Translators or interpreters, translation students and teachers, researchers, promoters of translation or interpreting, readers of translation, users of interpreting, clients or employers of interpreters and translators, their collaborators in language industry or publishing, developers of tools and reference materials used by translators and interpreters – all of them are often faced with a question: what is the right thing to do? Whose expectations should I respond to and fulfill? Do I owe loyalty to the author of the source message, to the one who is financing my work, to the end user, to the codes and standards of the professional body I belong to, to other professionals working in the field, to my political agenda, to the society, to my religious affiliation, to my people, to my gender, to technological development, to the liberal market, to a balance of nature, to the greater good, or to myself, my well-being and my own beliefs and values? What if different people involved in the production of translation or interpretation have opposing expectations? How do I resolve ethical dilemmas?

Ethics is indeed a perennial question of translation, be it in written or spoken form. Ethical issues have therefore always been debated and discussed, both by practitioners and by researchers. Still, focused scholarly work on ethical issues has remained sporadic in Translation Studies, and only a handful of monographs (Pym 1997/2012; Koskinen 2000; Meschonnic 2007/2011; Inghilleri 2012) and special issues (Pym 2001; Baker and Maier 2011; Drugan and Tipton 2017; Greenall, Alvstad, Jansen, and Taivalkoski 2019; Monzó-Nebot and Wallace 2020; Moorkens, Kenny, and do Carmo 2020) have been devoted to the subject. The Handbook on Translation and Ethics aims to bring together a wide array of issues relevant for a comprehensive picture of ethics in translating and interpreting. This handbook will provide no watertight and univocal answer to the persistent questions, but it will shed light on different takes on the issues of ethics by outlining the state of the art in research and by identifying numerous emerging issues. Many of the topics discussed are here presented in a coherent manner for the first time, and many of our authors report on collecting the various threads of argument from a variety of fragmented sources. Because of this foundational role, we believe this handbook will become a valuable stepping stone in the future development of ethical thought in Translation Studies. Hopefully it will also open up and encourage formulations of new perspectives and critical thoughts on ethical issues connected to the work of translators, interpreters and other translatorial actors.
1 What is ethics?

The term ethics is derived from the Greek word “
ta êthika,” meaning “things pertaining to ethos, i.e. to character” (Luce 1992, 163), and is used in a range of slightly different but related meanings. First, the term may refer to any code of moral rules, principles or values aiming to provide an answer to the question of how we should act. This means that moral codes, such as the Code of Hammurabi or the Ten Commandments in the Old Testament, are regarded and studied as texts pertaining to ethics. Second, the term ethics may also be used for any system or theory of moral values or principles. Most commonly, however, we use the term ethics to refer to the philosophical study of morality, i.e. a branch of philosophy called moral philosophy, the discipline concerned with what is morally right and wrong (Singer [1991] 2000, v–vi).

The origin of ethics, understood as the systematic study of what is morally right or wrong, began with the formulation of the first moral codes and was often closely linked to religion. The earliest surviving ethical writings could thus be traced to the ethical teachings of ancient Egypt and Babylonia. Indian ethics could be found in the Vedas, the oldest of Indian writings (c. 1500–800 BCE), in the Upanishads (post 500 BCE) and in Buddhist teachings. Around that time, in the 6th and early 5th centuries BCE, also two important moral philosophers of ancient China, Laozi and Confucius, developed their specific ethical thoughts (see Hansen [1991] 2000, 69–81). And finally, the major Abrahamic religions, Judaism, Christianity and Islam, formed their own ethical traditions as well.1 These great ethical traditions have all affected, to varying degrees, translation practice and the behaviour of translators and interpreters. However, even more decisive influence should be attributed to philosophical ethics.

If ethics is understood as a guide to behaviour, its meaning is close to that of morality, and in many contexts, both terms are used interchangeably. It is quite common to discuss ethical principles or ethical judgements of individuals like politicians and not their moral judgements or moral principles. In this volume, however, we have attempted to make a distinction between the terms and understand ethics as wider in scope than morality (cf. Gert and Gert 2017). The term morality here denotes a moral code an individual adopts as their own guide to life, and it therefore refers to an individual’s idiosyncratic principles defining what is right and wrong, while the term ethics or ethical system is used for guidance that the individual views as a proper guide for others as well. This distinction, however, is often fluid, and many thinkers have seen it more meaningful to blend the moral and the ethical, the personal and the communal, in their argumentation.

The origin of Western philosophical study of morality can be located in ancient Greece, where it found its most developed expression in the thought of Socrates (469–399 BCE) and the works of Plato (c. 427–347 BCE) and Aristotle (384–322 BCE). Socrates was the philosopher that seems to have been responsible for placing ethics in the centre of philosophical enquiry when he defined the very aim of philosophy, according to his pupil Plato, as the care and worry about the knowledge of good “and the perfection of your soul” (Plato 1914, Apology 29d–e). Philosophy was therefore, according to Socrates, intrinsically connected to ethical issues. There is a clear line of continuity in ethical thought from Socrates’s claim that a virtuous person is the one who knows what virtue is and insists on self-knowledge as a necessary path to good living (Luce 1992, 91), through Plato’s definition of justice as the harmony of intellect, emotion and desire and his equation of the good life to a good moral life (Rowe [1991] 2000, 123), to Aristotle’s treatises devoted to ethics in which he explored how human eudaimonia, i.e. happiness or well-being, can be realized in the individual and in the society through the practice of moral virtues (Luce 1992, 123). In later periods, alternative paths were
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taken by Greek and Roman Stoics pursuing the ideal of apatheia, i.e. complete absence of passion and emotion, which they believed would enable reason to take complete control of conduct, and by Epicureans, who aimed to maximize refined pleasure and reduce pain (Luce 1992, 136, 144–148).

These ancient schools of thought paved the way for the development of ethics as moral philosophy. Ethics as a philosophical discipline thus studies morality and researches how human communities socially constrain behaviours and relations and set value-based goals, and it ponders on the possibilities of good life, virtuous behaviour and happiness. However, although ethics has been developed by philosophers, it should be added that it is also distinct from other philosophical disciplines (cf. Bykova 2016). For instance, in his Nicomachean Ethics Aristotle insisted that ethics is not a theoretical discipline and does not focus on acquiring factual knowledge, which might be the case in other sciences like physics. He argued that when practicing ethics, we are engaging in a practical discipline, since “we are inquiring not in order to know what virtue is, but in order to become good, since otherwise our inquiry would have been of no use” (Aristotle [1908] 1994–2000, 1103b26–29 (Book II.2)). Ethics is thus praxis-oriented in the Aristotelian sense that it presupposes agentic human actors capable of making choices, that is, of choosing the more or less moral option in the situations they find themselves in. In other words, the foundation of ethics lies in a humanist view of free will and personal responsibility. It is also praxis-oriented in a Kantian sense, that is, it is likened to practical reason which operates by applying theoretical thought to one’s particular situation (cf. Kant [1785] 2002). And finally, ethics is also theoretical in the sense that it seeks to theoretically understand and explain human morality and ethical practice, and to provide conceptualizations and abstract theoretical foundations to everyday ethical dilemmas.

Within Translation Studies, ethics is the subfield that aims to understand what is good and bad, right and wrong in translatorial praxis. A traditional tripartite division of ethics that differentiates between normative ethics, applied ethics and metaethics can be usefully adopted in Translation Studies as well. Normative ethics studies ethical reasoning and seeks to set norms or standards for conduct, answering the questions such as what one ought to do, why some acts are right and others wrong or why some people are virtuous and others not. In the realm of translation, most early commentaries can be read as either explicitly or implicitly prescribing what a good translation is or how to be a good translator. Applied (or practical) ethics attempts to apply normative ethical theories to practical problems and formulate ethical judgments relevant to one’s decisions in everyday life, while metaethics remains in a more theoretical and abstract realm and studies the foundations of ethical statements.

Since in Translation Studies principles and theories of moral philosophy are applied to those particular areas of life that this discipline covers, ethics in Translation Studies can in its entirety be classified as applied ethics. A particularly strong tradition is the one that aims to codify translatorial behaviour in ways that guide and support the everyday actions of translation and interpreting professionals. This activity, often conducted by practitioners rather than academics, can be placed within the realm of deontology. Deontology refers to duty- or rights-based ethics that aims to normatively guide what we ought to do, rather than how we should be or what outcomes we should produce, and insists that our lives should be governed by moral rules that should not be broken regardless of the consequences (Davis [1991] 2000, 205–218). Or contrastively, that a good or beneficial effect does not necessarily whitewash any course of action. Conformance to a prior moral judgement is what matters, not the actor or the individual outcome. In deontological thinking, moral obligation is “categorical” in the sense of not being contextually negotiable. As a rule-based approach, deontology provides a framework for a systematic codification of conduct – this tie between codification and deontology is particularly
visible in Romance languages (for example, the code of ethics or conduct is called “code de déontologie” in French). Since familiarity of and submission to existing ethical codes is often seen as one cornerstone of training, in Translation Studies, deontology is closely connected to another branch of applied ethics: ethics training for future professionals.

The current intellectual and social climate seems to favour applied approaches, with their prescriptive tendencies responding to real-life issues that easily blend with deontology. Not surprisingly, the applied branch has been a stronghold in ethics over the first decades of the 21st century, as many fields have, similarly to Translation Studies, developed their own disciplinary ethical thinking and constructed profession-based guidelines. This trend has shifted the perspective from theoretical/analytical ethical theories to more deontological approaches, as applied ethics tends to be driven by pragmatic intentions and has a strong normative tendency. In translation praxis, we have seen a global surge of institutional and organizational codification of translation and, in particular, interpreting ethics. But since every deontological ethics addresses the question of authority, it inevitably also raises questions such as: who gets to decide which imperatives are deemed categorical? And if one does not accept or value a particular authority, do the rules still apply? What if the codes demand behaviour that cannot always be displayed in practice? In response to this, many deontological codes are therefore drafted collectively to enhance commitment, giving an institutional imprint to add authority, and are also often revised and amended.

In contrast, metaethics remains more theoretical and deals with questions about the nature of moral judgments, such as whether moral judgements are objective or subjective or which metaphysical, epistemological, semantic or psychological presuppositions have influenced their formulation (Chrisman 2017, xv). Metaethical reasoning does not aim to give guidelines, prohibitions or sanctions. This being said, we should keep in mind, however, that all ethical decisions are embedded in a system and cannot be adequately understood independently of it, therefore some issues discussed in normative ethics and metaethics are still very pertinent in ethical research and ethical positioning in Translation Studies as well. The new millennium has seen a steady growth in the interest in ethical considerations in Translation Studies, but a lot of metaethical terrain remains to be charted, as most interest has so far been directed in solving the dilemmas in the professional field and in training new generations of professionals. Existing contributions with a focused attention to a particular metaethical question include cooperation (Pym 1997/2012), postmodern ethical theories (Koskinen 2000), social responsibility (Drugan and Tipton 2017) and the connection of voice and ethics in translation (Greenall et al. 2019) and the ethics of machine translation (Moorkens et al. 2020).

The ethos of this handbook is metaethical. While we have aimed for thickly contextualized descriptions of the various ethical dilemmas, readers hoping to find ready-made codifications of good or right behaviour in this book will therefore mainly be disappointed. If anything, many chapters of this volume repeat the story of the codified ethics not being enough. According to Jacques Derrida (1997, 17 and passim), we only enter the field of ethics when we can no longer apply set of rules and we need to find our bearing in an inherently ambivalent situation where any course of action can be deemed ethical from one perspective but also unethical from another. Similarly, codes of conduct depict an ideal world, but the moral dilemmas are born of a messy and complex life. Because translatorial activities are by definition located in an intersection, in transit areas between entities, and they involve more than one language, culture, readership and interlocutor, they are ripe with bigger and smaller ethical dilemmas of this kind. Hence the need to talk about ethics. Hence also the futility of searching for fast and solid rule-based ethical codification to solve the ethics of translation once and for all.
2 Handbook: the making of

This current volume consists of chapters that aim to chart and analyze what has been said about the ethical issues related to a particular topic, and how as well as which elements need to be addressed in more depth in future discussions. Our ambitious aim was to provide a global view of the entire landscape of ethics in Translation Studies. Like in any human endeavour, the reality does not fully match the ambition, and we are aware of the many gaps in areas we could not cover, or that we only managed to cover partially, but the rationale for each chapter and for the entire volume is metaethical at heart.

When we were invited to edit this handbook with the title *Translation and Ethics*, it had already been decided at Routledge that no separate handbook on interpreting will be commissioned and that both written and oral modes of translation need to be included. This foundational decision pushed the authors of the chapters and our editorial activities towards including both modes in the same discussion whenever possible, highlighting similarities rather than specificities of each. Moreover, the fact that we strove to include relevant aspects of the various modes of interpreting and translating resulted in a fairly strict prototypical understanding of interlingual translation in the handbook’s chapters. This being said, when relevant, some authors also briefly cover such areas as subtitling and dubbing, intersemiotic, multimodal mediation, and interpreting into or from nonverbal languages. Intralingual translation and interpreting, however, remain entirely outside the scope of this volume.

Translation Studies as a discipline is attuned to cultural differences, and the self-understanding of the translatorial praxis often entails an image of the cultural bridge-builder. When completing the handbook, it has therefore been somewhat unexpected to realize that the Translation Studies history of ethical thinking may offer an argument for universalist ethics, despite the fact that we have tried (with varied success) to enlist authors from all continents and have encouraged authors to expand from the Western perspectives when possible. However, surprisingly, the final results show limited variation in terms of basic principles and viewpoints, which offers a number of possible explanations: either translation is understood in a homogenous way in most cultures or we failed to weave our network to areas where the thinking and categorizations are fundamentally different from ours, or else, the Western/European TS model has spread to all corners of the world. Nevertheless, some chapters depart from entirely Eurocentric positioning and thus reduce the Western bias: for example, the chapters focusing on translation ethics in socialist countries, on religious translation, on postcolonial, feminist and Chinese perspectives offer a broader, more global view of the issues discussed.

Besides giving visibility to some non-Western perspectives, we are glad that we have managed to include presentations of some Western ethical thoughts, like the ethical translation theory developed by Erich Prunč that has seldom crossed the confines of German language into English-dominated contemporary translation-studies discourses on ethics. We have also striven to make another language division which has marked the history of ethical thought in Translation Studies less pronounced: a linguistic and cultural division within Translation Studies/traductologie that has persisted through the Anglophonization of academic publishing. Many core thinkers in the realm of ethics and translation published their main contributions in French in the 1980s and 1990s, among them Antoine Berman, Henri Meschonnic, Paul Ricœur and Anthony Pym, and English translations have been slow to appear. We hope that chapters dedicated to these seminal theoreticians will make their pertinent ethical considerations more visible in Translation Studies. There remains a slight disconnection within the history of ethical TS literature in that while interest in ethical issues has been on the rise during the first decades of the 21st century, the more recent discussions do not always connect to the earlier contributions. One of the aims...
of this handbook is to encourage such connections and invite researchers to boldly cross the 
linguistic and theoretical boundaries.

Another aim of the handbook relates to ethics education in translator and interpreter training 
institutions. This volume has been designed and edited very much with translation students in 
mind. Authors have been asked to provide definitions and to avoid overly complex sentences to 
keep the junior members of our scholarly community from BA level onwards engaged. We have 
also decided to dedicate two chapters to issues of ethics and translator education, one of them 
looking at how ethics is or should be taught, and the other at what kinds of ethical issues may 
arise in the daily life of translator and interpreter trainers and institutions. Ever since Plato the 
issue of whether virtues can be taught has been raised. In Translation Studies and in translator 
and interpreter education the response has tended to be positive, and ethics has gradually gained 
ground in curricula. It is then essential that the ethics classes are not reduced to rote learning of 
the codes of conduct, “programming” the students to apply a pre-set codified system (see Koski-
nen 2000, 29). Instead, the future translatorial actors need to be given opportunities to practice 
their own muscles of ethical reasoning, to learn to contemplate complex questions from many 
directions, to deliberate dialogically and listen to other viewpoints in a non-judgemental man-
ner. Simultaneously, we need to cultivate a humble attitude. Abstract ethical reasoning always 
poses a risk of self-righteous attitude and hubris, but no one escapes the human condition of 
sometimes taking a wrong turn, and in ethics education no final answers are found. We hope 
these chapters will function as an incentive for critical reflection and debate in the classroom.

3 Outline of the contents

This is the first volume in Translation Studies that covers the field of ethics exhaustively, which 
means that we had no example to follow or to rebel against. We decided against some of the 
typical ways of creating disciplinary subdivisions: we did not want to proceed in a domain-based 
manner, providing chapters on medical translation or court interpreting, for example, or to base 
the structure on translatorial genres, by focusing, for example, on subtitling or poetry transla-
tion. The outcome is a combination of different approaches and viewpoints. Eventually, in order 
to cover different ethical considerations that proved most influential in Translation Studies, we 
decided, first, to focus on the presentation of the most prominent authors and currents in the 
development of ethical thought in Translation Studies, which is then followed by the discussion 
of the ethical considerations of more specific translation and interpreting-related issues.

Part I of the handbook thus offers a selection of most acknowledged ethical theories devel-
oped and applied within Translation Studies. It can be understood as the theoretical foundations 
of this area. The focus is sometimes more geographical and sometimes it centres on a specific 
thoretical current or tradition. The chapters that provide an insight into the development of 
ethical thought within specific national confines are the chapter by Xin Guangqin that traces 
the origins of Chinese discourse on translation ethics in the long tradition of Confucian ethics, 
and the chapter by Brian James Baer and Christina Schäffner that illustrates the way the ethics of 
translation was conceived in “socialist” theories of translation, in particular, in those developed 
in the Soviet Union and the German Democratic Republic. Other chapters in this section focus 
more on a specific theoretical translatological, ethical or philosophical current. For example, the 
chapter by Andrew Chesterman outlines the application of virtue theories of ethics in Transla-
tion Studies and proposes that a virtue-based Hieronymic Oath could be used to highlight the 
importance of professional translation ethics in translator training. Gernot Hebenstreit describes 
the absence and presence of ethics in the functional translation theory, in particular in the 
work of Hans J. Vermeer, Justa Holz-Mänttäri, Christiane Nord and Erich Pruné. Françoise
Massardier-Kenney provides an insight into the prima facie duties ethics of Antoine Berman and on the way ethics is embedded in a larger system, combining ethical issues with epistemological and metaphysical concerns in the work of Henri Meschonnic. The ethics of linguistic hospitality and untranslatability, developed by two other important French philosophers, Jacques Derrida and Paul Ricoeur, are outlined in the chapter by Nike K. Pokorn and Kaisa Koskinen. This is then followed by the chapters describing ethical consideration in three postmodern currents: first, Douglas Robinson explores the translational “ethics of difference,” honouring the difference of the source text, as an ethos of anticoloniality/decoloniality. Then Emek Ergun outlines the historical development of the ethics of feminist translation and its potential expansions into an intersectional, transnational, decolonial and interconnectionist feminist translation ethics. And finally, Jenni Laaksonen and Kaisa Koskinen describe the development of Lawrence Venuti’s ethics of difference. This section concludes with the chapter by Anthony Pym in which he describes the basic tenets of “translator ethics,” which focuses on the people involved in the production of translations rather than on translations as texts.

Chapters in Part II look at ethics from the perspective of a situated translator, charting the ethical issues of translatorial actors in various contexts. This section thus opens with a chapter by Joseph Lambert focusing on the various and overlapping ethical questions facing the professional translator, such as professionalization and the dynamics between the professional and personal ethics. In the next chapter focusing on literary translator’s ethics Cecilia Alvstad provides an overview of the key Translation Studies texts discussing ethical issues arising from translations of literary texts and addresses several ethical issues connected to the publishing and re-publishing of literary translations. In Translation Studies a focus on ethical issues has been particularly prominent in interpreting research: four chapters therefore more or less explicitly address ethical issues connected with various forms of interpreted discourse. Wen Ren and Mingyue Yin review previous studies on interpreter ethics working in conference settings, while Sonja Pöllabauer and Iris Topolovec focus on ethics in public service interpreting. Since community interpreting often involves high-stake encounters where interactants are steered by different motives, ethics is intricately interwoven with the work of community interpreters, and therefore research in this field is also extremely varied and often marks the avant-garde in the field. Interpreting is also present in the chapter by Salah Basalamah, which focuses on ethical issues connected to volunteering and non-professional translators and interpreters, i.e. on the growing phenomenon encouraged by the increase in global migration and the rising opportunities created by technological affordances for online self-publishing. The ethical issues connected to volunteering are also addressed by Julie Boëri and Carmen Delgado Luchner in their chapter on activist translators and interpreters, where they discuss ethically challenging issues of impartiality versus engagement and expertise versus grassroots knowledge. This section on human translators and interpreters in different contexts concludes with two chapters addressing the topical issue of the challenges of the traditional human-centeredness of the field. First, Lynne Bowker explores a wide range of ethically challenging professional and societal issues connected to the newest advances in translation technology. And finally, this section is rounded off by Chapter 19 “Translation and posthumanism,” in which Michael Cronin argues that Translation Studies should be concerned with the ethical positioning of translation in a time of ecological crisis, and insists that translation has an important role to play in the formulation of a different kind of ethics for a viable, future planet.

Part II acknowledges the personal, agentic elements of ethics and approaches ethical issues from the perspective of a particular actor, with different degrees of agency, and thus honours the tradition in Translation Studies to predominantly direct the ethical demands on the translators and interpreters. To balance this individual perspective and to emphasize the social and collective
embeddedness of ethics, we devote Part III to a number of institutions and organizations involved in translatorial practices, with a power to define and disseminate particular understandings of the professional ethical behaviour of translators and interpreters. Part III thus opens with a chapter by Lluís Baixauli-Olmos on different codes of ethics or conduct and standards of practice that, on one hand, depict professional practices of interpreters and translators, and, on the other hand, also shape the expectations that define and delimit the ethical positioning of the practitioners. The way globalization influences ethical concerns experienced by different stakeholders in the translation industry at various levels in translation production is presented in the chapter on ethics in translation industry by Joss Moorkens and Marta Rocchi, paying particular attention to issues such as disparities of power, ownership of resources and the challenge of crowdsourcing. Part III also looks into the central role and ethical challenges of trainers, educators and researchers and introduces some self-reflection in the field by exploring not only the ways in which we can research and teach ethics in the educational institutions educating translators and interpreters and in academic Translation Studies research but also, importantly, how we can be ethical in the provision of education and in conducting research on translating and interpreting. Thus, first, Georgios Floros provides an insight into the main pedagogical aspects of teaching ethics within the context of both academic and professional training institutions, and then Raquel Pacheco Aguilar and Dilek Dizdar discuss the ethics of translator and interpreter education and focus on the ways in which the pedagogical relationship between teachers and students are conceptualized and on the power relations that have an effect on how an “ethical” translator and interpreter education is manifested. The chapter that concludes this section explores research ethics in translation and interpreting studies. In this chapter Christopher D. Mellinger and Brian James Baer present an overview of the current state of research ethics in translation and interpreting studies and discuss issues, such as the prevalence of Western bias in dominant research paradigms, the positionality of the researcher, the representation of linguistic difference in acts of translation in research contexts, researcher bias, conducting ethical research in neighbouring disciplines and the dissemination of research results and the sharing of research data.

Finally, in Part IV we attempted to identify ethical dilemmas specific to translation and interpreting as mediating practices, as well as emerging challenges and trends in translator and interpreter ethics. Some of these topics have been in the focus of translatorial ethical thinking for quite a while; others have become an object of Translation Studies research only recently. Among emerging topics that have received increased scholarly attention recently are ethical challenges brought about by child language brokering, i.e. by the phenomenon when children are used to enable intercultural and interlinguistic communication in child-to–child, child-to-adult or adult-to-adult interactions. These challenges are discussed by Claudia V. Angelelli in the chapter that opens this final section of the handbook. In the second chapter of Part IV, Małgorzata Tryuk explores ethical issues connected with translating and interpreting in wartime, conflict-related settings and crisis situations associated with mass migration, humanitarian emergency or gender violence. Ethical stress that results from disparities between one’s ethical values and expected behaviours in the translation and interpreting professions, triggered by various job stressors such as time pressures, technology and competition and impacting the productivity and well-being of translators and interpreters is discussed by Séverine Hubscher-Davidson. Svetlana Probirskaja outlines ethical issues related to the practice of “linguistic first aid,” i.e. help in the form of interpreting or translation provision by a person with some proficiency in a foreign language to another person or a group of people who are not able to communicate in a specific language. The topics of accessibility and linguistic rights are addressed by Maija Hirvonen and Tuija Kinnunen, who discuss the ethical imperative to enable equal participation in society to all people with the help of various translatorial practices, with special focus on audio description.
The final two chapters in the handbook focus on topics that seemed to have encouraged ethical considerations already in some of the first recorded writings on translation. Hephzibah Israel in her chapter focusing on translations of sacred texts offers examples from different religious traditions to highlight that translation practices and strategies considered ethical in one religion may not hold as ethical in another. And finally, ethical tensions caused by the collaboration of literary translators with the commissioners of the translation, source text authors, translators (including those involved in collaborative translations, retranslations and indirect translations), censors, publishers, editors, literary agents and patrons promoting the publication of the translation are discussed by Outi Paloposki and Nike K. Pokorn.

All in all, we are aware of the fact that we might have missed out some important viewpoints from our handbook. In spite of its shortcomings, however, we would like to think that this current volume will not only provide an outline of the state of the art, but also offer new insights into the ethical considerations in Translation Studies. The handbook, for the first time in its disciplinary history, brings together 30 topics by 38 authors focusing exclusively on translation and interpreting-related ethical issues, and many of the themes are for the first time presented in a comprehensive manner. A repeated observation of the authors of the chapters included in this handbook was that information on a particular topic has been fragmentary, and that we need a lot more ethically focused research in Translation Studies. We hope the richness of the contributions will encourage our readers to explore the ideas further and to uncover new areas of interest. To assist them in moving forward in this quest, each chapter ends with recommended further reading where one can begin one’s own expedition into the realm of addressing translation- and interpreting-related ethical issues.
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