SEM38. Glossing and translanguaging as conceptualizations about trans-semiotizing practices, identity construction and humane culture

11 September h. 16:00-18:30, PN 14

Convenors
Laura Diamanti (Università degli Studi di Enna "Kore") laura.diamanti@unikore.it
Heather Pagan (University of Westminster, London, UK) H.Pagan@westminster.ac.uk

Abstract
Glossing and translanguaging have long been pivotal in the study of language contact, offering insights into how multilingual speakers negotiate meaning and construct their linguistic identities. From Middle English to the present, glossing has served as an interpretive tool in contexts of linguistic hybridity, mediating between Latin, French, and English in medieval texts such as Ancrene Wisse and Piers Plowman (Machan, 1994; Burrow & Turville-Petre, 1996).

Glossing has historically enabled EFL (English as a Foreign Language) learners to position themselves as active interpreters of meaning, engaging with language as a dynamic and socially embedded phenomenon (Kim, Lee & Lee, 2024). Whereas, translanguaging supports "[…] language users entextualize meaning in situated and embodied interactions, drawing on neural, bodily, and situational resources" (Wei, 2023). In particular, translanguaging challenges the monoglossic view opposing the deterministic one: it entails spontaneous human languaging as a multilingual, multisemiotic, multisensory, and multimodal resource for sense- and meaning-making. Translanguaging pedagogies may empower learners by validating their linguistic resources, challenging rigid language hierarchies, and promoting metalinguistic awareness (García & Wei, 2014).

Two questions arise: 1) Can historical glossing practices prefigure the translanguaging strategies observed in contemporary multilingual contexts? 2) Can glossing and translanguaging be based on common ground in trans-semiotizing practices in multilingual contexts? Glossing and translanguaging foster critical cognitive and identity-building skills and underscore their shared role in shaping multilingual subjectivities to cultivate linguistic flexibility, critical thinking and cross-cultural understanding (Aloni & Weintrob, 2017)

Additionally, digital technology has introduced new spaces for translanguaging, whereas online glossaries, digital annotations, and machine-assisted translation tools function as modern glossing mechanisms favouring multilingual negotiation (Pérez-Llantada, 2020). Digital platforms amplify translanguaging by enabling real-time, multimodal exchanges across linguistic boundaries, reinforcing the interplay between historical and contemporary multilingual practices (Androutsopoulos, 2015). Contributions from linguistic and humane education studies, including ongoing research, are encouraged.

References
Androutsopoulos, J. (2015). Networked multilingualism: Some language practices on Facebook and their implications. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *19*(2), 185–205.
Aloni N. & Weintrob L. (2017). *Beyond bystanders. Educational leadership for a humane culture in a globalizing reality*. Sense Publishers.
Burrow, J. A. & Turville-Petre, T. (1996). *A book of Middle English*. Blackwell.
García, O. & Wei, L., (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
Kim, H. S., Lee, J. H. & Lee, H. (2024). The relative effects of L1 and L2 glosses on L2 learning: A meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, *28*(1), 7–28.
Machan, T. W. (1994). *Textual criticism and Middle English texts*. University Press of Virginia.
Pérez-Llantada, C. (2020). *Scientific discourse and the rhetoric of globalization: The impact of culture and language*. Bloomsbury.
Wei, L. (2023). Towards critical translanguaging pedagogy – New ways of raising and answering questions from a Global South perspective. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, *20*(3), 298–303.

SEM38. Papers

11 September h. 16:00-18:30, PN 14
- *Scribes, readers and glosses in Medieval language learning texts* (Christine Wallis, University of Sheffield, UK)

- *False friends in glossing and translanguaging: Semiotic shifts, identities and humane culture* (Elisabetta Pavan, Università degli Studi di Padova)
- *Discussing translanguaging in the context of multilingual education: a focus on mediated learning and language planning* (Annalisa Bonomo, Università degli Studi di Enna "Kore")
- *Translanguaging in learning cities: Nurturing linguistic diversity and cultural heritage for inclusive community development* (Raffaella Leproni, Università degli Studi Roma Tre)
- *Translanguaging and the semiotics of translation: Reframing hybridity in film reviews* (Laura Diamanti, Università degli Studi di Enna "Kore")

SEM38. Abstracts

Discussing translanguaging in the context of multilingual education: A focus on mediated learning and language planning

Annalisa Bonomo (Università degli Studi di Enna "Kore") annalisa.bonomo@unikore.it

The global spread of English rethinks language epistemology beyond the geographical terms. This has implied attempts to grasp and unravel the pluricentricity of English in its ongoing characters within and outside the World Englishes and New Englishes frames. The next step of such a process, in Pennycook's words, is "to move away from nation based models of English and to take on board current understandings of translingual practices across communities other than those defined along national criteria." (2008, 30.4). Considering these developments, English teaching and language planning in multilingual education embody new communicative repertoires, moving EFL beyond the grammar and translation label, and rethinking translanguaging as a tool for critical literacies, as texts are never neutral and English Language Learners too may be engaged in critical literacy practices as active learners grappling with conflicting perspectives. However, translanguaging is always affected by a number of factors, such as, "crossborder mobility, shared language proficiencies of speakers, contextual and spatial frames, education and occupation which predefine the linguistic choices and translanguaging patterns." (Halvin, 2022, p. 12). English classes are then 'contact zones' where critical cognitive and identity building skills are called in action, drawing on a multilingual awareness which can gather, process and interpret meaning as a bridge between historical glossing and translanguaging effects in bi/multilinguals. In addition, translanguaging theory and practice dissolve restrictive language boundaries in monolinguals too as all speakers translanguage, "that is, all speakers select features from their linguistic repertoires that seem to be most appropriate for the communicative task at hand" (Garcia & Otheguy, 2021, p. 15).

Thus, relying on "multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of their bilingual worlds" (García, 2009, p. 45), translanguaging fosters dynamic meaning-making processes, increasing active engagement in class environments. That is, teachers and students should consider it as a "pedagogical strategy" which, as glossing in the past, create "merged spaces" that "utilize translation, code-switching, and any synthesis of multilingual elements" (Song, Howard & Olazabal-Arias, 2022) involved in multilingual language learning.

Though defining translanguaging is far from being straightforward, the present work muses on its "going between different linguistic structures and systems, including different modalities (speaking, writing, signing, listening, reading, remembering) and going beyond them" (Song, Howard & Olazabal-Arias, 2022) with a special focus on how can translanguaging improve specific learning goals, what should teachers or supervisors do in order to use it as an effective pedagogical strategy, and to what extent translanguaging cues can be accepted as steps of "a process of knowledge construction that goes beyond language(s)"(Wei, 2017, p. 12)

References
García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Wiley.
García, O. & Otheguy, R. (2021). Conceptualizing translanguaging theory/practice juntos. In CUNY-New York State Initiative on Emergent Bilinguals, (Eds.), *Translanguaging and transformative teaching for emergent bilingual students*, (pp. 3-24). Routledge.
Halvin, T. (2022). Multilingualism and translanguaging in migration studies: Some methodological reflections. *FQS*, *23*(1), 1-28.
Kramsch, C. (2006). The traffic in meaning. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *26*(1), 99–104.
Pennycook A. (2009). Plurilithic Englishes: Towards a 3-D model. In Murata K. & Jenkins, J. (Eds). *Global Englishes in Asian contexts: Current and future debates* (pp. 194–207). Palgrave Macmillan.
Pennycook, A. (2008). Translingual English. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, *31*(3), 30.1-30.9

Song, J., Howard, D. & Olazabal-Arias, W. (2022). Translanguaging as a strategy for supporting multilingual learners' social emotional learning. *Educ. Sci*. 2022, *12*(7), 475.

Wei, L. (2017). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, *39*(1), 9–30.

<div align="center">✻</div>

Translanguaging and the semiotics of translation: Reframing hybridity in film reviews

Laura Diamanti (Università degli Studi di Enna "Kore") laura.diamanti@unikore.it

This paper examines film reviews through the lens of Translanguaging theory, focusing on how linguistic, pragmatic and situated features shape their rhetorical structure. Drawing on the concept of the reconceptualisation of language as a dynamic (García, 2009, p. 93) and integrated semiotic repertoire (García & Wei, 2014, pp. 14–18), the analysis moves beyond monoglossic models to approach the text type of film review as hybrid and situated at the intersection of information, evaluation, and interpretation. Its structure reflects: an informative prose describing the plot summary and the character roles; a persuasive evaluation, attributing positive or negative judgment; a stylistic flair for wordplay, irony, and metaphor (Diamanti, 2025, p. 91). Considering these features, Translanguaging theory allows for an interpretation of hybridity not as interference, but as a resource for making meaning across linguistic and cultural systems.

Two research questions are formulated: (1) How do linguistic, rhetorical, and semiotic facets contribute to the hybridity of film reviews as translatable genres? Investigating how linguistic features (idioms, evaluative lexis), rhetorical strategies (irony, contrast, intensification), and semiotic cues (titles, paratextual markers) interact allows the understanding of the text-specific hybridity of film reviews in translation. The genre analysis framework emphasises the interaction between discourse purpose and textual structure (Hatim & Mason, 1997, pp. 32-33), through a classification of text types based on communicative function (Reiss, 2000, pp. 105–110). (2) What translanguaging-informed strategies best support the translation of hybrid genre elements such as idioms, metaphors, and evaluative tone in film reviews? The exploration of translanguaging-informed strategies emphasises repertoire-based decision-making, context-sensitive reformulation, and genre-aware equivalence. This methodological stance aligns with the pedagogical demand for translation training that prioritises functional and discursive competence (Colina, 2015, pp. 140–149), and the emphasis on critical genre awareness in the translator's education (Saldanha & O'Brien, 2014, pp. 81-83).

Ultimately, the paper proposes a translanguaging-based model for teaching translation that positions film reviews as sites of complex, hybrid meaning-making. By reframing translation as a practice of semiotic negotiation, rather than interlingual substitution, the study aims to contribute to current debates in translation pedagogy and applied linguistics regarding how to prepare students to translate culturally and rhetorically layered texts.

References
Colina, S. (2015). *Fundamentals of translation.* Cambridge University Press.

Diamanti (2025). The Film review as a hybrid text: Translating journalistic language. *International Journal of Linguistics 17*(4), 156.

García, O. (2009) *Bilingual education in the 21st Century: A global perspective*. Wiley.

García, O. & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Hatim, B. & Mason, I. (1997). *The translator as communicator*. Routledge.

Reiss, K. (2000). *Translation criticism: The potentials and limitations.* St. Jerome.

Saldanha, G. & O'Brien, S. (2014). *Research methodologies in translation studies.* Routledge.

<div align="center">✻</div>

Translanguaging in learning cities: Nurturing linguistic diversity and cultural heritage for inclusive community development

Raffaella Leproni (Università degli Studi Roma Tre) raffaella.leproni@uniroma3.it

The UNESCO concept of Learning Cities emphasises inclusive lifelong learning that embraces cultural diversity and promotes social cohesion (UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning, 2015). This paper explores how translanguaging practices can serve as powerful pedagogical and social tools within Learning Cities, fostering linguistic diversity while supporting identity construction and community belonging. Drawing on García and Wei's (2014) conceptualisation of translanguaging as going beyond code-switching, the fluid movement between languages emerges as a critical enabler for

citizens to negotiate meaning across cultural boundaries, particularly in contexts of increasing mobility and demographic change (Azara et al., 2023).

The analysis highlights how translanguaging approaches can help overcome communicative challenges identified in the UNESCO Beijing Declaration, particularly for marginalised communities whose linguistic heritage faces erosion (UNESCO, 2013). Translanguaging creates spaces where minority languages can coexist with dominant ones, including English, without perpetuating linguistic hierarchies (Leproni, 2023); rather than positioning English merely as a lingua franca (Jenkins, 2015), it can be conceptualised as one component in a rich multilingual landscape that values all linguistic resources equally, supporting what Norton and Toohey (2011) describe as identity investment in language learning.

The paper connects these theoretical perspectives with practical applications from an ongoing Erasmus+ KA220 project on Audiovisual Translation for Minority Endangered Languages, demonstrating how translanguaging pedagogies can support intergenerational knowledge transmission, community resilience, and inclusive citizenship (Marchetti, 2022). Also, it examines how digital technologies might amplify translanguaging spaces in Learning Cities, creating environments where endangered languages gain new domains of use and transform urban contexts into inclusive communities where linguistic diversity becomes a foundation for social cohesion rather than a barrier to it, aligning with Wei's (2023) vision of critical translanguaging pedagogy as a tool for social transformation.

References

Azara, L., Leproni, R. & Agrusti, F. (Eds.). (2023). *Learning cities: Sfide e prospettive delle città che apprendono*. Carocci.

García, O. & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Jenkins, J. (2015). Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a Lingua Franca. *Englishes in Practice*, *2*(3), 49-85.

Leproni, R. (2023). Lingue e linguaggi nella Città che apprende: alfabetizzazione plurilinguistica, incontro interculturale e valori UNESCO nella Learning City. In Azara, L., Leproni, R., & Agrusti, F. (Eds.), *Learning cities: Sfide e prospettive delle città che apprendono* (pp. 93-112). Carocci.

Marchetti, L. (2022). *Sulla tradizione orale. Il mito, il canto, il pianto*. Mimesis.

Norton, B. & Toohey, K. (2011). Identity, language learning, and social change. *Language Teaching*, *44*(4), 412-446.

UNESCO (2013). *Beijing Declaration on Building Learning Cities*. UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning.

UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning (2015). *Guidelines for Building Learning Cities*. UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning.

Wei, L. (2023). Towards critical translanguaging pedagogy – new ways of raising and answering questions from a Global South perspective. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, *20*(3), 298-303.

<div align="center">✱</div>

False friends in glossing and translanguaging: semiotic shifts, identities and humane culture
Elisabetta Pavan (Università degli Studi di Padova) elisabetta.pavan.1@unipd.it

This contribution explores the pedagogical potential of false friends in English as a foreign language (EFL) education, particularly through glossing and translanguaging practices. In the field of English language education, false friends, words that appear similar across languages but differ in meaning, are often seen as linguistic errors and obstacles; nonetheless, they can offer valuable learning moments and become productive learning opportunities. False friends sometimes confuse learners, but they also open to metalinguistic insight. When integrated into teaching strategies, false friends can enhance metalinguistic awareness, support identity formation, and promote culturally sensitive education. Besides, when addressed through glossing and translanguaging, these lexical mismatches help learners develop deeper linguistic awareness, engage with identity formation, and build empathy across cultures (Banks, 2008). False friends should be leveraged, not avoided, in EFL instruction informed by trans-semiotizing theory (Alvarez, 2022; Kress, 2010). False friends interrupt expected patterns, compelling learners to confront the limits of their assumptions and engage in analytical meaning-making (Canagarajah, 2013). This aligns with the lexical approach's emphasis on noticing chunking as essential to vocabulary acquisition: Lewis (1993) argues that learners internalise vocabulary more effectively when it is presented in lexical chunks and real-life contexts where semantic contrasts, such as those arising from false friends, become salient. The translanguaging approach allows learners to use their full linguistic repertoires, which fosters hybrid identities rather than suppressing non-native features (Garcia & Wei, 2014). False friends may also function as sites of identity negotiation where learners evaluate linguistic belonging and difference.

The humane dimension of pedagogy emphasises empathy and intercultural understanding (Banks, 2008): false friends reveal implicit cultural worldviews, prompting learners to question ethnocentric interpretations and engage with difference (Kramsch, 2009). Finally, glossing becomes especially effective when used contrastively with false friends. providing learners with etymological, contextual, and pragmatic insight. Students can be guided to produce reflective glossaries containing not only meanings but also cognitive reflections and cultural annotations (Boers, 2022).

In practical terms, false friends can be incorporated into interactive classroom activities, such as language games and roleplays, to enhance retention and engagement. However, they must be handled with care, as improper use may lead to the internalisation of incorrect meanings or cultural misunderstandings.

References

Alvarez Valencia, J.A. (2022). Trans-semiotizing and re-sourcing resources in language education. Towards a multimodal social semiotic perspective on intercultural communication. In Norbella, M., de Mejía, A. & Valencia Giraldo, S. (Eds.), *Language education in multilingual Colombia: Critical perspectives and voices from the field* (pp. 172-187). Routledge.

Banks, J. A. (2008). *An introduction to multicultural education* (4th ed.). Pearson.

Boers, F. (2022). Glossing and vocabulary learning. *Language Teaching*, *55*, 1–23.

Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. Routledge.

Garcia, O. & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Kramsch, C. (2009). *The multilingual subject: What foreign language learners say about their experience and why it matters*. Oxford University Press.

Kress, G. (2010). *Multimodality: A social semiotic approach to contemporary communication*. Routledge.

Lewis, M. (1993). *The lexical approach: The state of ELT and a way forward*. Language Teaching Publications.

*

Scribes, readers and glosses in Medieval language learning texts

Christine Wallis (University of Sheffield, UK) c.wallis@sheffield.ac.uk

John of Garland's *Dictionarius* is a text designed to teach Latin vocabulary by taking readers on an imaginary walk through Paris. In addition to the main text, many surviving manuscripts contain a commentary giving grammatical and etymological information and/or vernacular glosses explaining the vocabulary of the original text (Pagan et al., 2023). This supplementary material provides a valuable insight into how the *Dictionarius* was used to teach Latin, and how it was received by its audience.

Investigating glosses from multiple manuscripts of the same text reveals that glossators do not always act in the same way. For example, glosses in Bruges, Public Library MS 536 show signs of translanguaging-like strategies which encourage the use of linguistic resources across languages and sometimes rely on lexis with fuzzy language affiliation to help readers construe the text. These interlinear glosses are added by multiple hands, giving the impression of a community of practice which is deeply involved in using and interacting with the text. The evidence from this manuscript suggests that glossators used translanguaging as 'a deliberate pedagogical strategy to facilitate language acquisition within a multilingual community of practice' (Wallis et al., 2024).

On the other hand, the fourteenth-century manuscript, Berlin Staatsbibliothek lat. fol 607 demonstrates a much weaker understanding of the text and its transmitted glosses. Here the glosses form part of a grammatical and etymological commentary interspersed among the main text. As such, this glossing forms an integral part of the supporting material transmitted alongside the main text, and includes vernacular glosses labelled *gallice* ('French') or *anglice* ('English'). However, the manuscript's text is full of transmission errors: Hunt (1991: 154) states that 'the scribe has misplaced [gloss] items and frequently did not understand what he was copying'. For example, the scribe glosses *peritoneon* with the French *cercle de cul*, but gives *wiulbon* (MED s.v. *whirl-bon*, 'kneecap', which glosses *internodium* in other manuscripts) as the equivalent English term. Elsewhere, for the Latin *gingiva*, the etymologically English *gummus* is labelled *gallice*. Dealing with this material raises questions for modern-day researchers; there are undoubtedly transmission errors which suggest that the scribe may not have understood (or paid attention to) the text in his exemplar, but how certain can we be that the English *gummus* wasn't in fact used by French speakers (c.f. Rothwell, 2004)? This paper, then, explores some of the ways in which we can interpret gloss material for evidence of the linguistic resources of the producers and consumers of medieval grammatical manuscripts.

References

Hunt, T. (1991). *Teaching and learning Latin in thirteenth-century England*. Brewer.

Middle English dictionary (MED): https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-englishdictionary/dictionary

Pagan, H., Seiler, A. & Wallis, C. (2023). Linguistic layers in John of Garland's *Dictionarius*. *Études Médiévales Anglaises*, *102*, 63–108.

Rothwell, W. (2004). Ignorant scribe and learned editor: Patterns of textual error in editions of Anglo-French texts. *Anglo-Norman Dictionary*: https://anglo-norman.net/ignorant-scribe-and-learned-editor/

Wallis, C., Seiler, A. & Pagan, H. (2024). Multilingual glossing and translanguaging in John of Garland's *Dictionarius*: The case of Bruges, Public Library MS 536. *Lexis* HS 3: http://journals.openedition.org/lexis/8693