

TRANSEDITING AS A PURPOSEFUL TRANSLATION STRATEGY: THE HISTORY OF THE CONCEPT AND IDEOLOGICAL PRACTICES

In contemporary translation studies, it has become increasingly evident that translation cannot be reduced to the mechanical replacement of units of one language with units of another. The practice of media, marketing, political, and even sacred translation shows that the translator often performs not only a transfer function, but also an editorial, interpretive, and communicative-strategic one. To describe this grey area between translation and editing, Karen Stetting introduced the term transediting [7]. The term subsequently became an important analytical instrument in research on news translation, where the boundaries between transferring content, selecting it, condensing it, and rewriting it are particularly blurred [6].

The aim of this study is to historicize the concept of transediting and to present it as a strategy of textual intervention determined by functional, cultural, and ideological factors. The study employs conceptual analysis, a comparative translation-studies approach, and case-study analysis. This methodology makes it possible to trace not only the forms of transformation - omission, addition, lexical-semantic substitution, and restructuring of material - but also their skopos, that is, their communicative purpose, as well as the external forces that guide a particular translation decision.

The theoretical basis of the research consists of several complementary approaches. First, Itamar Even-Zohar's polysystem theory allows translation to be viewed as part of a dynamic and heterogeneous cultural system in which texts occupy different, either central or peripheral, positions [3]. Second, Hans Vermeer's functionalist theory of skopos explains why translation may consciously deviate from the source text: what becomes decisive is not formal identity, but the purpose of the target text and the conditions of its functioning in the target culture [11]. Third, Andre Lefevere's concept of patronage makes it possible to identify the influence of institutions, publishers, and the state on strategies of rewriting [5]. Lawrence Venuti's and Maria Tymoczko's ideas concerning the visibility, agency, and political responsibility of the translator are also important for the present study [9; 10].

An illustrative early example of such a practice is the Septuagint, the ancient Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures. Scholars have repeatedly noted that this translation cannot be reduced to literal reproduction: it contains structural changes, additions, omissions, and interpretive clarifications that adapted the text to a Hellenistic audience [8]. Thus, already in antiquity, translators acted not only as mediators between languages, but also as editors and exegetes who shaped a new version of a sacred text according to the expectations of a particular community. This example is significant because it demonstrates that the practice of transediting is much older than the term itself and has deep historical roots.

In contemporary public discourse, transediting becomes especially visible in the sphere of media and politically sensitive translations. A resonant case is connected with the Russian edition of Yuval Noah Harari's *21 Lessons for the 21st Century*. Public sources recorded that references to Russian aggression against Ukraine and the annexation of Crimea were either omitted or replaced with formulations that removed responsibility from Russia; the author later admitted that he had approved some of the changes in order to make the publication of the book

in the Russian Federation possible [2; 4]. In this case, transediting functioned as a tool of political rewriting, in which translation no longer simply transmits the author's thought, but models an ideologically acceptable version of the text.

The functioning of transediting in Chinese news discourse during the COVID-19 pandemic is no less revealing. An analysis of the materials of the state-run newspaper Reference News shows that translated news is accompanied by careful source selection, headline reframing, mitigation of unfavorable information, and the foregrounding of claims that strengthen the positive image of the state [13]. In addition, researchers of Chinese communication policy have recorded the systematic promotion of foreign-policy narratives about the origin of the virus and the responsibility of other countries [12]. In this model, transediting acquires the features of an institutional practice, where the role of the individual translator is transferred to a collective or state transeditor.

In this context, it is essential to distinguish between transediting, adaptation, and censorship. Adaptation is the broadest concept and refers to the modification of a text to ensure its effective functioning in a new environment. Censorship denotes external control over the content and limits of expression. Transediting, by contrast, describes the process of textual intervention at the boundary between translation and editing: condensation, rearrangement, explanation, compensation, and ideologically motivated substitution [6; 7]. In practice, these phenomena often overlap: censorship may function as the motivation, transediting as the mechanism, and adaptation as the result. This distinction allows translation to be analyzed more precisely as a social action rather than only as a linguistic operation.

Therefore, transediting should be understood not as a peripheral or accidental deviation from 'proper' translation, but as a historically long-standing and theoretically legitimate strategy. It becomes particularly visible where translation performs not only an informative function, but also a political, cultural, or institutional one. The translator thus emerges not as a passive transmitter, but as an active social agent responsible for the way reality is constructed in the target culture. Promising directions for further research include quantitative studies of transediting in media, legal, and popular-science discourses, as well as analyses of how different audiences receive transedited texts.

REFERENCES:

1. Bielsa E., Bassnett S. *Translation in Global News*. London; New York: Routledge, 2009.
2. Don't Mention Crimea! EUvsDisinfo. 2019.
3. Even-Zohar I. Polysystem Theory. *Poetics Today*. 1990. Vol. 11, no. 1. P. 9-26.
4. Flood A. Yuval Noah Harari admits approving censored Russian translation. *The Guardian*. 2019.
5. Lefevere A. *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London; New York: Routledge, 1992.
6. Schaffner C. Rethinking Transediting. *Meta*. 2012. Vol. 57, no. 4. P. 866-883.
7. Stetting K. Transediting - A New Term for Coping with the Grey Area between Editing and Translating. In: *Proceedings from the Fourth Nordic Conference for English Studies*. Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen, 1989. P. 371-382.
8. Tov E. The Septuagint Translation of the Hebrew Bible: Its Nature and Importance for Scholarship. *Bulletin of the Comparative Culture Institute*. 2008. No. 69. P. 1-17.
9. Tymoczko M. *Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators*. Manchester: St. Jerome, 2007.
10. Venuti L. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. 2nd ed. London; New York: Routledge, 2008.

11. Vermeer H. J. Skopos and Commission in Translational Action. In: Venuti L. (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*. London; New York: Routledge, 2000. P. 221-232.
12. Wendler J. R. Misleading a Pandemic: The Viral Effects of Chinese Propaganda and the Coronavirus. *Joint Force Quarterly*. 2021. No. 104.
13. Zhao P., Gao Y. Study on Paratextual Elements in News Transediting: A Case Study on the Transediting Strategies in Reference News. *Canadian Social Science*. 2021. Vol. 17, no. 4. P. 12-20.