

Mehrnaz Pirouznik
Universitat Rivira i Virgili

Translating Festivals as Cultural Identity-builders. A Hermeneutical Approach for the Cross-fertilisation of Cultures

Abstract

Cultures are known to possess a fundamental role and to have a crucial function in the building of individual and collective identities. “The diverse manifestations of culture – from our cherished historic monuments and museums to traditional practices and contemporary art forms – enrich our everyday lives in countless ways” (UNESCO 2022), namely, through awareness-raising by means of translation. Of the many instances of cultural identity-builders, the focus of this paper is on the transmission of festivals as instances of “Intangible Cultural Heritage” (UNESCO Convention 2003) through translation. Here festivals are defined as oral traditions expressed in the form of artistic performances. The underlying assumption is that bearers and practitioners of an oral tradition guide translators in delivering an adequate translation of a festive event. To respond to the question about the modalities by means of which multiple identities can communalise for the “cross-fertilisation of cultures”, I have drawn upon hermeneutics with the scope of offering a hermeneutical account of the process involving the translation for festivals based on the spread of oral traditions. It is proposed that communalising identities through festival translation can help to enrich cultures. The hermeneutical approach relies on the understanding that acknowledging and transferring the content of artistic performances require feeling one’s way into contextual meanings and community-held beliefs. This view rests on the assumption that any translator’s understanding of artistic performances needs acts of filling in cognitive gaps left by the affective vagueness of feeling by means of research and relying on the guidance that “communally-organised feeling” can provide (Robinson 2013).

1. *Introduction*

The present paper sheds light on the importance of translating festivals as a measure for safeguarding oral traditions in their capacity as manifestations of Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH) and cultural identity-builders. The

importance attached to processes of festival translation is investigated from the perspective of their prominent role as part of national cultural heritage and of the cultural identities of nations and communities that are associated with them, thus highlighting the significance of rendering festivals in all their diversity. The classes of festivals in focus in this study are nation-wide festivals and the thinking is that a festival has various practitioners from different groups of people who display diverse cultural traits, identities, and levels of creativity. It is proposed that when translating instances of oral tradition, the translator no longer interacts with an unknown and out-of-reach other. The translator's interlocutor becomes a present and living person who has extensively experienced the world and whose experiences need to be brought to the receiving culture(s). Thus, translating festivals can highlight cross-cultural differences between different nations and countries or different performing communities in the territory of a single country. It can also help to bridge cultural gaps between a variety of practising communities.

Festival translation contributes to promoting intercultural studies and dialogue among nations and communities, as well as building a culture of peace between the bearers and practitioners of the festive event and/or oral tradition. This implies that festival translation is scrutinised from a perspective which is more oral than text-based. The approach that is adopted is based upon processes of understanding and conveying feelings and experiences by tracking hidden meanings placed behind the practitioners' actions and utterances.

An example of a festival that is performed in diverse countries and possibly differently in each of its performing nations is *Nowruz*, a festivity officially shared and celebrated by twelve nations. "Nowruz, meaning 'new day,' is an ancestral festivity marking the first day of spring and the renewal of nature" (UNESCO 2022). An important feature of *Nowruz* is the presence of many people from all walks of life, contributing to the festival's display of cultural diversity, human creativity, and social diversity.

As we move forward, we will discuss how the translation strategy adopted in instances of festival renditions will need to follow a foreignising approach which is feeling-based. According to Robinson¹ (2022a, forthcoming) "A foreignising translation is one kind of simulation, with a simulated *Gefühl des Fremden*/

1 Quotations from Robinson 2022a and 2022b (still unpublished) are based on private correspondence between the authors.

Feeling of the Foreign mixed in as the hermeneutical norm”. The translation for festivals will therefore need to follow a feeling-based hermeneutical strategy. To be more precise, what takes place in the translation for festivals is the act of foreignisation. This signifies that source cultures, as they are narrated or performed, are conveyed to target receivers for the stabilisation of source identities and cultures by introducing the events in their original foreign forms to target receivers. This strategy is grounded in the larger socio-affective framework of the interacting cultures, rendering the translator’s role as an intercultural mediator. Considering that festivals are mainly performing events, translators of festivals are more involved in a source culture stabilisation practice than in any other activity. This stabilisation is brought about inter alia by the translator’s close interaction with the bearers and/or practitioners of the source culture, i.e. the performers of the festival, hereinafter referred to as ‘the community’, for ease of understanding and reference. They need to feel the bearers and/or practitioners in order to understand and to convey their culture and cultural identity as depicted in their performance. This statement follows in the path of the fundamentally feeling-based Schleiermacherian hermeneutics, the founding moment for which (qtd. in Robinson 2022a, forthcoming) came in 1774, when Herder suggested that understanding requires “feeling yourself into everything” (1774/1967, 37).

Moving back to the proposed foreignising strategy for translating festivals and to the importance of feeling one’s way into everything for understanding, it is interesting to note that Schleiermacher’s idea is that what the foreignising translator simulates for (and ideally in) the target reader is the *Gefühl*/feeling a non-native source reader has of reading the source text with only a mediocre command of the source language: to that sort of reader, the source text always feels foreign, and so the simulated reproduction of that text in the target language should feel foreign as well. These translations call for the understanding of communally organised feeling. This is a feeling that is guided by the community. The changes that take place in oral traditions over time as a result of globalisation, among other things, also call for a need, on the part of the translator, to fill in the cognitive understanding gap by means of “guidance provided by communally-organised feeling” (Robinson 2022a, forthcoming). Globalisation triggers changes in performance that mostly emanate from human creativity.

In the context of this survey, it is important to point out that the translation product target audiences receive may not necessarily be a text; in fact, the translation can be rendered through semiotic renderings involving,

for instance, a performance which is needed to be understood. In such a case, what emerges is that the audience perceives (of the simulated performance) the ‘experience’ of the translator’s understanding of the source culture, an identity-building element that is conveyed by means of a festival that the community has performed. In this view, the question that arises is whether it is the translator’s experience that is brought to the target receivers in translating festivals, or whether the target audiences are taken to the community, or whether the feeling and understanding of the target audiences are brought to the community.

Structure-wise, the paper follows a philosophically based question-and-answer approach. In this manner, each subsection that follows this introduction will seek to answer a question formed around the philosophical nature and modality of translating festivals. Finally, the conclusion will explain how the translations of artistic performances and oral traditions assist in putting communalised identities at the service of cross-cultural fertilisation by responding to the underlying question of the research: How are multiple identities communalised for cross-fertilisation of cultures? For the purpose of this paper, ‘communalised identities’ are defined as identities that are brought to the fore according to their shared cultural value. Shared cultural values are represented in the diverse performances of a festival, transnationally and nationally.

2. Is there a specific translation strategy for adequately conveying communal feeling and meaning?

Communal feeling or communally organised feeling is a feeling that is guided by the community, what Robinson (Ibid.) identifies as “collectivised feeling”. The acts of grasping and experiencing “collectivised feeling” are necessary with the aim to understand and convey meanings in the process of translating festivals. Bearing in mind the nature of the phenomenon that is to be translated, what matters here is not individual feeling. In other words, what matters is not the feeling of a single community member and/or bearer of the oral tradition or practitioner of the festival. In fact, a festival is performed by many people who share common interests and cultural values but, at the same time, possess and display different personality traits that might impact on the mode of

performing from person to person. Therefore, feeling is important, and it is important for feeling to be experienced in its general setting and not as shown by an individual. As such, translating festivals calls for the understanding of “any foreign feeling, any feeling that does not originate in the individual”, to put it Robinson’s words (Ibid.). The communal feeling that is hereby referred to helps to “stabilize hermeneutical situations---the research-based events where the reader is expected to feel his or her way into the writer’s intention and the writer is expected to feel his or her way into the reader’s interpretation”, explains Robinson (Ibid.). In this study, we do not have a writer or a reader. Instead, we have bearers (within the communities) and practitioners. Our receivers are not readers in this context, but mere spectators. For this reason, understanding communal feeling helps to stabilise hermeneutical situations. In the context of this research, hermeneutical situations of concern are the research-based events where the translator is expected to feel his or her own way into the intention of performing communities, and the receivers/spectators are expected to feel their own way into the translator’s experiencing and/or re-experiencing of the feelings belonging to source communities.

According to Makkreel and Oman (2002, 74; English trans. edited by Robinson; qtd. in Robinson 2022a, forthcoming):

Thus, feeling is, as it were, the organ for the grasping of our own and other/foreign individualities and, through empathy with nature, even for grasping of properties of nature that no knowledge can reach. Depths that are inaccessible to knowledge appear to reveal themselves in feeling. On the basis of objective grasp is effectuated, as it were, a turn into these depths. The grasp determined the object from the perspective of feeling, pressing forward to reach it, as it were; in the midst of the interplay between ourselves and objects, feelings measure the productive force of the self, the pressure of the world, and the energy of persons around us.

In conveying communally-organised or collectivised feeling, it would be adequate to adopt the strategy based on what Robinson (2022a, forthcoming) refers to as the “socioaffective stabilisation of understanding”. A strategy of such nature would contribute to reliable intermediating and interpreting between two cultures, the domestic/source and the foreign/target. I also claim that this strategy will also serve to enhance cognition. Cognition can be brought about by experiencing and/or re-experiencing, that is, by processes of embodiment and enactment of a world and a mind on the basis of a history of the variety of actions that a person

performs in the world. Cognition is thus brought about by experiencing or re-experiencing what is experienced by the performers and/or bearers of an oral tradition and/or a festival. According to Di Paolo et al. (2010, 39), “organisms do not passively receive information from their environments, which they then translate into internal representations. Natural cognitive systems ... participate in the generation of meaning ... engaging in transformational and not merely informational interactions: *they enact a world*”.

The situation that arises – in which a stabilisation of understanding is required, according to Robinson (2022a, forthcoming) –, bears on the fact that as an intercultural mediator:

The translator is tasked with mediating between the affective-becoming-conative-becoming-cognitive stabilizations of understanding affected by two communities – the source culture and the target culture – and that those stabilizations inevitably diverge and conflict...target readers should *feel* as if they were participating in a source-cultural stabilization, but they aren't and can't be – at least not through the target text alone. They are participating in a target-cultural hermeneutical stabilization that stimulates a source-cultural hermeneutical stabilization.

Yet, again, in the case of translating festivals, it is important to note that we have no readers in the target culture but receivers who are the spectators of a festival. When the ‘affective’ becomes ‘conative’ and the ‘conative’ becomes ‘cognitive’, feeling is rendered into action and then action becomes understanding. These multiple transfers take place through communal attempts to stabilise understanding by stabilising communication and by stabilising language use and cultural norms. The attempt to make two different cultural stabilisations align is indeed a difficult process and calls for a deeper interaction involving both the translators and communities. So, rather than striving for that reality, Schleiermacher goes for “simulation”, a strategy that highlights the hermeneutics of the act of translating festivals.

In view of the difficulty for aligning two different cultural stabilisations, the explanation previously offered emphasises the need for a simulation of the foreign in the target as part of the translation strategy required and adopted for adequately conveying communal feeling and meaning addressed to target culture receivers.

3. *Can intercultural communication serve as a filler for cognitive gaps of feeling in festival translation?*

The question of the role of inter-cultural communication as a filler of cognitive gaps of feeling – gaps in understanding communalised feeling – in the translation for festivals is thought to be raised by the translator in search of a strategy to manage the risk of cognitive gaps that can be faced in understanding and conveying feeling and meaning.

There are several ways to describe the term inter-cultural communication: “Intercultural communication is a symbolic, interpretive, transactional, contextual process, in which people from different cultures create shared meanings” (Lustig and Koester 2007, 46), or, “Intercultural communication refers to the effects on communication behaviour, when different cultures interact together. Hence, one way of viewing intercultural communication is as communication that unfolds in symbolic intercultural spaces” (Arasaratnam 2013, 48); or, also, “intercultural communication refers to the communication between people from two different cultures” (Chen and Starosta 1998, 28).

In the event of translating festivals, the three definitions are equally applicable, serve the same cause, and can potentially fill in the cognitive gaps of feeling. To be clearer, shared meaning and feeling need to be transferred within a setting of cultural diversity for it is to be visibly and effectively promoted and translated. This calls for an adequate understanding of the source culture and values. Festivals are, therefore, settings for transferring shared meaning and feeling in a context of cultural diversity and the relationship of the end product with its source is important for the effective translation of shared meaning and feeling. This transfer, rendition or translation calls for a feeling-based understanding of the source culture that is conveyed by the bearers and/or practitioners of the festival, i.e. the community. However, as the bearers may come from diverse cultural backgrounds, a process of intercultural communication is presupposed to have taken place between them to allow the festival to be performed. This is manifested in the shared meaning and feeling conveyed through the festival. As such, interacting with and having dialogue with the bearers is essential to facilitate an effective transfer of shared feelings and meanings, since dialogue enables the understanding of the source cultural backgrounds that contribute

to the development of shared understanding. The need for dialogue and/or communication stems from the need to overcome the formation of beliefs or judgements about other cultures that are rooted in culturally diverse settings and that are barriers to an appropriate transfer of feeling as they themselves create cognitive gaps of feeling. The hermeneutic translation for festivals is thus based on intercultural interchange and is, in the opinion of Robinson (2022a, forthcoming), what he defines the “vitalistic creator with a purpose in creating them”.

In response to a question that may arise regarding the nature of the translator’s relationship with the source culture in the process of translating festivals and with regard to the importance relating to the bearers within the act of transferring the source culture to the target culture in the context of translating festivals, we look at festivals as manifestations of intangible cultural heritage and as cultural events that are transferred mainly by word of mouth from generation to generation. Article 2 of UNESCO’s 2003 “Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage” provides relevant responses by identifying “intangible cultural heritage” as the sum of “practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts, and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage”. In addition, the convention refers to the constant “recreation by communities and groups” of this intangible culture “in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history” that “provides them with a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity” (UNESCO 2022).

Defining festivals as “Intangible Cultural Heritage” that provide communities with a sense of identity and continuity attaches further importance to the translator’s communication with the (local) communities in the event of festival translation. The communities are the true bearers of the source culture and the translator’s interaction with them is important for an effective transfer of shared meaning and feeling from the source culture to the target culture. From a hermeneutical stance, the intercultural communication of the spirit pointed out above can potentially contribute to the “socioaffective stabilisation of understanding” (Robinson 2022a, forthcoming).

4. *Should the target audiences be taken to the community, or, should the (feelings and understandings of) the community be brought to the target audiences?*

It goes without saying that there is an enormous difference between translating texts and translating performing events such as festivals based on the spread of local (oral) tradition. In relation to question 4 in the present subsection, a fundamental role is occupied by human agents in the context of translation and on the notions of “embodiment”, “embeddedness”, “enactivity”, “extendedness”, and affect – the 4EA cognitive science of translation theorized by Robinson (2020; 2022a, forthcoming). This definition attributes a prominent role to embodied and enacted experience, that is, an experience that is re-experienced or co-experienced by the translator and then brought into action again, and to affective response in translating festivals. The embodied and enacted experiences will lead to the translation strategy adopted in instances of festival renditions by means of a foreignising approach, that is, one that simulates the foreign meaning and feeling for the target receiver(s).

To emphasise the importance of human agency in the process of translating festivals, I rely on a comparison between Toury’s laws on textual translations and translation acts where the mediating role and agency of the translator are underlined for an appropriate rendition of meaning and feeling. We are aware that in text-based translations, as considered by Toury, the social conditions of the receiving culture from the perspective of significance and status are attached to the target literature and literary structure, whether it be considered superior or inferior by the target language users, and that the standardisation of the source text in the target culture in line with the target cultural repertoire is what matters. Toury’s proposed laws are of a nonhuman nature. According to Robinson (2022b, forthcoming), Toury’s “generalizations, however, are based on textual features without human agency. Human agency is perhaps implied, but peripheralised, backgrounded, in his use of the passive voice: will be converted, will be selected, will be characterised, and so on”. Nevertheless, as translations are carried out in the “particular domain of human culture” (Ibid.), the human agent of transfer must be significantly taken into account as the intercultural communicator and/or mediator in the process of interacting and, as a result of this interaction, in the acts of experiencing, re-experiencing or co-experiencing with the bearers of the performing arts in the event of translating festivals. In Toury’s laws, however, “there are no histories of group

interaction influencing linguistic choices. There are only words and sentence structures” (Ibid.).

Further on, I will offer a reading of how Toury’s two laws of textual translation operate. In accordance with Toury’s two laws, the “law of growing standardisation” and the “the law of interference”, the resulting text in the target language turns out to be simpler and flatter, in other words, the target text will appear to be more assimilated with the target cultural repertoires/repertories. In this sense, Toury believes (1995/2012, 306) that translations will be characterized by both the “disambiguation” of textual features, which are ambiguous in the source text, and “by greater simplification”. As Anthony Pym (2009, 79) sums it up, in line with the law of standardisation, “the language [of a translated text] is usually flatter [than that of a non-translated text], less structured, less ambiguous, less specific to a given text, more habitual, and so on”. To be more precise, the law of growing standardisation comes in several formulations amongst which the most retained one is the “conversion of textemes into repertories” (Toury 1995/2012, 267, qtd. in Pym 2008, 314). According to Pym (Ibid.), this may mean “a source-text feature in some way specific to that text will tend to be replaced by a feature from the stock held in waiting in the target-language genre”.

The law of interference, the less spoken law of the two in the context of text translation, reads as such: “In translation, phenomena pertaining to the make-up of the source text tend to be transferred to the target text” (Ibid.). Nevertheless, the “make-up can also come from the normal, codified practices of the target system” (Ibid.). Given the above explanation, and as remarked by Robinson (2022b, forthcoming), the former law has it that translations tend to be increasingly ‘standardised’ or assimilated within the target-cultural and target-language repertoire. This means that the text-specific features found in the source text will tend to be replaced by more general features found in broader target-language repertoires. In this sense, according to Toury (1995/2012; qtd. in Robinson 2022b, forthcoming), “instead of studying translations as reproductions of source texts, we should study them as features of target cultures”. Toury’s belief is that, in processes of translation, all has a target-side priority. In other words, in Descriptive Translation Studies, translations are target-cultural phenomena, or “facts of target culture” (1995/2012, 23). Given the definitions of the two laws, they seem to be interconnected. However, the question is whether the same law is or can be applied to the translation of

festivals, in a nutshell, whether it is possible to ‘standardise’ an action that is being performed, and how ‘interference’ would apply to action in performance.

When it comes to the translation for festivals from the perspective of orality, it is necessary to convey meaning and feeling as practised/performed by living bearers of an element of cultural significance: the community. In other words, what is being conveyed is culture-in-action. This highlights the role of translators as cultural mediators or agents of cultural transfer more than any other role. The law for standardisation does not apply to the translation for festivals because ‘standardisation’ in the sense used in the said law seeks to flatten out cultural differences between the source and the target, whereas the proper transfer of culture-in-action, a term I use here to refer to culture in its process of being performed, depends on the proper transfer of feeling as understood and communicated between the translator and the community. To contribute to the cross-fertilisation of cultures, there is a need to retain cultural diversity, human creativity and social diversity, as they all deal with human behaviour and culture, being therefore interconnected. As a constituting component of cultural diversity, what is claimed here is that gestures, facial expressions and body language displayed in festivals have to be included among the cultural identity-builders, as each one is a vehicle of cultural meaning. In this sense, the rendition of these features calls, above all, for a closer interaction between the translator and the performing communities with the aim to reproduce the feeling as an essential element in the making of festivals. Unlike what is stated in Toury’s laws, the “target-side priority” cannot be the sole priority when translating festivals as the concrete transmission of cultural values. In short, the target audience needs to perceive source feeling and meaning, which means that the target audience is moved towards the source culture, which is not replaced by similar elements in the target culture. This will allow translators to reproduce the true essence of the festival, while communicating with the target audiences for the cross-fertilisation of cultures, retaining and conveying the cultural elements in their original foreign forms for a more authentic understanding of the foreign culture (including feeling and meaning). The promotion of cultural diversity, with a view on human creativity, in the sense explained, will contribute to the strengthening of intercultural communication within and between nations.

Interference in the sense applied to the law of interference is not applicable to the case in point because once more it places us in a situation of flattening out

the differences. However, if we consider interference as a means of transferring source cultural differences to the target culture, in other words, as a means of bringing the foreign to the target culture or simulating the foreign culture for the target audiences, this will be acceptable. The difference between this transfer with the one explained in Toury's law of interference lies in the mode by which the transfer takes place, which is based on the interaction of the translator with the practitioners of any festival and on what the translator of the festival feels from re-experiencing and co-experiencing the source feeling while simulating it as a hermeneutical norm for the target receiver. This type of transfer emphasises what Robinson (2022a, forthcoming) refers to as "the affectively experienced embodiment, embeddedness, enactivity, and extendedness of cognition" in the translation for festivals, i.e. the translation for culture-in-action. Again, according to Robinson (Ibid.), in the translation for festivals "the embodied affective simulation that the translator builds for the target reader stands in for all the other conceptual innovations". Since festivals-in-action do not have readers but receivers, viewers and practitioners and/or bearers, I will replace the term 'target reader' with 'target receiver'.

I would therefore conclude this sub-section by suggesting that in the translation for festivals there is the need to bring the feeling and understanding of the community to the target audiences in ways which would also include bringing the translator's experience to the receivers.

5. *What risks will the translator encounter in the process of transferring feelings, content and meaning?*

Risks and their management are an inseparable part of any human activity including translation. Following in the footsteps of Anthony Pym (2015, 1) and bearing on the secondary findings of my own PhD research (Pirouznik 2019), translational risk is a problem driven by some type of translation-specific credibility loss and risk-management is the translator's response to credibility threatening mechanisms/systems. According to Pym (2018, 9) "all translation is communication". In a talk given at the LCNAU conference in Adelaide, Pym (Ibid.) explains "translation is communication when it reaches a receiver (in written or spoken mode, since both are concerned here); it is communication when performed in a role play setting or similar exercise;

and it is also communication when used to check on acquisition, since it communicates the acquisition level to the instructor. In short, translation is always communicative, in many different ways”.

Bearing on this definition and considering all translation as communication and looking at communication, with special emphasis on intercultural communication, as an inseparable part of translating festivals, the main risks any translator might encounter in the process of rendering festivals concern the mode(s) of establishing effective communication with the communities (the bearers), capturing the feelings and meaning(s) of the element being performed and then conveying it to the target receivers, while maintaining the source experience, feeling and meaning alive.

Thus, to tackle the risks they may encounter in the process of translating festivals, translators might ask themselves questions of the nature concerning the mode(s) of a) establishing effective communication and b) of transferring what they receive from the established communication. The significance of both activities lies in the proper capturing of community-held beliefs, which is the gateway to affective communication, hence, to feeling one’s way into contextual meaning. The following are some potential examples of questions asked by the translators:

- How can I identify the identity-building markers of the festival?
- What risks will I be facing if I do not manage to convey the feeling and meaning of the festival in a manner that is tangible for the receiving community/s?
- How will the target audiences receive a festival that simulates the foreign feeling, meaning and experience for them?
- What if the practitioners do not open up about their feeling(s)?
- What if there are cultural restrictions for them to explain the entirety of what they are performing/practising?
- How can I best fill in the cognitive gaps that exist for me?
- How should I act and react to win the trust of the practitioners?
- What conceptual strategy/s and/or innovations will I be needing to appropriately transfer the feeling and meaning of the festival to my target audiences?
- How can I capture the history behind the festival? Would I be needing to do historical research? Or will simply effectively communicating with the practitioners of the festival help me?

These questions and many more that come to the mind of the translator in the act of rendering a festival, not only accentuate the translator’s agency, but also shed light upon the importance of: (a) both the source and target sides

in the translation for festivals (as opposed to a mere focus on the target-side); (b) the need for establishing effective communication and interacting with the community (i.e. the practitioners) to fill in the existing cognitive gaps; (c) the translator's endeavour to feel his/her way into the act being performed prior to translating; (d) the target receivers' need to feel their way into everything for better understanding; (e) the translator's efforts to affectively experience the source culture and to embed and extend it affectively; and, finally, drawing on Robinson (2022a, forthcoming), f) the fact that the simulation the translator tries to build for the target receivers stands in for all other conceptual strategy/s and/or innovations in the translation of a festival.

6. Conclusion

Here, I respond to the main question underlying this paper: "How are multiple identities communalised (for cross-fertilisation of cultures)?" As already explained, communalised identities are defined as identities that are brought to the fore according to their shared cultural value, where shared cultural values are represented in the diverse performances of a festival. Bearing on this definition, communalising identities call for a closer interaction between the translator with the festival's bearers and practitioners.

In line with the translation for festivals through the lens of hermeneutics and 4EA cognitive science, we might want to refer to the translation for festivals – as viewed from the lens of this study – as an act centred upon experiencing, re-experiencing and co-experiencing the source culture, as well as simulating the source culture for the target receivers. The translator's effort at experiencing, re-experiencing and co-experiencing the source culture can be translated into the attempt to in essence grasp the feeling and meaning of the source side. The translator cannot do this in the absence of interaction and cooperation with the practitioners of the festival. From my perspective, grasping the feeling and meaning of any performing act should come about in mutual dialogue between the translator and the bearer of that action or tradition. When feeling is embodied and extended through this translational practice, it is no longer an individual faculty but a collective feeling, which may then turn into what Connerton (1989/2003, 1) refers to as "social memory" by continued practice and awareness-raising.

The collaboration between the translator and practitioners of the festival will essentially contribute to his/her understanding of communally organised feeling and identities, whose result means that “the cognitive gaps left by the affective vagueness of feeling” can be overcome “through research based on the guidance provided by communally organised feeling” (Robinson 2022a, forthcoming). The translator’s interaction with the performers/practitioners of the festival will help the translator understand communal activities, rituals and rites, which serve as the identity-building markers of any community and are put on display by the different groups of practitioners/bearers through their gestures, facial expressions, body and spoken languages. This understanding, combined with simulating the source feeling and meaning for the target audiences, will most likely contribute to the cross-fertilisation of cultures and to communalising multiple identity-builders for the different groups of performers of a festival by the translator’s efforts in raising awareness and, as a result of the awareness thus aroused, by maintaining and promoting cultural diversity and human creativity.

In relation to the translation of body language and the necessity of an effective dialogue between the translator and the practitioners of festivals, also in light of the translation of body language in relation to the 4EA cognitive science, it is not out of place here to make reference to the connection between body language and ‘feeling’. Robinson (2013, 357) believes that, as part of the somatic theory:

...our bodies simulate the body states of the people around us, so that we feel (more or less) what they’re feeling. I call this the “somatic transfer,” or – given that there is no substance that is physically transferred, but rather each body reads other bodies’ outward displays of emotions (body language) and simulates their states – “somatic mimesis.” When what others are feeling is *evaluative affect* – especially approval or disapproval – we tend to experience their affect not only as our own affect, but as pressure to feel their affect, and to act in accordance with it. This is what I call “affect-becoming-conation”: your affect being felt inside my body as conative pressure to change how I feel, and how I act on how I feel, and how I explain my feelings and actions cognitively.

In view of the above, two challenging questions concern the modalities of the translator’s practice: a) whether the translator is doing immediate translation; b) whether the translator needs to first carry out his/her own research and then translate. The former question implies that translators are present at the

festival and therefore translate orally and straightforward while establishing immediate contact with the performers/bearers of the festival. The latter question brings the idea to the mind that translators are entrusted with the responsibility of conducting a translation of a living festival through research and textual reading, which means that they are not spectators at the time of the translation. The term 'living' signifies that the festival has initiated in the past and is still performed and upheld in the present times, therefore it is a living entity. The response to the above two questions is: both possibilities are valid and both possibilities require the translator's interaction with the practitioners and bearers of the festival with the scope of filling in the cognitive gaps of meaning, feeling and cultural values. In both cases body languages exist but in different forms: a) in the former instance, there is a physical transmission (when the translator is present at the festival); b) in the latter, there is a textual transmission (when the translator is absent at the festival and carries out his/her own research for achieving information and understanding). And, in both cases alike, whether in presence or absence, the translator re-experiences or co-experiences the body language through 'somatic mimesis' or 'somatic transfer'.

Bibliography

- Arasaratnam, Lily A. 2013. "Intercultural Communication Competence." In *Intercultural Communication: Representation and Construction of Culture*, edited by Anastacia Kurylo, 47-68. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Chen, Guo-Ming, William J., Dajin Lin, and Zeshun, You. 1998. *Foundations of Intercultural Communication*. Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.
- Connerton, Paul. 1989. *How Societies Remember*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Di Paolo, Ezequiel A., Rhode, Marieke, De Jaegher, Hanne 2010. "Horizons for the Enactive Mind: Values, Social Interaction, and Play." In *Enaction. Towards a New Paradigm for Cognitive Science*, edited by John Stewart, Olivier Gapenne and Ezequiel A. Di Paolo, 33-87. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT University Press.
- Lustig, Myron W., and Koester, Lustig. 2007. *Intercultural Competence: Interpersonal Communication across Cultures*. 5th edition. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Makkreel, Rudolf A., and William H. Oman, trans. 2002. Wilhelm Dilthey, "Plan for the Continuation of the Formation of the Historical World in the Human Sciences." In *The Formation of the Historical World in the Human Sciences Part III*, edited by Rudolf A. Makkreel and Frithjof Rodi, Vol. 3 of *Wilhelm Dilthey: Selected Works*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Pirouznik, Mehrnaz. 2019. *Personification in Translators' Performances*. Unpublished PhD diss. Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Tarragona.
- Pym, A. 2008. "On Toury's Laws of How Translators Translate". In *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies. Investigations in Homage to Gideon Toury*, edited by Anthony Pym, Miriam Shlesinger and Daniel Simeoni, 311-328. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Pym, Anthony. 2009. *Exploring Translation Theories*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Pym, Anthony. 2015. "Translating as Risk Management". *Journal of Pragmatics*, 85: 67-80.

Pym, Anthony. 2018. "Rebranding Translation." The University of Melbourne. https://usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/on-line/training/2018_Rebranding_translation_revised_web.pdf (accessed: 10/07/2022).

Robinson, Douglas. 2013. *Schleiermacher's Icoses: Social Ecologies of the Different Methods of Translating*. Bucharest: Zeta Books.

Robinson, Douglas. 2020. "Reframing Translational Norm Theory through 4EA Cognition." *Translation, Cognition & Behavior* 3, no. 1: 122-142.

Robinson, Douglas. 2022a. "Editor's Introduction: The Emergence of 4EA Cognitive Science out of Hermeneutics." In *Cognition and Hermeneutics: Convergences in the Study of Translation*, edited by Douglas Robinson, a special issue of *Yearbook of Translational Hermeneutics*, vol. 2. Forthcoming.

Robinson, Douglas. 2022b. "Question 5: What is the Legal Status of Toury's Laws?" In *Questions for Translation Studies*. Forthcoming.

Toury, Gideon. 1995/2012. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.

UNESCO: "International Day of Nowruz". <https://www.unesco.org/en/days/nowruz> (accessed: 02/10/2022).

UNESCO. 2003. "Text of the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage". <https://ich.unesco.org/en/convention> (accessed: 08/07/2022).

UNESCO: CULTURE-"Protecting Our Heritage and Fostering Creativity". <https://en.unesco.org/themes/protecting-our-heritage-and-fostering-creativity> (accessed: 15/02/2022).

UNDP: "How cultural and creative industries can power human development in the 21st century". https://hdr.undp.org/en/content/how-cultural-and-creative-industries-can-power-human-development-21st-century?utm_source=EN&utm_medium=GSR&utm_content=US_UNDP_PaidSearch_Brand_English&utm_campaign=CENTRAL&c_src=CENTRAL&c_src_2=GSR&gclid=CjwKCAjwp7eUBhBeEiwAZbHwkThzrXYQ-eavBMVRnrLFmgLt_8Iy54F11BeTqX1UKH0nmJm9EsS77RoC750QAvD_BwE (accessed: 07/06/2022).

Mehrnaz Pirouznik is Head of the International Affairs Unit and translator and interpreter at the Regional Research Centre for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage in West and Central Asia (Under the Auspices of UNESCO). From 2001 to 2020 she also served at the Iranian National Commission for UNESCO as Head of the Translation Office (10 years), Senior Programme Specialist for Culture (3-and-a-half years), Programme Specialist for Natural Sciences (4 years), Senior Advisor to the Secretary General and Programme Specialist for International Affairs (1-and-a-half year). In 2005 she served at the Water Division of the Natural Sciences Sector at UNESCO Headquarters for three months. She has served as freelance translator for UNESCO Headquarters since 2008. Translation and conference interpretation have always been a major part of her activities in any position, and not only for UNESCO, but also for other Tehran-based UN Agencies. She has also functioned as lecturer at the Islamic Azad University at Ray, Tehran, Iran, for a year in the early 2000s, teaching General English and Translation to Students of Applied Chemistry. She received her PhD in Translation and Intercultural Studies from the Universitat Rovira i Virgili in 2019. Since then, she has been active as a young researcher in Translation and Intercultural Studies. She has three (interdisciplinary) forthcoming papers to be published at the end of 2022 in the fields of Hermeneutical Translation Studies, Translation Psychology, and Cognitive Translation Studies. She has translated numerous UNESCO publications from and into English and has various published interviews.

