Editing nominalisations in English−German translation: when do editors intervene?

Mario Bisiada

Published online: 09 May 2017.

Submit your article to this journal ☒

Article views: 79

View related articles ☒

View Crossmark data ☒

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Check for updates

Editing nominalisations in English–German translation: when do editors intervene?

Mario Bisiada

Department of Translation and Language Sciences, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain

ABSTRACT

The work of editors and their influence on translated texts is an under-researched phenomenon in translation studies. We usually attribute the language we encounter in translated texts to the translator, ignoring any intervention that another agent might have made in the production process of the translation. This paper deals with editors' influence on nominalisation in English to German translation. There is a conflict between language users' preference in German for a nominal style and the demand by house styles to avoid nominal formulations, based on journalistic presumptions of readers' aversion to that style. Studying expressions that translators nominalised, I investigate when editors intervene to change those expressions into verbal structures and when they decide to retain the nominalisation. I use a corpus of manuscript and published translations of business articles to differentiate translators' and editors' actions. Findings show that editors systematically intervene in the text based on readability considerations. At times, the only change they make is turning noun into verb, especially when function verb complexes or preposition–noun constructions are involved, but often they reformulate the entire sentence. While translators are shown to nominalise a lot more than editors, there are some instances where editors nominalise constructions, again along with significant changes to the sentence.

1. Introduction

When we talk about phenomena in translated language, we usually base our studies on the language we find in translated books, magazines, newspapers or other published written sources, usually assuming that these represent the translators' actions. In this way, we gloss over the many 'other agents playing key roles in the preparation, dissemination and fashioning of translations. These include commissioners, mediators, literary agents, text producers, translators, revisers and editors' (Munday 2012, 229).

That these agents' linguistic actions are not usually subject to empirical investigations has not gone entirely unnoticed. Künzli (2007) has noted that the reviser does not feature in research and theoretical discussions, Kruger (2012, 354) argues that 'editing [...] frequently remains invisible in conventional corpus-based studies comparing translated and non-

CONTACT Mario Bisiada ✉ mario.bisiada@upf.edu 🖂 Department of Translation and Language Sciences, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain

translated language' and Utka (2004) suggests that analysing translations at various stages of the production process 'provide[s] exciting opportunities for analysis of the language of translation'. Apart from these, few studies exist that systematically analyse the linguistic influence of editors on translated text.

Translations pass through many intermediate stages where editing, revision or proof-reading change the language in the text, sometimes significantly. This makes translated language a hybrid product, influenced by many language users. To argue that a particular feature really pertains to the language of translation, we need to isolate intermediate stages and analyse them separately. This will 'lead to improvements in the ecological validity of experimental settings' (Muñoz Martín 2010, 179; see also Saldanha and O'Brien 2013, 110) and increase the accuracy of results obtained from corpus-based analyses of translation. This paper seeks to propose such a methodology by analysing nominalisations in business articles translated from English to German and how translators' and editors' actions have affected the texts in this regard.

To study editing in translation, it is necessary to first discuss which strategies editors use and what guides their activity while editing (Section 2). I then focus on the particular editors that have worked on the texts under analysis in this paper and outline the methodology for the analysis (Section 3). In Section 4, I try to find motivations for the editors' decisions to revert or maintain nominalisations and in Section 5, I analyse nominalisations by the editor to find out if there are stylistic differences between the formulations that may influence editors' decisions.

2. Editing and readability

There is some friction in editing translations between achieving a translation which is stylistically faithful to the source text but which also respects the house style, which usually sets demands for readability. The readability of the text is one of editors' main concerns when working on a text (Cunningham 1971, 149; Mossop 2014, 26–28). Readability is concerned with the comprehensibility of a text, which is measured mainly by considering features pertaining to the text, but sometimes also relying on reader feedback on their comprehension of the text (so-called text-focussed and reader-focussed methods; see Schriver 1989, 241). Studies of readability have produced a range of formulas that aim to measure the readability of a text (for a criticism of readability formulas, see Bailin and Grafstein 2015). Formulas such as the Flesch–Kincaid and the Gunning Fog index have been produced with English in mind (Dubay 2006), but there are also some for German (Best 2006).

There are also models of readability that do not attempt to boil down readability into a formula but instead provide strategies of text production, which Schriver (1989) calls 'expert-judgement-focussed' methods and which assess text comprehensibility based on criteria such as linguistic simplicity, structure and concision (Langer, Von Thun, and Tausch 1974; Göpferich 2009; for a detailed discussion, see Wolfer 2015, 40–46).

The effects of editing on readability have not yet been studied to any significant degree. One study has analysed 101 draft research papers submitted to the *Annals of Internal Medicine* in 1992 (Roberts, Fletcher, and Fletcher 1994). The study measures the Gunning Fog index of readability of the papers before and after the peer review/editing process and finds an average score of 17.16 before and 16.85 after (Roberts, Fletcher, and Fletcher 1994). Thus, the editorial process did not have a significant effect on readability, and the authors further report that the texts were 2.6% longer after peer

review/editing (Roberts, Fletcher, and Fletcher 1994), though they do not say whether the increase in length is due to added content in response to suggestions by the peer reviewers or whether it is due to linguistic changes made by editors.

There is some evidence to suggest that the house style takes priority in editors' work. In one of the few studies of the procedures applied in professional editing, Bisaillon (2007) conducted a case study of six professional editors working on real projects. These editors were filmed during the two hours that they worked on the texts and made to discuss their work afterwards (Bisaillon 2007, 300–301). One finding of this study is that editors develop automatisms for copyediting, which they apply to issues of grammar or syntax. Such automatisms minimise the amount of reflection that is needed for the task of copyediting (Bisaillon 2007, 306). Bisaillon (2007) calls this 'speed editing', referring to editors who do not 'have the time to read for comprehension or to check the modifications they have made'. They use a 'strategy of anticipation', reading texts 'in search of certain types of problems that are anticipated' before they even occur in the text (Bisaillon 2007, 317). Thus, on average, half of the issues where editors were recorded intervening were 'solved automatically or immediately', a figure that rose to 75% for the most experienced editors (Bisaillon 2007, 310). One of the editors studied by Bisaillon reported to 'correct certain problems of syntax, such as overlong sentences [or] the irrelevant use of impersonal pronouns and structures' (Bisaillon 2007, 306; on sentence splitting, see also Bisiada 2016).

Bisaillon (2007) argues that her finding that editors use automatisms to facilitate their workflow is consistent with existing work done by Hayes et al. (1987). She quotes them as having 'noted that a vast repertory of procedures (condition/action) enables editors both to work quickly, as the association is automatic, and to free up their working memory for cases that require reflection' (Bisaillon 2007, 306). Elsewhere, she argues that

> this knowledge is a boon to the editor's work; as Flower et al. (1986, 34) have explained: 'It helps us stop automatically at red lights, hit the carriage return without thinking, and detect many problems in texts with little demand on our attention'. (Bisaillon 2007, 310).

Although it seems plausible to assume that those statements are true, their applicability to editing has to be seen critically. Hayes et al. (1987) and Flower et al. (1986) are talking about self-revision in the sense of Mossop (2014, 167), not editing of texts written by others, so any comments they make about automatisms in text production cannot necessarily be applied to the work of editors.

In a similar vein, Robert (2014) carried out a study of the working procedures of 16 professional revisers. They each revised four press releases translated from Dutch to French and were asked to use different revision procedures for each task: 'monolingual revision with consultation of the source text only if in doubt', 'bilingual revision', 'bilingual revision followed by monolingual revision' and 'monolingual revision followed by bilingual revision' (Robert 2014, 93–94). She finds that 'participants immediately solve between 30% and 50% of the problems they detect, apparently without using a strategy' (Robert 2014, 104). This is slightly lower than what Bisaillon (2007) found but still shows that in every other case, revisers change the language of the text applying some 'ready-to-use solution' (Robert 2014, 104).

However, she also finds that when revisers do use a strategy, they use 'reflection reformulation', which is the most time-consuming but also the highest quality strategy in revision (Robert 2014, 104). The use of 'speed editing', then, seems to be a method to avoid having to apply the reflection strategy where this is possible and only think about

an issue when that is deemed absolutely necessary. Rather than spend a little thought on every issue they encounter, the editors studied by these scholars seem to prefer either reflecting properly or not at all.

Editors themselves may think of that lack of reflection as a 'feeling for language'. On this issue, Britta Domke, editor at the *Harvard Business Manager*, has said (personal communication, 31 March 2015):

> Wir Redakteure legen natürlich großen Wert auf den guten Klang eines Satzes, so dass wir Entscheidungen für die eine oder andere Formulierung oft genug aus dem Bauch heraus treffen – mit anderen Worten aus unserer langjährigen Berufserfahrung und unserem Gespür für gute Sprache.
> [As editors, we also pay special attention that a sentence has a good ring to it, so that often enough we decide for a particular structure based on gut feeling – in other words, drawing on our long experience in the profession and our feeling for good language.]

Existing research on editing in translation, then, seems to argue that a sizeable amount of changes to texts are made based on such 'gut feeling', although what effect this has on the text remains to be analysed. This study aims to analyse further the working methods of editors, seeking to find what motivates their decisions with respect to nominalisations that they encounter in the text, or that they themselves introduce.

3. Corpus and methodology

The object of study in this paper is nominalisations, which are the most frequent part-of-speech shift in translations from English to German (Alves et al. 2010, 116). I investigated factors that may motivate editors' decisions to maintain or revert a nominalisation, drawing on a corpus of business articles translated from English to German. The corpus consists of articles published between 2006 and 2011 by the American magazine *Harvard Business Review* and their translations as they appeared in the German sister publication *Harvard Business Manager*. As a third component, the corpus also contains draft translations of the articles as they were sent to the publisher by the translation company *Rheinschrift*. The resulting parallel corpus of 315,955 words has been aligned and consists of triplets that allow a comparative analysis of the texts before and after the editing stage.

I selected all the sentences containing deverbal nominalisations by searching for the German nominalisation morphemes *-ung, -tion* and *-ieren*. This yielded a data set of around 11,000 words, which provides a meaningful basis for qualitative study. For the analysis in Section 4, I then manually inspected these sentences to reduce them to those instances where the editor either maintained the nominalisation or reverted it. For the analysis in Section 5, I filtered out just those sentences where the translator rendered the source text verb as a verb and the editor nominalised the construction.

The corpus has been part-of-speech tagged with TreeTagger and then manually corrected. The tagged corpus was then analysed using the R package koRpus by Meik Michalke[1]. The values to be measured are part-of-speech statistics, average sentence length, readability according to the *Neue Wiener Sachtextformeln* (Bamberger and Vanecek 1984) and nominal density.

Apart from some structural and content editing (Mossop 2014, 28), the types of editing that are conducted most notably by the editors studied for this paper are stylistic

editing and copyediting. The former consists of tailoring the text to the target audience and creating 'a readable text by making sentences more concise' (Mossop 2014, 27), while copyediting is 'the work of correcting a manuscript to bring it into conformance with pre-set rules' (Mossop 2014, 27), such as the publisher's house style. The house style used by the *Harvard Business Manager* specifically requests to avoid the nominal style, and *Harvard Business Manager* pay attention to when working on the texts, according to Britta Domke (personal communication).

> Auch sprachlich arbeiten wir zum Teil noch stark an den Übersetzungen, je nach Qualität und Engagement des jeweiligen Übersetzers. So zerhacken wir Bandwurmsätze in leichter verständliche Einzelteile, formulieren Substantivierungen und Passivkonstruktionen um und streichen überflüssige Hilfsverben.
> [We also edit the language of the translations, at times significantly, depending on the quality and effort of each translator. Thus, we split convoluted sentences into more comprehensible pieces, reformulate nominalisations and passive constructions and remove superfluous auxiliary verbs.]

The resulting conflict between the stylistic preference German for the nominal style in many genres (Göpferich 1995, 420–421; Fabricius-Hansen 1999, 203; Krein-Kühle 2003, 160; Hansen-Schirra et al. 2009, 112) and the editors' motivation to remove that style provides an interesting basis for the analysis of editorial influence on translated language. The source text also plays a role here, because editors at the *Harvard Business Manager* always consult the source text (Britta Domke, personal communication):

> Wenn wir mit der Redigatur eines übersetzten Textes beginnen, legen wir uns in der Regel den Originaltext aus der HBR daneben und vergleichen beides Satz für Satz, sowohl sprachlich als auch inhaltlich.
> [When we start editing the translated text, we usually place next to us the original text from the HBR and compare both texts sentence by sentence, with regard to both language and content.]

4. Analysis of editors' reverbalisations

There are a total of 541 deverbal nominalisations, that is, translations using nominal expressions where the source text expression has a verbal structure. Of those, 339 were maintained by the editors [as in example (1)], and 202 were turned back into verbs [see example (2)]. It is this latter type of construction that will be analysed in this section, with the aim to find out if there is anything that makes particular nominalisations more prone to be maintained or reverted by editors than others.

(1) But how you **make a profit** is only one piece of the model. (HBR 12/08,50)

Doch die **Gewinnerzielung** ist nur ein Teil des Modells. (manuscript)	Doch die **Gewinnerzielung** ist nur ein Teil des Geschäftsmodells. (HBM 4/09,36)
[But profit-making is only one part of the model]	[But profit-making is only one part of the business model]

(2) Akamai is now working with the mobile giant **to change** consumers' internet experiences on mobile devices. (HBR 7/11,68)

Akamai arbeitet jetzt mit dem Mobilfunkriesen an der **Verbesserung** der Internetnutzung auf mobilen Geräten. (manuscript)	Akamai arbeitet jetzt mit dem Mobilfunkriesen daran, die Internetnutzung auf mobilen Geräten zu **verbessern** (HBM 10/11,22)
[Akamai is now working with the mobile giant on the improvement of internet on mobile devices.]	[Akamai is now working with the mobile giant to improve internet use on mobile devices.]

For this purpose, the sentences in the corpus have been analysed by measuring their part-of-speech statistics (Steiner 2001). Given that readability is a factor influencing editor's decisions, the hypothesis to be investigated is that a nominalisation is more likely to be reverted if the sentence is considered to be difficult to understand, for instance, due to high nominal density.

Statistical significance has been ascertained using *z*-ratios for the significance of the difference between two independent proportions (for an accessible account of this test, see Black 2012, 397). As regards parts of speech, the two subcorpora of maintained and reverted nominalisations are rather similar to each other in most respects, with the exception of pronouns, of which there are significantly more in the subcorpus of maintained nominalisations (see Table 1). This is surprising from a readability perspective because the presence of pronouns is usually considered to increase reading difficulty (Garrod, Freudenthal, and Boyle 1994; Müller-Feldmeth et al. 2015, 281).

The sentences where nominalisations were retained are on average 22.8 words long, while those where they were reverted are somewhat longer, at 23.2 words, though this difference is not statistically significant according to a *t*-test ($t = -0.34$, $p = 0.73$). The readability analysis is shown in Table 2. According to this, the sentences containing the nominalisations that were reverted are more difficult.

Nominal density can be measured by 'dividing the number of nouns plus the number of names by the number of words' (Müller-Feldmeth et al. 2015, 236). I will provide the name density separately because names cannot be metaphorised and thus cannot be equated with nouns (Müller-Feldmeth et al. 2015, 252). The calculated results are shown in Table 3.

Table 1. Part-of-speech statistics for the subcorpora of maintained and reverted nominalisations.

Subcorpus	Nouns	Verbs		Pronouns	Adjectives	Adverbs
		Lex.	Aux./Mod.			
Maintained	27.2%	8%	5.5%	9.7%	10%	3.9%
Reverted	27.2%	8%	5.2%	8.2%	11%	3.7%
z Ratio	−0.305	−0.019	0.797	2.521	−1.519	0.287
p Value	0.7604	0.985	0.426	0.012	0.129	0.774

Table 2. Readability score according to the four *Neue Wiener Sachtextformeln* (nWS).

	nWS1	nWS2	nWS3	nWS4
Maintained	14.30	13.92	14.56	14.86
Reverted	15.11	14.76	15.28	15.55

Table 3. Nominal density analysis of maintained and reverted nominalisations.

	Nominal density		Name density
	Nouns/Lex. words	Nouns/Words	Names/Words
Maintained	1843/3453 (53.4%)	1843/6781 (27.2%)	83/6781 (1.2%)
Reverted	1101/2068 (53.2%)	1101/4011 (27.5%)	38/4011 (1.0%)
z Ratio	0.097	−0.305	1.319
p Value	0.923	0.760	0.187

Either calculation of nominal density, based on just lexical words and all words, yields the same result, showing that there is no difference in this respect between the two subcorpora. Name density does not show a statistically significant difference either.

None of the readability features analysed above, then, stands out as a statistically significant indicator as to what influenced the editor's decision to revert the nominalisation or not. However, they all indicate a marginally higher information density of the sentences where the nominalisaton was reverted. While that difference is by no means the only explanatory factor of reverbalisation, it is possible that a trained editor's eye will notice that difference in informational density and thus make simple or more extensive changes to increase the readability of the sentence.

To delve deeper into what motivates editorial interventions, I have conducted a qualitative analysis of the changes to those constructions where editors reverted a nominalisation in the translation. For this purpose, I use a scale of the extent of editor's intervention (replacement of words, addition/omission of content or slight reformulations) ranging from no change other than the reverbalisation via one change and two changes to three or more changes, which I consider a complete rewrite, as exemplified in example (3). Here, the editor has not only replaced the lengthy *die Möglichkeit haben* ('to have the ability') by the simple *kann* ('can') but also introduced the pronoun *dessen* ('its'), adapted the sentence to German discourse norms by using the surname rather than the first name and omitted some informational content.

(3) Reporting also **enables** her to ally herself with the board, to shape the direction of the inquiry, and to be seen as a leader who protects the company's and the directors' interests (HBR 10/07,47).

Durch die *Einbeziehung* des Board **erhält** Cheryl auch **die Möglichkeit**, Verbündete zu finden, die Richtung der Untersuchung mitzubestimmen und als Führungspersönlichkeit aufzutreten, die die Interessen des Unternehmens und der Board-Mitglieder schützt. (manuscript)	Durch dessen *Einbeziehung* **kann** Tobin auch Verbündete gewinnen und sich als Führungspersönlichkeit profilieren, die die Interessen des Unternehmens und der Boardmitglieder schützt. (HBM 12/07,108)
[Through the involvement of the board, Cheryl obtains the ability to find allies, to shape the direction of the inquiry and to be seen as a leader who protects the company's and the board members' interests.]	[Through its inclusion, Tobin can also win allies and present herself as a leader who protects the company's and the board members' interests.]

Slight reformulations such as the use of *können* ('can') instead of *ist möglich* ('is possible') or the replacement of *gegenseitig* ('mutual') with *einander* ('each other') in example (4), which are necessary in the course of verbalisations, are not counted as separate changes, as long as the meaning of the expression is not changed.

(4) If they work closely together, one service can seamlessly **back up** the other. (HBR 9/09,90)

Wenn das kardiologische und das herzchirurgische Team eng zusammenarbeiten, ist eine nahtlose gegenseitige **Ergänzung** möglich. (manuscript)	Wenn das kardiologische und das herzchirurgische Team eng zusammenarbeiten, können die beiden Teams einander nahtlos **ergänzen**. (HBM 12/09,78)

In about half of the reverbalised sentences, the reverbalisation is the only change that occurs, and in about a fifth of them, the editor completely rewrote the sentence. The exact figures in Table 4 show that there is a small difference between expressions that have a finite verb in the source text and those that have a gerund: expressions with gerunds have a slightly higher amount of zero or one additional change and a slightly lower amount of two or more changes, so it seems that more extensive changes are made if the source text verb is finite and less if it is gerund. As we know that editors always consult the source text, this issue may make a slight difference to their decision.

Regarding the expressions where no change was made other than the reverbalisation, two types of constructions stand out among them. The first is what is called *Funktionsverbgefüge* ('function verb construction'). These are similar to English support verb constructions (but see Langer 2005, 180) in that they express an activity using a noun and a full verb that serves as a function verb. Consider example (5) where the editor has replaced *nicht zur Verfügung stehen* ('not to be available') by the simple verb *fehlen* ('to lack').

(5) When patents are hidden, companies unknowingly **lack** vital information when *creating* new products. (HBR 6/08,129)

Wenn Patente verborgen sind, **stehen** Unternehmen beim *Entwickeln* neuer Produkte wesentliche Informationen **nicht zur Verfügung**, ohne dass sie es bemerken. (manuscript)	Wenn Patente verborgen sind, wissen die Unternehmen beim *Entwickeln* neuer Produkte nicht, dass ihnen wesentliche Informationen **fehlen**. (HBM 8/08,62)
[When patents are hidden, certain products are not at the company's disposition during the development of new products without their taking notice.]	[When patents are hidden, companies do not know that they are missing important information during the development of new products.]

Table 4. Extent of changes accompanying the reverbalisation.

Verb form	No other change (%)	One change (%)	Two changes (%)	Complete rewrite (%)
Finite verb	45	22	12	21
Gerund	49	28	5	17

Another instance of this is shown in example (6), where the editor only replaced *Entscheidungen treffen* ('to make decisions') by *entscheiden* ('decide').

(6) The lab director had **provided** plenty of permission and privacy (employees could retreat to an Office if they chose). (HBR 7/11,102)

Der Laborleiter hatte in Bezug auf die Aspekte 'Erlaubnis' und 'Privatsphäre' richtige **Entscheidungen getroffen**. (manuscript)	Der Laborleiter hatte in Bezug auf die Aspekte Erlaubnis und Privatsphäre richtig **entschieden**. (HBM 10/11,46)

The other type of construction that features numerously among the constructions where the only editorial change was a reverbalisation is so-called *Finalangaben*, which are constructions expressing purpose using the preposition *zu* and a noun. These are usually transformed into *um… zu* constructions ('in order to'), as shown in examples (7) and (8).

(7) Alliances are most effective when relatively few people and organizational units from each party need to work together to **coordinate** the joint activities. (HBR 7/10,102)

Bündnisse sind besonders effektiv, wenn zur **Koordination** der gemeinsamen Aktivitäten auf beiden Seiten nur wenige Personen und Unternehmenseinheiten zusammenarbeiten müssen. (manuscript)	Bündnisse sind besonders effektiv, wenn auf beiden Seiten nur wenige Personen und Unternehmenseinheiten zusammenarbeiten müssen, um die gemeinsamen Projekte zu **steuern**. (HBM 2/11,84)

(8) Success therefore requires developing new approaches to **mobilizing** and **coordinating** human efforts. (HBR 2/09,91)

Um erfolgreich zu sein, müssen folglich neue Methoden zur **Mobilisierung** und **Koordination** menschlicher Anstrengungen gefunden werden. (manuscript)	Um erfolgreich zu sein, müssen folglich neue Methoden gefunden werden, um menschliche Anstrengungen zu **mobilisieren** und zu **koordinieren**. (HBR 4/09,86)

Overall, the analysis has shown that extensive changes to the text accompany the reverbalisations in over half the cases. This suggests that the editors responsible for the present data take their time to work carefully on the text. In reference to what Bisaillon (2007, 317) called strategies of anticipation (see Section 2), some evidence points to function verb constructions and preposition–noun constructions being a likely trigger for a 'ready-to-use' reverbalisation.

5. Analysis of editors' nominalisations

There are just 18 instances where the editor intervened by nominalising an expression that the translator did not nominalise. This shows that translators nominalise a lot more frequently than editors. The sentences in which editors nominalise are interesting because they all feature extensive changes to the text and often show adaptations to target language conventions.

Example (9) shows a nominalisation on the editor's part, which turns a complex sentence into a simple sentence. The verb *richten* ('judge') has been subsumed into the translation of *control* as *Selbstüberwachung* ('self regulation'). It also turns the sentence into an imperative.

(9) Trust us to **control** and exercise jurisdiction over this important occupational category. (HBR 10/08,70)

Ihr könnt uns vertrauen, denn wir werden diesen wichtigen Berufszweig **kontrollieren** und darüber richten. (manuscript)	Vertraut uns die **Selbstüberwachung** dieses wichtigen Berufszweigs an. (HBM 1/09,20)
[You can trust us because we will control this important occupational category and judge it.]	[Entrust us with the self regulation of this important occupational category.]

In example (10), the editor has changed the sentence significantly by putting the main information that is located in the subordinate clause introduced by *dass* ('that') in the manuscript into a main clause, which improves the clarity of the sentence. The editorial change has also recreated the thematic structure from the source text sentence, which may have been done to retain the rhetorical impact from the source text. The sentence was also split.

(10) To regain society's trust, we **believe** that business leaders must embrace a way of looking at their role that goes beyond their responsibility to the shareholder [...]. (HBR 10/08,70)

Wir **sind** davon **überzeugt**, dass Führungskräfte in Unternehmen das Vertrauen der Gesellschaft nur dann zurückgewinnen können, wenn sie ihre Tätigkeit als eine Aufgabe begreifen, die mehr umfasst als die Verantwortung gegenüber den Anteilseignern [...]. (manuscript)	Sie können das Vertrauen der Gesellschaft nur dann zurückgewinnen, so unsere **Überzeugung**, wenn sie sich nicht mehr allein gegenüber den Anteilseignern verantwortlich fühlen. (HBM 1/09,20)
[We are convinced that leaders in companies can only regain society's trust if they understand their role as a task that comprises more than the responsibility towards the shareholders [...].]	[They can only regain society's trust, in our understanding, if they no longer feel solely responsible towards shareholders.]

The modifications in example (11) have introduced a fixed expression *schalten und walten* (lit. 'operate and rule') and also changed the noun *Erfolg* ('success') to the adjective *erfolgreich* ('successful'). A somewhat controversial change is that the feminine *Managerin* and its pronoun *she* were changed to the male *Manager* and the pronoun *er* ('he') by the editors. The sentence is again changed significantly and not only made longer this time, but also less informationally dense.

(11) Based on success in a previous role, a manager may **believe** she has a mandate. (HBR 1/09,54)

Angesichts des Erfolgs in einer früheren Position kann **sich** eine Managerin für besonders kompetent **halten**. (manuscript)	War ein Manager in einer früheren Position sehr erfolgreich, dann neigt er nun womöglich zu der **Auffassung**, er könne schalten und walten, wie er wolle. (HBM 3/09,10)
[Based on the success in a previous position, a manager can believe herself to be especially competent.]	[If a manager was very successful in a previous position, he may tend to the belief that he can do as he likes.]

Example (12) shows another extensive editorial intervention. Most significantly, the editor has eliminated the slightly misleading translation of *didn't simply* as *mehr als* ('more than'). The term *no-frills*, which cannot be relied on to be understood widely by a German audience, was also rendered by the German equivalent *ohne Schnickschnack*.

(12) When the resulting fare war brought Ryanair to its knees, its leaders didn't simply urge the airline to **try harder**. They revamped the strategy and transformed the company into a no-frills player with a true low-cost business model. (HBR 1/08,54)

Als der daraus entstandene Preiskrieg Ryanair in die Knie zwang, unternahmen die Verantwortlichen mehr als die Fluggesellschaft anzuspornen, sich **mehr zu bemühen**. Sie verwarfen die bisherige Strategie und machten aus dem Unternehmen eine so genannte No-Frills-Fluglinie mit einem echten Niedrigkosten-Geschäftsmodell. (manuscript)	Als Ryanair in dem durch seine Tarife entfachten Preiskrieg in die Knie ging, reagierten die Führungskräfte nicht damit, das Unternehmen zu noch **mehr Leistung** anzuspornen. Vielmehr verwarfen sie die bisherige Strategie und machten aus der Gesellschaft eine Fluglinie ohne jeglichen Schnickschnack und mit einem echten NiedrigkostenGeschäftsmodell. (HBM 5/08,10)
[When the fare war resulting from this brought Ryanair to its knees, its leaders did more than urge the airline to try harder. They discarded the present strategy and turned the company into a so-called no-frills airline with a real low-cost business model.]	[When Ryanair went to its knees in the fare war sparked through its prices, leaders did not react by urging the company to even more performance. Instead they discarded the present strategy and turned the company into an airline without any bells and whistles and with a real low-cost business model.]

As a final example of extensive changes accompanying nominalisation by editors, consider example (13). The manuscript sentence has again been extensively revised and also split. The editor nominalised the verb *commissioned* as *den Auftrag geben* and reverted the verbalisation of *conduct interviews*, which the translator rendered as *befragen* ('to interview'). They also verbalised *Ernennung* ('promotion') into the passive construction *ernannt worden war* ('was named'). The complex modal verb structure with *würden* ('would') was replaced by the simpler adverb construction with *vermutlich* ('presumably'), and the omission of *key* from *key executives* in the translation was corrected.

(13) When Ludwig *took over* as CEO of Becton, Dickinson, he **commissioned** a task force of trusted managers to *conduct* open-ended *interviews* with key executives about the challenges the firm faced. (HBR 7/08,50)

Nach *seiner Ernennung* zum CEO von BD **beauftragte** Ludwig eine Arbeitsgruppe zuverlässiger Manager, Führungskräfte in zeitlich unbefristeten Interviews zu *befragen*, welche Herausforderungen sie auf das Unternehmen zukommen sehen würden. (manuscript)	Nachdem Ed Ludwig zum CEO von Becton Dickinson *ernannt worden war*, **gab** er einer Projektgruppe von zuverlässigen Managern **den Auftrag**, zeitlich unbefristete *Interviews* mit den wichtigsten Führungskräften im Haus zu *führen*. Darin sollten sie erfragen, welche Herausforderungen vermutlich auf das Unternehmen zukommen würden. (HBM 8/08,20)
[After his promotion to CEO of BD, Ludwig commissioned a task force of trusted managers to ask leaders in open-ended interviews, which challenges they would envision to face the company.]	[After Ed Ludwig was named CEO of Becton Dickinson, he gave a project group of trusted managers the job to conduct open-ended interviews with the most important leaders in the house. In these, they should find out which challenges might face the company.]

To conclude, then, contrary to translators, the editors studied in this paper do not seem to nominalise very frequently. An explanation for this may be that the translators of the articles in this corpus have worked with a strict linguistic focus on individual sentences (which may be increased by the segmentation approach of CAT tools), while the editors may give greater consideration to the text as a whole. The translators may thus be affected to a greater extent by the academic nature of the source texts, which conventionally favours a nominal style in German, while the editors in this case incorporate popularising strategies. These increase readability through, among other things, a greater adaptation to target language conventions and an increased use of verbal structures as 'advocated in educational texts for journalists' (Müller-Feldmeth et al. 2015, 237; see also Rüth 2012).

This study has shown that editors effect extensive changes on the translated text. With regard to nominalisation, they intervene with notable frequency and while around half of these interventions are restricted to the nominal form in question, the other half of those

interventions consist of extensive changes that lead to a complete reformulation of the sentence in question. Thus, while existing studies have predominantly characterised editing as an activity primarily characterised by the application of low-effort and ready-to-use solutions to improve readability, the present study contributes evidence from a genre in which editors often take the time to rewrite parts of the text to adapt it to the target audience. Such findings underline the importance of considering intermediate stages in translation production to counteract the editor's invisibility in corpus-based translation studies.

Note

1. http://reaktanz.de/?c=hacking&s=koRpus

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Funding

Notes on contributor

Mario Bisiada is lecturer at the Universitat Pompeu Fabra in Barcelona (Spain), where he is a member of the Discourse Studies Research Group. He is currently working on the project 'Evidentiality and epistemicity in texts of evaluative discourse genres. Contrastive analysis and translation'. He received his PhD in Intercultural and Translation Studies from the University of Manchester (United Kingdom). His recent publications include articles on the effects of sentence splitting on readability, contact-induced language change in translation and linguistic features of translated and edited language.

ORCID

Mario Bisiada http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3145-1512

References

Alves, F., A. Pagano, S. Neumann, E. Steiner, and S. Hansen-Schirra. 2010. "Translation Units and Grammatical Shifts: Towards an Integration of Product- and Process-Based Translation Research." In *Translation and Cognition*, edited by G. M. Shreve and E. Angelone, 109–142. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bailin, A., and A. Grafstein. 2015. *Readability: Text and Context*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bamberger, R., and E. Vanecek. 1984. *Lesen–Verstehen–Lernen–Schreiben*. Wien: Jugend und Volk.

Best, K.-H. 2006. "Sind Wort- und Satzlänge brauchbare Kriterien zur Bestimmung der Lesbarkeit von Texten?" In *Wissenstransfer—Erfolgskontrolle und Rückmeldungen aus der Praxis*, edited by S. Wichter and A. Busch, 21–31. Frankfurt/M: Peter Lang.

Bisaillon, J. 2007. "Professional Editing Strategies Used by Six Editors." *Written Communication* 24 (4): 295–322. doi:10.1177/0741088307305977.

Bisiada, M. 2016. "'Lösen Sie Schachtelsätze möglichst auf': The Impact of Editorial Guidelines on Sentence Splitting in German Business Article Translations." *Applied Linguistics* 37 (3): 354–376. doi:10.1093/applin/amu035.

Black, K. 2012. *Business Statistics: For Contemporary Decision Making*. 7th ed. Upper Saddle River: J. Wiley & Sons.

Cunningham, D. S. 1971. "Translation and Editing." *Meta* 16 (3): 135–152. doi:10.7202/002443ar.

Dubay, W. H. 2006. *Smart Language: Readers, Readability, and the Grading of Text*. Costa Mesa: Impact Information.

Fabricius-Hansen, C. 1999. "Information Packaging and Translation: Aspects of Translational Sentence Splitting (German–English/Norwegian)." In *Sprachspezifische Aspekte Der Informationsverteilung*, edited by M. Doherty, 175–214. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Flower, L., J. R. Hayes, L. Carey, K. Schriver, and J. Stratman. 1986. "Detection, Diagnosis, and the Strategies of Revision." *College Composition and Communication* 37 (1): 16–55. doi:10.2307/357381.

Garrod, S., D. Freudenthal, and E. Boyle. 1994. "The Role of Different Types of Anaphor in the On-Line Resolution of Sentences in a Discourse." *Journal of Memory and Language* 33 (1): 39–68. doi:10.1006/jmla.1994.1003.

Göpferich, S. 1995. *Textsorten in Naturwissenschaften Und Technik: Pragmatische Typologie—Kontrastierung—Translation*. Tübingen: Günter Narr.

Göpferich, S. 2009. "Comprehensibility Assessment Using the Karlsruhe Comprehensibility Concept." *The Journal of Specialised Translation* 11: 31–52.

Hansen-Schirra, S., S. Hansen, S. Wolfer, and L. Konieczny. 2009. "Fachkommunikation, Popularisierung, Übersetzung: Empirische Vergleiche Am Beispiel Der Nominalphrase Im Englischen Und Deutschen." *Linguistik Online* 39 (3): 109–118.

Hayes, J. R., L. Flower, K. A. Schriver, J. F. Stratman, and L. Carey. 1987. "Cognitive Processes in Revision." In *Advances in Applied Psycholinguistics, Vol. 2 of Reading, Writing, and Language Processing*, edited by S. Rosenberg, 176–240. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Krein-Kühle, M. 2003. "Equivalence in Scientific and Technical Translation: A Text-in-Context-based Study". PhD diss.

Kruger, H. 2012. "A Corpus-Based Study of the Mediation Effect in Translated and Edited Language." *Target* 24 (2): 355–388. doi:10.1075/target.24.2.07kru.

Künzli, A. 2007. "The Ethical Dimension of Translation Revision: An Empirical Study." *The Journal of Specialised Translation* 8: 42–56.

Langer, I., F. S. Von Thun, and R. Tausch. 1974. *Verständlichkeit in Schule, Verwaltung, Politik Und Wissenschaft*. München: Reinhardt Verlag.

Langer, S. 2005. "A Formal Specification of Support Verb Constructions." In *Semantik Im Lexikon*, edited by S. Langer and D. Schnorbusch, 179–202. Tübingen: Narr.

Mossop, B. 2014. *Revising and Editing for Translators*. 3rd ed. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Müller-Feldmeth, D., U. Held, P. Auer, S. Hansen-Morath, S. Hansen-Schirra, K. Maksymski, S. Wolfer, and L. Konieczny. 2015. "Investigating Comprehensibility of German Popular Science Writing." In *Translation and Comprehensibility*, edited by K. Maksymski, S. Gutermuth, and S. Hansen-Schirra, 227–261. Berlin: Frank & Timme.

Munday, J. 2012. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. 3rd ed. Abingdon: Routledge.

Muñoz Martín, R. 2010. "On Paradigms and Cognitive Translatology." In *Translation and Cognition*, edited by G. M. Shreve and E. Angelone, 169–187. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Robert, I. S. 2014. "Investigating the Problem-Solving Strategies of Revisers through Triangulation." *Translating and Interpreting Studies* 9 (1): 88–108. doi:10.1075/tis.9.1.05rob.

Roberts, J. C., R. H. Fletcher, and S. W. Fletcher. 1994. "Effects of Peer Review and Editing on the Readability of Articles Published in *Annals of Internal Medicine*." *Journal of the American Medical Association* 272 (2): 119–121. doi:10.1001/jama.1994.03520020045012.

Rüth, L. 2012. "Grammatische Metapher und Common Ground". Master's thesis.

Saldanha, G., and S. O'Brien. 2013. *Research Methodologies in Translation Studies*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Schriver, K. A. 1989. "Evaluating Text Quality: The Continuum from Text-Focused to Reader-Focused Methods." *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication* 32 (4): 238–255. doi:10.1109/47.44536.

Steiner, E. 2001. "Translations English–German: Investigating the Relative Importance of Systemic Contrasts and of the Text-Type 'Translation'." *SPRIKreports* 7: 1–48.

Utka, A. 2004. "Phases of Translation Corpus: Compilation and Analysis." *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 9 (2): 195–224. doi:10.1075/ijcl.9.2.

Wolfer, S. 2015. "Comprehension and Comprehensibility." In *Translation and Comprehensibility*, edited by K. Maksymski, S. Gutermuth, and S. Hansen-Schirra, 33–51. Berlin: Frank & Timme.