

## **Introduction**

JUSTYNA GICZELA-PASTWA

It was quite a challenge to decide how the papers submitted for this issue should be ordered. Would it be sensible to group the articles according to the type of translation they reflect on? Or would it be wiser to focus on the methodologies that have been applied? Or perhaps it is specific translation problems that should be set as the ordering criterion? Having considered a few options, I eventually went for the most general *translation vs interpreting* classification. Meanwhile, it occurred to me that the dilemma caused by various interrelations among the papers perfectly reflect the nature of Translation and Interpreting Studies as a field of study. First and foremost, it is interdisciplinary and explores a wide range of topics relating to complex operations on languages and cultures. To do so, researchers dealing with translation and interpreting apply diverse methodologies and turn to other branches of research, in search of insightful perspectives and new research tools. Likewise, it may be noticed that the topics which the Authors discuss in this issue reappear or partly overlap, however, each contribution addresses them from a different perspective and brings something to the table. As is the case with Translation and Interpreting Studies in general, despite the observed diversity, it is possible to discern common ground and shared interests, e.g. in particular translation strategies and techniques, in particular modes of translating, or in the benefits and applicability of particular research methods. The first two papers in this special issue focus on translating EU texts, although they use them for quite a different purpose. Aleksandra Tomaszewska and Natalia Zawadzka-Palucktau compile and analyse an English-Polish parallel corpus of EU

press releases concerning the COVID-19 pandemic, in order to carry out a multifaceted analysis of translation techniques applied in the translation of pandemic-related terminology. The Authors identify a number of features that reflect the nascent nature of an evolving linguistic phenomenon, i.e. institutional multilingual communication about the global COVID-19 emergency.

The study presented by Krzysztof Łoboda discusses practical methods for evaluating the quality of machine-translated EU texts. The solutions offered by the Author may be of particular use to translators who deal with specialised translation and wish to increase their efficiency. Even though, as we can see, quantitative quality evaluation has its drawbacks, in some contexts it may significantly reduce the workload of freelance translators.

Quantitative analysis of the material and primary focus on terminology permeate the first part of the issue. The paper by Wioleta Karwacka certainly fits into this pattern, and at the same time, it echoes the interest of the opening paper, i.e. pinpointing translation techniques and strategies as applied in translating certain type of discourse. The Author deals with medical terminology and aims at identifying procedures used to translate the International Classification for Nursing Practice into Polish. In contrast to the observations presented in the opening paper, this study reveals more stabilised communication conditions and a clear preference for functional translation. The contribution by Paula Gorszczyńska marks the shift to interpreting. The first paper in this part presents the results of a pilot study into types of disfluencies recurrent in sight translation. The study was carried out with the participation of ten subjects, all of them professional interpreters. The Author analyses their sight translation output and by adapting disfluency taxonomies developed in the field of simultaneous interpreting studies, identifies the frequency of particular types of disfluencies. Furthermore, a possible correlation between their occurrence and a dominating source text function has also been examined.

Contrastingly, Heather Adams and David Bovy discuss interpreting in a macro perspective: they present the findings of another pilot study, focused on the activities that freelance conference interpreters undertake in the non-institutional market, apart from interpreting. The Authors designed a questionnaire and managed to collect thirteen sets of answers. A list of various tasks, together with their approximate frequency, has been drawn and discussed on the basis of the returned responses.

Along with this article, as well as with the contribution by Krzysztof Łoboda, the closing paper of the volume, by Arkadiusz Badziński, deals with the nitty-gritty of current professional practice. On top of that, by echoing the topic explored in the opening paper, it also brings the issue full circle. This is quite significant: in 2020 COVID-19 dominated our lives, and in some aspects, influenced our research curiosity as well. As is observed, the pandemic has undeniably changed the contexts and practices of professional medical interpreting, and is likely to leave a lasting imprint on the demands of the profession.

The papers collected in this issue may be viewed as illustrating the interdisciplinary nature of Translation and Interpreting Studies, noticeable in both theoretical and applied orientations of the field. Obviously, even though the perspectives and methods adopted in particular papers differ, the inherent diversity of the discipline exceeds the columns of any academic journal. Future issues of *Beyond Philology* will certainly offer further opportunities to gain deeper insight into the current interests of Translation and Interpreting Studies.