12

Heritage interpretation(s)

Remembering, translating, and utilizing the past

Sharon Deane-Cox

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5368-6531

Pauline Côme

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3373-2107s

Abstract

This chapter addresses the synergistic relationship between heritage, memory, and translation from a conceptual and an applied perspective. It begins by emphasizing how all three operations can be framed in relation to narratives, interactions, subjectivities, and shifts; and yet there remains significant interdisciplinary scope for further investigation into the myriad ways in which translation mediates heritage meanings and simultaneously negotiates visitor experience and engagement. Similarly, little space has been carved out for practical translation considerations within heritage interpretation guidelines, and so this chapter calls for more sustained, empirically led, and joined-up thinking about the heritage–memory–translation triad. The chapter then gestures towards the participatory turn in the cultural sector as a framework for bringing together various stakeholders in that triad to encourage a collaborative approach to interpretative materials. It reports on the endeavours of the 'Translating Scotland's Heritage' research network to stimulate cross-sectoral discussions and provides an applied case study on translation at the Kelpies heritage site. Central issues include anxieties over translation quality, the role of technology, the reception of translated material, accessibility, and minority language use. The chapter concludes with some reflections on directions in which the research horizon might expand.

Introduction: heritage, memory, and translation

Thinking about who and where we come from, how fragmented and difficult or straightforward that journey was, and which socio-political, economic, ecological etc. factors have left their mark along the way entails a turn to our individual, collective, and cultural pasts. In other words, our heritages *present* themselves through acts of memory that serve to both make manifest and operationalize our stories today; reconstructing our pasts is a fundamental human activity that shapes our identities and behaviours, at the same time as it inflects our relationships with the people and spaces around us. Scholars in heritage studies and memory studies are very much alert to what Viejo Rose has termed the 'heritage-memory dyad,' a relationship premised on the notion that 'memory seems so integral to our sense of knowing the past and of interpreting its remains' (2015). As detailed further by Sather-Wagstaff, the points of contact are numerous:

> Heritage and memory are similar in that they are productively synergistic by way of myriad forms of communication; we simultaneously share and produce memories with others through various narrative and activity modes, while heritage is also shared and produced through narratives, engagement with landscapes, performance and other endeavours. As such, they are also individually and collectively experiential and require sustained social, interpersonal interaction in order to endure. Memory and heritage in practice are both partial, subjective, contested, political, subject to particular historical contexts and conditions, and thus dynamically changing – never fixed.

(2015: 191)

The language used here to define the dyad is standard fare in translation studies, concerned as the discipline is with narratives, interactions, subjectivities, and shifts. And yet, we are only now at the very beginning of our own exploration of where such interdisciplinary resonances might lead us in terms of our theoretical, conceptual, and practical understanding of translation's role in heritage across operations that include remembrance and preservation, management, communication, and commercialization. In particular, the conceptualization and practice of heritage interpretation, defined as 'the full range of potential activities intended to heighten public awareness and enhance understanding of [a] cultural heritage site' (ICOMOS 2008: 4), lends itself readily to an investigation of the ways in which the activity of translation mediates heritage meanings, while simultaneously negotiating visitor experience and engagement.

Significant and well-documented inroads have of course been made in respect of museum translation (see Chapters 10 and 11 in this present volume by Neather and Liao, respectively) on questions of how translation influences the interplay between verbal, visual, and cultural meaning-making systems in the museum space, as well as the interplay between the visitor, the exhibition, and various form of memory. Similarly, a substantial and important body of practice-oriented work has developed around translation and museum accessibility, especially in relation to audio description and the attendant challenges around the choice of what to describe and how to translate the visual into the verbal (e.g., see Jiménez Hurtado et al. 2012; Soler Gallego 2018; Neves 2018).

At the same time, though, the scope of heritage extends much farther beyond the museum to include heritage that is built (e.g. historical buildings, monuments, ruins, walls), heritage that is embedded in natural land- and seascapes (e.g. standing stones, national parks, vineyards, battlefields, shipwrecks), and heritage in more intangible forms (e.g. dialects, music and song, food and drink, games). There is a wealth of heritage sites across the globe

that operate in and through translation, across languages, cultures, times, and visitor profiles; but our understanding of the nature, extent, and outcomes of those operations remains ripe for expansion.

In turn, practical heritage interpretation guidance, produced by those working in heritage on academic and applied levels and in monolingual English-speaking contexts, demonstrates a certain tendency to understand translation in a broad intralingual sense, as illustrated by the scenario where 'the interpreter … translates the archaeologist's report into understandable and therefore potentially enjoyable discourse for the public' (Izquierdo Tugas et al. 2005: 18). Similarly, the importance of interlingual translation has been enshrined in the Ename ICOMOS charter for the interpretation of cultural heritage sites, with Principle 1.4 stating that 'the diversity of language among visitors and associated communities connected with a heritage site should be taken into account in the interpretive infrastructure' (2008: 7). However, practical information on how that linguistic diversity should be accommodated does not seem to be forthcoming within heritage interpreting documentation, where guidelines on the production of effective interpretation material threaten to write content into a challenging corner when it comes to translation. Consider the advice to:

> include metaphors, analogies and comparisons. Your audience may understand better if you relate what you're writing about to something that's already familiar to them. For example: 'Loch Ness is so deep, you could stand 100 Nelson's Columns in it, one on top of the other.'
>
> (Scottish Natural Heritage)

But any translator reading this guidance will be acutely aware that the more source culture-specific a metaphor, analogy, or comparison is, the harder they will have to work to facilitate the familiarity that is assumed by the heritage interpreters.

In addition, academic writing on heritage more broadly reveals a striking absence of engagement with translation and translation studies, even in those contexts that lend themselves readily to reflections on meaning-making as negotiated in and through translation. Indicative examples of this blind spot can be found in the (otherwise incredibly illuminating) body of work on heritage discourse, where it is not uncommon to see heritage framed as 'a globalizing process – a series of material and discursive interventions which actively remake the world in particular ways' (Harrison 2015: 297), or to find attempts to 'probe into the discursive (re)production of heritage and consider how such (re)production is manifested on the global–local interface' (Wu and Hou 2015: 37). And yet, translation tends to be overlooked in discussions of the semiotic resources and agents that drive those interventions and in explorations into the discursive mediation of heritage sites as cross-cultural interfaces.

That said, a relatively broad brushstroke approach to translation can be found in the work of Dallen Timothy and Stephen Boyd, who incorporate a three-page section on 'bilingual and multilingual interpretation' into their monograph-length study of *Heritage Tourism* (2003: 213–216). Building on the work of Light's earlier (1992) study of Welsh heritage sites, the authors propose some rules of thumb for providing interpretative material for international visitors, noting that in addition to spoken and written content, 'accommodations can be made by doing physical demonstrations of activities that do not require a great deal of explanation' (Timothy and Boyd 2003: 213). And, contrary to the Loch Ness example cited above, they further argue that 'it is essential to adapt the presentations out of common courtesy and to provide [foreign groups] with valuable learning experiences. It must also be kept in mind that certain language-specific things like idioms,

jargon and humour, do not translate well' ibid.: 213–214). Just quite how those accommodations and adaptions are to be achieved goes undisclosed or unproblematized.

More notably, a nascent interdisciplinary dialogue between heritage studies and translation studies comes to light in Russell Staiff's *Re-imagining Heritage Interpretation*, where an entire chapter is dedicated to the challenges that attend the act of 'conversing across cultures' (2016: 137–157). This is an insightful deliberation that draws out the potentialities and dilemmas inherent in preserving or collapsing difference through translation, as realized across a range of different heritage sites. Interspersed throughout Staiff's case studies (on Katherine Boo's [2012] account of life in a Mumbai slum; a performance of the Barong in Bali; Hu Mei's [2010] film *Confucius*; Angkor in Cambodia; Sukhotai in Thailand; and the Uluṟu-Kata Tjuṯa National Park in Australia) are observations informed by David Bellos (2011) on translation as meaning-making in context and as access, and by Lawrence Venuti (1993) on translation as a form of appropriative violence and political intervention. At the core of the chapter is a concern about how representations of the Other are mediated through translation and how those translations might impact visitor experience. Its case studies give rise to nuanced reflections on: (1) what Staiff terms 'similitude' (2016: 138), or the muting or erasure of cultural difference, and its simultaneous capacity to enable communication and stifle particularism; (2) the power of the heritage spectacle to elicit an affective response above and beyond language, i.e. a response that is not contingent on translation; (3) the enhancement of cultural difference as both a barrier to visitor comprehension and a defensive measure for the source culture; and (4) non-translation that respects the source culture's need for silence around sensitive, taboo etc. matters, yet is at odds with the informative, educational bent of heritage interpretation material. At the same time, although there is no indication that the case studies have been deliberately selected to foreground minority languages and cultures per se, Staiff is nevertheless mindful of the 'power relationships

involved in all encounters with the cultural "other"' (ibid.: 157), especially when it comes to Western gazes on and negotiations of otherness.

In order to 'navigate the ethical dimension of cross-cultural communication at heritage places' (Staiff 2016 154), the author takes his steer from Kwame Anthony Appiah's notion of the 'conversation,' used 'not only for literal talk but also as a metaphor for engagement with the experience and the ideas of others' (Appiah 2006: 85, cited in Staiff 2016: 155). This conversation is a form of engagement that is premised on shared values and experiences across people and cultures, and that stops short of attempting to reconcile points of tension; it is a tolerance of difference and an acceptance of the limits of knowing (Staiff 2016: 155–156). For Staiff, this paradigm has clear practical implications for heritage interpretation, including its translation: 'emphasizing the things we share, as opposed to the things we do not, allows for a conversation across cultural difference' (ibid.: 156). However, Staiff is equally aware of the utopian thrust of this argument, warning in his conclusion that:

> Whatever we do, no matter how noble the intention, there is always the possibility that the experience of cultural difference in a heritage setting may lead, not to greater tolerance and understanding, but to its opposite. In the heritage interpretation 'business' we can never control the outcomes of complex social and cultural processes.
>
> (ibid.: 157)

Nevertheless, such absence of control does not obviate the importance of thinking about and planning for heritage interpretation strategies, including those of an interlingual, cross-cultural nature. What Staiff's work offers us is a starting point for explorations – particularly empirical ones – into the ways in which translation might serve to initiate and shape the

outcomes of those cross-cultural conversations, real and metaphorical, that occur between the visitor and the heritage site. And, in turn, those outcomes will reveal how visitor engagement with heritage, via translation, might give rise to a plurality of meanings, processes of identity formation, and ethical responses that are brought to bear on how the past is remembered.

But, having sketched out the contours of the scholarly landscape as it stands, it is important to underscore the fact that Staiff's interdisciplinary take is both embryonic and an exception, rather than the rule. Instead, there remains much work to be done to arrive at a point where thinking about heritage interpretation and translation becomes more joined up and subsequently more revelatory. One attempt to move beyond siloed ways of working has been the initiation of the research network on 'Translating Scotland's Heritage,' funded by the Royal Society of Edinburgh and led by Sharon Deane-Cox in conjunction with Historic Environment Scotland (HES). Since 2018, the research network has been driven by an impetus to encourage exchanges between academics, translation professionals, and heritage professionals about the ways in which Scotland's heritage sites are (and might better be) mediated through translation, including interlingual and intralingual translation, and accessibility endeavours. In what follows, the chapter will discuss the participatory ethos that underpins the research network, before reporting on the themes, issues, and potential future initiatives that have already emerged from the bringing together of different perspectives and insights. It will then incorporate a case study that serves as a practical illustration of how Pauline Côme, a doctoral candidate and professional translator, worked collaboratively alongside Falkirk Community Trust to produce French translations for the Kelpies Visitor Centre. Lastly, attention will turn to the future in order to pre-empt new directions of research into heritage translation and to set out an agenda for that works on the basis of a 'heritage–memory–translation' triad.

A participatory turn

The arts and culture sector has, for the past two decades at least, been undergoing something of a 'participatory turn' (Bonet and Négrier 2018), whereby the public and other stakeholders become active participants with the power to shape decision-making. Within the museum and heritage sector specifically, this turn has been driven by a commitment to increased democratization and the enhancement of the visitor experience, with public engagement often underpinning attempts to co-create meanings, narratives, values, policies, and so on. It is therefore no surprise that collaborative projects between the sector and academia are commonplace; for example, the Museum University Partnership Initiative (2016–2018) brought together 107 universities and 59 museums and was motivated by the following goals: 'enabling research; nurturing resilience; steering innovation; developing institutional identity; supporting student learning; delivering public engagement; developing new audiences; exchanging expertise; generating and evidencing impact' (Bonacchi and Willcocks 2016).

So, what space have brokers from in and around translation studies taken up in this participatory landscape, with all the added value it offers? Surprisingly, relatively few projects in the field have positioned themselves squarely within a collaborative, multidirectional, and impactful museum-university partnership, one that would, according to Maloney and Hill (2016: 247), 'yield tangible and lasting outcomes, whether institutional change for organizations, access to real-world experiences for students, growth in perspectives for staff or contributions to more innovative and deeper practice in the field.' There are of course notable exceptions, not least the pioneering Museums, Galleries and the International Visitor Experience (MGIVE) project that was initiated in 2007 by the University of Westminster's Department of Modern and Applied Languages and piloted a series of workshops and focus groups in conjunction with six London-based museums and galleries (Cranmer 2013: 5). Exploring welcome leaflets for international visitors in particular, MGIVE stakeholders – including linguists, intercultural specialists, and museum

and gallery professionals – were able to work together to identify the need for 'high-quality, culturally-informed, audience-targeted information for international visitors' (University of Westminster 2014). In terms of practical outcomes, the collaboration yielded some general options for improving communication with international visitors, namely the production of: (1) 'culturally "customized" foreign language texts'; (2) an international (i.e. simplified) source language text, extrapolated from the domestic version, that can be sent for multilingual translation; and (3) one 'inclusive' text to be used by both domestic and international visitors (Cranmer 2013: 8–9). If these options are brought into dialogue with Staiff's (2016) reflections on heritage translation above, a certain correlation emerges in relation to the tension between facilitating encounters and collapsing difference. In turn, Robert Neather (2012) has worked alongside museum communities in Guangzhou, Hong Kong, and Macau to trace, by means of interview, how translation is practiced and problematized within the specific contours of the museum context. Those involved in the research team 'approached the interviews in a collaborative spirit, projecting them as an opportunity for mutual learning and engagement between translation studies and museum communities' (Neather 2012: 252). The resultant findings reveal the anxieties around the handling of specialist content that attend the outsourcing of translation, the subsequent mitigating steps that are taken, such as the provision of glossaries and feedback to external translators, as well as the ways in which translation is carried out in-house or in-community by 'non-expert' translators, including the role played by feedback from the visitor as end-user. Indeed, several points raised in the interviews echo in part those that emerged in the research network discussions, and these will be addressed in more detail below. More recently still, a collaboration between Multilingual Manchester (based in the School of Arts, Languages and Cultures at the University of Manchester and involving Rebecca Tipton) and Manchester Museum has given rise to the Multilingual Museum, a virtual space where users

are encouraged 'to translate the Museum's existing content and narratives about objects from the collection, and in so doing, showcase the city's linguistic diversity and regional language variation' (Multilingual Museum 2021). In this instance, what the museum terms 'storied translation' becomes central to the participatory endeavour; an online platform was created where 'contributors could submit their translations in any language or dialect and provide commentary on others,' at the same time as 'shar[ing] their own experiences, observations and opinions relating to the objects' (ibid.). In other words, this is a scenario in which interlingual communication becomes a mode of co-production and identity marking.

However, it is within the area of audiovisual translation (AVT) and its application to issues of accessibility that we find the greatest concentration of collaborative endeavours. In Spain, the 'Translation and Accessibility: Science for All' project took on the ambitious project of prototyping a multimedia guide for Granada's Science Park Museum that would ensure access across a wide range of groups. It includes:

> audio description (AD) for visually-impaired people, sign language interpreting (SLI) for hearing-impaired people who use sign language, subtitling for oral deaf and hard of hearing people (SDH), and text adaptation for people with different levels of prior knowledge (lay, semi-lay and expert) and cognitive abilities (children, teenagers, young people, elderly people).
>
> (Jiménez Hurtado et al. 2012: 13)

The process served to highlight various strategies in the creation of audiovisual content, including matching the register of the audioguide to the audience (ibid.: 17), the need to coin new terms in Spanish sign language to deal with scientific terminology (ibid.: 18), and the

simplification of vocabulary and syntax in subtitles in accordance with the cognitive needs of the user (ibid.: 20). But the extent to which the museum was invited to feed into these decisions, above and beyond facilitating access to the exhibition source material, is not immediately clear; instead, the extensive list of roles attributed to the museum translator as a producer of content, and an 'expert and advisor on museum accessibility' (ibid.: 12), seems to suggest a one-way flow of knowledge. In the absence of information about the subsequent implementation and user response to the prototype, it is impossible to say whether and how mutual consultation might have shaped the impact of the project. Nevertheless, later work by Jiménez Hurtado and Soler Gallego places important emphasis on the fact that museums and other experts such as 'linguists, educators, translators, interpreters, and mediators … need to join forces' to arrive at the end goal of 'inclusion and universal accessibility' (2015: 296). This imperative can also be seen at the heart of the OPENArt Project in Poland; the project's aim was to design a multimedia app 'which provides descriptions of works of art in the form of short videos in different languages as well as with subtitling and signing' (Szarkowska et al. 2016: 305) that can be used by all visitors, and it brought together 'a consortium of partners including museums, universities, a research institute and a media access foundation' (OPENArt – Modern Art For All). Similarly, in the UK, Ellen Adams's project, 'Ways of Seeing: Sensory Impairments and the Ancient World' (MANSIL 2021), entails working with a range of London museums and art galleries to explore how audio description, British sign language, and touch tours facilitate access for Deaf and blind or partially sighted visitors, and how those modalities might also be used to engage other visitor groups more broadly. In addition, the University of East Anglia's Support Access for Audiovisual Media (SAAM) project, led by Carlos de Pablos-Ortega, has, since 2016, been bringing AVT student volunteers together with external partners in order to produce subtitles for audiovisual material. The project lists heritage organizations amongst its partners, with collaborations

'enabling the Deaf and Hard of Hearing community to engage with local history' (SAAM Project). Not only does this initiative open up heritage experiences to new users, but it also serves as an opportunity for students to refine their skillset in authentic heritage settings.

What unites these projects is a commitment to participatory practices that are designed to share knowledge, build capacity, and engage audiences. And it was precisely in that optic of collaborative gain that the Translating Scotland's Heritage research network was forged and developed, bringing together a range of stakeholders from the heritage sector, the translation profession, advocates for the Deaf community and for minority languages, and academics. The following section will detail the discussions that emerged out of the research network with regard to the challenges and opportunities of heritage translation, and it is hoped that the experiences and ideas summarized here will serve as a point of reference for the future participatory endeavours that are needed to drive research and practice forward in this area. At the same time, this appeal for collaborative projects is in no way intended to detract from the valuable insights that have been, and will continue to be, gained from the comparative case studies that we more commonly see in the field. In many instances, and as I have found in my own work (Deane-Cox 2014), such case studies are often loosely participatory and can serve as a crucial point of departure for deepening links with heritage bodies and other stakeholders, while usefully bringing the underlying and applied mechanisms of the heritage–memory–translation triad to the fore.

Translating Scotland's Heritage: insights and innovations

The central participatory activities of the research network were designed to facilitate cross-sector discussions around the ways in which heritage translation, broadly understood, is commissioned, practiced, consumed, and researched, all with a view to enhancing access to Scotland's heritage sites for international and local visitors alike.[1] An initial scoping session that identified stakeholder needs, concerns, and blind spots gave rise to two workshops: one

that explored the expectations and responses of heritage translation end users and another that turned its attention first to questions of best practice in terms of integrating CAT tools and translation briefs into workflow processes, and then to the role of Scots and Gaelic in and as heritage translations. The following overview of salient focal points aims to illustrate the insights that can emerge from joined-up, collaborative thinking; in this instance, on how to best mediate the past via translation for heritage site visitors, while also acknowledging the very real constraints of time, budget, and other limited resources. Accordingly, the approach taken was a pragmatic one, and as such diverges somewhat from the highly commendable 'universal access translation' ethos for which Neves advocates, whereby

> resources should *simply* be made available to all [museum visitors] in such a way that anybody may choose to use them. … This would *simply* mean making all content available in multiple forms, with different levels of complexity and allowing for diverse modes of interaction.
>
> (2018: 422; my emphasis)

At the time of writing, further exploration of the issues and ideas discussed below has been stymied by the Covid-19 pandemic. But the foundations have nevertheless been laid for future, more concrete participatory action, in both the immediate context of Scotland and beyond. It would be a welcome and valuable development indeed if the groundwork carried out in the research network was able to support similar collaborative efforts elsewhere, and it is certainly our hope that it moves us a step closer to the realization of Neve's vision.

Focal points

One of the most immediate matters to come to the fore in the scoping session was a certain anxiety around interlingual translation quality. Having only limited capacity to evaluate the content and effectiveness of the target texts received, heritage translation commissioners could sometimes find themselves on unsteady ground, a position rendered all the more destabilizing when contrasted with the substantial level of consideration and precision that is dedicated to the production of the source language interpretative material itself. The very acknowledgement of this anxiety was instructive in several respects. First, it spoke to an awareness of the workings of translation that may not always be present in heritage bodies. In fact, previous research has suggested that such insights cannot be taken for granted, with Chen and Liao warning museum staff against 'the innocent view that their commissioned translations are just the same as the source text, or that translations are transparent, neutral and impartial' and highlighting the need for 'more rigorous policies and procedure[s] to commission and assess translations … to be in place' (2017: 65). In our case, though, half the battle had already been won, meaning that attention could be more productively focused on identifying potential solutions to the evaluation dilemma, as will be addressed in the section below. Secondly, the multilateral setup of the network meetings meant that the heritage translators had the opportunity to make a compelling case for their expertise, thereby offsetting concerns over quality in no small measure, while also being able to give voice to the frustrations and challenges that beset their own practice. More than once it was noted that HES appeared to be ideal clients given both their existing sensitivity to issues such as space and time constraints and their willingness to provide additional explanations and context where needed. It also became evident that open lines of communication between commissioner and client are not always assured; this is often due to the dynamics of the translation process when outsourced by agencies, as succinctly described by Abdallah and

Koskinen (2007: 6): 'the original client may be several links away from the translator and direct contact is not facilitated, or it may even be prohibited.'

It follows, then, that the inter-community interactions raised here differ slightly from those observed in Neather's (2012) study. The museum staff in Guangzhou, Hong Kong, and Macau already possessed a very applied, experience-based understanding of translation, which manifested itself in what Neather has termed 'expertise anxiety' (ibid.: 266) over terminological accuracy; instead, a more generalized anxiety over quality made itself felt in the research network since no specific issues were pinpointed. Additionally, Neather found that museums in Hong Kong and Macau would provide external translators with glossaries of technical terms and guidelines, an interaction that can be understood as 'a more collaborative engagement … that allows some flow of disciplinary knowledge out of the host or client community and into the service community' (ibid.: 261). The research network, in its turn, facilitated a two-way flow of expert insights, and it is interesting to note that, in this more coactive context, thinking also turned to the use of termbases and translation briefs as ways of best managing the commissioner–client relationship. These threads will be picked up again and further nuanced below.

In addition, despite benefitting from a firm grasp of what is at stake in interlingual translation, HES flagged up their unfamiliarity with the ways in which translation technology can be integrated into workflows. This was an opportunity for Côme (2019a) to share her findings from a case study on the use of machine translation to produce French content on the VisitScotland website. Although human translation supports the mediation of general interest articles on broad topics such as Scottish culture and history, machine translation is demonstrably and understandably applied to attraction listing pages whose content is likely to be more transient. The pitfalls flagged up by Côme included the omission or non-translation of terminology that falls under the heritage domain, such the Scots word '*doocot*' [dovecote]

that remains in its original form; the mishandling of polysemous terms, whereby the 'keep' in the verbal phrase 'keep going' was interpreted as a noun, i.e. the keep of a castle, resulting in a nonsensical statement; and inaccuracies in the source texts themselves, all of which detracted from the overall intelligibility of the webpages. The ensuing discussion took us along paths that might seem well trodden to translation studies scholars, namely the qualitative benefits of expert human translation vs. the time- and budget-saving advantages of automated translation in certain scenarios, but that nevertheless opened up new dimensions and considerations to stakeholders with no prior grounding in these issues.

Similarly, it transpired that the use of computer-assisted translation (CAT) tools was unchartered territory for many, including one or two translators, and so Côme (2019b) was further able to demystify some of the processes through a short demo of SDL Trados Studio and MultiTerm, before addressing several dilemmas around pricing structures and intellectual property rights. Of particular note was the revelation from heritage translation clients that they were not privy to any information regarding whether or not CAT tools had been used in any commissioned translations; nor had they received any indication as to the presence and/or reuse of any termbases or glossaries that might have been compiled on the basis of their material. As above, knowledge about translation technology that may often be taken for granted in certain circles was reactivated in this participatory setting to new revelatory ends, not least the identification of potential weak points in the communication chain between heritage translation clients and language service providers.

However, exchanges within the workshops did focus solely on the translation process itself; another pressing unknown that presented itself was how the translation products were being received by heritage site visitors. To date, heritage organizations have had only limited sightlines into the reception and efficacy of translated interpretation material, and a resounding call was made for more data on what visitors expect from and how they respond

to the target texts provided. This call chimes with Neather's (2005) much earlier observation that end-user needs have been given scant attention in the museum translation context, a gap that still evidently persists today. At the same time, though, the challenges around capturing and accommodating the needs of heritage site translation users are significant. Most notably, the field of visitor studies alerts us to the sheer diversity of visitor behaviour, with Falk observing that 'visitors who possess different cultural backgrounds and experiences are not only likely to utilize the same museum spaces, exhibitions, and programs in different ways, but they are almost certain to make very different meanings' (2009: 101). That said, there is still merit in trying to pre-empt behavioural patterns as a way of informing heritage translation planning and strategies, although this is perhaps more readily done on smaller or larger group levels. In that respect, Guillot's (2014) work on cross-cultural differences in museum visitor engagement certainly stands as an important anchor point for thinking about expectations around museum text conventions, but there is considerable scope for these insights to be supplemented by further empirically grounded research in other heritage settings as experienced by a wide range of visitor groups.

Workshop discussions yielded several areas that would benefit from additional investigation. A pilot content analysis study of TripAdvisor reviews for Doune Castle by Deane-Cox pointed towards discrepancies in expectations as far as audio guide language provision was concerned; French visitors appeared aggrieved that there was no audio guide in French (e.g. maggie4759 2019), while German and Spanish visitors both used and responded positively to the English audio guide version, which was deemed to be entertaining, enjoyable, and informative (e.g. FamReisen 2018; EGLP1 2018). These positive evaluations were often linked to the fact that the English language content had been voiced by Terry Jones of *Monty Python* fame and by Sam Heughan from the TV series *Outlander*. In other words, one group appears to require the type of customized language text proposed by the

MGIVE project (Cranmer 2013: 8), while another welcomes the foreign text on its own terms and merit. In the stakeholder exchanges that followed, it was suggested that this inconsistency may be attributable to varying levels of English competence, but also, and interestingly, to generational differences, the assumption being that older visitors were perhaps more open to interpretation material that introduced an element of otherness and, by extension, a more foreignizing experience. In a sense, our back and forth about international visitor needs was somewhat inconclusive; the absence of substantial and substantive evidence as to what end-users want means that any ideas about those visitors seeking out magical, or romantic, or authentic Scottish heritage experiences remain on the level of conjecture. But that inconclusiveness also clearly signals the importance of adding empirical backing to our thinking, as and when applied research into interlingual heritage translation progresses.

In contrast, stakeholders within the Deaf community had a much more decisive stance with regard to the needs of Deaf heritage visitors who value inclusive, rather than potentially alienating, experiences. Such inclusivity is underpinned by the presence of interpretative material that resonates with visitors and allows them to see their own stories and heritages reflected in those of the site. Harnessing the past to shine a light on and speak to the lived experiences of those end-users goes some way to ensuring that the wider social marginalization of the Deaf community is not compounded, but rather counteracted, by the heritage site. This particular scenario adds yet another ethical and political dimension to the navigation of otherness and reinforces the significance of Neve's argument that universal accessibility translators 'need to work directly with the curatorial team towards the design of spaces that will allow for multiple "readerships," who … will be arriving at the cultural venue with quite distinct expectations' (2018: 421). In practical terms, according to participant John Hays of Deaf History Scotland, Deaf visitors, who may not have English as a first or a preferred language, appreciate the presentation of information in plain terms, alongside the

use of visual material that can be comprehended in a single gaze. In addition, accessibility can be enhanced through the integration of technology, including the use of handsets with videos and QR codes. Speaking as someone with a wealth of tour guiding experience, Hays further stressed the importance of quality, in terms of both the interpersonal communication skills of the guide and their standard of sign language interpreting: quality guiding should convey passion, provide role models for the Deaf community, and facilitate a deeper understanding of end-user needs. Another recommendation from Hays was that personal touch could also be complemented by increasing the number of opportunities for tactile experiences and by increasing access to historical re-enactments; indeed, a keenness to deliver more immersive, multisensory experiences for visitors was expressed across the board, if money were no object. Ultimately, the onus is on heritage organizations to acknowledge, drill deeper into, and act on these end-user needs, while also bearing in mind, as HES does, the legislative impetus that comes from the British Sign Language (Scotland) Act 2015 to 'make Scotland the best place in the world for BSL users to live, work and *visit*' (Scottish Government 2017: 4; my emphasis) in general and to 'improve access to the historical environment' (ibid.: 27) more specifically.

Inclusiveness is also an issue when it comes to minority language use at Scottish heritage sites and the question of what roles and space might be carved out for Scots and Gaelic in interpretative material. Ashley Douglas (2020) makes a compelling case for the presence of parallel Scots–English interpretative texts at sites: 'using Scots to tell Scotland's story imbues it with visceral and authentic immediacy that transcends the centuries and brings people closer to the past.' In so doing, Scots functions simultaneously as a tool of engagement and education, as a concrete embodiment of the country's linguistic heritage, and, in an echo of the trope of translation as survival, as a means of preserving the past (ibid.). Similarly, Alasdair MacCaluim's (2020) presentation points to the symbolic and

educational value of Gaelic at heritage sites, but then nuances that provision by highlighting that 'it can sometimes be hard to get the right balance between awareness-raising and providing a service to the Gaelic community.' In other words, translating for differentiated users and goals – ranging from the non-Gaelic speaker who sees and recognizes the language as such to the native speaker who relies on Gaelic as an interpretative window on to the past – introduces an additional layer of complexity into minority language usage at heritage sites. Whereas Douglas calls for large-scale bilingual content, MacCaluim suggests that the use of Gaelic on place names and signs would allow the historical and current presence of the language to be felt, while acknowledging budgetary constraints and varying degrees of visitor interest (ibid.). Both speakers also flagged up the difficulties of making practical translation decisions in the heritage domain where the very term 'visitor experience' proves problematic in both Gaelic and Scots, and where the absence of the type of specialized training means that translators are self-guided, relying on their own experience and seeking ad hoc input from other speakers. The workshop discussions also turned to the political dimensions of minority language use, and it was noted that translation choices may be premised on the need to clearly differentiate the Scots or Gaelic terms from English ones in the interests of visibility and equality. It follows that, in addition to the financial and spatial implications of providing interpretative material in minority languages, heritage bodies may find themselves having to negotiate points of contention around where, how much, and what content is put on display, issues that are thorny in and of themselves but that also invite comparison across the different languages involved.

Potential action points

The preceding summary demonstrates how participatory dialogue has led to the identification and elaboration of a range of different gaps, concerns, and issues around heritage translation. Although ideas as to how Scotland's translation provision might be enhanced have yet to be

fully explored, let alone realized, the action points below that emerged from the network discussions serve to map out feasible routes ahead in terms of what could be initiated, scaffolded, or perpetuated further. One definitive guiding principle established itself firmly in the network discussions, namely the fundamental importance of sharing best practice as any future endeavours take root and develop. In that respect, all involved can usefully lead by example, create precedents, and promote guidelines and models for quality heritage translation, thereby allowing knowledge and success stories to circulate in the public domain where they might engender and support new initiatives. As a first step on the journey though, more participatory weight could be put behind the following:

- *Quality assurance measures*. These might include the co-development of processes, such as checklists for bilingual staff or machine back-translation, that would facilitate basic comparisons between source and target texts to support quality evaluation and control within the heritage organization; the co-creation and maintenance of a termbase (text-based or multimodal, and within one organization or beyond) that would facilitate terminological consistency across e.g. place names or specialized terms in written or signed form; the introduction of training initiatives that would support heritage translators (especially those working with Scots and Gaelic) and BSL interpreters, including specialist modules at postgraduate level (see also Jiménez Hurtado et al. 2012: 13), work placements and traineeships, along with other CPD initiatives.

- *Improved communication channels between client and translation provider*. Working directly with freelance translators may well be the most evident solution to ensuring an effective and efficient flow of information (see Abdallah and Koskinen 2007: 280), but public heritage organizations are often

bound by tendering processes that involve larger LSPs; in those instances, a detailed translation brief may provide highly beneficial reference points – indeed, Sally Gall (HES) has made significant strides in drafting a heritage-specific template that was lightly refined during one of the workshops, and its application in real-world contexts will prove revelatory in terms of the benefits such a brief might yield and the further modifications it might require.

- *Research and practice capacity building.* Sustained empirical research efforts are clearly required in order to garner data on and feedback from heritage translation users across different groups; joint funding applications between academic and heritage organizations, such as those supported by the AHRC Collaborative Doctoral Partnership Studentships, could be sought at doctoral level and beyond, while master's students could also be encouraged to carry out smaller, more informal projects; an interdisciplinary approach that is informed by the conceptual and methodological apparatuses of visitor studies presents itself as particularly expedient (see also Chapter 10 by Neather in the present volume); not only should the implementation of any changes in e.g. how and where interpretative material is provided be driven by end user-derived data, but positive visitor feedback should also be tracked and shared; in turn, findings can be leveraged to advocate for increased resources and support around translation and accessibility, while linking clearly to legislative initiatives such as the aforementioned British Sign Language (Scotland) Act 2015 and the Gaelic Language (Scotland) Act 2005, or using documents such as the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages as touchstones.

- *On-site measures.* More localized initiatives could help to reinforce visitor experience via translation and accessibility services, such as inviting front-line

staff to communicate where they feel existing stumbling blocks are and gauging the potential to provide those staff members with basic foreign language training so as to ensure a warm welcome for visitors; translation and interpreting provision could be extended by encouraging students to volunteer as guides at heritage sites, where they can facilitate a more personalized experience that, anecdotally at least, seems to be highly valued; a more integrated approach with Scottish tourism bodies could lead to e.g. the development of logos that boost the visibility and uptake of sign language interpreting services, multilingual audio guides, audio description tours etc.

Although inchoate in nature, these ideas have the potential to be developed, through sustained participation and knowledge exchange, into beacons of change for the implementation and utilization of heritage translation. The following case study on Côme's collaborative endeavour at another Scottish heritage site further illuminates the benefits of working openly and with a shared sense of purpose.

The Kelpies – another case in point

The Kelpies are two monumental horse head sculptures standing 30 metres high on the banks of the Queen Elizabeth II canal in Falkirk, Scotland (Figure 12.1). The work of artist Andy Scott, they form part of the larger Helix Park, which opened to the public in 2014, and have been a popular visitor attraction from the outset for this important heritage site that brings together elements of contemporary art, the area's industrial past, and Scottish folklore. The sculptures are a tribute to the workhorses that used to transport goods on the roads and canals between Edinburgh and Glasgow, and their steel construction is a nod to the iron works that once drove the region's industrial development. At the same time, their name derives from Scottish folklore, where kelpies are shape-shifting creatures who often assume the appearance of a horse; this myth adds another heritage dimension to the Kelpies of Falkirk and also

points to the transformations that Falkirk and its region has undergone over the last few centuries.

Figure 12.1 Here

The Kelpies and the Helix Park are run by the Falkirk Community Trust (FCT), which oversees the management of community-facing sport, recreation, arts, heritage, and library services for the Falkirk Council (Falkirk Community Trust 2020). David Moody, the Visitor Services Manager for Helix Park, contacted the University of Strathclyde's Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in autumn 2019 to enquire about the possibility of Modern Languages students translating the Kelpies Souvenir Guide and the interpretation of the permanent exhibition at the visitor centre as a form of internship. This initial request for Modern Languages students, with no professional training in translation, to undertake the project perhaps echoes a common belief in the tourism industry that any competent speaker of a language can translate (see Pierini 2007; Duran Muñoz 2012). But it certainly signals the budgetary constraints within which many heritage organizations operate, especially those that rely on public funding. In these instances, turning to untrained, volunteer translators can very understandably become the only option; while this approach may well have implications for translation quality, it is important to remember that it is nevertheless motivated by a welcome desire to reach out to and accommodate international visitors. In turn, the request was sensitively made in that Moody was very conscious of the pro bono nature of the work and was willing to work within the parameters of time and extent as established by the volunteer. As it happens, his request also came at a time when the right person for the task was available: Pauline Côme, an experienced translator then at the start of her doctoral studies on heritage translation, volunteered to translate the souvenir guide and interpretation material into French. As a pilot project, built on the premise of close communication between translator and commissioner, this endeavour was designed to be of mutual benefit to those involved, providing Côme with an illuminating case study within the context of her thesis and

an opportunity to raise awareness of the challenges of interlingual translation, while also facilitating international visitor engagement for the FCT.

The translation project

The Kelpies Souvenir Guide is a 72-page book available to purchase from the Visitor Centre Gift shop that charts the history of the Kelpies, from mythical creatures and the source of inspiration for the artwork, to the building process and the finished sculptures. Most of the challenges encountered during the translation process related to cultural references and the inclusion of fragments from two Scottish poems, as discussed below. In addition, Côme volunteered to translate into French the interpretation material of the main exhibition, which retraces the history of Falkirk and its region through a voiced-over video animation and a timeline that runs around all four walls of the room. This content also presented different challenges from those encountered in the book, expressions of Scottish identity and mode of delivery being the main ones.

Most of the challenges relating to the book were content-related. The first had to do with the use of cultural references, either Scottish (e.g., Irn Bru, Pollock Country Park), or British (e.g., the Queen's Baton relay). Such references contribute to a sense of place and identity; yet their specificity means that they might not be understood by all international visitors. In these instances, the strategy was to keep the references and add short explanations as required. In so doing, readability and space were carefully considered. As French generally takes up about 10% more space than an equivalent English text, explaining cultural differences meant further increasing the volume of translated text. At this point, it is important to note that souvenir guides in general are very visual in their appeal (Interviewee HP01, personal communication, March 24, 2021), with high-quality pictures occupying pride of place in a work with comparatively little text. So, even though it may seem like the layout offers a lot of space for expanding text in translation, this is actually not always the case, and

care must be taken to ensure that the layout does not become too cluttered with verbal, rather than visual, signs. In the case of the Kelpies Souvenir Guide, however, it was felt that cultural references were not so numerous that the addition of an explanation would impede readability or overpower the images, and Moody agreed that the layout of the souvenir book afforded sufficient space for them to be included. Here, clear lines of communication between the translator and the commissioner allowed decisions to be taken speedily and effectively.

The book also contains fragments of two poems, one in Scots by Robert Burns and the other by Jim Carruth, Poet Laureate of Glasgow. The challenges and debates around poetry translation have been well documented, and it is beyond the scope of the present chapter to delve in any great depth into the decision-making process. However, two different general solutions presented themselves: for Burns, the use of a pre-existing translation, and for Carruth, the production of an original one. It is no surprise that the Kelpies souvenir guide should incorporate the work of Robert Burns since 'images of Scotland from the period in which Burns lived and the humanitarian values with which he is associated are central to [the] appreciation of Scotland worldwide' (Pittock 2019: 5). That said, Burns's poetry is still not widely known to the French public (Malgrati 2019), and this despite the comprehensive translation of his works into French. For the poem used in the souvenir book, the twelfth stanza of 'Address to the Deil' (Burns 1786, cited in The Kelpies Souvenir Guide, 2019: 19), a pre-existing translation was found by Léon de Wailly, 'Requête au Diable' [Request to the Devil] in *Poésies Complètes de Robert Burns* [The Complete Works of Poetry of Robert Burns] (1843: 36–39). The publication date meant that the poem was no longer under copyright, allowing the translation to be freely re-used with the appropriate credit. Another advantage of de Wailly's translation is that its datedness may more appropriately match visitors' romantic expectations of old Scotland, since much of the image of Scotland abroad is reflective of a national reputation that was created in the period from 1740 to 1860 (Pittock

2019: 39). Furthermore, the fact that de Wailly's translation of Burns's poems is still in print to this day reflects favourably on the translator's work.

Compared to Robert Burns, Jim Carruth is lesser known to the French public, and it seems that his works have yet to be translated into French. Even if they had, re-using an existing translation for such a recent work may have caused copyright issues. This meant that a new translation had to be attempted. Carruth's poem on the Kelpies was written in response to some of Andy Scott's initial drawings as part of the Kelpies commission (J. Carruth, personal communication, July 7, 2021). The full version of the poem is published in Scott's *The Kelpies* (2014: 110), while only the first 12 lines of the poem are reproduced in *The Kelpies Souvenir Guide* (2019: 6) book. Those same 12 lines are also engraved on the stone slabs on the site of the Kelpies, at the entrance to the Kelpies site, and at different locations around the site (see Figure 12.2). The poem is strongly evocative of the physical, dynamic presence of the Kelpies with lines such as: 'Bow down / your strong heads' and 'Stretch up / your long necks.' The use of words such as 'harness' and 'unbridled,' 'canal,' 'firth,' and 'river' also evokes the industrial heritage of the surrounding regions. The multimodal presentation of Carruth's poem, in print and carved into stone, means that visitors are very likely to stumble (perhaps literally) across some or all the lines while wandering around the site. This multimodal presentation led to the production of a translation that aimed to preserve the sense over the form of the poem, in an attempt to explain rather than reproduce the original. Côme and Moody further agreed that the poem and its translation would sit side by side on a double page of the souvenir book since, happily, the layout offered enough space to do so (although this is not always a viable solution in other heritage translation scenarios where space can often be at a premium). The parallel presentation could help visitors recognize the lines etched in stone as being the same ones as in the book and serve as a point of reference to anyone who wished to explore their significance further. The same layout was

also adopted for Burns's poem, although for different reasons; here, placing the original poem next to its translation gives international visitors a flavour of Burns's original work in Scots and also increases the visibility of the minority language, in line with Douglas's (2002) aforementioned agenda.

Figure 12.2 Here

Although the interpretation material in the Visitor Centre's exhibition was shorter than the book, it presented proportionately more challenges. As noted above, the exhibition space offers a timeline and a video animation dedicated to retracing the history of Falkirk and its region. An island also sits in the middle of the room with scaled reproductions of other world-famous landmarks to be compared with the size of the Kelpies. The animation voiceover formed the bulk of the content to translate, while the timeline and island contained only some dates and labels.

Figure 12.3 Here

Plans to secure translations in three other languages in the near future, combined with the unfeasibility of introducing a system for individual language selection, meant that it was not practical to translate the video content into on-screen subtitles. Similarly, another medium had to be found for the translation of the labels of the timeline and the island. Because the dates and labels on the timeline reflect the different stages of the animation, Côme first suggested that they should be combined into a written text, to be printed on leaflets for visitors to pick up and put back as they needed. The creation of a leaflet also offered an opportunity to add some information about the island in the centre of the room. The models on the island are all labelled with the name of the monument, its location, and height (see Figure 12.3), but during the initial project meeting, Moody voiced his regret that no more source text information was offered about their scale or the fact that they are 3D prints. The translation project was here seen as an opportunity to rectify this lack of information, and in the translated leaflet, a short paragraph was added to provide some detail on the models.

In terms of its tenor, the souvenir book tends to be rather formal, whereas the voiceover is comparatively much more informal, not just because it adopts a conversational, engaging tone through the use of first and second person pronouns, but also because of the incorporation of hyperbole (e.g., '[they] ate oysters like there was no tomorrow') and idiomatic phrases (e.g., 'do a runner'). The voiceover was narrated by a female with a Scottish accent who uses mostly standard English, though some Scots words and Scottish colloquialisms do make an appearance (e.g., shoogly, canny, wee, tryst) and contribute to creating a strong sense of Scottishness. The inter-semiotic translation, from spoken to written, means that there is an inevitable loss since the accent as a meaning-making resource cannot be easily recreated in written text, and it further means that the translation feels somewhat more academic than the original audio. Admittedly, French heritage texts are usually perceived as being more formal than English ones (Guillot 2014: 74–89), and so French visitors have come to expect this tenor of interpretation when visiting heritage sites. However, market research suggests more broadly that the Scottish reputation for being friendly and welcoming is highly valued by international visitors, and by French visitors more particularly (VisitScotland 2019: 10). In this case, it was felt that the 'authentic' informality of the original should be preserved as much as possible over the formality that French-speaking visitors might have expected.

Interestingly, the exhibition retraces the history of Falkirk and its region without making explicit reference to the place of the Kelpies in this narrative. The myth of the Kelpies is not widely known outside of Scotland, and so French visitors could not be expected to be familiar with it; yet, this myth is key to fully understanding the sculpture. Côme was able to raise this issue with Moody, who agreed to the addition of a paragraph in the exhibition leaflet that explained the mythical origins of the Kelpies. This was a direct advantage of having first-hand access to the translation commissioner and of their growing

awareness around the needs of international visitors. The open communication and discussions that took place throughout the project allowed a relation of trust to be built, as a result of which suggestions offered by the translator were very well received as expert advice. The project being carried out pro bono might have influenced this attitude and made the client more willing to discuss and approve suggestions, but professional experience seems to confirm that clients generally value these communications positively. And, indeed, it is to everyone's advantage to discuss options and suggestions as early as possible during a translation project, lest issues should be identified post-delivery and thus incur extra costs for re-translation, re-printing, and so on.

Impact of the Covid-19 pandemic

Unfortunately, the Covid-19 pandemic has meant that the publication of the souvenir book had to be put on hold. The translation is currently in the hands of the publisher for typesetting and will then be proofread before being sent to print. This is to ensure that no section of the translated text mistakenly disappears during the typesetting process. However, the lack of certainty as to when tourism activities might resume on an international scale means that there is a risk the project might be delayed until early 2022 (D. Moody, personal communication, February 2, 2021) as providing translations for international visitors has, for obvious reasons, now fallen down the priority list. As for the translation of the exhibition interpretation, despite laminated leaflets being a common low-tech and inexpensive solution to deliver translations in touristic and heritage attractions, the last few months have made it necessary to reflect on the future of such a high-touch solution in the post Covid-19 world. In the summer of 2020, similar concerns had already led some sites to withdraw their audio guides (e.g., the Loch Ness Centre and Exhibition) and film screenings (e.g., Urquhart Castle), or make their audio guides available to download on mobile devices (e.g., Edinburgh Castle; Royal Yacht Britannia). Looking ahead to the reopening of the Kelpies visitor centre,

it has been decided in concertation with the Visitor Services Manager to trial this latter solution. An audio recording of the content of the translated leaflet was created by Côme, a native French speaker. This process was rather straightforward and, at this scale, required no specialist equipment. The main challenge, however, was not a technical one; rather, it was the pronunciation of a Gaelic term, 'Eaglais Bhreac' [speckled church], from which the name of Falkirk is derived. Here, Côme researched and listen to the phrase on the original animation and on LearnGaelic and practiced mimicking the pronunciation as closely as possible before attempting to record it. When the exhibition space reopens, visitors will be able to connect to the free onsite Wi-Fi and access the recording via a QR code on their smartphones. Some single-use leaflets may still be made available for visitors who do not have a smartphone or who may have other accessibility needs. Aside from being a low-touch digital solution, the audio recording has a significant advantage over the printed leaflet: the use of the first and second person pronouns, the hyperboles, and the opportunity to play with different tones and inflections allow the informality of the original voice over to be more closely recreated.

It follows that, in working through these translation challenges in close co-operation, an important and productive relationship has been established between translator and commissioner, one that will reinforce the heritage site's offerings to international visitors as and when it reopens, and one that could prove additionally beneficial as a model of open dialogue for other collaborative heritage translation activities – despite and in the face of any sectoral uncertainties that may lie ahead.

The future of heritage translation

At this stage, it is difficult to predict whether the participatory turn evidenced in the arts and culture sector will take hold in translation studies in more sustained ways. The initiatives highlighted in this chapter are certainly nudges in that direction, and it is strongly hoped that the identification of critical challenges and the signposting towards collaborative solutions

that have stemmed from the research network and from the Kelpies case study will help to build additional momentum in and around heritage translation. One key driver behind any future participatory projects is likely to be the significant scope for innovation and impact; so far, the surface has only been scratched, leaving many rich and complex seams of the heritage–memory–translation triad unexplored. As Harrison has argued, 'different forms of heritage practices enact different realities and hence work to assemble different futures' (2015: 24; original emphasis), but our understanding of where, when, and how translation contributes to those enactments and assemblages, themselves founded on different remembrances of the past, remains somewhat restricted.

This chapter thus concludes with a call for more research that is situated at the intersections of the triad and that draws on cross-disciplinary and cross-sectoral perspectives to lay bare the representational, pragmatic, interpersonal, educational, ideological etc. dynamics of heritage translation in any of its semiotic manifestations. Scanning the horizon, several prevalent issues appear to invite further applied participatory research, not least the operative role of technology in terms of how the past is remediated for visitors. Having previously used Landsberg's notion of 'prosthetic memory' to investigate how translated audio guides might shape visitor engagement in the memorial museum (Deane-Cox 2014), it is clear that more empirical work is needed on museum technology in all its forms, whether handheld audio guides, mobile apps, or other interactive, immersive, and multisensorial technologies, in order to move beyond tentative claims about the influence of translation on visitor affect, ethics, and cognition in museal and other heritage settings. Also, as Côme has highlighted, the implications of the pandemic on touch points are likely to alter the way in which interpretation material is offered and used at heritage sites; this moment of change presents an opportunity for research and planning around translation to be usefully integrated from the outset in any (re)design activities. In addition, translation studies stands to make

valuable contributions to what Henderson (2020: 195) has succinctly summarized as 'debates about cultural rights, oppression and privilege raging in and around the heritage sector' by lending theoretical and practical perspectives on central questions of power, ideology, activism, and narratives. In other words, a new direction of travel can be set that will encourage heritage thinkers to turn their attention more squarely to applied translation research and practice, whose insights can help to inform the provision of interpretation material for so-called difficult or dissonant heritage sites. Similarly, heritage studies scholar Apaydin has underscored the need for a joined-up discussion and analysis of 'examples of memory and heritage destruction through war, terror, sectarian conflict, capitalism, natural disasters and economic downturns in those spheres that affect the preservation of cultural heritage' (2020: 2); in this context, the consideration and activation of translation as a form of survival (see Brodski 2007) may feed productively into heritage endeavours that seek to establish themselves as bulwarks against destruction. These are but a few strands that might be taken further; in essence, the future of heritage translation will be predicated on how the past is reconstructed, learned from, enjoyed, and remembered at heritage sites, and on how much knowledge can be exchanged beyond our academic borders with regard to the utility and impact of translation on the transmission of heritage and memory.

Further reading

Apaydin, V. (ed.) (2020). *Critical perspectives on cultural memory and heritage: construction, transformation and destruction*. London: UCL Press.

This thematically rich volume turns its attention to the destruction of cultural memory and heritage. Contributors bring to the fore driving factors such as climate change, neocapitalism, colonialism and warfare, and in so doing offer a thought-provoking starting point for considerations of how translation might function not as a mode of survival, but as one of eradication.

Neves, J. (2018) Cultures of accessibility: translation making cultural heritage in museums accessible to people of all abilities. In: S-A. Harding and O. Carbonell (eds.). *The Routledge handbook of translation and culture*. London and New York: Routledge, 415–430.

This chapter is a key reference point for readers interested in a universal approach to accessibility at museums and cultural heritage sites more broadly. It acknowledges the complexities of accommodating multiple visitor profiles, while stressing the importance of tailored cultural experiences for all and placing the translator as multifaceted expert at the centre of the heritage interpretation process.

Staiff, S. (2016) *Re-imagining heritage interpretation: enchanting the past-future*. London and New York: Routledge.

This monograph rethinks the ways in which heritage interpretation mediates visitor engagement and does so from a compelling anecdotal perspective. In addition to a chapter on the translation of cultural difference, the author also offers reflections on embodied experiences, visual and digital cultures, and narratives and narrativity that will resonate with and be of use to a broad range of readers.

Related topics

Translation, memory, and the museum visitor; reframing collective memory in museums; travelling memory, transcreation, and politics

Reference list

Abdallah, K. and Koskinen, K. (2007) Managing trust: translating and the network economy. *Meta*, **52** (4), 673–687. https://doi.org/10.7202/017692ar.

Apaydin, V. (2020) Introduction: why cultural memory and heritage? In V. Apaydin (ed.). *Critical perspectives on cultural memory and heritage: construction, transformation and destruction*. London: UCL Press, 1–10.

Appiah, K. A. (2006) *Cosmopolitanism: ethics in a world of strangers*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Bellos, D. (2011) *Is that a fish in your ear? Translation and the meaning of everything*. London: Particular Books.

Bonacchi, C. and Willcocks, J. (2016) *Realities and impacts of museum–university partnerships in England. A report for the Museum University Partnerships Initiative*. [Online]. Available from: https://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/sites/default/files/publication/mupi_literature_review_and_research_report.pdf [Accessed 12 June 2021].

Bonet, L., and Négrier, E. (2018) The participative turn in cultural policy: paradigms, models, contexts. *Poetics*, **66**, 64–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2018.02.006.

Brodski, B. (2007) *Can these bones live? Translation, survival, and cultural memory*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Burns, R. (1843) *Poésies complètes de Robert Burns* [Complete works of poetry of Robert Burns]. Translated by Léon De Wailly. Paris: Adolphe Delahays.

Chen, C.-L., and Liao, M.-H. (2017) National identity, international visitors: narration and translation of the memorial museum. Museum and Society, **15** (1), 56–68. https://doi.org/10.29311/mas.v15i1.662.

Côme, P. (2019a) *VisitScotland's French website translation*. [Online]. Translating Heritage. Available from: https://www.translatingheritage.com/post/workshop-one-heritage-translation-end-users [Accessed: 26 August 2021].

Côme, P. (2019b) *An introduction to CAT tools*. [Online]. Translating Heritage. Available from: https://www.translatingheritage.com/post/workshop-two-best-practice [Accessed: 26 August 2021].

Cranmer, R. (2013) Welcoming international visitors – communication and culture. *Transcultural visions*, **2** (2), 3–10.

Deane-Cox, S. (2014) Remembering Oradour-sur-Glane: collective memory in translation. *Translation and literature*, **23** (2), 272–283. https://doi.org/10.3366/tal.2014.0156.

Douglas, A. (2020) *Scots: a living repository of Scotland's past*. [Online]. Translating Heritage. Available from: https://www.translatingheritage.com/post/scots-a-living-repository-of-scotland-s-past [Accessed: 26 August 2021].

Durán Muñoz, I. (2012) Analyzing common mistakes in translations of tourist texts (Spanish, English and German). *Onomázein*, **26** (2), 335–349.

EGLP1 (2018) *Castillo Doune* [Doune Castle]. [Online]. TripAdvisor. Available from: https://www.tripadvisor.co.uk/ShowUserReviews-g1010312-d286657-r617454917-Doune_Castle-Doune_Stirling_Scotland.html [Accessed 10 January 2020].

Falkirk Community Trust (2020) *About the trust*. [Online]. Available from: https://www.falkirkcommunitytrust.org/about-the-trust/ [Accessed 10 February 2022].

FamReisen (2018) *Game of Thrones, Outlander und Monty Python*. [Online]. TripAdvisor. Available from: https://www.tripadvisor.co.uk/ShowUserReviews-g1010312-d286657-r605889452-Doune_Castle-Doune_Stirling_Scotland.html [Accessed 10 January 2020].

Guillot M.-N. (2014) Cross-cultural pragmatics and translation: the case of museum texts as interlingual representation. In: J. House (ed.). *Translation: a multidisciplinary approach*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, London, 73–95.

Harrison, R. (2015) Heritage and globalization. In: E. Waterton and S. Watson (eds.). *The Palgrave handbook of contemporary heritage research.* London: Palgrave Macmillan, 297–312.

Henderson, J. (2020) Beyond lifetimes: who do we exclude when we keep things for the future? *Journal of the institute of conservation*, **43** (3), 195–212. https://doi.org/10.1080/19455224.2020.1810729.

ICOMOS (2008) *The ICOMOS Ename charter for the interpretation and presentation of cultural heritage sites*. [Online]. Available from: http://icip.icomos.org/downloads/ICOMOS_Interpretation_Charter_ENG_04_10_08.pdf [Accessed 28 August 2020].

Izquierdo Tugas, P., Juan Tresserras, J., and Matamala Mellin, J.C. (eds.) (2005) *Heritage interpretation centres: the Hicira handbook*. Barcelona: Diputació Barcelona.

Jiménez Hurtado, C., Seibel C., and Soler Gallego, S. (2012) Museums for all: translation and interpreting for multimodal spaces as a tool for universal accessibility. *MonTI. Monografías de traducción e interpretación*, **4**, 1–24.

Jimenez Hurtado, C., and Soler Gallego, S. (2015) Museum accessibility through translation: a corpus study of pictorial audio description. In: J. Díaz Cintas and J. Neves (eds.). *Audiovisual translation: taking stock*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 277–298.

Killington, V. (2019) *The Kelpies souvenir guide*. Exeter: Jigsaw Publishing.

Light, D. (1992) Bilingual heritage interpretation in Wales. *Scottish geographical magazine*, **108** (3), 179–183.

Ludolini, C. (2021) *The multilingual museum*. [Online]. Hello future. Available from: https://mmhellofuture.wordpress.com/2021/03/12/the-multilingual-museum/ [Accessed 10 August 2021].

MacCaluim, A. (2020) *Symbolism or substance? Gaelic interpretation and translation*. [Online]. Translating heritage. Available from:

https://www.translatingheritage.com/post/workshop-two-best-practice [Accessed: 26 August 2021].

Malgrati, P. (2019) Le barde et la révolution française: découvrons Robert Burns, poète national écossais [The bard and the French Revolution: discovering Robert Burns, Scottish national poet]. [Online]. *Le grand continent*. Available from: https://legrandcontinent.eu/fr/2019/12/06/le-barde-et-la-revolution-francaise-decouvrons-robert-burns-poete-national-ecossais/ [Accessed 21 June 2021].

Maloney, B., and Hill, M.D. (2016) Museums and universities: partnerships with lasting impact. *Journal of museum education*, **41** (4), 247–249. https://doi.org/10.1080/10598650.2016.1235814.

maggie4759 (2019) *Peut faire mieux!* [Can do better]. [Online]. TripAdvisor. Available from: https://www.tripadvisor.fr/ShowUserReviews-g1010312-d286657-r697805431-Doune_Castle-Doune_Stirling_Scotland.html [Accessed 12 January 2020].

MANSIL (2021) *Ways of seeing project*. [Online]. Available from: https://mansil.uk/ways-of-seeing-project [Accessed 10 August 2021].

Neves, J. (2018) Cultures of accessibility: translation making cultural heritage in museums accessible to people of all abilities. In: S.-A. Harding and O. Carbonell (eds.). *The Routledge handbook of translation and culture*. London and New York: Routledge, 415–430.

Neather, R. (2005) Translation quality in the museum: towards a greater awareness of end-user needs. *Translation quarterly*, **38**, 1–24.

Neather, R. (2012) Translators in a professional community. *The translator*, **18** (2), 245–268. https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2012.10799510.

OpenArt – Modern Art for All (n.d.) Project. [Online]. *Researchgate*. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/project/OPENArt-Modern-Art-For-All [Accessed 20 August 2021].

Pierini, P. (2007) Quality in web translation: an investigation into UK and Italian tourism web sites. *The journal of specialized translation*, **8**, 85–103.

Pittock, M. (2019). *Robert Burns and the Scottish economy. Final report*. [Online]. Available from: https://www.gla.ac.uk/media/Media_705140_smxx.pdf [Accessed 22 June 2021].

SAAM Project (n.d.) About. [Online]. Available from: https://saamproject.org/about [Accessed 17 July 2021].

Sather-Wagstaff, J. (2015) Heritage and memory. In: E. Waterton and S. Watson (eds). *The Palgrave handbook of contemporary heritage research*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 191–204.

Scott, A. (2014) *The Kelpies*. Glasgow: Freight Books.

Scottish Government (2017) *British Sign Language (BSL): national plan 2017–2023*. [Online]. Available from: https://www.gov.scot/publications/british-sign-language-bsl-national-plan-2017-2023/ [Accessed 22 June 2021].

Scottish Natural Heritage (n.d.) Natural heritage interpretation. [Online]. Available from: https://www.nature.scot/sites/default/files/2019-11/Guidance%20-%20Natural%20heritage%20interpretation_1.pdf [Accessed 28 August 2020].

Soler Gallego, Silvia (2018): Audio descriptive guides in art museums: a corpus-based semantic analysis. *Translation and interpreting studies*, **13** (2), 230–249. https://doi.org/10.1075/tis.00013.sol.

Staiff, S. (2016) *Re-imagining heritage interpretation: enchanting the past-future*. London and New York: Routledge.

Szarkowska, A., Jankowska, A., Krejtz, K., and Kowalski, J. (2016) Open Art: designing

   accessible content in a multimedia guide app for visitors with and without sensory

   impairments. In: A. Matamala and P. Orero (eds.). *Researching audio description:*

   new approaches. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 301–320.

Timothy, D. J., and Boyd, S. W. (2003) *Heritage tourism*. Harlow: Prentice Hall.

University of Westminster (2014) *Museums and galleries and the international visitor*

   experience (MGIVE). [Online]. REF2014 impact case studies. Available from:

   https://impact.ref.ac.uk/casestudies/CaseStudy.aspx?Id=24573 [Accessed 10 June

   2021].

Viejo Rose, D. (2015). Cultural heritage and memory: untangling the ties that bind. *Culture*

   and history digital journal, **4** (2), e018. https://doi.org/10.3989/chdj.2015.018.

Venuti, L. (1993) Translation as cultural politics: regimes of domestication in English.

   Textual practice, **7** (2), 208–223. https://doi.org/10.1080/09502369308582166.

VisitScotland (2019) *Insight department: France factsheet 2018*. [Online]. Available from:

   https://www.visitscotland.org/binaries/content/assets/dot-org/pdf/research-papers-

   2/international-factsheets/france-factsheet-2018.pdf [Accessed: 20 June 2021].

Wu, Z., and Hou, S. (2015) Heritage and discourse. In: E. Waterton and S. Watson (eds.). *The*

   Palgrave handbook of contemporary heritage research. London: Palgrave Macmillan,

   37–51.

Figure 12.1 The Kelpies at the Helix Park, Falkirk. Photo credit: Pauline Côme

Figure 12.2 Stone slab at the site of the Kelpies engraved with lines of Jim Carruth's poem.

Photo credit: The Helix: Home of the Kelpies

Figure 12.3 Beginning of the timeline in the Visitor Centre exhibition space. Photo credit:

Pauline Côme