ISSN 1974-4382

ECO-TRANSLATION: RAISING ECOLINGUISTIC AWARENESS IN TRANSLATION

LAURA DIAMANTI
UNIVERSITY OF CASSINO AND SOUTHERN LAZIO

l.diamanti@unicas.it

Citation: Diamanti, Laura (2022) "Eco-Translation: Raising Ecolinguistic Awareness in Translation", in Lucia Abbamonte and Flavia Cavaliere (eds.) *Updating Discourse/s on Method/s*, *mediAzioni* 34: A184-A198, https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.1974-4382/15556, ISSN 1974-4382.

Abstract: This contribution investigates early theories of Ecological Linguistics (Haugen 1972) and Ecosophy (Naess 1989), and current perspectives (Eliasson and Jahr 1997; Fill 2001, 2018; Steffensen and Fill 2014; Finke 2014; Stibbe 2014) along with the domain of Translation Studies (Lefevere 1992; Tymoczko 2010, 2014) to approach the concept of Ecological Translation (Cronin 2017, 2021; Scott 2015, 2018). A holistic perspective (Mühlhäusler 2000) is considered, which also takes into account the phenomenon of language contact (Ludwig, Mühlhäusler, Pagel, 2018), with regard to the translational practice. Different areas of studies are explored to reflect on the implications of English as a global language, which exerts its dominant impact over non-dominant languages, by effecting their disappearance and loss of cultural identity (Cronin 2003; Mühlhäusler 1996; Kachru 1986, 1992, 1994, 1996; Phillipson 1992). A connection between Ecolinguistics and Translation Studies is identified in the Ecosystemic Translation theory (Lynes 2012), encompassing an "ecology of translation" or a "translation of ecology". In this respect, as an "interdiscipline" operating "as craft" (Cronin 2017), translation is discussed in the process of foreignisation of the source-text language, opposed to that of its domestication in the target-text language. In particular, the need to minoritise translation rather than to assimilate it to elude ethnocentric translation reveals the aim of a "discursive heterogeneity" contrasting with the assimilation of non-dominant linguistic and cultural difference to the dominant language (Venuti 1996; 2008). An analysis of different views is thus offered in favour of an ethical and ecological approach re-thinking the translation process.

Keywords: ecolinguistics; eco-translation; ecosophy; ecological linguistics; ecological translation; translation studies.

1. Introduction: The Concept of Ecosophy in Ecolinguistics

In order to approach the field of Ecological Translation, influential theories of Ecological Linguistics and Translation Studies are taken into account, by considering the holistic perspective (Mühlhäusler 2000: 306) in the translational practice, as it appears that languages reflect their speakers' cultural tenets in that resulting in their interactions with the environment. These theories are dealt with in the subsequent paragraphs discussing the implications of the use of a dominant language over non-dominant languages in translation, to identify effective strategies to rethink the process of translation, to minoritise rather than assimilate it and to elude the anthropocentrism or the ethnocentrism in language. Whereas the approach to the concept of "ecosophy" (Naess 1989: 35-40) is here introduced in order to define the field of ecolinguistics. Considering Arran Stibbe's study investigating ecolinguistics as a discipline, he discusses the role the ecolinguist would have in forging his/her "own ecosophy", to look into the vast variety of philosophical theories about "human communities and the natural world". To do so, on the one hand the ecolinguist would need to approach to the "scientific understanding" of the species, human/nonhuman, of the ecosystem, to ascertain the way they interact and reciprocally influence as well as mutually impact one another. On the other hand, s/he would aspire to base his/her research on scientific assumptions within "an ethical framework", to manage decisions on the issues linked to the subsistence of these species in the natural world (2014: 118-119). Stibbe's theory of ecolinguistics thus focuses on how discourse would conceptualise the impact of human culture on the environment and how language would be utilised to raise awareness of it (2014: 119-121). This view draws on the theory of *ecosophy* posited by Arne Naess: it follows from a threefold belief based on the combination of the study of *ecology*, which would investigate in a biological sense the organisms in the ecosystem in the way they interrelate, and that of philosophy, to postulate an *ecophilosophy*. The study of ecophilosophy would thus deal with the practical issues conveyed by discourse resulting from environmental considerations based on philosophical assumptions. This interdisciplinary framework, aiming at a systematic and ethic knowledge of the ecological diversity in its complexity, would thus create the premises for an *ecosophy* (Naess 1989: 35-40) as "*a philosophical world-view or system inspired by the conditions of life in the ecosphere*" (1989: 38). Hence, ecosophy reflects multiform and complex processes of reasoning leading to the utter value of "deep ecology" (Naess 1989: 38-39). In drawing on Naess's theoretical principles of ecosophy, Arran Stibbe approaches to ecolinguistics as to a discipline aiming to analyse how discourses convey ecological worldviews "to examine how ecological identities are forged in language" (Stibbe 2014: 124-125).

2. Ecological Linguistics: The mutual relation between Language and the Environment

In delineating the scope of ecolinguistics, Alwin Fill (2018) points out it deals with "how language construes our view of nature and environment". Fill argues that

https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.1974-4382/15556

ecolinguistics historically dates back to the 19th century, by virtue of Charles Darwin's theory of evolution in biology, and that was only in the 1960s that the lexeme "*ecological*" would be interpreted as "biological, natural, environmentally friendly" (2018: 1). The ecological perspective of studies applied to linguistics, developed in the last fifty years, would thus incorporate different approaches to the domain of ecology that are related to language by focusing on the environment where its organisms coexist and affect each other. As Fill notes, ecolinguistics embraces two main directions of research, in the 'ecological linguistics' and in the 'ecology of language(s)', that are deemed complementary anyhow (2018: 2-3). In this respect, Einar Haugen's theory of the Ecology of Language (1972) appears to account for the aforementioned directions, although differing from them, in that combining the ecological perspective to language within a sociological framework (Fill 2018: 3). It looks into the mutual interconnection between language and the environment, where language is deemed as a code socially used that is learnt, shared and thus handed down by its speakers who are related to their natural surroundings (1972: 325). In particular, by drawing on Greek philosophy, Haugen considered language as endowed with a "life" of which the twofold nature consists in "*enérgeia*", as activity (Peters, 1967: 55-56), and "*érgon*", as object resulting from that activity (Peters, 1967: 61-62). In reconsidering Wilhelm von Humboldt's thought of language as being "no product (*Ergon*), but an activity (*Energeia*)" (1988: 49), Haugen also opposed a naturalistic view, in that language would incorporate both concepts, inasmuch as any speaker reflects a potentiality in performing an activity (1972: 326).

As regards the numerous approaches to the field of ecolinguistics, a recent study by Steffensen and Fill (2014) categorises them according to four different ecological dimensions, moving from the concept of language in its environment, although each would not be seen as rigidly separated from the others (2014: 7). The first dimension is the "*symbolic* ecology" and aims at exploring languages with a broad scope denoting their comprehensiveness rather than their distinctiveness: it looks at how languages would coexist geographically or institutionally, as systems of symbols coherently interacting and preserving their diversity. The second dimension is the "*natural* ecology" and examines different strands denoting how languages would relate, for instance, by dealing with the topographical analyses of their surrounding ecosystems. In particular, one of its strands investigates the device of metaphor for the conceptualisation of discourse on the environment. The third dimension is the "*sociocultural* ecology" and observes how languages would interrelate with their structured societies, by focusing on the field of language acquisition, on how their speakers' interactions take place socially and culturally, to uphold an ecological subsistence of multilingual settings. Lastly, the fourth dimension, the "*cognitive* ecology", analyses a psychological perspective that considers how languages are cognitively realised as resulting from the relationship between the different species and as adapting in their environment (Steffensen and Fill 2014: 8-14). In reconceptualising the language coherently with an ecological view, Steffensen and Fill's survey aims at postulating "a unified ecological language science" by developing a threefold reasoning to approach to a model they consider of

https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.1974-4382/15556

"naturalised language". The first assumption of this reasoning would entail rethinking language by considering it as interwoven with the natural environment, and thus rejecting the basic principle of language merely observable on the basis of the relation between form and function. Whereas the second assumption would incorporate the aforementioned four ecological dimensions as "*descriptive* dimensions of a single *explanatory* framework", with the aim to grasp the complexity of language. With regard to such assumptions, language would accordingly denote the "interbodily coordination" humans are endowed with, inasmuch as a species within a varied and complex ecosystem. Their specificity, nevertheless, would merely reveal their interdependence with the other organisms in the environment, for the principle that "there are no self-sufficient realms", as well as the human realm is not separable from the others. In this respect, Steffensen and Fill's third assumption of reasoning critically discusses the framework of theories based on a social constructivism that would not privilege the natural perspective in discourse. An ecolinguistic approach would thus advocate the "human interactivity" in favour of a sociocultural ecological discourse rather developing "ethnographically informed explanations of how human beings integrate symbolic structures in their lives" (Steffensen and Fill 2014: 17-20).

Another recent study in the field of cognitive linguistics by Johanna Rączaszek-Leonardi (2009) reconsiders the analysis of natural language from a different perspective. This is investigated by assuming the relation between language as a system, codified by symbols, and language as a device of coordination regulating the interactional communication, utilised according to symbolic structures. If on the one hand speakers shape their natural language, on the other hand speakers' natural language shapes their human interactions. In particular, the analysis of the lexicogrammar of a language would disclose the dynamical processes that regulate these interactions, which are not necessarily exerted by their locutors individually and above all consciously. These dynamics would rather be the result of the coordination of individuals' interlocutions and, in that a dynamical system, they would play a crucial role in shaping the linguistic symbols that thus function as constrains to these interactional dynamics (Rączaszek-Leonardi, 2009: 666-670). In focusing on these assumptions, Johanna Rączaszek-Leonardi notes that "communication does not happen because of how we use *language*. Rather language directs and constrains coordination by enabling us to use extant forms of communication both on-line and in its evolution" (2009: 667).

In supporting the view of the interdependence between the lexicogrammar of a language and the environment, Andrew Goatly's analysis (1996) explains how the former would affect the individuals' understanding and actions on the latter, as well as the individuals' environment would influence the lexicogrammar. This mutual relation in Goatly's standpoint, which represents the essence of culture, would reflect the aforementioned dynamical systems and be affected by time. By drawing on the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, which states how language shapes the individuals' experience of the world in the way this is conceptualised, Goatly discusses the need to rethink the essential value of the

https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.1974-4382/15556

use of language in relation to the natural environment, insofar as the latter comes out conceptually marginalised (2018: 227-228). By means of the linguistic analysis of a prototypical transitive clause in English, Goatly denotes the semantic anthropocentrism rendered by the lexicogrammar of the language, which, for instance, would be manifest in a common correlation expressing the relation human-nonhuman. He firstly examines the active voice "The dog chased me", to which he opposes the passive voice "I was chased by the dog". Accordingly, by reversing its referents in the active voice "I chased the dog" he opposes the improbable passive voice "The dog was chased by me". From this correlation, Goatly identifies an empathic hierarchy constructed by the prototypical clause resulting in "*speaker* > *hearer* > *human* > *animal* > *physical object* > *abstract entity*", which would be conceptually interpreted as "a human actor provides the energy to act upon a passive (perhaps nonhuman) affected nature in a setting/environment", thus unavoidably marginalising the value in meaning of the latter (2018: 234). By investigating different texts, Goatly's analysis (2018) explores the lexicogrammar of the language in its processes of nominalization as well as of verbal ergativity to show how language semantically epitomises nature in its passivity with empathic hierarchy or in its activity, although merely to serve human necessities. The dominance of the human realm over the nonhuman realm would thus need to be linguistically undermined. In this respect, by discussing an ecolinguistic approach to language, Goatly draws on William Wordsworth's *The Prelude* and on *The Collected Poems of Edward Thomas*, who represented nature in the language of poetry endowed with vitality rather than abstractness or passivity, and examines the lexical occurrences of human/nonhuman words in terms of their frequency of use. Two instances are here offered from Goatly's lexical analysis: the first is from Wordsworth's *The Prelude*, where it is the weather acting and influencing the human's reality (book IV, 85–86) (Goatly 2018: 240):

> That lowly bed whence I had heard *the wind*
> **Roar** and the *rain* **beat** hard

Whereas the second, Thomas's poem *Sedge Warblers*, is devoted to birds communicating their vigour in nature (Goatly 2018: 241):

> This was the best of May—the small brown birds
> Wisely **reiterating** endlessly
> What no man learnt yet, in or out of school.

With regard to the concept of semantic anthropocentrism, Fill notes how "languages 'name' all natural phenomena from the point of view of their usefulness for humans" (2001: 49) or, differently, languages signify them, hence from their perspectives, even implicitly. In this respect, it might be argued that Mühlhäusler's mere statement "Life in a particular human environment is dependent on people's ability to talk about it" (1995: 155) provides the evidence to confirm Fill's assumption. Mühlhäusler's (1996) view would entail languages reflecting their speakers' cultural tenets as resulting in their interactions with the

https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.1974-4382/15556

environment. Meaning, as socially construed, is shaped by speakers' aptitude to utilise a language mutually expressing their cultural identity: as a dynamic system, language evolves over time and stratifies, and effects linguistic diversity and variational complexity. These considerations would comply with Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) approach according to which "the internal organization of language is not arbitrary but embodies a positive reflection of the functions that language has evolved to serve in the life of social man" (1976: 26). This would suggest the threefold function played by the language, which consists in meanings construed and exchanged by its speakers within a social system (Halliday 1978: 2): "language is at the same time a part of reality, a shaper of reality, and a metaphor for reality" (Halliday 2001: 180). Hence, a critical view would advocate a change in language that would adapt to the ecological processes so as to represent the environment effectively as a life system. Language itself would be conveyed to diminish linguistic dominance over the other species of the natural environment, and to maintain linguistic diversity.

As Peter Finke observes the ecological linguistics would not rest on the structural patterns that render language as a system separated from its environment, and would rather embrace a holistic view (2014: 74). As a discipline with its epistemology and field of enquiry on empiricism, ecolinguistics thus appears to investigate language in its environment by encompassing different theoretical studies (Fill 2001: 51). In this respect, research in ecolinguistics has now developed "a unified ecological worldview", by carrying the relation between humans and the environment towards ethical and religious issues (Fill 2018: 3).

3. From Ecolinguistics to Eco-Translation

The numerous theories of ecological linguistics exploring different areas of studies, some of which are cited in this contribution, would share the awareness suggesting the significance for any existing natural language to subsist and be preserved in its own degree of diversity and complexity. The vision contrasts with the concept of global language which, inasmuch as dominant, would exert an impact over the other non-dominant languages, by effecting their disappearance along with the loss of their cultural identity. This consideration might be inferred, for instance, from the concept of the ethnocentrism of language discussed in Peter Mühlhäusler's survey, which results from the policy that he defines of "linguistic imperialism". The notion is based on the assumption that a language is imposed over other indigenous languages, as the expression of "a single set of economic, political or cultural norms" (1996: 18), as influential, and as the only conceivable in institutional, educational, and professional contexts. Similarly, from a different angle Robert Phillipson discusses the concept of "*linguicism*" as a facet of linguistic imperialism that epitomises "ideologies and structures where language is the means for effecting or maintaining an unequal allocation of power and resources" (1992: 55). Linguiscism also results in the

https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.1974-4382/15556

power a language exerts due to its accent as well as lexicogrammar, for instance, considering the native-like variety as if it were the only entitled to be officially spoken when compared to the other local varieties. This phenomenon would usually occur with the emerged varieties of English by non-native speakers, used in countries that were former colonies of the British Empire or reflecting language contact due to its political expansion. As Phillipson explains: "Linguicism is in operation if the Centre language is always used, and Periphery languages are not accorded enough resources to develop so that the same functions could be performed in them" (1992: 57).

These instances concern the international status the English language has acquired: as David Crystal remarks, to become global "a status, a language has to be taken up by other countries around the world" (2003: 4). In the broad sense, a categorisation according to three Circles of the regions in the world affected by the spread of English has been made by Braj Kachru, the first being the Inner Circle that refers to the countries where English is spoken as a native language. Whereas the countries considering English as a non-native language, in that the official secondary language and the leading foreign language, are respectively associated to the Outer Circle and the Expanding Circle (1992: 3). English is also said to be spoken as a language of contact, in that the "*foreign* language of communication", by non-native speakers who share different native languages and cultures (Firth 1996: 240) or, from a different angle, as "lingua franca" (Kachru, 1996: 906). In this respect, due to language contact as well as to its language policy (1994: 147-148), English is characterised by multiple "identities" and is perceived as a "neutral" language among the other languages. As deemed "an *effective* code of communication" in international and political affairs, English exerts its strategic influence of 'power' on the one hand, and of "solidarity" on the other hand (Kachru 1994: 139-141). In his analysis, Braj Kachru examines different processes such as the linguistic and ethno-cultural "*nativisation*" and "*acculturation*" that result from the extended contact of English with other languages and cultures over a long time. The former concerns the influence of the English variety on the local identity of language in its lexicogrammar, such as in the case of Indian English; whereas the latter deals with the resulting local shift in culture (1992: 6). Accordingly, Kachru discusses the "*Englishisation*" and "*nativisation*" as two phenomena due to contact determining an impact that the English language and literature has had on the languages in those countries converging to an English variety. The phenomenon of *Englishisation* is the results of a "new English-mixed" code not only changed in its lexicogrammar but also in its literary genres (Kachru 1992: 8). In this respect, by focusing on the process of acculturation with regard to international migration, John Berry's analysis categorises four "acculturation strategies" that non-dominant ethnic groups as well as individuals would experience when migrating, which consist in "*assimilation, separation, integration and marginalization*" (1980: 11). The process of acculturation would thus presuppose an "*acculturated behaviour*" determined by "*acculturative influences*" of cultures interrelated with the change occurred in different ecological settings (Berry and Annis, 1974: 387). Considering the implications of language contact experienced

https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.1974-4382/15556

by non-dominant ethnic groups, in situ or abroad, it might be argued that the process of acculturation entails a twofold process leading unavoidably to the marginalisation of their original linguistic and cultural identity.

In contrast with a hierarchical view and by supporting the existence of a structured variety of languages, Mühlhäusler's "ecological theory of language maintenance" emphasises the need any language has to constitute its "ecological support system" to subsist, by establishing a relationship with other languages that is functional to their coexistence (1996: 322-323). Mühlhäusler's ecological support system would consider mutual relations between languages entailing "other languages from which they can borrow, internal dialect variation, territory, language-centred cultural practices, natural boundaries, optimum size of a population of speakers, metalinguistic belief systems" and other factors (1996: 276). Mühlhäusler's concept of "structured diversity" would thus reject the monolingualism entailing an official standard representing the norm, and would rather look at languages as coexisting in multilingual contexts in that interdependent (1996: 77-79). Furthermore, according to the theory of linguistic ecology as a subfield of linguistics, the phenomenon of language contact would involve, among others, four main "dimensions", namely of "*speakers*, *space*, *time*, and *language systems*" (Ludwig, Mühlhäusler, Pagel, 2018: 20). These are looked at as "significant parameters" (Ludwig, Mühlhäusler, Pagel, 2018: 36) of the social and cultural context they belong to or refer. Accordingly, these dimensions would also play a crucial role in the translational practice.

The mediation between languages in the translation of a source text (henceforth ST) into a target text (TT), according to an ecological view would uphold their coexistence, by attributing a different character to the process generally concerned with the theory of translation. In principle, this process would not rest in the mere interpretation of a text in its metadiscourse, where the interactions between the author and his/her text, as well as between the author and his/her reader are examined in the organisation and structure of its propositional content. The process of translation would rather involve an in-depth analysis in "constant experimentation *with* the text, such that the text as something closed and organic is undone, unravelled, opened out" (Scott 2018: 110). It could be argued that the translation process needs the translator to approach the text as 'an open work' (Eco 1989: 9), as a widened ST in its manifold signifying functions, to the detriment of a plain rewording performed according to 'a term-to-term determination' (Eco 1989: 11). In this way, the translation process would rather consist in "the reformulation of the ST as a new signifier, projecting the ST into a new becoming" (Scott 2018: 48). The translation process would thus render a reformulated TT that allows the reader to take his/her own position on the interpretation of the "network of relationships" in the text, by making use of the different dimensions simultaneously offered to his/her sensorial perceptions (Eco 1989: 11). In this respect, in a lecture held at the University of Exeter, Clive Scott discussed the notion of eco-translation considering the process of translation as based on "a psycho-physiological involvement". The involvement that Scott suggested concerns the data of the ST observed from the angle of the psycho-physiological

https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.1974-4382/15556

relation that an author would have with the language of his/her open work. Undoubtedly, this view rests on the consideration that the language utilised to produce any text reflects the individuality of the writing subject (Scott 2018: 33). Hence, the involvement of the data presented by the ST "can only be achieved if translation is first order creation, a reformulation of the source text which enlarges or extents or relocates its activity by enacting the existential and multisensory response of the reading subject" (2015: 2:15).

A link between ecolinguistics and Translation Studies is correspondingly established by Philippe Lynes's Ecosystemic Translation theory that is based on the mutual relationship looking at "ecolinguistics and environmental ethics as ecological literacy". This perspective would suggest the development of an ecosystemic translation encompassing on the one hand an "ecology of translation", utilised to investigate languages in their historical and social background. On the other hand, a "translation of ecology", of which its linguistic patterns would be rendered according to an ecological perspective entailing the processes of foregnisation and minoritisation (Venuti 1996: 93) of dominant languages (2012: 5-6). In this regard, Lynes discusses the role of translation, which would be rethought in the awareness that dominant cultures need to develop a comprehension of the diversity of other cultures as well as of other species. Translation would thus imply "negotiation of differences and transmission" (Lynes 2012: 24). Lynes's concept of transmission is drawn upon Michael Cronin's theory on "translation ecology" (2003: 167), which would see the translator as mediator between languages with a "transmissive rather than communicative" approach (2012: 25), the only allowing translation to contribute effectively "to genuine biocultural diversity on the planet" (Cronin 2003: 167). In this respect, translation needs to be looked at from an interdisciplinary perspective by operating "as 'craft'" (Cronin, 2017: 6). In favour of an ecological approach to translation, Cronin urges to re-think the translation process, in reconsidering the languages and cultures of the ST and the TT with the aim to minoritise dominant linguistic and conceptual patterns of translation. Cronin denotes the need of translating diversity in the relationship of human beings and other species: the lack of intelligible communication between human and nonhuman creatures would reveal the basic necessity that humans have to be "multilingual" in order to reconnect by transcending these differences and survive in facing the environmental crisis collectively (2003: 58-59).

Translation is conventionally considered "a rewriting of an original text" (Lefevere, Bassnett 1992: Editors' Preface), or more specifically a "refraction, a form of writing that is rewriting" (Tymoczko 2014: 42). Maria Tymoczko points out how the refraction of the text is concerned with its metonymic character, which is fractional and incomplete, especially considering the load of the cultural shift needed to be transferred from the interpretation of a ST reformulated in a rewriting of a TT (2010: 81). This view draws attention to the practical use of metonymy in the rewritings (Tymoczko 2014: 42) according to which the metonymic character of the text would be observed along with two other features, "literal" and "metaphoric". The former relates to the literary field forwarding the broadening of the metaphorical facets that allows the latter to develop its

https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.1974-4382/15556

metonymic signifying functions (Tymoczko 2014: 45). This assumption would imply more considerable issues in the translation of "marginalized texts" that are written by those cultures considered linguistically marginalised, in that their writings would appear as opaque to the receiving culture. By definition, the refraction of a ST, reformulated and offered to an audience, would render the translator responsible for the nature of his/her rewriting. Especially, s/he would be accountable to the receiving culture for the translation of a text that would acquire the representativeness "of the whole source literature and, indeed, of the entire source culture for the receptor audience" (Tymoczko 2014: 47). Hence, the unfamiliarity effected to the receiving culture by those texts presenting metonymic features related to the literature of their marginalised cultures, would render them as unintelligible to dominant cultures and would rather be seen as "irrespective of any linguistic or even ideological barrier". The overload of defamiliarised language, consisting in the degree of the unfamiliar instances in a translated text would thus be completely or partially incomprehensible to the receiving culture, who would render it familiar by reinterpreting and reshaping it (Tymoczko 2014: 48). Hence, in these circumstances, Tymoczko argues that choices are necessarily to be made to manage this overload of unfamiliar information in the process of translation. An explanation in the form of "metatranslation" and "paratextual devices" to deals with any metonymy identified in the ST would thus need to be provided, by turning the refraction into a range of contextualised material appealing to the audience. This process, however, would inevitably entail "linguistic loss and gain", which pertains to the literature and the culture of the ST, as it would not be possible to entirely grasp in the translation process the features characterising the language of the ST in its paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationships (2014: 48-49). As a result, scholarly and professional translations give prominence to particular features of these metonymic relationships, namely considering the relation "between text and literary system, or text and culture" (Tymoczko 2014: 50). Hence, the process entails conforming the translation to the receiving culture by removing the metonymic features from its ST, and assimilating them to the metonymic features of the dominant language, especially when dealing with a marginalised text (Tymoczko 2014: 50).

In this respect, Lawrence Venuti argues that translating a ST into a TT by rendering the latter "a cultural other" in order to appear as familiar, would imply the risk of an indiscriminate domestication of the ST (Venuti 2008: 14). The principle of foreignisation of the ST in translation would entail "disrupting the cultural codes that prevail in the translating language" with the result of experiencing "an alien reading". In light of this, by opposing a process of foreignisation to that of domestication of the ST would imply resisting "against ethnocentrism and racism, cultural narcissism and imperialism, in the interests t democratic geopolitical relations" (Venuti 2008: 15-16). In particular, the necessity of minoritising translation rather than assimilating it would elude ethnocentric translation in its main function of "inscribing the foreign text with domestic intelligibilities and interests" (Venuti 1996: 93). Translation aims at "discursive heterogeneity" in order to contrast with the assimilation of non-dominant linguistic and cultural difference to the dominant language (Venuti 1996: 94-95).

https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.1974-4382/15556

In light of these considerations, to rethink the process of translation into a TT, conventionally oriented to the language of the receiving culture, by converting it into the expression of an eco-translational rationale, would represent a crucial argument for the retention of the linguistic and cultural specificity of the ST. In conceptualising the structures of the ST, made up of signs expressing sense and designating reference, the translator would ideally aim to render them properly in the TT, to reach their equivalence. However, the interpretation of linguistic and cultural differences would rather entail selective choices. Equivalence in translation appears to be practically attainable only at the level of lexical semantics; whereas, at higher structural levels, linguistic constrains in sets of expressions or complex sentences of a ST would recurrently hinder their various senses designating multifaceted references from being fully rendered in the language of a TT. Hence, an ecological translation would look at the metonymic density and focus of the linguistic structures that characterise the ST and retain them, by avoiding a language shift into the TT of the receiving culture. This choice would be the result of a cognitive and ethical practice of translation ascribing the original cultural value to the language of the ST.

4. Concluding remarks

Current theories concerning the fields of Ecological Linguistics and Translation Studies have been discussed in the present analysis by dealing with Mühlhäusler's holistic view (2000) from the perspective of the contact between two natural languages (Ludwig, Mühlhäusler, Pagel, 2018: 20) in the practice of translation. It appears that if on the one hand speakers shape their natural language, on the other hand speakers' natural language shapes their human interactions. In particular, the analysis of the lexicogrammar of a language discloses the dynamics that are rather the result of the coordination of individuals' interlocutions and, as a dynamical system, they play a crucial role in shaping the linguistic symbols that thus function as constrains to these interactional dynamics (Rączaszek-Leonardi, 2009: 666-670). In this respect, the linguistic analysis of a prototypical transitive clause in English shows how the semantic anthropocentrism rendered by the lexicogrammar of the language is manifest even in a common correlation expressing the relation human-nonhuman. In light of this, to rethink the essential value of the use of language in relation to the natural environment is needed, inasmuch as the latter comes out conceptually marginalised (Goatly 2018: 227-228). Furthermore, from a different angle Mühlhäusler's (1996) view stresses that languages reflect their speakers' cultural tenets as resulting in their interactions with the environment. Meaning, as socially construed, is shaped by speakers' aptitude to utilise a language mutually expressing their cultural identity: as a dynamic system, language evolves over time and stratifies, and effects linguistic diversity and variational complexity. Hence, a critical view advocates a change in language to adapt to the ecological processes by representing the environment effectively as a life system. Language itself needs to be conveyed to diminish linguistic dominance over the other species of the natural environment, and to maintain linguistic diversity.

https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.1974-4382/15556

These theories share the vision in contrast with the concept of global language, inasmuch as dominant, which exerts an impact over the other non-dominant languages, by effecting their disappearance along with the loss of their cultural identity. A link between ecolinguistics and Translation Studies is correspondingly established by Lynes's Ecosystemic Translation theory, based on the development of an ecosystemic translation encompassing on the one hand an "ecology of translation", utilised to investigate languages in their historical and social background. On the other hand, a "translation of ecology", of which its linguistic patterns are rendered according to an ecological perspective entailing processes of foregnisation and minoritisation of dominant languages (2012: 5-6). In favour of an ecological approach to translation, Cronin's view on "translation ecology" urges to re-think the translation process and reconsider the source-text and the target-text languages and cultures involved, in order to aim to minoritise linguistic and cultural dominant conceptual patterns of translation. Translating diversity in the relationship of human beings and other species represents the premise that cannot be left out. In this sense, the lack of intelligible communication between human and nonhuman creatures reveals the basic necessity that humans have to be 'multilingual' in order to reconnect by transcending these differences and survive by facing the environmental crisis collectively (Cronin 2003: 58-59). From another angle, the principle of foreignisation of the text in translation is opposed to that of domestication by the dominant language (Venuti 2008: 15-16). In particular, the need to minoritise rather than to assimilate the translation process eludes the ethnocentric translation in dominating to the detriment of the foreign language and culture of the text. Translation thus aims at "discursive heterogeneity" in order to be in contrast with the assimilation of non-dominant linguistic and cultural difference to the dominant language (Venuti 1996: 93-95).

The facets of an ecological translation here discussed could be said to epitomise the principle of ecology as "latent" in the text, a broad view supporting an ecological understanding of the translation process: "we do not translate words as if they had meanings, but as if they were looking for meaning in the text we are translating" (Scott 2018: 18). The process of translation into a TT is to be rethought, by assuming the eco-translational rationale of the ST and supporting the retention of its linguistic and cultural positioning. Hence, an ecological translation preserving the metonymic aspects of the original language in their structural density and focus, would avoid its conventional linguistic and cultural shift into the language of the receiving culture. For its ethical dimension, this cognitive approach to translation would ascribe the cultural value to the language of the ST.

REFERENCES

Berry, J.W., Annis, R.C. (1974) "Acculturative Stress: The Role of Ecology, Culture and Differentiation", *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 5(4): 382-406.

------ (1980) "Acculturation as varieties of adaptation", in A. Padilla (ed.) *Acculturation: Theory, models and some new findings*, Boulder: Westview, 9-25.

https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.1974-4382/15556

Cronin, M. (2003) *Translation and Globalization*, London and New York: Routledge.
------ (2017) *Eco-translation, Translation and Ecology in the Age of the Anthropocene*, London and New York: Routledge.
------ (2021) "Ecology of translation", in Y. Gambier, L. van Doorslaer (eds.) *Handbook of Translation Studies* Book 5, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 54-60.
Crystal, D. (2003), *English as a Global Language* (2nd edition), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Eco, U. (1989). *The Open Work*, Translated by Anna Cancogni, With an Introduction by David Robey, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
Eliasson S., Jahr E.H. (1997) *Language and its Ecology, Essays in Memory of Einar Haugen*, Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Fill, A.F. (2001) "Ecolinguistics: State of the Art 1998", in: A.F. Fill, P. Mühlhäusler (eds.) *The Ecolinguistics Reader, Language, Ecology and Environment*, London and New York: Continuum, 43-56.
------ (2018) "Introduction", in A.F. Fill, H. Penz (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Ecolinguistics*, London and New York: Routledge.
Finke, P. (2014) "The ecology of science and its consequences for the ecology of language", *Language Sciences* 41: 71-82.
Firth, A. (1996) "The discursive accomplishment of normality on 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis", *Journal of Pragmatics* 26: 237-259.
Goatly, A. (1996) "Green Grammar and Grammatical Metaphor, or Language and Myth of Power, or Metaphors We Die by", *Journal of Pragmatics* 25: 537-560.
------ (2018) "Lexicogrammar and Ecolinguistics", in A.F.Fill, H. Penz (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Ecolinguistics,* London and New York: Routledge.
Halliday, M.A. K. (1976) "Functions and Universals in Language", in G.R. Kress (ed.) *M.A.K. Halliday: System and Function in Language*, London: Oxford University Press, 26–31.
------ (1978) *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*, London: Edward Arnold.
------ (2001) "New Ways of Meaning, The Challenge to Applied Linguistics", in A.F. Fill, P. Mühlhäusler (eds.) *The Ecolinguistics Reader, Language, Ecology and Environment*, London and New York: Continuum.
Haugen, E. (1972) "The Ecology of Language by Einar Haugen", in A.S. Dil (ed.) *The Ecology of Language. Essays by Einar Haugen*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 325–339.
Kachru, B.B. (1986) "The power and politics of English", *World Englishes* 5(2/3): 121-140.
------ (1992) "World Englishes: approaches, issues and resources", *Language Teaching* 25: 1-14.
------ (1994) "Englishization and contact linguistics", *World Englishes* 13(2): 135-154.
------ (1996) "English as lingua franca", in H. Goebl, P.H. Nelde, Z.S. Wolfgang (eds.), *WölckKontaktlinguistik, Contact Linguistics, Linguistique de contact,*

https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.1974-4382/15556

HSK 12.1, Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung, An International Handbook of Contemporary Research, Manuel international des recherches contemporaines, Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 906-913.

Lefevere, A. (1992) *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, London and New York: Routledge.

Ludwig R., Mühlhäusler P., Pagel, S. (2018) (eds.) *Linguistic Ecology and Language Contact*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lynes, P. (2012) "Ecologies of Translation, Translations of Ecologies: Between Ecolinguistics and Translation Studies", The Ecolinguistics Association, www.ecoling.net/articles, February 2013.

Mühlhäusler, P. (1995) "The Interdependence of Linguistic and Biological Diversity", in D.A. Myers (ed.) *The Politics of Multiculturalism in the Asia/Pacific*, Darwin: Northern Territory University Press, 154–161.

------ (1996) *Linguistic ecology, Language change and linguistic imperialism in the Pacific region*, London and New York: Routledge.

------ (2000) "Language Planning and Language Ecology", *Current Issues in Language Planning* 1(3): 306-367.

Naess, A. (1989) *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle, Outline Of An Ecosophy*, Translated and revised by David Rothenberg, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Peters, F.E. (1967) *Greek Philosophical Terms, A Historical Lexicon*, London and New York: New York University Press.

Phillipson, R. (1992) *Linguistic Imperialism,* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Rączaszek-Leonardi, J. (2009) "Symbols as constraints: the structuring role of dynamics and self-organization in natural language", *Pragmatics & Cognition* 17(3), 653–676.

Scott, C. (2015) "Working with the Notion of Eco-Translation", University of Exeter, Audio recording of his lecture https://humanities.exeter.ac.uk/modernlanguages/research/centres/translatingcultures/downloads/.

------ (2018) *The Work of Literary Translation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Steffensen, S.V., Fill A. (2014) "Ecolinguistics: the state of the art and future horizons", *Language Sciences* 41: 6–25.

Stibbe, A. (2014) "An Ecolinguistic Approach To Critical Discourse Studies", *Critical Discourse Studies* 11(1), 117-128.

Thomas, E. (1949) *Collected Poems*. London: Faber and Faber.

Tymoczko, M. (2010) *Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators* (2nd edition), London and New York: Routledge.

------ (2014) *Translation in a Postcolonial Context, Early Irish Literature in English Translation*, London and New York: Routledge.

Venuti, L. (ed.) (2008) *The Translator's Invisibility, A History of Translation*, (2nd edition), London and New York: Routledge.

https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.1974-4382/15556

------ (2012) *Translation Studies Reader* (3rd edition), London and New York: Routledge.

Von Humboldt, W. (1988) *On Language, The Diversity of Human Language-Structure and its Influence on the Mental Development of the Human Species*. Translated by Peter Heath, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney: Cambridge University Press, 25-64.

Wordsworth, W. (1933/1960) (first published 1805) *The Prelude*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.1974-4382/15556