An Interview with Jonathan Evans

By Nidhi J. Makwana

Jonathan Evans (hereafter **JE**) has been a Reader at the University of Glasgow since 2024, having joined the university as a Senior Lecturer in 2020. Evans's work revolves around two interconnected concerns: firstly, the political dimensions of translation, particularly how texts move across nations and the impact this has on identity and meaning; and secondly, the creative, often under-explored domains of fan cultures, online media, and "non-canonical" forms of translation. His reflections help chart the course of Translation Studies, from its origins to its future directions.

Nidhi J. Makwana (hereafter **NJM**) is a PhD scholar at Pandit Deendayal Energy University, Gandhinagar, working on "Translations within Satyagraha: A Critical Study of M. K. Gandhi as a Translator." Her broader research interests include South Asian intellectual history, Gandhian studies, and translation theory.

NJM: Dr Evans, your research profile is diverse and impressive, spanning culture, politics, and films to translation for social change. What inspired you to examine translation's role in social and political justice, as well as its meaning beyond traditional boundaries?

JE: Thank you for your kind words and for inviting me to do this interview.

I think various factors led me to work on a range of topics. I started working on literary translation and, in fact, my PhD supervision was split within a department of literature. However, my first permanent position was in a department of languages and area studies, where literature wasn't the central focus. As such, I had to develop research that fitted more clearly within that department, which meant thinking about how translation might be relevant for area studies. The obvious way that was the case was to think about translation politically.

Writing that makes the decision-making process look a lot neater than it was. I had also got tired of having discussions about literary

translation that kept coming back to ideas like foreignization and domestication, which weren't really all that helpful for the work that I was trying to do in literary translation. That (which forms much of my first book, *The Many Voices of Lydia Davis*) was much more about seeing translation as a literary and creative act, and as an uncomfortable part of a writer's work: uncomfortable as it was not clearly their own work, but at the same time could clearly be connected to it. To me, literary translation offers some very interesting ways of disturbing literary study, as it also disturbs and complicates the study of film and media. But a lot of the discourse around literary translation in the early 2010s would keep coming back to the sort of binaries that I found very limiting, but which have been a staple of European discourse on translation since the Romans (i.e. free/literal).

I wanted to move away from this and other limitations that I was feeling with translation studies at the time, and this is why I started writing about film. The collective authorship of film complicated ideas about authorship in some very productive ways, and there wasn't such a long history of people writing and thinking about the translation of film (though people have, of course, been doing that for over 100 years, too). I also thought that it would be useful for students to think about translation beyond written texts, considering a more multimodal framework of analysis.

The move to think about translation in relation to social justice was inherent, really, in starting to think about translation politically. Working with Fruela Fernández, we always envisaged doing something about translation in relation to social justice (and Fruela has published a good deal on this independently of me). This crystallised much more clearly into practical discussions in my work with Ting Guo, which came out of her work on translating sexuality and her earlier, sociologically-oriented work on interpreting in the Second Sino-Japanese War. She had an idea about doing something on activist translations of queer cinema, which fitted nicely with the work I was doing on fandom and translation at the time (and which has led us to write a book on fan translation together).

So, in short, then, there was a good deal of intellectual curiosity and attraction to the topics, combined with a bit of frustration with

the work I was seeing around me in translation studies, and some chance elements stemming from collaborations that helped me to think beyond what I was doing on my own.

NJM: Translation Studies has become increasingly interdisciplinary, integrating with fields like media studies and cultural studies, as evident in your work on film translation and intermediality. How has this evolution shaped the development of Translation Studies over time, and what interdisciplinary approach would you advise for translators to connect Translation Studies with other disciplines? Should this approach be driven by personal creativity or political objectives?

JE: I think how people work on translation comes from their wider interests. My undergraduate degree was in comparative literature, and that has always influenced how I approach texts, and I've always been interested in cultural studies as an approach, which also leads, to some extent, to film and media studies. I tend to want to write about texts and the relationships around them, which shapes the sort of work that I do. Were I interested in other things, then I would approach the work differently.

In the early days of the discipline, people were coming from various disciplinary areas, and this meant they brought those questions and ways of working to translation studies. Somebody trained in applied linguistics will ask different questions and use different methods than someone working in comparative literature, for instance. I think that at various times, translation studies have renewed their focus by incorporating new ideas from elsewhere. This does sometimes make it hard to find common ground, which is something I've felt at conferences where the people working on literary history don't end up talking to the people working on corpora, for instance (though it does sometimes happen). I find this hard when I'm explaining translation studies to people outside the field, but I think you'd have the same problem trying to explain what sociology or literary studies actually do, as they're massive disciplines with a lot of distinct areas of research.

If someone working on translation wants to talk to other disciplines, then I think you have to ask, "Why is this interesting to

them?" This is something I learned from my own practice as well as in discussions with other scholars. I have got a lot of mileage out of thinking, "Well, what would that look like to someone in media studies?" Or literary studies, or film studies. I think it's important to try to talk to other disciplines, especially as a lot of other disciplines don't really know what translation studies is or does. (My colleague Susan Bassnett has proposed this as an 'outward turn' (Bassnett and Johnson, 2019).) I've been trying, sometimes successfully, to publish outside of translation studies for the last 10 years or so, and you constantly come up with the question of how to convince these readers that translation is something worth writing about. I've had people at conferences say to me things like "we didn't know you could write about this." It's nice in some ways, but also a problem if you think there's an enormous amount of work published in translation studies that isn't being read outside the field.

NJM: Interesting, in your work on migration and translation, you illustrate how cross-cultural communication creates a layered network of regional and foreign languages, and you also contend that translation both crosses and reinforces borders, not only geographical but also cultural, linguistic, and symbolic. How do you perceive translation functioning within migration as both a bridge and a border-making practice that actively reshapes these intangible boundaries in intercultural communication?

JE: I probably think about this differently now I live in Scotland and not England, as I'm very much more aware of my own linguistic difference whenever I speak (no one, hearing my accent, would ever think I was from Glasgow, after all). Translation obviously creates bridges in the sense of allowing people to access information, which can be very practical things, such as using the doctor's surgery or other services. This is, generally, a good thing, as you want people to be able to access services, and it's good that it's acknowledged that not everyone can do so in one language. I think it becomes a barrier in a much less obvious way. To an extent, as soon as you need to use translations, you're saying, you're not the same as us, or you're not speaking the same language as us. That can lead to groups within a community feeling excluded. It's a very double-edged sword, because the thing that has been designed for inclusion also serves as

exclusion. I don't know how you could make it less double-edged: it seems integral to translation that it has both capacities, even if we tend to focus on the positive side of it.

I think, though, this might be more of a case in locations where there is one, strongly hegemonic language. That's the position of English in the UK, and there is a strong tendency to think of the UK as monolingual, even if our everyday experience tells us it's not. I'm not sure how translation affects inclusion and exclusion in multilingual spaces, but my guess is that one would always end up not including all languages, and so there would always be some form of exclusion caused by using translations, as speakers of the languages not included would always feel somewhat left out.

NJM: Retranslation requires a critical reading of both the source and earlier translations. How do you view the dual focus that influences the creative freedom of translation for retranslation? Does it expand opportunities by showing different approaches or limit the process by tying the translator too tightly to existing versions?

JE: I think it depends on how the translator approaches it. In my experience, knowing that there's an existing translation can be very freeing, as you can see solutions you don't want to use and there's a version to kick against, as it were. In practice, I don't think it ties translators to existing versions – the variety of *Madame Bovary* translations shows that, but also, you see it in other retranslations of classics, such as in Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky's Dostoevsky translations. I guess this works best in the case of literary texts, where there's an established understanding that translation is creative and interpretive, whereas it's not necessarily the case for technical texts.

I studied with Clive Scott when I was doing my BA and MA, and his approach was obviously an influence on me. He saw translating a writer like Baudelaire, who had been translated many times, as very freeing because you had no obligation to translate in a way that made the text accessible, as you could assume that readers were already familiar with the text, and so you could translate in a more personal, interpretive way. When you're translating a writer for the first time, you have much more of a duty to provide an accurate

rendering, whatever that might be, that can serve as a springboard for other people's readings. But when they already know the text, the translation can more fully embody your own readings.

Many translators doing retranslation probably feel somewhere in between, or that they're doing a more accurate translation through their own reading of the source text and existing translations. I do think that dual reading, as you put it, is really important for activating creativity, as you can't just do what someone else has done, and you have to be able to say why.

NJM: You distinguish between two types of rewriting, which ultimately converge in Davis's rewriting of Proust as a novelist and as a translator. Do you think her fiction teaches us something about how she translates, and vice versa? Also, how do you see self-translation? Is it a form of interpretative rewriting?

JE: There's a lot in this question. The simple answer about Lydia Davis is that I see her translation and writing on a continuum, and they do mutually inform each other, and as a reader, I found her translations interact in many subtle ways with her stories. I'm not sure this is the case for all writers who translate, but it's very tempting to think that it would be so.

Self-translation is a different question entirely. It's not an area that I've studied much, and working predominantly in English, it's not something that I encounter all the time (though of course Scottish writers sometimes self-translate between Gaelic and English). I think in other literary traditions, especially in multilingual spaces but also in diasporic contexts, self-translation is much more common.

I think, ultimately, there will be a spectrum of how writers see self-translation. Some will see it as a necessary evil, as it were, to make their work visible to a wider public, while others will see it as a chance to develop and edit. Samuel Beckett certainly makes changes in his translations of his own work; I'm not sure about other writers.

Another answer to this would be to say that, seeing as I see all translation as interpretative rewriting, then self-translation is also, necessarily, a form of interpretative rewriting.

NJM: Furthermore, you propose using retranslation as a form of critical practice to link theory and practice in the classroom. Can teaching retranslation help future translators see themselves not only as service providers but also as critical interpreters of culture and discourse? Reshaping their technical skills alongside cultural and ideological aspects.

JE: Retranslation, as I noted earlier, gives you a chance to move away from existing translations. In some cases, you really need to think about why you want to use a specific solution, how it differs from existing ones, what it allows you to do, and so on. It makes you much more of a reflective practitioner, which I think is helpful for professional practice in many ways.

NJM: You describe film remakes as the 'black sheep' of Translation Studies and even as a form of cultural cannibalism. Why do you think remakes have been marginalised in translation research, and how does the cannibalism metaphor help us grasp the politics of remaking across world cinema? At the same time, since remakes often generate significant economic benefits for film industries, how should we rethink their role as cultural and translational practices shaped as much by power and profit as by aesthetics?

JE: I think remakes have been marginalised in translation research – though they are cropping up more and more – as they're not a type of translation that it's easy to teach people how to do. A lot of the practices of translation that we see people writing about are those we can teach in a classroom without a lot of resources, such as written translation and subtitling. Dubbing can be taught without a lot of resources, but it still needs more than subtitling. Making a film, on the other hand, is really complicated and is not typically taught in the same places where translation is taught. It's often taught in film schools, whereas translation is often taught in modern languages departments.

I borrowed 'cannibalism' from the Brazilian translation theorists, especially Haroldo de Campos, who argue for it as a postcolonial metaphor for translation. I think they also talk about how cannibalism was, traditionally, a form of respect that led to the taking on of the qualities of the enemy who had been captured. On

the other hand, it does also feel like a metaphor that could sound very negative. I'm not sure I would use it now: I think the ways in which texts and narratives circulate and get reworked and re-appropriated for different locales are far more complex (though I think de Campos was also trying to make this point). I think remakes show a mix of homage and appropriation, and there's always a complex connection with the films they're based on.

I don't think you can separate out the commercial aspect of film, except in the case of a very small number of non-commercial filmmakers. I think this is one thing that attracted me to working on film: the idea that it's (almost) always commercial and that brings a reasonable degree of complexity to how you approach the analysis of films. However, I think that's also true of literary texts, but I had to go through film to get to that understanding. A lot of the ways in which texts circulate and get remade or reworked or translated relate to commercial activity, some of which can be supported or encouraged by policies (e.g. grants for translations from some languages). But in many cases, something is being sold.

NJM: One of the interesting yet debated aspects of fan translation is its originality and validity, as the motivation behind such translations is to create and expand their desire to contribute to the narrative. In such a case, do these translations have a claim to fan patronage? If yes, have you seen any instances where fan translations were later recognised and published with official publishers?

JE: There is a long history of people doing translations on spec (that is, without a publisher in mind or a contract) that would fit into the idea of 'fan translation', and in that case, there have been quite a few translations that started off as passion or fan projects that have been officially published. I think there's definitely some fan-translated *danmei* (Boys' Love) novels that have been published this way. Potentially, Viki as a platform makes use of fan translations of East Asian TV, but I don't know if contributors have gone on to become professional translators. A lot of the discussion of this tends to rely on anecdotes, and there's potential for a more systematic, large-scale study, also of what happens to fan translators – do they go on to become professionals? That idea has been suggested by a

few people, but I've also not seen any systematic studies of their destinations.

NJM: One of the most intriguing aspects of your writing is the broad category of non-professional subtitling, which includes fan-subbing, activist subtitling, and volunteer subtitling. Do you believe that the boundary between fandom and activism is becoming increasingly indistinct in subtitling practices? Some argue that activist subtitling gives a voice to marginalised groups, while others warn that it might reproduce stereotypes to appeal to a global audience. Where do you see subtitling fitting within this tension between resistance and complicity?

JE: I really dislike the term 'non-professional'. I think this has been a term that has appeared in Translation Studies as a way to contrast it to professional translation. There's been a move recently to reclaim the term 'amateur', by writers such as Saikat Majumdar (2024) and Joanna Walsh (2025), as a lot of the ways people engage with texts, and even produce texts for the internet, following Walsh, are amateur. There was a bit of a backlash against amateurism in the 2000s, including by writers such as Andrew Keen (2007), who saw it as a threat to professional practices. Perhaps, following Majumdar and Walsh, it's a better term to use in Translation Studies, too.

There is some overlap between fandom and activism, both in the sense of aesthetic or cultural activism, where fans push publishers or distributors to do something, such as keep a TV show on air or bring back a cancelled show (Henry Jenkins wrote about this in *Textual Poachers*, back in 1992). There's also negative fan activism – sometimes called anti-fans – where people push for the cancellation of a product. A good example of this was the really negative fan reaction to the 2016 *Ghostbusters* film, which has been essentially removed from canon since then and seems to be regarded as a mistake (I really liked it, personally). There are also more political forms of activism that are linked to fandom, such as the Harry Potter Alliance, or the LGBTQIA+ fans Ting Guo and I have studied. I think this was always a potential, as early Birmingham school cultural studies work, such as *Resistance through Rituals* (Hall and Jefferson 1975) and Dick Hebdige's *Subculture* (1979), saw political

potential in the groups and practices they were studying, which look a lot like what we now recognise as fan practices.

So, when you ask if the boundaries between fandom and activism are fading in subtitling, I think they always were fairly porous and unclear.

With regard to the last part of the question, I think any form of text distribution has the risk of misrepresenting its source text or reproducing stereotypes, and I'm not convinced activist subtitling is any different in that.

NJM: If we see subtitling as activism, should Translation Studies reposition subtitlers as cultural agents with political influence rather than invisible technicians? How do you see the rise of AI-driven subtitling tools changing the scope for activist subtitling? Could automation undermine the political edge of volunteer-driven communities?

JE: I think if we see translation as an interpretative, creative act, then that also applies to subtitling, and that brings with it the idea of agency (both creative and political). There's an overwhelming tendency to assume that translation is transparent and straightforward, especially outside of translation studies. That's been combated a bit since the 1970s, and literary translators are more routinely discussed as creative professionals in the English-speaking world (I think the situation is different elsewhere). Subtitlers are seldom ever named – can you think of any famous ones? There's maybe Darcy Paquet, who has translated a lot of Korean movies into English, but he's very much an exception. I think recognition of the complexity of the job of subtitling, and how central it is for watching media in other languages, would be good. But it's hard to know how to get there. I was talking to Jan Pedersen at Stockholm University about this, and he was saying that in Sweden, they have been working on awards for subtitlers, which should help to drive visibility.

Your question about AI tunes into many of the worries I've heard from professional communities and my students. In one way, machine translation and genAI make it easier to subtitle media. However, the way that AI is trained is that it will pick the most

likely translation, which might miss nuance or political meaning, especially for minority communities. We also know that it tends to be biased in various ways, so I think that fan groups who use it might end up editing it to fit their own preferences – we already know that fan groups will often retranslate texts if they don't like earlier translations.

NJM: The 'Korean Wave' has become a global phenomenon, and its translation into English dubbing and subtitling often influences its spread; but subtitles do more than translate words; they also convey cultural references, humour, and social norms. Would you say the global circulation of Korean media through English subtitles risks flattening cultural nuance, or does it create new hybrid forms of cultural understanding?

JE: In general, the fact that Korean culture is becoming known outside of Korea is a good thing. There's always a risk that the culture becomes stereotyped, but it's better that it's circulating than that it's not. What's been interesting about Korean culture's circulation is how much fans have been prepared to learn about Korea and learn Korean in order to understand it better. I think that was also the case for Japanese culture earlier (in the 1990s in the UK and USA).

Working in the UK and thus the Anglosphere more generally, any interest in work in other languages is to be celebrated. It's very easy to read or watch material solely in English. That's not the case in other languages or locations. However, there's still a risk that by only accessing some Korean culture, viewers get a limited view of it (though this is the same for all cultures).

NJM: Additionally, you have examined the Korean media scene in the UK and South Korea's reception of foreign media? What does translation reveal about this two-way dynamic of global media exchange, and do you think translation influences these asymmetries of power in media flows?

JE: The asymmetries in media flows are influenced by preexisting power dynamics, both at a national and linguistic level. So, a flow of English-language material into South Korea is sort of a given, due to both the history of South Korea as well as the relative power of the

English language (which itself is also a product of historical events). At the same time, Korean is a relatively narrowly diffused language, as it's mainly only spoken in the Korean peninsula, with some pockets of speakers internationally who are often first and second-generation migrants.

What's kind of amazing is how Korea has managed to internationally promote its culture, especially film, TV and music. This has been the result of a concerted effort, but it's also demonstrated that smaller nations and languages can become much more visible internationally. I would like to think that changing distribution practices have made this more possible – it's a lot easier to get hold of music or TV through the internet than it was before fast internet (i.e. the 1990s). Films still work on more physical distribution practices; even if cinemas are using digital files for screenings, the fact that you have to go to a cinema makes it more physical than TV (which can be distributed over the internet). As such, Korean cinema has been promoted through more traditional channels (film festivals) as well as through newer systems such as video on demand.

Translation ends up secondary to these already existing political relationships and also to the distribution channels. People will put up with imperfect translations if it's the only way they can access something, but if they can't access it in the first place, there's no need to think about translations.

NJM: In your essay with Ting Guo, you demonstrate how translation circulates queer Asian TV globally and, in the process, reshapes both 'queer' and 'Asian' identities. Building on Evren Savcı's idea of translation as a queer methodology, could you elaborate on how translation unsettles identity categories and how heteronormative stereotypes circulating through subtitles and remixes might contribute to fixing or shifting those identities into clearer, more digestible forms? And how translation unsettles not only linguistic norms but also heteronormative structures of media circulation?

JE: Savcı argues for translation as a way of questioning the self-sameness of concepts in discourses on homosexuality, especially, in her case, in the travels of queer concepts from American English to

Turkish, but also within Turkish (Savcı 2021). It's basically a way to question the fixity of ideas and to make clear the sorts of contingency that go into meaning-making, but also to highlight the sorts of negotiations that take place when concepts travel from one situation to another.

As such, translation can unpick identity categories through demonstrating that they can always be otherwise, or that they may not be as universal as first imagined. The difficulties around translating the word 'queer,' which are well documented at this point, demonstrate this: it only really works in the senses that it's come to have in the academy in an Anglophone situation, and it's very difficult to translate it to be meaningful in other languages and situations.

In terms of unsettling heteronormative structures, it can both question and support them (following our earlier discussion of it often being a double-edged sword). There is a potential to see different types of gendered behaviour, or to make different forms of homosociality visible, but depending on what you choose to circulate, you can also reinforce existing heteronormativity by distributing texts that reinforce this.

NJM: In the *Routledge Handbook of Translation and Politics*, you describe translation as a constant presence in political life, sometimes making information accessible and shaping identities, but also excluding or censoring. Why do you think the political dimensions of translation have remained a kind of 'secret history' in Translation Studies, and how might making them more visible transform the discipline? What do you think are the most urgent political questions for Translation Studies today?

JE: The ongoing invisibility of the translator and the professional norm of neutrality has made it so that a lot of translator training, and thus the ongoing discussion of translation, tends to avoid politics. In relation to the general public, if you're thinking that translators are just technicians, then you don't entertain the idea that translation can have political effects. A more interpretative model of translation, where translation is a creative act, opens up more possibilities that translation can be a political intervention (in the same way that any cultural activity can have political effects).

I think a lot of writing about translation continues to position it as something that is not political. It's interesting that many of the theorists who stress the social and political nature of translation, such as Naoki Sakai, Lydia Liu, or even Tejaswini Niranjana and Vicente Rafael, are not based in translation studies institutionally, but in area studies, comparative literature, cultural studies and history. That's not to say that Translation Studies never discussed politics, but more to point out that discussions of translation that make politics central often happen in other fields. There have been more movements to discuss the political in Translation Studies in recent years, and of course, feminist approaches have always been political.

Making politics more central would change the discipline, possibly in ways that are risky. There's a lot of discussion, backlash even, dating back to the 1990s, about the politicisation of the humanities. While there's a lot to be gained from it theoretically, there are also institutional issues around it. Given the changing situation of translators and their ongoing marginalisation, I can imagine many people would not want to do anything to create further risks. I know that I tend to keep the political role of translation to a small number of classes when I'm teaching, as students are not always happy discussing it. And yet, thinking translation politically can be a very effective way to make it more relevant to more people, especially in other disciplines. I don't think there's a simple solution. Not everyone wants to think about translation and politics; I do, and so that's why I've worked on this area.

NJM: Throughout your work, a recurring theme of translation emerges that extends beyond simple interlingual practice, involving media studies, queer theory, film studies, and intercultural communication. How far can we broaden the idea of 'translation' before it becomes entirely metaphorical? Do you think Translation Studies should continue defending its boundaries as a discipline, or embrace this permeability as a strength?

JE: In my work, I tend to actually position translation that I'm discussing as interlingual translation; I think that everything I've written about translation has been between two natural languages

and often two cultures. The work on remakes actually uses that as a way of limiting what I was talking about and highlighting how it was relevant for thinking about translation. That's quite an old-fashioned viewpoint on it, I guess. There is a risk that if you use translation for every form of interaction or interfacing between systems, it becomes meaningless, or it becomes interchangeable with adaptation or migration or some other term that exists.

I think Translation Studies already embraces this permeability. People have been writing about it as an interdiscipline since the early 1990s (Snell-Hornby, Pöchhacker and Kaindl, 1994). This does pose a number of problems, especially of coherence. At a big conference, like EST or IATIS, for instance, the topics are so diffuse that it doesn't feel like they're all in one discipline. I often feel more comfortable presenting at literature or media conferences, where the medium under discussion tends to be similar, and that leads to a bit more obvious coherence in discussions. André Lefevere wrote in the early 1990s about the risks of Translation Studies as a discipline (Lefevere 1991), that is, that all forms of translation would get mixed up and you would lose some of the specific knowledge of different practices and media, especially literary texts. I think about this sometimes as I'm trying to teach ideas that were developed in a literary context and wondering if they apply in a technical context, and the other way around.

Sometimes I experience the diversity of Translation Studies as bracing and exciting, but at other times I just struggle to see how I can use my work in areas that aren't adjacent to mine. At the same time, I work in a school of modern languages and cultures where most people don't work on translation as their central area, and finding points of contact with my colleagues tends to mean discussing ideas that did not originate in Translation Studies, but in the wider humanities, so there's a need to be able to talk about my work in a more general way, which I think probably feeds into shaping that work.

I do think translation can and should be discussed as one of a wider range of textual rewritings or reworkings (as Lefevere argued back in the 1980s), but in that case, you're no longer doing Translation Studies, but comparative literature if you're working on

literature or film studies if you're working on film. You shift the object of study from translation to literature or film or the medium under discussion. There can be advantages to this, but it would change how we think about what we're doing, and as such, translation would no longer be central, and you might lose the more interesting questions about translation as a specific practice.

NJM: Lastly, the rise of AI and machine translation tools is reshaping the field. How do these technologies impact the translator's role in politically sensitive contexts? Where linguistic diversity and cultural nuance are paramount? What strategies can translators employ to maintain agency and ensure cultural and political sensitivity while collaborating with Machine translation?

JE: I'm struggling with this as much as everyone else is at the moment. I think there's a tendency to think machine translation is neutral, but a lot of work on AI has demonstrated precisely that it's not neutral (e.g. Kate Crawford's *Atlas of AI*, 2021). A lot of machine-translated outputs need reviewing by humans, but I think the agency of a reviser is reduced compared to a translator, that is, someone who translates a text end-to-end. We'll see how people manage to maintain agency in the coming years, although we are seeing people already moving away from digital environments to increase their own agency, by, for example, not being on social media or by reading printed books. I've noticed many of my students are taking notes using handwriting again this year, whereas a couple of years ago, it was all on laptops. There's perhaps a greater tendency to value analogue tools than there was a few years ago, and I think something like that might happen in translation – for certain tasks, a quick AI version will be fine, but for other types of text or situations, people will want to know that humans have done the work. My guess is that it will be literary and cultural texts, but I've also heard translators saying that a specialism in medical or financial means lots of confidential texts that cannot be translated using machine translation. However, the technology is changing so fast at the moment that it's very hard to say what will happen in a few years.

References

BASSNETT, SUSAN, and DAVID JOHNSTON. 2019. "The Outward Turn in Translation Studies." *The Translator* 25 (3): 181–88. doi:10.1080/13556509.2019.1701228.

CRAWFORD, KATE. 2021. *Atlas of AI*. Yale University Press.

HALL, STUART, and TONY JEFFERSON, eds. 1975. *Resistance through Rituals: Youth subcultures in post-war Britain*. Hutchinson.

HEBDIGE, DICK. 1979. *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*. Methuen.

JENKINS, HENRY. 1992. *Textual Poachers: Television Fans and Participatory Culture*. Routledge.

KEEN, ANDREW. 2007. *The Cult of the Amateur: How today's internet is killing our culture*. Currency.

LEFEVERE, ANDRÉ. 1991. "Translation and Comparative Literature: The Search for the Center." *TTR,* 4 (1): 129–144. https://doi.org/10.7202/037086ar

MAJUMDAR, SAIKAT. 2024. *The Amateur: Self-making and the Humanities in the Postcolony*. Bloomsbury.

SAVCI, EVREN. 2021. *Queer in Translation: Sexual politics under neoliberal Islam*. Duke University Press.

SNELL-HORNBY, MARY, FRANZ PÖCHHACKER and KLAUS KAINDL, EDS. 1994. *Translation Studies: An Interdiscipline*. Benjamins.

WALSH, JOANNA. 2025. *Amateurs! How we built internet culture and why it matters*. Verso.

<center>***</center>

About the Interview

Nidhi J. Makwana is a Doctoral Research scholar at the Department of Linguistics, Central University of Kerala. Email: sanjanarajan47[AT]gmail[DOT]com

Cite this Work: