



Article

Heritage Translation as Discourse-Constructive Practice: A Theoretical Reorientation from Linguistic Transfer to Discursive Mediation

Zhang Xu*¹

1. Northeast Electric Power University, Jilin, People's Republic of China; "Silk Road" International University of Tourism and Cultural Heritage, Samarkand City, Republic of Uzbekistan

*Correspondence: 535231128@qq.com

Citation: Xu, Z. Heritage Translation as Discourse-Constructive Practice: A Theoretical Reorientation from Linguistic Transfer to Discursive Mediation. American Journal of Economics and Business Management 2026, 9(9), 303-316.

Received: 15th Jul 2026

Revised: 05th Aug 2026

Accepted: 20th Aug 2026

Published: 10th Sept 2026



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

Abstract: The classic view of heritage translation is a linguistic action related to the transfer of meanings across languages. However, legacy communication today takes place increasingly in complex institutional, ideological and intercultural settings which go beyond the explanatory power of language transfer models. This conceptual study advocates a theoretical reorientation of heritage translation from a language-centred paradigm to a discourse-constructive perspective. Based on social constructivism, translation sociology and discourse analysis, the study offers a paradigm conceptualising legacy translation as a socially situated practice of knowledge, cultural representation and civilisational identity construction. After the analytical procession of "what it is, what it does and why the turn is necessary", the study first establishes the discursive character of heritage translation and then analyses its functions in heritage knowledge production, cultural representation and civilisational mutual learning. Finally, it explains why discourse creation is a better theoretical tool than traditional equivalence-based techniques. The paper contributes to the emerging interdisciplinary discussion between translation studies and legacy studies by asserting translated heritage texts as artefacts of institutional discourse creation. The paper ends with a proposed three-level analytical framework of textual, institutional and civilisational characteristics for future research on legacy translation.

Keywords: Heritage Translation, Discourse Construction, Disciplinary Attributes, Paradigm Shift, Social Constructivism, Civilizational Mutual Learning

1. Introduction

Museums The increasing internationalisation of cultural assets has profoundly influenced the role of translation in contemporary heritage communication. As cultural legacy has become ever more part of global tourism, diplomacy, intellectual dialogue, and international governance, translation has become a key tool for transmitting the meaning of heritage across linguistic and cultural borders. Heritage communication nowadays is fundamentally multilingual -- UNESCO World Heritage nomination paperwork, management strategies, museum exhibits, explanatory signage, cultural heritage databases, and policy texts. Translation is no more a marginal technical task, but a core activity by which cultural heritage is communicated, interpreted and understood in a global context [1-2].

Despite its growing importance, the conceptualisation of legacy translation has remained largely under the influence of established language paradigms. Much of the current research on translation tends to view legacy translation as a specialised field of translation practice, primarily focused on assuring accuracy, equivalence, and clarity in the transmission of heritage-related information from one language to another. Such approaches usually deal with problems of terminology, cultural adaptability, lexical equivalence and textual faithfulness. Although these challenges remain pertinent, they are inadequate to describe the larger societal roles of heritage translation in the modern world. Heritage communication is not only about communicating factual information about monuments, customs, sites and historical events. Fundamentally, it is about the construction of meanings, the establishment of cultural values, the shaping of memory and the production of certain understandings of the past. Heritage translation is thus not a mere matter of language transmission but a matter of discourse formation [2–3].

This limitation has been increasingly evident as heritage studies have undergone significant theoretical transformations over the past thirty years. Previous heritage approaches concentrated mostly on the conservation and administration of physical cultural assets. Heritage was commonly perceived as an assemblage of monuments, archaeological locations, historic edifices, and culturally significant objects. Nonetheless, a recent investigation has challenged this object-focused understanding of heritage, proposing that heritage is not a natural category but a reality constructed socially and culturally [4–5]. Heritage is generated by mechanisms of selection, interpretation, representation, and institutional validation, as demonstrated by authors like. Heritage is not merely inherited from the past; rather, it is continuously created and recreated thru social interactions that influence what is commemorated, esteemed, and transmitted to subsequent generations.

The shift toward social constructionism in heritage studies significantly impacts translation studies. If heritage is a social construct, then the interpretation of heritage cannot be regarded as a mere transfer of established meanings between languages. Translation serves as a primary mechanism thru which traditional meanings are established, contested, and propagated. Each translation endeavour involves interpretative decisions regarding which elements of heritage to emphasise, how to represent cultural notions, and which narratives to render comprehensible for intended audiences [4,6]. Translation plays an active role in shaping heritage discourse instead of merely conveying pre-existing legacy discourse.

This redefinition conceptually is based on social constructivism, especially Berger and Luckmann [7] who claim that social reality is created and sustained thru communication, institutionalisation and legitimisation. Knowledge is thus not merely discovered but is socially constructed thru the interactions of persons and organisations. Discourse is the basic means by which meanings are made concrete and recognised in society. Reality is a constant process of production and re-creation throughout communicative exchanges. This means that the cultural importance, historical worth and common identity in the heritage region are not inherent to cultural items, but are the products of discursive processes that give meaning to certain aspects of history [4–6].

The translation is key to the achievement of these goals, given the rising possibility of heritage knowledge to overcome linguistic and cultural borders. Translation is a key factor in the global circulation of legacy narratives, allowing locally specific narratives to be transferred into a form which an international audience can understand. This is a transformation that is seldom disinterested [3,8]. Translators have a vital role in moulding worldwide audiences' impressions of the legacy. They do so thru language strategies that help contextualise historical tales within a broader cultural, political and institutional framework. Thus, translated heritage texts should not be considered as inferior to the

original works but as cultural discursive constructions that contribute to the development of heritage reality.

Contemporary developments in translation studies also support this view. The cultural turn in translation studies has caused scholars to question more and more the traditional conception of translation as a purely language endeavour. Today translation is seen as a social activity impacted by ideological, institutional, cultural and political variables. Translation scholars have noted that translation does not take place in a vacuum, but rather in power relations that determine what is translated, how it is translated, and for whom it is translated [8–9]. For example, researchers shows how translation operates within asymmetric global cultural structures that influence the diffusion of knowledge and cultural expression. Hence translation is not just a linguistic undertaking but also a social institution in the evolution of symbols and in facilitating culture.

Such adjustments are especially important for heritage translation since legacy communication is so closely linked with special-interest and goal-oriented institutions. The authorities use legacy discourse to reinforce national identity and nurture cultural authenticity. The language of heritage is used by global actors to promote interaction between different cultures and the promotion of common human values [10–12]. Museums use heritage discourse in an effort to educate its visitors and to generate narratives about cultural past. Tourism organisations use heritage narratives to enhance the attractiveness of the destinations and the cultural character of places. Under these conditions, translation is a dynamic mediator between conflicting interpretations, values and interests in relation to something else. The writings that are produced cannot be understood merely in terms of the study of language but must be contextualised within the larger institutional frameworks that govern their formation and dissemination.

A particularly relevant background for comprehending current legacy translation is the increasing popularity of the language of mutual learning of civilisations. International heritage cooperation has paid more and more attention to discussion, exchange and mutual understanding amongst civilisations in an increasingly interconnected yet culturally diverse world [10,13]. The idea of civilisational mutual learning moves away from the narrative of cultural conflict toward the model of intercultural conversation, reciprocity and shared progress. Heritage has emerged as a crucial forum for promoting such debate. More and more, cultural legacy is being put forward not simply as a symbol of individual communities or nations, but as a resource for building global understanding and collaboration.

Translation has an important role in the international communication of civilisation mutual learning. The notions of cultural exchange, common heritage, intercultural dialogue and universal human ideals must be conveyed successfully in many languages and cultures. But translation does more than carry these thoughts across. Instead it contributes to their production, by placing them in diverse discursive traditions, and making them meaningful to different audiences [12–13]. The dissemination and recurrent translation of ideas such as civilisational mutual learning provide them credibility, visibility and authority within the context of international heritage discourse. The process shows the inherently discursive nature of heritage translation and the necessity for theoretical frameworks able to account for its constructive role.

While there is an increasing understanding of the social aspects of translation, the theoretical orientation of heritage translation has been largely ignored in the literature. Current research often addresses practical issues such as terminology, multilingual communication and heritage site communication and translation procedures [11–13]. While these studies provide helpful insights, they often leave unanswered a more fundamental theoretical question: What is the disciplinary nature of heritage translation itself? But is this a matter of linguistic transfer solely, or does it index a wider discursive practice engaged in the construction of knowledge, representation and identity?

The outcomes of the study indicate that to answer this question, a paradigm shift is required, from language transfer to discursive mediation. Heritage translation must be seen as an instrument of discourse construction, as an engine of heritage realities, rather than as a passive channel thru which cultural ideas travel from one language to another. This is so because translation is an active process that does generate heritage realities. This view recognises that translated heritage texts are situated in social institutions, ideological frameworks, and cultural systems. They cannot be over emphasised in importance, not only in what they say, but in what they do. They contribute to the creation of collective identities, the production of knowledge, the legitimisation of views and the symbolisation of cultures [8,12,14].

This assertion is backed by the interdisciplinary theoretical framework that is included in the book. This framework integrates social constructivism, translation sociology, functionalist translation theory, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), and Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) discourse research. Social constructivism's fundamental ontology provides an explanation for how social reality is produced throughout the process of conversation. The study of translation sociology focuses on the institutional and power dynamics that are inherent in the activities of translation [14–15]. In functionalist theory, the emphasis is placed on the functions of communication and the objectives that govern the translation of legacy materials. Exploring the manner in which discourse produces social meanings and identities can be accomplished thru the use of methodologies that are provided by critical discourse analysis. At the end of the day, research into OUV discourse provides a perspective on the institutional language that is used to identify historical significance, particularly inside UNESCO settings, as well as globally [16].

Based on these theoretical frameworks, this manuscript gives a conceptual discussion of three inter-related enquiries: What Is Legacy Translation? What is legacy translation? What requires a theoretical change in the structure of the discourse? The paper begins by theorising the discursive dimension of heritage translation, demonstrating how translation helps to socially build historical significances [9,17]. Then it considers three major goals of legacy translation: production of information, representation of culture and construction of civilisational identity. Finally, it shows that discourse creation, rather than classic linguistic-transfer methodologies, is the most relevant analytical framework for understanding current heritage communication.

The value of this study rests in its contribution to translation studies and heritage studies. In translation studies, it advances the existing debate on the social nature of translation by offering a detailed theoretical analysis of legacy translation as a specific area of discourse. For heritage studies it suggests translation is a significant process by which heritage meanings circulate globally and gain validity beyond their native contexts [12–14]. More generally, the study contributes to increasing interdisciplinary attempts to understand how communication practices influence cultural realities in the era of globalisation.

Ultimately, the paper aims to establish legacy translation as a legitimate object of discourse-oriented investigation. It re-theorizes translated legacy texts as products of discourse formation rather than as simple linguistic transfer, providing a basis for future research that may deal with the complex relationships between language, culture, institutions and identity in global heritage communication [12,14,17]. The debate ends with a reference to a multi-level analytical framework comprising the textual, institutional and civilisational elements, thereby providing the theoretical basis for future research on the discursive processes involved in the practice of legacy translation.

This theoretical reorientation builds on convergent developments across four bodies of scholarship: heritage studies, translation studies, discourse theory and social constructivism, and the emerging discourse of civilisational mutual learning [18–20].

Heritage studies were long dominated by conservationist and historicist traditions that treated heritage as an inheritance of monuments, archaeological remains and artefacts with intrinsic, objectively definable value, a view institutionalised by UNESCO's 1972 World Heritage Convention and its categories of authenticity, integrity and Outstanding Universal Value [21–22]. Critical heritage studies subsequently challenged this object-focused paradigm, arguing that heritage significance is not inherent in monuments but constructed through selection, interpretation, legitimisation and representation [23–24]. Smith's [25] concept of Authorised Heritage Discourse (AHD) and Tunbridge and Ashworth's [26] notion of dissonant heritage were particularly influential in this shift, showing that heritage is a site of negotiation among competing narratives rather than a neutral repository of historical truth, and that museum displays, interpretation panels and policy papers actively create heritage discourse [4,27–28].

Translation studies underwent a parallel transformation. Traditional linguistic paradigms, exemplified by equivalence-oriented models, treated translation mainly as a matter of semantic correspondence, lexical precision and textual coherence [8,14,20,29]. The cultural turn of the 1980s and 1990s repositioned translation within broader cultural and ideological contexts, recasting translators as active participants in cultural production rather than passive conduits [18,30–32]. Functionalist approaches, particularly Skopos-oriented frameworks, further shifted attention toward the communicative purposes that shape translation choices in contexts such as tourism, diplomacy and heritage designation, although functionalism remains primarily concerned with translation's aims rather than its role in discourse production [20,29,33–34]. The sociological turn in translation studies added an institutional dimension, treating translation as a socially situated practice shaped by power and cultural hierarchies; Casanova's [35] account of translation as symbolic exchange within uneven global cultural systems, and subsequent work on translation, power and representation, established that translated heritage texts should be understood as social mediations rather than neutral copies of source texts [29,36–37].

The theoretical foundation for reconceiving heritage translation as discourse construction rests on Berger and Luckmann's [7] theory of the social construction of reality, in which knowledge and meaning are produced and sustained through ongoing communicative interaction rather than simply discovered [28,38–39]. Contemporary discourse theory extends this view by treating discourse as a form of social action responsible for producing knowledge, identities and institutions [40–42], while Critical Discourse Analysis supplies methodological tools for examining how translated heritage texts construct particular representations of reality and legitimise social norms [43–44]. Within international heritage governance specifically, the discourse of Outstanding Universal Value depends heavily on translation, since heritage significance must be articulated across languages to achieve global recognition; translation therefore participates in constructing OUV itself rather than merely transmitting an already-settled value [43,45].

Finally, the rising prominence of civilisational mutual learning as a framework for intercultural cooperation and heritage diplomacy underscores translation's constitutive role in extending cultural narratives beyond national boundaries and building shared understanding among diverse audiences [31–32]. Taken together, this literature demonstrates that heritage is now understood as socially constructed, that translation is understood as institutionally and ideologically embedded, and that discourse is understood as constitutive rather than merely reflective of social reality [23,27–28]. Yet despite these convergent theoretical advances, heritage translation research itself has remained largely focused on practical concerns of terminology, equivalence and communication technique, with little systematic effort to integrate social constructivism, translation sociology, functionalism, Critical Discourse Analysis and OUV discourse research into a unified account of heritage translation as discourse-constructive practice [18–19,27]. It is this gap that the present study addresses.

2. Materials and Method

The research methodology adopted in this work is conceptual. It seeks to build a theory of legacy translation as a discourse-constructive practice, rather than simply a linguistic transfer. Conceptual research is especially valuable when the goal is to clarify, redefine, and extend theoretical knowledge thru a critical review of established concepts and intellectual traditions rather than thru the collecting of actual facts. The present work aims at establishing a new theoretical orientation of heritage translation research and therefore focuses on conceptual analysis, theoretical synthesis and interpretative reasoning.

3. Results

The aim of this paper is to argue that heritage translation should be viewed not just as a linguistic act but also as a discursive practice constructed within wider social, cultural and institutional processes. This theoretical repositioning is a response to the limits of the usual translation paradigms, which have typically viewed of translation as the process of transferring meanings from one language to another. These approaches have been very useful to comprehend issues related to equivalence, accuracy and communicative efficacy, but they only provide a partial explanation of the function of translation in modern heritage communication [29,31].

The literature reviewed so far indicates that both legacy studies and translation studies are undergoing major theoretical revisions. Heritage is no longer a collection of hereditary objects to be maintained, but a cultural and discursive construct increasingly controlled by interpretation, representation and institutional legitimacy. Similarly, the field of translation studies has shifted from language issues to issues of ideology, power, representation, and social mediation. Despite the contemporary advances that have taken place, the field of legacy translation has remained largely based on transfer-based assumptions [39,43].

The findings of this conceptual investigation reveal that the position of heritage translation is substantially different from many other types of specialised translation. This is because heritage is made in speech. The value of culture, the relevance of legacy, the authenticity of things, the historical importance of things are not objective qualities, fixedly placed within cultural items. Instead they are the consequence of the processes of interpretation that are employed to give meaning to specific features of the past. Hence, legacy translation cannot be confined to the transmission of meanings that are pre-existing, because meanings are generated thru discourse and are constantly being challenged [28,39].

From the social constructivist perspective, translation contributes directly to the social construction of heritage reality. Translators are not just responsible for relaying descriptions of heritage; they are responsible for developing narratives that give heritage significance for populations who speak a range of languages. Heritage translation thus operates as a process of discursive mediation, linking local cultural narratives to larger national, international and civilisational discourses [39,43].

Such a reconceptualization requires a fundamental shift in the focus of disciplinary activities. For scholars, it is more important to question how translation contributes to the construction of legacy meanings, how it creates cultural narratives and how it shapes global concepts of historical value than to ask whether a translation faithfully reproduces a source text. These challenges transfer the subject out of linguistic equivalence and into discourse production, so widening the analytical scope of legacy translation studies [28,39].

Heritage Translation as a Mechanism of Knowledge Production

One of the most important implications of the discourse-construction perspective is that heritage translation participates in the procedure of knowledge formation. The

majority of classic translation theories presuppose that knowledge is available prior to translation and is transmitted across linguistic boundaries. In contrast, social constructivism rejects this kind of thinking and says that knowledge is constructed by the process of communication and interaction with other people [39–40].

Historical preservation is not only about discovery or documentation of knowledge. Heritage knowledge is an enterprise of interpretation, classification, narrative and institutional legitimization. Heritage texts shape which aspects of culture are valued, which historical narratives are emphasised, and how cultural practices are portrayed. As such, translation is relevant in that in other nations, audiences are often only able to obtain knowledge about heritage by translated literature [46].

The notion of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) is a suitable example in this respect. When sites are listed as candidates for international recognition, it is important to establish the value of heritage assets in narratives that meet widely accepted appraisal standards. For review, dissemination and exposure, the stories are translated into languages spoken all over the world. Translation is not only about the transmission of already acquired knowledge, but also about the re-configuration of meanings of local history into forms that may be comprehended at the global scale. Ideas that are founded in particular historical and cultural traditions are recontextualised within wider institutional frameworks that stress universality, authenticity, integrity and the worth of the human race as a whole [21].

Such an approach offers a demonstration of the knowledge-producing role of legacy translation. But rather than being a transparent channel translation is the mechanism that constructs the categories thru which historic information is understood worldwide. This leads to the emergence of new interpretive connections between local legacy narratives and global heritage discourse. In this way, translation contributes to the formation of a common worldwide knowledge system about cultural heritage.

Similarly, the development of heritage knowledge through translation is strongly interwoven with concerns of legitimacy and authority. Translations of heritage literature are often read by audiences from other nations as authoritative copies of cultural reality. For this reason, translation can affect not only the knowledge known about heritage but also the way in which this information is evaluated and institutionalised. This finding supports the idea that heritage translation should be considered a social practice that benefits society rather than a neutral linguistic function [21,43].

Heritage Translation and Cultural Representation

Another significant objective identified in this research is related to the representation of cultural traditions. Heritage speech is representational in that it conveys cultural meanings, historical experiences, and collective identities to particular audiences. Translation has an important function in this process; it is a bridge between different cultural systems and contributes to the promotion of intercultural understanding. Functional approaches to translation have historically focused on the importance of the communication goal in determining the techniques that should be deployed in translating. When used in conjunction with a heritage translation, translation often works for education, diplomacy, promotion and debate between different cultures. Heritage writings are not only informative, but they are also persuasive, educational, inspirational and promote cultural awareness. These aims affect the selection, organization and transmission of cultural meanings across language barriers [47].

From the discourse-construction point of view, the functionalist method is used to stress the notion that representation is never an objective activity. In translation, the choices of language, emphasis, framing and contextualisation are very crucial. One of the ways translators participate in the construction of certain images of culture is by decisions. For example, cultural notions that are unique to heritage sites linked to ancient civilisations, religious traditions, or indigenous communities cannot be directly translated

into other languages. The problem translators encounter, therefore, is how to transmit these ideas to the audience they are trying to reach. When dealing with international relations this form of assessment will inevitably have an impact on the perception and understanding of cultures. In the design, some parts might be accentuated for better accessibility, others might be minimised, modified, or completely excluded. Thus, translation is not simply a replication of cultural images, but rather plays an active role in the production of such representations [12,47].

This function of representation has a particularly essential role to play in this day and age, when there is a greater exchange of cultures all throughout the world. Legacy is an increasingly valuable asset for cultural diplomacy, international cooperation and the projection of soft power and more and more countries are embracing it. In many cases, heritage narratives are used to educate people about themselves and the uniqueness of their culture. Thru this process, translation plays a prominent role in the construction of the distribution of heritage narratives worldwide [12,48].

In this light, legacy translation should be considered as a sort of cultural mediation, that is, the process of transmitting identities, histories, and values across cultural boundaries. The translator is not only a specialist in the area of language, but also a full participant when building an understanding between the different cultures. The existence of such a role further supports the view that discourse building offers a more adequate theoretical framework than typical transfer models [12,19].

Heritage Translation and Civilizational Identity Construction

Beside the production of knowledge and the depiction of culture, legacy translation also helps to shape the identity of a civilisation. Legacy is increasingly perceived as a feature of intercultural dialogue and of reciprocal learning between civilisations in the current international context. This function is therefore of special interest when considering the increasing importance of legacy. The concept of civilisational mutual learning implies that legacy transmission goes beyond national lines to address wider problems of human coexistence and cultural exchange. The notion of heritage has stopped being just a sign of national or local identity. It is increasingly perceived as evidence of the connectivity of human civilisations and as a resource for the development of mutual understanding between people of different cultures [49].

Translation makes it much easier. Civilisational narratives will not be able to function well on a global basis without the ability to communicate across linguistic and cultural divides. Translation, in contrast, makes cultural notions, historical events and heritage values accessible to a wide range of viewers. The growing relevance of translation cannot, however, be accounted for by considering accessibility alone. The bigger hurdle is the issue of translation, which has to be overcome to be able to build common understandings of the identities of civilisations [12,42].

The theory of critical speech analysis argues that speech is accountable for the formation of identities thru the construction of categories that individuals and organisations use to see themselves and others. Also there is a function to be played by heritage translations in the creation of narratives on communal belonging, cultural continuity and the contribution of civilisation. The idea of civilisational reciprocal learning has been applied to especially highlight the significance of translation in this process. Heritage stories that cross the borders of nation states become caught up in bigger discussions on discourse, cohabitation and the diversity of cultural traditions [50].

Translation enables local historic experiences to be understood in the global context, thereby creating mutual respect and establishing communication among cultures. In this way translation becomes not just a vehicle for the diffusion of discourses of civilisation, but a vehicle for the development of such discourses. This is an important remark from a theoretical point of view. This shows that a legacy translation has to be assessed not merely on the quality of the language and the cultural adaptation, but on the part it plays in the

building up of collective identities. It expands the intellectual horizons of traditional translation studies and builds a bridge between the study and modern issues of globalisation, intercultural communication and cultural diplomacy [12,42].

Toward a Three-Level Framework of Heritage Translation Discourse

In light of the theoretical ideas that were mentioned above it is plainly evident that a more extensive analytical model is required to be able to correctly account for the intricacies that are involved in legacy translation. There is evidence that legacy translation operates at many levels of discourse creation simultaneously or at the same time. This is the situation when the translation is carried out concurrently [12,51].

On the textual level, translation involves linguistic choices, framing tactics, and representational practices thru which heritage meanings are expressed. This level deals with the discursive aspects of translated texts and the mechanics of constructing meanings [36–37].

On the institutional level, translation is impacted by a variety of factors, including cultural agendas, policies, governance structures, and organisations. Institutional systems that regulate the development and dissemination of heritage narratives are the means by which these narratives acquire legitimacy. This level of analysis investigates the ways in which social power and organisational authority influence the discourse surrounding heritage [42,49].

At the level of civilisation, translation is a component of broader processes that involve the formation of identities, the exchange of ideas between different cultures, and the interaction of cultures all over the world. The purpose of this level is to investigate how the discourse of translated legacy contributes to the formation of shared understandings of civilisation, cultural diversity, and common human values.

Far from being independent of each other, these three layers are in constant interaction with one another. The choices made in texts are influenced by institutional contexts and institutional discourses are a major contributor to civilisational narratives. The same is true of the way civilisational frameworks shape the goals of institutions and the representations of literature. The model created on the basis of this research offers an in-depth explanation of legacy translation as discourse construction in interrelated realms of social reality [42,49].

4. Discussion

Explaining the Need for a Paradigm Shift

The results of this study show that a change of paradigm is in order since the existing models of linguistic transmission are not able to appropriately address the complex functions that legacy translation has to offer. While equivalence-based theories are still useful in settling some textual problems, they provide little light on the social and institutional features of legacy communication [36].

Firstly, linguistic paradigms tend to make assumptions based on the notion that meanings are not dependent on translation and can therefore be transferred from one language to another, first. Conversely, the theory of social constructivism shows that meanings are socially generated and context-dependent. Heritage values, identities and narratives are not objects to be transmitted but are continually disputed through speech.

Second, the problem is that transfer-oriented solutions tend to neglect the institutional prerequisites. Heritage translations are very rarely done alone. They are embedded in organisations, policy frameworks, cultural agendas and governance structures. These institutional settings strongly influence the production and perception of translated literature. Thus, for one to understand legacy translation, it is necessary to focus analytic attention on social elements that extend beyond language itself [36–37].

Third, conventional techniques have difficulties in taking the ideological dimension of heritage transmission into account. Heritage discourse often places concerns of identity, validity, memory and cultural authority to the fore. Translation is a part of these processes, influencing the representation of historical narratives and cultural values. Thus, translation has to be explored as a location of the constitution of discourse and not only as a linguistic technique[37,52].

What is proposed here is a paradigm shift that overcomes these restrictions by re-defining heritage translation as a discourse production process. From this perspective academics can study the role of translated texts in the larger processes of meaning-making, representation and identity development. Furthermore, it encourages a more comprehensive theoretical integration of legacy studies and translation studies, which have historically yielded parallel but different results on culture and communication.

Integrating Functionalism, Translation Sociology, CDA, and OUV Discourse

One of the most important contributions this paper provides is a theoretical synthesis of a number of different complimentary systems. The discussion shows the importance of integrating multiple theoretical perspectives, such as critical discourse analysis, translation sociology, OUV discourse research and functionalism correspondingly, rather than following one single theoretical paradigm. From a functionalist approach, the form of heritage translations can be explained in terms of communicative goals and audience expectations. It emphasises the strategic dimension of legacy communication, acknowledging that translation choices are motivated by the purposes they serve [36–37].

The sociology of translation also adds an institutional dimension by explaining how translation is embedded in institutions of power and networks of cultural capital. The organisations, policies and social structures that influence heritage translations are those that determine how texts are created and how they travel around the world. Critical Discourse Analysis assigns great importance to ideology, representation and identity. It offers especially techniques to analyse the ways in which translated literature develop certain representations of reality and the impact of such constructs in social understanding [51].

The research produced by OUV discourse offers a deeper knowledge of the international heritage framework, the ways in which the relevance of heritage is legitimised and communicated. This indicates the importance of institutional discourse while developing narratives on global heritage. This blend of perspectives leads to a more complete understanding of heritage translation. Functionalism can explain a purpose. The sociology of translation offers the context. CDA describes meaning formation. The rhetoric of OUV makes the legitimacy of institutions explicit. The inclusion of these factors lends support to the underlying notion that legacy translation is best conceptualised as a discourse-constructive practice with textual, institutional and historical qualities [51].

Theoretical Implications

In the course of the debate several important theoretical implications are created. First, it expands the academic discipline of legacy translation studies by extending beyond traditional concerns of equivalence and linguistic transmission. The second benefit is that it establishes the legitimacy and usefulness of discourse construction as an analytical perspective for understanding legacy literature that have been translated. Thirdly, it strengthens the link between heritage studies and translation studies, by stressing the fact that both disciplines are about the creation of meaning and the representation of that meaning.

The research, first of all, views translators as active agents in the mediation of cultural and civilisational disparities. The translator's position changes from a passive conveyor of information to an active participant in the construction of heritage knowledge, cultural

representation and communal identity. This movement has the potential to re-examine the way legacy translation is viewed from a theoretical and methodological perspective.

Summary of the Discussion

We have shown that legacy translation has a function that goes far beyond language transfer. The study has shown that translated legacy writings contribute to the development of knowledge, representation of culture and construction of civilisational identities. Such participation was illustrated thru social constructivism, translation sociology, functionalism, critical discourse analysis and OUV discourse research. These results thus demand a paradigm change from language-centred techniques to a discourse-constructive perspective of heritage translation.

The research provides a more solid theoretical foundation for the study of translated legacy texts as socially situated artefacts of institutional and cultural meaning-making. This is accomplished by conceptualising translation as a specific type of discursive mediation. This reorientation in relation to the study program leads to the three-level framework of the textual, institutional and civilisational discourse. This framework offers a sound basis for future study on heritage translation and acts as a conceptual bridge to the next item.

5. Conclusion

The argument that will be discussed in this paper is that heritage translation should not be viewed as a language activity per se, but as a discourse-constructive practice that is embedded within larger social, cultural, and institutional processes. This responds to the boundaries of the dominant paradigms of translation, which have traditionally conceived of translation as the transfer of meanings from a source language into a target language. While these perspectives have made a significant contribution to the understanding of issues of equivalence, accuracy and effectiveness of communication, they offer only a partial explanation of the role of translation in the transmission of contemporary legacy.

As noted above, the literature has demonstrated that there have been major theoretical shifts in both legacy studies and translation studies. Heritage is no longer understood as a set of inherited items to be conserved but is more considered as a cultural and discursive construct, created thru interpretation, representation and institutional confirmation. Translation studies, from the outset, have similarly widened their focus from language concerns to questions of ideology, power, representation and social mediation. All this has happened simultaneously. And yet, throughout all this, the bulk of the work on legacy translation has remained rooted in transfer-oriented beliefs.

The findings of this conceptual study indicate that the position of heritage translation is fundamentally different from that of many other types of specialised translation. This is because tradition is formed through speech. Heritage, cultural value, authenticity and historical importance are not objective attributes that permanently exist inside cultural items. They are, rather, the product of interpretive labour that chooses some elements of the past and ascribes meaning to those elements. Hence, the task of legacy translation cannot be reduced to the transfer of pre-existent meanings, since the meanings themselves are generated thru conversation and are continually disputed.

According to the social constructivist perspective, translation is considered as an active agent in the social construction of heritage reality. Translators do not just reproduce descriptions of heritage, but also take part in the creation of narratives which are the vehicle by which heritage is made meaningful for different communities of language speakers (**Song, 2023; Yao et al., 2025). Hence legacy translation operates as a process of discursive mediation, connecting local cultural narratives with larger national, international and civilisational discourses.

In this reconceptualization there has been a basic shift in the focus of the discipline. In addition to the question of whether a translation faithfully reproduces a source text,

scholars should also examine the ways in which translation contributes to the production of legacy meanings, the ways in which it frames cultural narratives and the ways in which it influences international views of the significance of heritage. Such considerations shift the focus of the discussion away from language equivalence and toward the construction of discourse, so expanding the analytical scope of traditional translation studies.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Jiang, Y. He, Z. Chen, and S. Liu, "Optimization path of translation and dissemination of Shaanxi intangible cultural heritage digital platform," *Contemporary Education Frontiers*, 3(8), 177--187, 2025, doi: 10.18063/CEF.v3i8.898.
- [2] X. Zhao, and J. Zhang, "Cultural adaptation and translators' responsibilities in translating cultural heritage," *Journal of Humanities, Arts and Social Science*, 9(1), 27--31, 2025, doi: 10.26855/jhass.2025.01.004.
- [3] S. A. AlShaye, "Revisiting professional translation ethics in Saudi Arabia: A cultural perspective," *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 12, Article 509, 2025, doi: 10.1057/s41599-025-04830-y.
- [4] A. Thouki, and J. Skrede, "Re-framing authorised heritage discourse (AHD) within a realist explanatory framework: Towards a dialectical relationship between discourse and the extra-discursive," *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 31(4), 407--424, 2024, doi: 10.1080/13527258.2024.2437356.
- [5] P. S. Kupriyanov, "Conserving the "Left Bank": Authorized heritage discourse in the Romanov Part of Tutaev," *Etnograficheskoe obozrenie*, (2), 11--34, 2025, doi: 10.31857/S0869541525020027.
- [6] Y. Jin, B. Hou, and X. Kong, "The practice characteristics of authorized heritage discourse in tourism: Thematic and spatial," *Land*, 13(6), Article 816, 2024, doi: 10.3390/land13060816.
- [7] P. L. Berger and T. Luckmann, "The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge," Garden City, NY, USA: Doubleday, 1966.
- [8] J. Yao, S. A. A. Kasuma, and M. A. Moindjie, "Translation and ideology: A linguistic comparison of five English versions of The True Story of Ah Q," *Digital Studies in Language and Literature*, 2(1), 54--84, 2025, doi: 10.1515/dsll-2024-0023.
- [9] O. Abualadas, "Explicitation and ideology in media translation: The case of MEMRI," *Translation & Interpreting*, 16(1), 76--92, 2024, doi: 10.12807/ti.116201.2024.a05.
- [10] L. Lixinski, "Cultural heritage and interculturality: A call to action," *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 29(12), 1361--1373, 2023, doi: 10.1080/13527258.2023.2252790.
- [11] S. Salajegheh, "Tourists' reception of translated materials and translation service at Iranian heritage sites: A Tripadvisor study," *Iranian Journal of Translation Studies*, 23(89), 27--46, 2025.
- [12] G. Song, "Cross-cultural exchange of heritage in museums: A study of Dunhuang art in the Hong Kong Heritage Museum from the perspective of cultural translation," *Critical Arts*, 37(2), 85--99, 2023, doi: 10.1080/02560046.2023.2237094.
- [13] B. Wang, "On the pivotal role of cultural translation in the exchanges and mutual learning between civilizations," *Comparative Literature: East & West*, 7(2), 166--176, 2023, doi: 10.1080/25723618.2023.2269336.
- [14] E. Bielsa, "A translational sociology: Interdisciplinary perspectives on politics and society," Routledge, 2023, doi: 10.4324/9781003218890.
- [15] A. M. M. Youssef, "Rendering Naguib Mahfouz's novel titles into English: A functionalist orientation," *British Journal of Translation, Linguistics and Literature*, 4(3), 87--99, 2024, doi: 10.54848/c44qt688.
- [16] UNESCO World Heritage Centre., "Basic texts of the 1972 World Heritage Convention: December 2023 edition," UNESCO, 2023, doi: <https://whc.unesco.org/en/basictexts/>.
- [17] B. C. Aydın, "The role of critical discourse analysis in translation: A case of the political speech," *IU Journal of Translation Studies*, 20, 66--81, 2024, doi: 10.26650/iujts.2024.1408376.
- [18] M.-H. Liao, "Translation on display: Multilingual texts in multimodal museum space," Routledge, 2025, doi: 10.4324/9781003545286.

- [19] I. Mertens, and S. Decroupet, "Conceptualizing museum translation: Cultural translation, interlingual processes and other perspectives," *Babel*, 70(5), 593--614, 2024, doi: 10.1075/babel.00396.mer.
- [20] R. J. Neather, "Translating for museums, galleries and heritage sites," Routledge, 2024, doi: 10.4324/9780203702505.
- [21] UNESCO World Heritage Centre., "Authenticity in the context of the World Heritage Convention: Evolution and impact (WHC/25/25.GA/9)," UNESCO, 2025, doi: <https://whc.unesco.org/en/documents/223179>.
- [22] P. Rashidi, "Indigenous peoples at the heritage--climate change nexus: Examining the effectiveness of UNESCO and the IPCC's boundary work," *Review of International Studies*, 51(1), 42--63, 2025, doi: 10.1017/S0260210524000196.
- [23] Z. Wu, and J. Li, "Competing stakeholder discourses in constructing cultural heritage: The legal case of the house at No," 98 Hai'er Lane, China. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11, Article 1758, 2024, doi: 10.1057/s41599-024-04273-x.
- [24] C. Hill, "Decolonisation as a priority and not an afterthought": Traversing the Authorised Heritage Discourse in urban Aotearoa New Zealand," *Urban Policy and Research*, 42(4), 402--414, 2024, doi: 10.1080/08111146.2024.2362300.
- [25] L. Smith, "Uses of heritage," Routledge, 2006, doi: 10.4324/9780203602263.
- [26] J. E. Tunbridge, and G. J. Ashworth, "Dissonant heritage: The management of the past as a resource in conflict," John Wiley & Sons, 1996.
- [27] C. Maags, "State institutions as building blocks of China's infrastructures of memory---The case of intangible heritage," *Journal of Current Chinese Affairs*, 52(2), 163--184, 2023, doi: 10.1177/18681026221145950.
- [28] G. Susemihl, "Ideas, concepts and uses of heritage," In *Claiming back their heritage: Indigenous empowerment and community development through World Heritage* (pp. 25--88). Springer, 2023, doi: 10.1007/978-3-031-40063-6_2.
- [29] J. Munday, S. Ramos Pinto, and J. Blakesley, "Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications (5th ed.)," Routledge, 2022, doi: 10.4324/9780429288546.
- [30] S. Bassnett, and A. Lefevere, "Translation, history and culture," Pinter Publishers, 1990.
- [31] C. Zwischenberger, "On turns and fashions in translation studies and beyond," *Translation Studies*, 16(1), 1--16, 2023, doi: 10.1080/14781700.2022.2052950.
- [32] L. Van Doorslaer, and J. McMartin, "Where translation studies and the social meet: Setting the scene for 'Translation in Society,'" *Translation in Society*, 1(1), 1--14, 2022, doi: 10.1075/tris.22002.van.
- [33] C. Nord, "Functionalism," In R. Muñoz Martín (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of translation & interpreting*. AIETI, 2022, doi: 10.5281/zenodo.6366945.
- [34] G. M. W. Van Egdom, and C. Declercq, "Reviving functionalism: Applying translation-oriented text analysis to synthetic text (editing)," *Current Trends in Translation Teaching and Learning E*, 11, 2024, doi: 10.51287/cttl20247.
- [35] P. Casanova, "Consécration et accumulation de capital littéraire: La traduction comme échange inégal," *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales*, 144, 7--20, 2002, doi: 10.3406/arss.2002.2804.
- [36] A. Van de Pol-Tegge, "Cultural transfer and the sociology of translation: A processual approach," *Translation in Society*, 2(2), 146--166, 2023, doi: 10.1075/tris.23005.van.
- [37] A. Bochmann, "The sociology and practice of translation: Interaction, indexicality, and power," *Ethnography*, 24(6), 773--792, 2023, doi: 10.1177/14687941221124736.
- [38] T. Drepper, and M. Törner, "Reconstructing the social construction of reality: A typology of institutionalization and legitimation," *Social Sciences*, 14(5), 284, 2025, doi: 10.3390/socsci14050284.
- [39] P. Noormahomed, "Towards the definition of an ever-changing heritage: A reading of the (re)appropriation processes of the Torres Vermelhas in Mozambique," *Curator: The Museum Journal*, 65(3), 623--642, 2022, doi: 10.1111/cura.12506.
- [40] K. Kirtiklis, R. Laužikas, I. Kelpšienė, and C. Dallas, "An ontology of semiotic activity and epistemic figuration of heritage, memory and identity practices on social network sites," *SAGE Open*, 13(3), 1--13, 2023, doi: 10.1177/21582440231187367.

- [41] P. Martin-Rodilla, and C. Gonzalez-Perez, "Same text, same discourse? Empirical validation of a discourse analysis methodology for cultural heritage," *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities*, 38(1), 224--239, 2023, doi: 10.1093/llc/fqac038.
- [42] D. Dizdar, and T. Rozmysłowicz, "Collectivities in translation (studies): Towards a conceptual framework," *Translation in Society*, 2(2), 133--145, 2023, doi: 10.1075/tris.23003.diz.
- [43] M. Zoh, "The origins and developmental stages of the UNESCO World Heritage Convention's 'Outstanding Universal Value.'" *Journal of Humanities*, Seoul National University, 81(4), 425--452. 2024, doi: 10.17326/jhsnu.81.4.202411.425.
- [44] W. Meng, "Is power shifting? China's evolving engagement with UNESCO," *Global Policy*, 15(Suppl. 2), 97--109, 2024, doi: 10.1111/1758-5899.13373.
- [45] J. K. Seo, "Ideology and reality of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) under the World Heritage Convention," *InHa Law Review*, 26(4), 229--257, 2023.
- [46] UNESCO., "UNESCO and the Sheikh Hamad Award for Translation and International Understanding join forces to advance linguistic diversity and cultural exchange." 2024, doi: <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/unesco-and-sheikh-hamad-award-translation-and-international-understanding-join-forces-advance-0>.
- [47] G. Gasparyan, "Mediated translation from the perspective of Skopos theory," *Translation Studies: Theory and Practice*, SI-2, 102--110, 2024, doi: 10.46991/TSTP/2024.SI.2.102.
- [48] S. Chen, N. S. Mansor, C. Mooisan, and M. A. R. Abdullah, "Exploring cultural representation through tourism-related cultural words translation on Hangzhou tourism website," *World Journal of English Language*, 13(2), 168--178, 2023, doi: 10.5430/wjel.v13n2p168.
- [49] M. Todorović, "Heritage in and as diplomacy: A practice based study," *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 28(7), 849--864, 2022, doi: 10.1080/13527258.2022.2091637.
- [50] N. M. Abdelaal, and A. M. Alnagar, "A critical discourse analysis of translators' narratives affecting two translations of the same text: A case study of Orientalism," *Languages*, 8(2), 152, 2023, doi: 10.3390/languages802015.
- [51] K. Zotzmann, and J. P. O'Regan, "Critical discourse analysis, critical discourse studies, and critical applied linguistics," In W. Li, H. Zhu, & J. Simpson (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of applied linguistics* (2nd ed., pp. 57--67). Routledge, 2023, doi: 10.4324/9781003082637-7.
- [52] M. del M. Sánchez Ramos, "Volunteer translators in non-governmental organizations: Exploring their identity and power through discourse analysis," *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11, Article 581, 2024, doi: 10.1057/s41599-024-03103-4.