

HANSEN, GYDE, CHESTERMAN, ANDREW, and GERZYMISCH-ARBOGAST, HEIDRUN, eds (2008): *Efforts and Models in Interpreting and Translation Research: A Tribute to Daniel Gile*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 302 p.

Jonathan Ross

Volume 56, Number 4, December 2011

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1011268ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1011268ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal

ISSN

0026-0452 (print)

1492-1421 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this review

Ross, J. (2011). Review of [HANSEN, GYDE, CHESTERMAN, ANDREW, and GERZYMISCH-ARBOGAST, HEIDRUN, eds (2008): *Efforts and Models in Interpreting and Translation Research: A Tribute to Daniel Gile*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 302 p.] *Meta*, 56(4), 1028–1031.  
<https://doi.org/10.7202/1011268ar>

what the author refers to as alternating attention, constantly adjusting and re-allocating cognitive effort in line with various underlying sub-tasks. Typographic errors may coincide with such switches in effort allocation. The author describes a study which examined occurrences and distributions of *interventions*, defined as interruptions in the flow of typing followed by any keyboard activity not adding to the rightmost boundary of the text, and *missed phenomena*, or *anomalies* that should have prompted the translator to intervene. Subjects tended to intervene more frequently regarding typographic errors when translating than when revising. This suggests that the translator forms interpretations during the act of translating, followed by more shallow interpretations after the task completes. This shallowness results in typographic errors being overlooked in one's own work. Interestingly, many of the typographic errors found in subjects' translations seem to involve inadvertently typing the letters of words which actually appear in subsequent words in the same text passage. This seems to corroborate the translator's tendency to fixate on problematic words well in advance of their actual production in the target text.

In Chapter 9 (p. 191-218), Alves and Liparini Campos examine how the internal and external support tendencies of professional translators are impacted by time pressure and the presence of a terminology management system (TMS). Internal support involves tapping into world knowledge and refraining from using external resources. External support involves turning to such resources instead of relying on one's own encyclopedic knowledge. Both forms of support are utilized in situations involving *orientation*, the time span from when the ST is first viewed to the time when the first character is produced in the TT, *drafting*, defined as the time from when the first character is entered in the TT until the last character is entered, and *revision*, or the time from when drafting ends to the time the translator feels he or she is finished with the task. The study reports that professionals spent very little time on orientation as a separate stage of translation. Both orientation and revision behavior were marked by the utilization of simple internal support. All subjects exhibited fewer revision pauses under time pressure. When the translators had access to a TMS, there was an increase in the occurrence of dominant internal support for orientation. In other words, support was predominately internal for all tasks. These findings further confirm the tendency for professionals, unlike students, to rely more on internal support before turning to online resources when encountering problems.

In the volume's concluding chapter (p. 219-

251), Stamenov outlines the optimal structure of a prompting dictionary for the translation of cognates. Weaknesses of current dictionary resources can be traced back to a fundamental mismatch between the way information is presented to the user in the dictionary and the way the bilingual retrieves cognates from the mental lexicon. Most dictionaries do not consider formal similarities, despite the fact that psycholinguistic research points towards a tendency for the bilingual to recognize cognates as such based on matches in form. Stamenov takes a "less is more" approach in presenting a dictionary entry model with three interrelated levels of prompting that correlates directly with the manner in which the bilingual accesses lexical items. The first prompt level provides the translator with two or three target language equivalents if problems with a ST word are indicated by gaze data in the form of extended fixations. If the first level prompt does not suffice, a second level prompt provides the translator with a series of senses associated with the word, along with their equivalents in the target language. Finally, if required, a third level prompt provides the translator with phraseological information for the cognate. This chapter shows the promise of well thought out efforts to integrate the findings of psycholinguistic research into the design of computer-assisted translation tools.

In summary, this volume provides the reader with a number of novel models and methodologies for tapping into the "black box" of translation. TAPS, keystroke logging, and eye-tracking are utilized in novel ways to study a wide range of translation phenomena and activities. *Behind the Mind* is a true showcase for innovative approaches to translation and cognition.

ERIK ANGELONE AND GREGORY M. SHREVE  
Kent State University, Kent, USA

HANSEN, GYDE, CHESTERMAN, ANDREW, and GERZYMISCH-ARBOGAST, HEIDRUN, eds (2008): *Efforts and Models in Interpreting and Translation Research: A Tribute to Daniel Gile*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 302 p.

*Efforts and Models in Interpreting and Translation Research* is a collection of fourteen articles written in honour of Daniel Gile, interpreting and translation researcher and teacher, conference interpreter and technical translator, and "former mathematician," as Gile puts it. The contributions to this Festschrift, by eminent colleagues and collaborators of Gile, genuinely honour him by responding more or less directly to his ideas, methodologies

and diverse research concerns, thereby testifying to his wide-reaching influence in the field.

The articles are arranged into four sections: “Scientometrics and history,” “Conceptual analysis,” “Research skills” and “Empirical studies,” with the latter (consisting of six articles) being the largest, mirroring Gile’s own passion for empirical work, especially on the subject of conference interpreting. The two articles in the first section lead us appropriately into the *Festschrift* by underlining Gile’s contribution to Interpreting and Translation Studies in very concrete ways. Nadja Grbić and Sonja Pöllabauer deploy the tools of scientometric analysis to document the quantity, thematic breadth, and impact of Gile’s publications. Franz Pöchhacker outlines the history of the discipline through discussing its “turns,” “traditions,” “shifts” and “paradigms” and drawing attention to the way in which individual scholars like Gile have determined the trajectory of the field. Invoking Mary Snell-Hornby’s taxonomy of scholarly roles (Snell-Hornby 2006), he crowns Gile the “master” of the field of Interpreting Studies.

Other articles engage, sometimes quite critically, with theories and methods with which Gile has come to be associated. Andrew Chesterman’s discussion of “The status of interpretive hypotheses,” for instance, starts by gently contesting a claim Gile made in 2005 that research in Translation Studies draws on two main paradigms: that of the liberal arts tradition and that of empirical science. Chesterman argues that the paradigms “might not be so different after all” (p. 49), in that both of them have a place and need for interpretive hypotheses.

Unsurprisingly, given the book’s title, one of Gile’s innovations that receives particular attention is his Effort Models (Gile 1995), which are subject to a powerful and well-grounded yet even-handed critique by Anthony Pym. Pym concedes the overall usefulness of Gile’s theory, concluding that – in an era when translators are having to work to ever tighter time constraints – the Effort Models might be more salient to written translation than even Gile himself had assumed. What he takes issue with, though, is the assumption behind the Effort Models that the apparent failures of simultaneous interpreters can be explained principally as a reflection of their incapacity to ensure that the sum-total of their four Efforts (Listening and Analysis, Short-term Memory, Speech Production, and Coordination of the four Efforts) does not exceed their overall processing resources. Pym argues that contextual factors also need to be considered when analysing interpreted output and, with delightful *chutzpah*, makes his point by reinterpreting data from the very experiment that Gile had used to substantiate an aspect of his Effort Models (p. 90).

A less critical view of the Effort Models is evident in Ingrid Kurz’s “The impact of non-native English on students’ interpreting performance,” which reports on a pilot study conducted by one of Kurz’s MA students at the University of Vienna (Kodrnja 2001). Dominika Kodrnja’s thesis had furnished empirical evidence in support of Gile’s hypothesis that “a higher processing capacity is required for comprehension when the speaker has a strong foreign accent” (p. 180). Although Kodrnja’s rigorous methodology is admirable, one wonders whether the findings of the experiment might have been more interesting and more indicative of simultaneous interpreting in general had different participants been chosen. Kodrnja compared the way two groups of five students interpreted the same speech read out in part by an English native speaker and in part by a non-native speaker with a marked foreign accent, and she concluded that both of the groups interpreted much more effectively when their source was the native-speaker. Kurz explains this in Gilean terms as follows: “Too much mental capacity was needed for comprehension (listening and analysis), so that the capacities required for speech processing and speech production were insufficient” (p. 190). This certainly makes good sense. However, a more complex and interesting picture of the relationship between the accent of a speaker and the performance of interpreters might have been obtained if the subjects had been experienced interpreters instead of novices with merely “at least two semesters’ experience with simultaneous interpreting” (p. 185), whom one would expect to falter when faced with a challenge such as a strong accent. Heike Lamberger-Felber and Julia Schneider’s case study “Linguistic interference in simultaneous interpreting with text” is a good contrasting example of the benefits that can be derived from studying the performance of seasoned interpreters.

Apart from Kurz and Lamberger-Felber and Schneider, two other authors – Ángela Collados Aís and Miriam Shlesinger – respond with their articles to Gile’s call for more empirical research into simultaneous interpreting. In her fascinating piece “Towards a definition of *Interpretese*: An intermodal, corpus-based study,” which gives a taste of the kinds of insights that Corpus Interpreting Studies can provide, Shlesinger takes up issues that have preoccupied Gile and that several other authors address in their articles, namely the relationship between written and oral translation and the ways in which research methodologies for investigating one modality can be used for studying the other.

To recap so far, while some articles in *Efforts and Models in Interpreting and Translation Research* concentrate on documenting Gile’s important place

within our discipline, others are more focussed on engaging with his ideas, and still others heed his plea for empirical research. A fourth category in which one could place certain contributions – notwithstanding the fact that many texts fulfil multiple functions at once – is that of articles that echo Gile's concern for rigour and thoroughness in scholarly thinking, research and writing. As a prime example of this, Heidrun Gerzymisch-Arbogast addresses the topic of the writing of abstracts, drawing on her own experience of collaborating with Gile on a one-day course in research paper writing and reading. In demonstrating the need for abstracts to communicate effectively to their readers and evaluators, she makes fruitful use of Schulz von Thun's "Four Tongues-Four Ears" model. My one objection to this very instructive article is the author's advice "Before writing an abstract for a conference or a journal publication, it [...] saves time and effort to check what the conveners of a conference or the editors of a journal stand for – and as a result refrain from even applying when it is clear that our own stance proposes a thesis that is outside the group's scope and positions" (p. 135). It is difficult to argue with the advice not to submit an abstract on a subject beyond the boundaries proposed by the initiators of the conference or publication. However, maintaining that scholars should avoid raising a challenge to the "positions" of the organisers seems remarkably defeatist, since it denies the need for discussion between different and even opposing views and could legitimate meetings, books and journals in which every author is preaching to the converted.

Another accessible and practicable article is Barbara Moser-Mercer's "Constructing quality." In view of the widespread use of surveys as a means for researching the quality of interpreting, the author emphasises the need for more thoughtful and careful application of this methodology. In addition to explaining some of the basic concepts and procedures in surveying, she makes some invaluable concrete recommendations to those interested in researching perceptions of the construct "quality" with regards to simultaneous interpreting.

Something that any new student of Translation Studies is immediately struck by is the proliferation of terms: many scholars seem to invent new terms to refer to a phenomenon which other scholars have already named, and often we find the same term used in quite different ways by different writers. In his article (in French), Yves Gambier demonstrates this problem with respect to the term "strategy." He ends with an appeal for a more assured and stable metalanguage (p. 79), proposing the use of "strategy" to refer to global and macro-strategies and "tactic" to denote a conscious or

automatic way of dealing with a specific kind of problem within a translation.

As should be evident from the above, *Efforts and Models in Interpreting and Translation Research* is a rather eclectic collection in terms of the subject-matter of its individual contents. The glue that holds the latter together is their relevance to the research interests, ideas and scholarly and pedagogic principles of Daniel Gile. From the perspective of readers, the range of issues covered may prove a strength or a weakness. A reader relatively new to the field will get a sense of the vigour and meticulousness with which seasoned experts in Interpreting and Translation Studies approach their subject and will have their eyes opened to the diverse topics and methodologies available to interpreting researchers in particular. He or she is sure to derive benefit from the eminently practicable contributions on "research skills." It is debatable, though, how useful articles such as those by Gerzymisch-Arbogast and Moser-Mercer, which appear to be pitched at researchers at the beginning of their academic careers, will be for more experienced readers, who would perhaps derive greater pleasure from the contributions related to new research or to ongoing debates on concepts and methodologies. Furthermore, whereas most of the authors seem to have striven to make their articles easily readable and accessible to a wide range of readers, through techniques such as the explanation of field-specific terminology and concepts, an interpersonal style, preference for verbalisation over nominalisation, "signposting," and the occasional mid-text recap, a small number of articles in the book are conspicuously challenging and imply a reader with greater pre-knowledge than is the case elsewhere. The clearest example of this is Minhua Liu's "How do experts interpret? Implications from research in Interpreting Studies and cognitive science." Although this is an impressive survey of the state of research on expertise in interpreting, the uninitiated reader will find themselves confronted with a plethora of technical terms (largely from the cognitive sciences) like "subvocalization" and "digit span tests," which are not always defined or illustrated and thus render the article rather difficult to digest.

As one would expect from a book edited by three such prolific veterans of Translation and Interpreting Studies and published by John Benjamins, there are minimal typos, the articles are formatted in a consistent manner, and the various tables and figures are visually attractive and easy to decipher. Helpful name and subject indexes have been added, as well as a chronologically-ordered list of Gile's publications. The editors' preface contains a potted summary of each article which, combined with the finely-tuned abstracts, should

enable readers of all levels of expertise to appreciate at least the general issues at stake.

In the introduction to his article for a *Festschrift*, the Canadian neuroscientist Endel Tulving quips that, besides honouring a scholar, “a *Festschrift* frequently enough also serves as a convenient place in which those who are invited to contribute find a permanent resting place for their otherwise unpublished or at least difficult-to-publish papers” (Tulving 2007: 39). Tulving’s contention undoubtedly holds true for some *Festschriften* but certainly not for *Efforts and Models in Interpreting and Translation Research* which contains for the most part fascinating and inspiring contributions and which does justice to its dedicatee in a number of ways.

JONATHAN ROSS

*Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, Turkey*

#### REFERENCES

- GILE, Daniel (1995): *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- GILE, Daniel (2005): The liberal arts paradigm and the empirical science paradigm. Visited on 5 November 2011, <[http://www.est-translationstudies.org/resources/research\\_issues/The%20liberal%20arts%20paradigm.html](http://www.est-translationstudies.org/resources/research_issues/The%20liberal%20arts%20paradigm.html)>.
- KODRNJA, Dominika (2001): Akzent und Dolmetschen. Informationsverlust beim Dolmetschen eines non-native speaker’s. Master dissertation, unpublished. University of Vienna.
- SNELL-HORNBY, Mary (2006): *The Turns of Translation Studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- TULVING, Endel (2007): Are there 256 different kinds of memory? In: James S. NAIRNE, ed. *The Foundations of Remembering: Essays in Honor of Henry L. Roediger*. III. New York: Psychology Press, 39-52.
- TORIKAI, KUMIKO (2009): *Voices of the Invisible Presence*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 197 p.

This book is based on Torikai’s Ph.D. thesis which was submitted in December 2006 to the University of Southampton. In this book, the author brings light to the role of interpreters in the arena of intercultural communication. Using the method of oral history, the author brings actual interpreters’ life stories to the fore in order to make clear what these interpreters experienced and thought about during their careers. The main research questions asked throughout this book are as follows: 1) “What kind of people became interpreters in post-WWII Japan?”; 2) “How did they perceive

their role as interpreters?”; and 3) “What kind of role did they actually play in Japan’s foreign relations?” By exploring in depth what the five pioneer interpreters recounted, she is able to display the complex nature of answers to these questions.

This book can be useful and informative for a range of readers including educators and trainers of interpreters, students who are studying interpreting or researchers in Interpreting Studies, scholars whose academic fascination lies in the history of interpreting and intercultural communication, and those who are simply interested in learning more about interpreting, a profession that is often considered *invisible*. This book is the first of its kind on interpreting history in post-WWII Japan and provides new directions in Interpreting Studies.

There are seven chapters in total. In the first chapter, the introduction, the author introduces the general development of interpreting as well as rationales for using oral history as a core method for this study. The chapter also provides background information on the five chosen pioneer interpreters.

The second chapter presents a brief history of both interpreting and translation specifically in Japan, connecting the distant past to post-WWII situations. In chapter three, the author analyzes the *habitus* (in Pierre Bourdieu’s sense) of the five pioneer interpreters in Japan with a focus on how they learned English or grew up bilingual as well as their experiences of WWII. In chapter four, she further analyzes each *habitus* at the entrance to the world of interpreting and how these interpreters established themselves as specialists in intercultural communication in post-WWII Japan.

The fifth chapter provides details about what these interpreters experience in the *field* of interpreting. The interpreters’ actual recounts in this chapter vividly illustrate their experience as professional interpreters in Japan during the period in which the country was progressively developing as a member of the global community. This chapter is at the core of this book and shows readers the authentic world of interpreting. It is notable that these five interpreters had very different experiences. As well, their perceptions and understanding of interpreters’ roles also varied significantly.

In chapter six, the author explores insights into the practice of interpreting and interpreter’s roles in relation to the issue of intercultural communication while drawing on the findings from Claudia Angelelli’s 2004 study on the role of interpreters. This chapter reveals that an interpreters’ role is generally understood as that of *kurogo*, “the supposedly invisible help” on the stage of *kabuki* theatre (p. 154). This analogy is effectively