might begin by pointing out that there have been some very important and penetrating insights from historians about the practice of translation in history and the interpretation of history as a process of translation, but none of them has developed these insights thoroughly. As an example, Hayden White (1975) reached the conclusion that the historian’s work is essentially a work of translation, since the source documents do not speak for themselves, but can say something significant only through the interpretation that the historian gives to them. White actually “dreamt of ‘a means of translating from one mode of discourse to another, in the same way that we translate from one language to another’” (Paul, 2011, pp. 104-5), which implies that the work performed by historians can be considered as a process of translation and thus, determined by the ‘form of the content’, to recover the title of one of his best-known books. This approach to history has been comprehensively described by Alun Munslow (1997, p. 142), who highlighted that:

White’s historical method works from the general assumption that written history is unarguably a literary enterprise and we cannot gain access to what the past was about other than through it. It follows that we understand the past through the narrative form we devise to organise it [...] The deconstructive historian’s function remains that of interpretation, but

¹ HTN quote available at: <https://historyandtranslation.net/>

an interpretation viewed as the translation or rendition of one text (the past) into a new narrative version which is another text.²

It is interesting to note that Reinhart Koselleck faced similar problems and reached similar conclusions in his endeavours to match concepts and languages. To understand Koselleck's approach to the relationship between history and translation, we must start from the hermeneutic problem raised by Otto Brunner, one of his intellectual fathers. Brunner's works represent, despite their limitations, one of the first and most profound empirical demonstrations of the theoretical consequences of the concept of history as a translation of the past. Brunner, indeed, forcefully emphasised that the language of nineteenth-century historians was an anachronistic distortion of medieval concepts (a bad translation of them, one could say). In fact, as he himself emphasised, it would have been possible to understand those concepts only by acquiring an awareness of the differences between the medieval political and social context and the contemporary one. These distances/differences could/should be bridged through a linguistic and conceptual translation, which went from the present to the past. Koselleck contended, however, that this translation was not sufficient, and that a second translation (*Rück-übersetzung*: retranslation) from the past to the present was necessary. In particular, Koselleck believed that to fulfil this task on a methodological and comparative level it would have been necessary to define a metalanguage as a term of comparison, falling into theoretical difficulties that have been well highlighted by Kari Palonen (2012).

In 1999, Willi Paul Adams published an article in *The Journal of American History*, which directly addressed the issue of the historian's role as translator. This short article, published as the outcome of a roundtable discussion on the topic of interpreting the Declaration of Independence through translation, can only partially serve as a summary of the situation at the end of the last century. The questions Adams raised were simply that of a historian confronted with the problem of translating texts and documents; to do so, he advanced some common-sense considerations and drew on some classic texts on linguistics and translation. However, the methodological and epistemological perspectives outlined by White and Koselleck on the subject were substantially neglected in this article, and nothing in his reconstruction pointed towards the issues that would be addressed at the beginning of the twenty-first century as a consequence of the 'translation turn' in historiography. On the other hand, the observation that Adams (1999, p. 1284) made at the beginning of his article is symptomatic: "no student of American historiography [...] has so far enriched the unusually sophisticated pages of the journal *History & Theory* with an analysis of the pitfalls and conundrums translating historians and readers of translated historiography face".

Four years later, *History & Theory* published a 'Forum on translation and historiography'. Of particular interest is the article 'The predicament of ideas in culture:

² A few pages earlier, Munslow (1997, p. 115) had described the translation process put in place by the historian, "akin to mixing colours and producing shapes on a canvas".

translation and historiography' by Douglas Howland, the author of *Translating the West. Language and political reason in nineteenth-century Japan* (2002). In this article he reviewed some books published in previous years, dividing them into two groups. The first group, composed of Eric Chefitz's *The Poetic of Imperialism* (1991), Tejaswini Niranjana's *Siting Translation* (1992) and Vicente Rafael's *Constructing Colonialism* (1988), was characterized as being based on post-colonial essentialism (through the concept of identity) and on the extended use of the concept of translation (especially as 'representation'); the second group, towards which he was more inclined, included Lydia H. Liu (*Translingual Practice* 1995), Naoki Sakai (*Translation and Subjectivity* 1997) and Frederic C. Schaffer (*Democracy in Translation* 1998), who "all undertake rigorous explanations of the meaning of concepts as they were used in history" (Howland, 2003, p. 53). Essentially, the division used by Howland laid on the greater or lesser proximity to intellectual history, as practiced in those years by Quintin Skinner. Even if we admit that such a distinction can be accepted, it is easy to argue that the trend of studies in the following years has gone precisely in the direction criticised by Howland, that is, towards a progressive extension of the concept of translation favoured by the 'translation turn' in cultural studies.

Beyond other considerations that could be made, Howland's article is further proof of the fact that the infrequent dialogues between historians and translation scholars were often not productive dialogues, but rather discussions on common topics carried forward on parallel tracks. It is along these lines that the aforementioned volume edited by George Bastin and Paul Bandia on *Charting the Future of Translation History* might be placed, in that it was an attempt to grasp the advantages that translation scholars could draw from the theories that historians had developed in recent years, encouraging a dialogue between disciplinary fields that remained very distinct. However, as mentioned, even in this case there was no delineation of a research path based on a common ground but rather an attempt to develop a dialogue between the two disciplines, historiography and translation studies.

It was precisely in those years that one of the most important contributions that historians have offered to the study of translations in history was made, namely the book *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe* (2007) edited by Peter Burke and Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia. In this case too, the book was composed solely of historians; however, working on the general issues of cultural translation and cultural hybridity, Peter Burke also made a fundamental contribution to the specific understanding of the role of the historian as a translator of the past.

If the past is a foreign country, it follows that even the most monoglot historian is a translator. Historians mediate between the past and the present, and face the same dilemmas as other translators, serving two masters and attempting to reconcile fidelity to the original with intelligibility to their readers (Burke, 2007a, p. 7; see also Burke, 2007b).

To my knowledge, one of the few volumes that have brought together historians and translation scholars is the one edited by Martin J. Burke and Melvin Richter, *Why Concepts*

Matter. translating social and political thought, which included articles by Melvin Richter, Jeremy Munday, Anthony Pym, Kari Palonen, Jörn Leonhard, Mario Turchetti, Eric Nelson, Peter Burke, Joachim Kurz, Douglas Howland, Steven Lukes, Keith Tribe. This volume aimed at breaking “new ground in its focus on the theory and practice of translating political and social thought” (Burke and Richter, 2012, p. 1).

Especially novel is the application to these issues of not just translation studies, but also the history of concepts, or conceptual history (*Begriffsgeschichte*), which emphasizes the central place of language and translation in political and social discourse, especially in concept formation, transmission, and reception (Burke and Richter, 2012, pp. 1-2). This collaboration between disciplines was not above suspicion, however, to the extent that Melvin Richter felt the need to point out that “in such a meeting of fields hitherto separate, it is most profitable to assume that no one professional expertise trumps all others [and that practitioners of these disciplines] regard such dispute as normal, rather than pathological” (Burke and Richter, 2012, p. 2). He also openly admitted that ‘few historians of concepts in the human sciences know anything about the existence of translation studies, much less, about its distinctive methods, theoretical foci, and highly developed fields, such as the history of translation’ (2012, p. 4), an observation that is also largely true in reverse (consider, for example, that this volume edited by Martin J. Burke and Melvin Richter is rarely cited in the context of translation history). Ultimately, despite the efforts made in recent years to achieve a fruitful collaboration, the two disciplinary fields have remained substantially separate.

However, as we will see in the following pages, major results in overcoming these disciplinary cleavages are beginning to be achieved by scholars that are focusing instead on common theoretical objectives, who have not worried about rigidly observing the limits imposed by their respective disciplines and who have ventured into unexplored fields, often founding their investigations on a broad metaphorical conception of translation.³

3. History as translation: a new approach to history and translation

Over the last fifty years, interdisciplinarity has become something of a buzzword in academic inquiries, though it has primarily been understood as a dialogue between disciplines and not so much as the creation of a common field of research. This has also happened in translation history, especially in the perspective outlined in the volume edited by George Bastin and Paul Bandia, described above. More difficult to overcome is the challenge of abandoning traditional ways of conducting research and opening up to new

³ I have limited myself to outlining some aspects of the relationship between historiography and translation studies, for the purposes of this article. As regards the problems relating to the relationship between history and linguistics, a good overview is provided by Langer, N., Davis, S. and Vandenbussche, W. (eds) (2012), while the article by Patrick Honeybone in the same volume (2012) is especially emblematic of the difficult relationships between the two disciplines. Interestingly, Honeybone argues that a common space between the two disciplines can be found at the cognitive level, although his reconstruction turns out to be rather thorny on a theoretical level and, as far as we are concerned, at odds with the theoretical proposal contemporaneously advanced by Malvin Richter.

perspectives, entailing the creation of new common ground and ways of seeing that unsettle our habits. Ultimately, Chris Rundle's theoretical proposal ran into these difficulties. How can one be a historian within a linguistics department, and how can one legitimize one's position as a historian within Translation Studies?

The concept of 'history as translation' is even more radical than the perspective advanced by Chris Rundle; indeed, in the latter case, despite a reversal of perspective, the concept of translation remained within the boundaries of traditional understandings, as I have described above. Instead, the concept of 'history as translation' truly implies the creation of a common space in which History and Translation coexist on the same level. This common space is polyphonic, and in it, the historian is a translator moving between different times and places (Burke, 2010, 2023). In other words, while Rundle considers the translation of books as the means to understand historical phenomena, the 'history as translation' approach is not interested in translated books but in a shared concept of translation and all that this implies at the cognitive and theoretical level. As a consequence, 'history as translation' does not refer to traditional concepts of history and translation, but requires a theoretical bent that has the linguistic dimension as one of its main components while, at the same time, relying on a broad and metaphorical understanding of both concepts.

As outlined by Antoine Berman (1995, 2012), the metaphorical consideration of the concept of translation was developed in German Romanticism and expanded from the linguistic and literary structure across other disciplinary fields. In particular, Berman insisted on the importance of the concept of versatility introduced by Novalis, who compared translation to the voluptuous movement of liquids (1995, p. 125). This led to a desire for 'total translation', which some scholars are returning to by connecting it to the concept of Anthropocene (Littau, 2023) and arriving at the identification of new fields of study such as eco-translation, biosemiotic translation, geo-linguistics, geo-media and geo-translation (Cronin, 2017). Berman's work was precisely intended to identify the possible overflow between the linguistic (restricted) and metaphorical (generalized) understandings of translation. Rainer Guldin has conducted a close analysis of the 'inner tensions' existing between the linguistic concept of translation and the metaphorical transpositions of it elaborated by Berman, underlining that he "does not take into consideration the fact that the different disciplines generally use the metaphors they borrow from other disciplines to suit their own ends, even if the choice of a specific metaphor clearly also introduces a new point of view" (Guldin, 2022, p. 26). More recently, Piotr Blumczynski (2023) even pointed out that etymologically the concept of translation derives from the material transfer of objects, so linguistic and textual translation should be considered, in fact, a metaphorical extension of material translation.

From this perspective, we are witnessing a refreshed conception of the field of translation, inclined towards the cognitive and material level (Apter, 2006; Arduini, 2014; Gentzler, 2017; Bassnett and Johnston, 2019; Simon, 2019, 2023; Israel and Franz, 2020; Bennett and Puga, 2024; Campbell and Vidal, 2024, 2025; Savchenkova, 2024; D'hulst,

2025), which tends to overturn restricted conceptions of translation studies, seen now not from within but from outside. A particularly interesting contribution to the definition of a common ground between history and translation is that offered by Hillary Footitt, who appropriately remarks that the discussion on the subject “implicitly assumes that both disciplines are conceptually reified, that they are not subject to the constant challenge and redefinition which is the norm within all academic fields” (Footitt, 2022, p. 66). She thus invites scholars “to engage with the materiality and spatiality of translation over time”, arguing that “a translation history which explores the material relationality of translation can help to move us beyond questions of finality and disciplinary identity” (2022, pp. 66-67). Especially important from my point of view is the notion of “presenting the past” implied by her proposal for an ethnographic approach to translation history, which “serves to reframe translation history as simultaneously diachronic and synchronic”; this kind of history is aimed at providing “a snapshot of translation from below at a particular moment in time, as lived on the ground of its materiality, silences and asymmetrical dominations” (Footitt, 2022, p. 76).

A pronounced attention to spatiality and materiality in the field of translation studies has been shown in recent years by M.^a África Vidal Claramonte, who is the author of *Translation and Objects: Rewriting Migrancy and Displacement through the Materiality of Art* (2024). Also very recent is her book *Translating His-stories* (2025), part of the *Elements in Translation and Interpreting* series. The concept of ‘history as translation’, as developed by M.^a África Vidal Claramonte, foregrounds the notion that History is always a reconstruction, until now a linear and homogeneous narrative constructed by the winners, which urges the need to re-write histories in the plural, to re-narrate and re-translate the old male/winners his-stories from the point of view of the silenced/female/feminist voices (her-stories). The premise of this bold work was first stated in the important book that Vidal Claramonte published in Spanish in 2018: *La traducción y la(s) historia(s): Nuevas vías para la investigación*. The creation of a common space between history and translation was delineated so substantially here that it is not possible to say whether Vidal’s argument refers primarily to history or to translation. This result was achieved by highlighting above all the intralinguistic aspect of the translational process, i.e. the fact that every time we write or speak, we actually translate.⁴

The foundations of this discourse, which drew inspiration from the fervent intellectual season of post-modernism and post-structuralism as well as from German conceptual history and the linguistic turn, had already been admirably brought into focus by George Steiner and Paul Ricoeur; however, I will not revisit the well-known arguments of these two authors in detail, having dealt with them elsewhere (Alonzi, 2023). Furthermore, many of these elements can be found in Theo Hermans’ (2022) very recent textbook: *Translation and History*. The volume contains a detailed account of the discourses on translation developed by Hayden White, Reinhart Koselleck, Quentin Skinner

⁴ On this fundamental aspect, see Pillière and Berk Albachten (2024)

and other historians, and can be considered much more than a textbook for translation scholars; it clearly indicates a research perspective that deserves to be fully developed and which we can include within the concept of 'history as translation'. This is the opening statement of the volume (Hermans, 2022, p. 1):

The past lives inside us. It is there in the form of private memories and in the historical knowledge we have acquired, individually and collectively. Its remnants are all around us in the form of pictures, recordings, books, statues, objects in museums and other sites of private and collective memory. It is growing with every moment that passes but also selectively remembered and forgotten. We cannot think of ourselves without simultaneously dredging up a version of our past history.

In the pages that follow, Hermans outlines a conception of 'history as translation' in which the cognitive aspects and the relationship with materiality are appropriately highlighted.⁵ The new perspective of translation history is perceptively delineated as something exceeding the traditional field of translation, while acknowledging the difficulties that such an overcoming engenders for the practice of both disciplines. In his own words:

disciplinary boundaries can be crossed, even though this is generally harder than it seems because different research communities have different discourses, communication circuits, points of reference. For my own part, I take the view that the two disciplinary angles do not have to be mutually exclusive [...]; even if the focus of one's research is translation rather than the slice of history into which it fits, the motives for translating and the effects of translation always exceed translation.⁶

Taking inspiration from Hermans' textbook, Alexandra Lianeri (2024) adds further insights for the creation of a common space including history and translation. In her view, this common space could be structured around three theoretical kernels:

1. the habitation of spaces of translation;
2. the temporality of translating;
3. the configuration of historical being and change in terms of translation's transformative movement.

Necessarily simplifying here a highly complex discourse, Lianeri overlaps the Greek notion of *metaphrasis* and the Latin concept of 'translation', reading historical change as a form of multitemporal and multilayered transformation, where the flowing of time is represented as a translational movement triggered by withdrawal and following after, disappearance and appearance, swallowing and regurgitation (*metabolē as kairos* or, perhaps better, *kairos as metabolē*).

⁵ There are clear affinities between Hermans' approach and that developed by a historian like Kleinberg (2017).

⁶ See also the recent collection of essays by Hermans (2023).

When the past appears as highly translatable, we consider it as something with no interruptive power of agency. Set between these excesses, a translation perspective may highlight the pasts *Nachleben* and “translated presence,” wherein historical sense is marked by the temporally and politically polymorphous intensity of receptivity and traumatic confrontations between past, present and future (Lianeri, 2024, p. 286).

Finally, translation is the means through which cultures encounter and synchronize with each other. The result of this encounter, of this translation, is a third term born ‘in relation to’ and in the ‘flow of times and cultures’. Indeed, we have not only translations through spaces but also translations through time. Each of the translated cultures has its temporality which is synchronized at the moment of translation; and of course, this translation/synchronization is itself inserted into the flow of times and spaces and is, in itself, the main means through which this flowing occurs. I do not think to translation and synchronization as a final and definitive step, but rather as a process occurring in the fleeting time of Augustinian memory. This discourse can be metaphorically extended to the work of both historians and translators. In this way, the theoretical discourse on translation is inextricably connected to the recent theoretical discourse on temporality in history and historiography (Kleinberg, 2012; Helgesson, 2014; Tamm and Olivier, 2019; Jordheim, 2022; Rebello Cardoso Jr. et al., 2023; Kleinberg, 2025), each shedding light on the other, and contributing to the overcoming of traditional cleavages, encouraging us to leave behind pre-established paths and move towards an open common space.

The most important aspect of the conception of ‘history as translation’, as intended here, is the correct understanding of the concept of presence/presentism. What kind of presence/presentism is it? It is a synchronistic presence and a translated presence. In this sense, the difficult relationship between a diachronic approach and a synchronic approach, emphasized by some translation scholars (as an example by Rundle, 2018), is resolved within a conception of presence wherein the diachronic dimension is contained within the synchronic dimension. This development of the Koselleckian conception of the ‘synchronicity of the nonsynchronous’⁷ is, in turn, a consequence of the conception of translated presence, that is a presence containing different temporalities. History is all in the present – a notion that refers less to the important concept of history as contemporary history, as outlined by Benedetto Croce (also because in this case we move along a linear temporality), but rather to a conception of presence in which plural temporalities intersect at each moment in the flow of time. What we call history is something that theoretically belongs to the past but is concretely present in the world around us. From this point of view, the work of the historian as translator consists exactly in connecting theory (the past) and practice (the present), projecting them to the future.

We interact with (linguistic, material) objects that surround us synchronically, each of which has its own temporality, each of which was born at a specific moment in time, underwent a specific development, and has reached us with the full weight of its history,

⁷ On this topic, see the important article by Jordheim (2011).

its myriad transformations, like an object already 'translated', as Alexandra Lianeri (2023 and 2024) would say. This is what urges us to approach 'history as translation'. All the objects around us are historical (that is, translated), including language; thus, these already-translated objects are in turn retranslated by us, and are thus delivered to the future. It is an approach to history that insists on processuality, on transformation, on relationality while at the same time being an approach to translation that is laid out in an expanded conception, fostering the creation of a common space between the two disciplines.

This represents a reversal of the accentuated processes of specialization that took place in the second half of the twentieth century, and which had led to a situation of difficult dialogue within the human sciences and between the human sciences and other sciences. The hope is that the concept of 'history as translation' can help revive that dialogue, leading to the creation of a common theoretical space, and enabling people to have a more balanced and conscious relationship with the human and natural world around them.

REFERENCES

- Adams, W. P. (1999) 'The historian as translator: an introduction,' *The Journal of American History* 85(4), pp. 1283-1288.
- Alonzi, L. (2023) 'Introduction: translating the past' in Alonzi, L. (ed.) *History as a translation of the past: case studies from the West*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, pp. 1-22.
- Apter, E. (2006) *The translation zone: a new comparative literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Arduini, S. (2014) 'Metaphor, translation, cognition' in Miller D. S. and Monti, E. (eds.) *Tradurre figure. Translating figurative language*. Bologna: CeSLiC, pp. 41-52.
- Bassnett, S. and Johnston, D. (eds.) (2019) 'The outward turn', *The Translator* (Special issue), 25(3).
- Bastin, G. L. and Bandia, P. F. (eds.) (2006) *Charting the future of translation history*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Bennett, K. and Puga, R. M. (eds.) (2024) *Translation and transposition in the early modern period. Knowledge, literature, travel*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Berman, A. ([1984]/1995) *L'Épreuve de l'étranger: Culture et traduction dans l'Allemagne romantique*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Berman, A. (2012) *Jacques Amyot traducteur français. Essais sur l'origine de la traduction en France*. Paris: Belin.
- Blumczynski, P. (2023) *Experiencing translationality. Material and metaphorical journeys*. London: Routledge.
- Burke, P. (2007a) 'Cultures of translation in early modern Europe' in Burke, P. and Po-Chia Hsia R. (eds.) *Cultural translation in early modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burke, P. (2007b) 'Lost (and found) in Translation: A cultural history of translators and translating in early modern Europe', *European Review*, 15(1), pp. 83-94.
- Burke, P. (2010) 'Cultural history as polyphonic history', *Arbor*, 186(743), pp. 479-486.

- Burke, P. (2023) 'The historian's dilemma: domesticating or foreignizing?' in Alonzi, L. (ed.) *History as a translation of the past: case studies from the West*. London: Bloomsbury, pp. 91-106.
- Burke M. J. and Richter M. (2012) *Why concepts matter. Translating social and political thought*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Campbell, M. and Vidal, R. (eds) (2024) *The experience of translation: materiality and play in experiential translation*, New York and London: Routledge.
- Campbell M. and Vidal, R. (eds) (2025) *The translation of experience: cultural artefacts in experiential translation*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Cronin, M. (2017) *Eco-Translation: translation and ecology in the age of the anthropocene*, New York and London: Routledge.
- D'hulst L. (2025) *A cultural history of translation*. Vol. 6. London: Bloomsbury.
- Footitt, H. (2022) 'Challenging the Archive, 'present'-ing the past: Translation history as historical ethnography' in Baker, M. (ed.) *Unsettling translation. Studies in honour of Theo Hermans*. New York and London: Routledge, pp. 65-80.
- Gentzler, E. (2017) *Translation and re-writing in the age of post-translation studies*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Guldin, R. (2022) 'Translation as metaphor revisited: on the promises and pitfalls of semantic and epistemological overflowing' in Baker, M. (ed.) *Unsettling translation. Studies in honour of Theo Hermans*. New York and London: Routledge, pp. 15-28.
- Helgesson, S. (2014) 'Radicalizing temporal difference: anthropology, postcolonial theory, and literary time', *History & Theory*, 53(4), pp. 545-562.
- Hermans, T. (2022) *Translation and history: a textbook*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Hermans, T. (2023) *Metatranslation: Essays on translation and translation studies*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Hermans, T. and Rundle, C. (2021) 'The Significance of translation history: A roundtable discussion', *Chronotopos: A Journal of Translation History*, 1, pp. 17-30.
- Honeybone, P. (2012) 'History and historical linguistics: Two types of cognitive reconstructions?' in Langer, N., Davis, S. and Vandebussche, W. (eds.) *Language and history, linguistics and historiography. Interdisciplinary approaches*. Lausanne: Peter Lang, pp. 15-45.
- Howland, D. (2003) 'The predicament of ideas in culture: Translation and historiography', *History and Theory*, 42(1), pp. 45-60.
- Israel, H., Frenz, M. (2020) 'Translation traces in the archive: Unfixing documents, destabilising evidence', *The Translator*, 2(4), pp. 335-348.
- Jordheim, H. (2011) 'Does conceptual history really need a theory of historical times', *Contributions to the History of Concepts*, 6(2), pp. 21-41.
- Jordheim, H. (2022) 'Stratigraphies of time and history: beyond the outrages upon humanity's self-love' in Ekström A. and Bergwik S. (eds.) *Times of history, times of nature. Temporalization and the limits of modern knowledge*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn, pp. 19-44.
- Kleinberg, E. (2012) 'Introduction: the new metaphysics of time', *History and Theory. Virtual Issue*, 1-7.
- Kleinberg, E. (2017), *Haunting history. For a deconstructive approach to the past*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Kleinberg, E. (2025) *Temporal vectors and the compass of history. Politics and ethics at the end-time*. Edited by Regazzoni, L. Bielefeld: Bielefeld University Press.

- Alonzi, L. - History as translation: a common theoretical space
Translation Matters, 8(1), 2026, pp. 11-24, DOI: https://doi.org/10.21747/21844585/tm8_1a1
- Langer, N., Davis, S. and Vandenbussche, W. (eds) (2012) *Language and history, linguistics and historiography. Interdisciplinary approaches*. Lausanne: Peter Lang.
- Lianeri, A. (2023) 'Translated history and historical time: Transtemporal understanding of Greek and Roman Concepts' in Alonzi, L. (ed.) *History as a translation of the past: case studies from the West*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, pp. 141-166.
- Lianeri, A. (2024) 'Translation in history and metahistory' (review to Theo Hermans, *Translation and history: A textbook*), *History & Theory*, 63(2). New York: Routledge, pp. 272-287
- Littau, K. (2023) "'Just ask the stones": Eco-translation, natural history and geomediality' in Alonzi, L. (ed.) *History as a translation of the past: case studies from the West*. London: Bloomsbury, pp. 167-190.
- Munslow, A. (1997) *Deconstructing history*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Palonen, K. (2012) 'Reinhart Koselleck on translation, anachronism, and conceptual change' in Burke M. J. and Richter M., *Why concepts matter. Translating social and political thought*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, pp. 73-92.
- Paul, H. (2011) *Hayden White: The historical imagination*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Pillièr, L. and Berk Albachten, Ö. (eds) (2024) *Handbook of intralingual translation*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Rebello Cardoso Jr., H., Mudrovcic, M. I., & Landwehr, A. (2023) 'Times of history: an overview of time studies related to the theory of history (concepts, issues, and trends)', *História (São Paulo)*, 42, pp. 1-17.
- Rundle, C. (2011) 'History through a translation perspective' in Chalvin A., Lange A., Monticelli D. (eds.) *Between cultures and texts. Itineraries in translation history*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, pp. 33-43.
- Rundle C. (2012) 'Translation as an approach to history', *Translation Studies*, 5(2), pp. 232-240.
- Rundle C. (2014) 'Theories and methodology of translation history: the value of an interdisciplinary approach', *The Translator*, 20(1), pp. 2-8.
- Rundle C. (2018) 'Temporality' in D'hulst L. and Gambier Y. (eds) *A history of modern translation knowledge. Sources, concepts, effects*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 235-245.
- Rundle, C. (2021) 'Historiography' in Baker M. and Saldanha G. (eds.) *The Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies*. 3rd edn, New York and London: Routledge.
- Savchenkova, M. (2024) *La traducción emocional de la historia. La memoria traumática en la obra de Svetlana Alexiévich*. Granada: Editorial Comares.
- Simon, S. (2019) *Translation sites. A field guide*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Simon, S. (2023) 'Foreword: thinking translationally' in Beattie, P., Bertacco, S., and Soldat-Jaffe, T. (eds.) *Time, space, matter in translation*. New York and London: Routledge, pp. xii-xv.
- Tamm, M. and Olivier, L. (2019) (eds) *Rethinking historical time. New approaches to presentism*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Vidal Claramonte, M. C. Á. (2018) *La traducción y la(s) historia(s). Nuevas vías para la investigación*. Granada: Comares.
- Vidal Claramonte, M. C. Á. (2024) *Translation and objects: rewriting migrancy and displacement through the materiality of art*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Vidal Claramonte, M. C. Á. (2025) *Translating his-stories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Alonzi, L. - History as translation: a common theoretical space
Translation Matters, 8(1), 2026, pp. 11-24, DOI: https://doi.org/10.21747/21844585/tm8_1a1

White, H. (1975) 'Historicism, history, and the figurative imagination', *History and Theory*, 14(4), pp. 48–67.

White, H. ([1987]/1990) *The content of the form. Narrative discourse and historical representation*. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press.

About the author: Luigi Alonzi is Associate Professor of Early Modern History at the University of Palermo. His recent studies are mainly concerned with the relationships between language, history and cognition. He is the editor of the volume *History as a Translation of the Past. Case Studies from the West* (Bloomsbury Academic, 2023).