**Catherine Way/Sonia Vandepitte/Reine Meylaerts/Magdalena Batłomiejczyk (eds.) 2013.** *Tracks and Treks in Translation Studies. Selected Papers from the EST Congress, Leuven 2010.* **Benjamins Translation Library Vol. 108. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 298 pages. ISBN 978-90-272-2459-0**

The volume *Tracks and Treks in Translation Studies* contains 15 articles, 13 in English and one each in French and German, based on contributions made at the 6th Congress of the European Society for Translation Studies (EST) held in Leuven, Belgium, between 23 and 25 September 2010. The title of the Congress and volume is designed to convey the many directions and methods adopted in what the editors call the "often arduous task of research" (Way et al. 2013: 1) in Translation Studies (TS), presenting "a collage of the field, reflecting the diversity of tracks and treks in TS […] marked by translation scholars for future TS researchers and scholars from other disciplines to observe and integrate into their own research" in terms of both the areas covered by the selected papers and the research methodologies they describe (Way et al. 2013: 4). Although the editors freely admit to the absence of certain significant fields of investigation, such as audiovisual translation and newly emerging practices (transcreation, non-professional translation etc.), they nevertheless hope that this collection will "contribute to further fruitful interaction and cohesion, which are essential to the international status of TS" (Way et al. 2013: 4).

The articles in the volume do indeed cover a wide range of research interests and approaches, often interdisciplinary in their nature and/or potential. In the first, "Who's who and what's what in Translation Studies", Javier Franco Aixelà cogently argues the relevance of bibliometric studies in analysing, descriptively and evaluatively, key patterns and trends in the light of the "quantitative and qualitative boom" experienced by TS (Way et al. 2013: 7-8). He presents a preliminary project to assess impact using the now generally familiar BITRA database as a data source, which suggests that BITRA is a reliable tool both for mapping major "tracks and treks" in TS and for an accurate assessment of academic impact (Way et al. 2013: 24).

The second paper, "Translation in the network economy" by Hanna Risku, Nicole Rossmanith, Andreas Reichelt and Lukas Zenk, switches the focus to translation as a situated "sociological event" (see Chesterman 2013) in a networked professional environment and economy. As such, it marks a valuable contribution to an increasingly important strand of applied TS, workplace research. Comparing the results of a field study of a translation service company with one performed five years earlier (in 2002), it convincingly explores the growing dependencies of the company's employees and managers on other actors in the translation process and on the technologies deployed. Changes are identified in four key areas: increasing standardisation (of processes and communication), computerisation, specialisation (in work distribution) and networking (with external cooperation partners). The authors assign particular relevance to the more powerful, demanding role of translation managers, to the increasingly client- and resource-oriented nature of their work and to a shift in competence profiles, with language and cultural competencies required for fewer, more specific activities. There are implications here both for training and for future research, with the authors calling not only for related studies on translation quality and job satisfaction but also on empirical research to "extend its analysis of the individual to also include relevant social aspects […] by studying the social, organisational and relational network aspects of translation alongside those cognitive and local factors that apply to the individual actors involved in transcultural communication" (Way et al. 2013: 46).

By way of contrast, the next three articles describe studies exploring aspects of the individual act of translation and revision. Gyde Hansen's "Many tracks lead to the goal" presents preliminary results of a long-term process-oriented study of individual translation styles. Using a combination of product evaluation, key logging and retrospection with replay to compare the translation processes and target texts of professional translators with those they had produced as students ten years previously, the author attempts to identify whether participants' individual competence pat-

terns (ICP), or translation styles, have changed as they gained increasing professional experience. Interestingly, a limited sample of four processes and products seem to show they have not, suggesting that their ICP "had already developed during their 5-6 year long course of studies, or that cognitive processes, as required by translating, were perhaps already present in the participants' personality from the outset" (Way et al. 2013: 62). The article presents very good quantitative data analysis, but is clearly work in progress: it is unfortunate that the qualitative data in the commentaries receive only summary treatment and that the key issue of what led to the poorer quality products could not be addressed.

In "Triangulating translational creativity scores", a methodological study in translation process research derived from a published German PhD thesis (Bayer-Hohenwarter 2012), Bayer-Hohenwarter addresses the challenges of empirically studying translators' creativity. Her approach, a refined procedure for scoring creativity based on product- and process-based indicators, is discussed in detail, with an especially enlightening consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of using think-aloud data. Her study reveals convergent scores when a purely product-oriented analysis is compared to her own combined product-and-process approach. This appears quite convincingly to support the use of the latter – with the added diagnostic and didactic value that the process dimension potentially harbours for procedural performance profiling.

Robert's study of "Translation revision", by which other-revision is meant, highlights a key translation skill (see Risku et al. above) but a hitherto neglected area of research in TS. By analysing product quality and process data similar to that collected by Hansen and Bayer-Hohenwarter (key logging, think-aloud protocols and retrospective interviews), Robert examines the impact of revision processes on the product in experiments with 16 professional revisers in their normal working environment. Despite certain limitations in terms of sample size, ecological validity, tasking and data elicitation impacts, the results of her well-designed study indicate that revision procedure does have a significant effect on revision quality when full revision is performed. Methodologically, it widens and lengthens the trail cut by Künzli (2006, 2007), Mossop (2007) and others to investigate a field that clearly warrants further attention.

At this point, the volume diverts from its previous path. In "Understanding variability in interpreting quality assessment", Emilia Iglesias Fernández presents a meta-analysis of users' and interpreters' quality preferences, concluding that the often variable responses can be linked both to gender and to a lack of methodological refinement in assessing non-verbal delivery criteria – especially *pleasant voice*. This reception study is well executed and has clear implications for interpreting performance evaluation metrics in both professional and didactic contexts.

It is to translator training that the next two articles turn, with Rosemary Mitchell-Schuitevoerder considering "A project-based methodology in translator training" and Cécile Frérot writing on "Incorporating translation technology in the classroom". Mitchell-Schuitevoerder presents a fine case study of the process-oriented syllabus of a post-graduate translation and technology module, very much in line with those Kiraly (2013) has repeatedly called for. Significantly, she not only convincingly argues how interactive group learning can develop the professional competences and metacognitive skills which students need to meet the demands of the workplace, but also suggests that the project-based methodology, in facilitating action research and reflective teaching (González Davies 2005), serves to enhance the teachers' own critical self-awareness (Way et al. 2013: 140). Frérot's impeccably researched contribution concentrates on the advantages of using corpora to train translators, with parallel corpora in particular offering a powerful though neglected means to provide "evidence for translation strategies, raise student awareness of language differences and enhance their translations" (Way et al. 2013: 162). Presenting a then new tool to build and browse corpora and extract terminology, the article is forward-looking, anticipating as it does an array of recent conference presentations and publications on corpus-based translator training and practice.

Corpora remain in focus in the volume's ninth paper, Josep Marco's "Tracing marked collocation in translated and non-translated literary language", which also introduces to the collection the

theme of literary translation. Comparing data from the English-Catalan section of the Valencian Corpus of Translated Literature (COVALT) with texts originally written in Catalan, his case study of 23 translations (and their source texts) and 17 original texts show positive and negative transfer ("interference") to be an important factor in collocative markedness. However, the primary interest of this study lies in its method (quantitative and qualitative cluster analysis followed by manual concordance analysis), which according to Marco (Way et al. 2013: 187) may be replicated to explore collocation in translation in other language pairs, genres and even time periods.

Back in 2010, eye-tracking was most certainly a "new trek" in process-oriented research (Way et al. 2013: 192, 202). A good example of the pioneering work being done at the time is Agnieszka Chmiel's and Iwona Mazur's article "Eye-tracking sight translation performed by trainee interpreters", which uses the method to investigate an under-researched area of interpreting practice, though one the authors incorrectly describe as "rarely taught to prospective interpreters" (Way et al. 2013: 190). The experiment reported made use of a manipulated English source text to determine cognitive effort on the basis of fixation count, fixation duration and observation length within an area of interest (AOI) among interpreting students at different levels of training. Although no group effects were found in terms of skills development, the study does possess methodological value, despite the caveats of a purely process-oriented study that made no use of product data to ascertain quality of performance. Indeed, the authors themselves point to this potential weakness in the strong self-reflective conclusion, proposing that eye-tracking data should be triangulated with product research and other process elicitation techniques such as retrospective commentaries.

With Waltraud Traub's "Who are *they*?" the collection returns to research on translators' processes, this time undertaken to scrutinise decision making in literary translation. She uses key-logging records, concurrent and retrospective verbal reports, paper records (notes, printed drafts and hand-written revisions), final target texts and questionnaire-based biographical data to analyse how five German translators of a Hemingway short story respond to particular features of the source text and arrive at their various target-text versions. In particular, she examines the way they handle the weak implication of an underspecified personal pronoun (*they*) and a humorous pun. The results indicate that source-text reception involves much more cognitive effort than hitherto assumed, but more importantly that translators' role awareness and self-concept play a key part in governing translation processes. Given the limited scope of the study, the main interest of the article remains methodological: it highlights the usefulness of such empirical data in understanding major factors influencing translators' choices and demonstrates that process-oriented techniques like those described by Hansen, Bayer-Hohenwarter and Robert (see above) can be beneficially applied to literary translation, too.

The literary locus is extended by Alexandra Assis Rosa's consideration of "The power of voice in translated fiction". Working squarely within a linguistically oriented Descriptive Translation Studies framework (see Toury 2012) and using elements of Narrative Theory, Critical Discourse Analysis and Appraisal Theory, she develops and deploys a classification of discourse representation to study the interpersonal dimension of translated fictional discourse. Concentrating on interpersonal meaning in narrator-character-narratee relations in a corpus of extracts from three of Dickens' novels and 14 corresponding Portuguese translations, her fascinating study analyses the applicability and operability of these discourse representation categories by grouping them into the binary modes of dialogic contraction (narrative report of speech acts, indirect speech, free indirect speech) and expansion (direct speech, free direct speech). The results show how the translators, all working in the second half of the 20th century, appear to align their target texts with readers' discursive norms, "rendering Dickens' narrators less conspicuous and less audible" (Way et al. 2013: 240). However, the results themselves are of less relevance than the methodological aspect foregrounded in this contribution. Assis Rosa cogently concludes that her proposed classification, in producing text-linguistic dependent variables relatable to pertinent contextual independent variables, should allow comparative discursive profiling, both qualitative and quantitative, of any

narrative fiction source and target texts.

Continuing along the literary track, Hanne Jansen's "The author strikes back" examines the additional comments with which writers provide their translators in order to determine how these authors seek to influence the interpretation and translation of their work. She regards these often copious instructions as special forms of paratext worthy of analysis not only because they are relevant to translation sociology but also because they mark the stages by which original texts evolve into transitory *texts to be translated* (Way et al. 2013: 264). For her, the authors explicitly mediate between their work and the translators as a response to the threat of losing authorship.

Like Risku et al. (see above), Jansen's article looks at translation as an event involving actors – and factors – that bring external influences to bear on the (cognitive) act of translation and the activities of the translator. This is also the track broadly followed by the two final contributions to this volume. In "Les sources de la traduction et leur valeur heuristique en Histoire", Dolores Sánchez explores the fruitful interdisciplinary interface between TS and the History of Science. Viewing the translator as an agent in a socio-discursive practice interacting with other socio-discursive practices, she analyses Paul Julius Möbius' *Über den psychologischen Schwachsinn des Weibes* and its Spanish translation to reflect on the interpretative and heuristic potential of translation sources and paratexts. Her article succinctly reveals how translations contribute to the discursive construction of the reality from which they emerge.

The volume closes with "Zur Münchhausen-Rezeption in Portugal" by Maria Antónia Gaspar Teixeira. This case study of the Portuguese adaptation of the adventures of Baron Munchausen serves to illustrate the applicability of polysystem theory (Even-Zohar 1978/2012) to the exploration of translation in its historical and social contexts. The author presents and discusses representative changes made by the translator-adaptor which effectively demonstrate his suppression of socio-political, erotic and ethical-religious issues raised in the source text. She concludes that the adaptation reflects the conditions of production and reception prevalent in 18th-century Portugal, betraying characteristics of a conservative approach to translation aimed at satisfying conventional reader tastes rather than subverting dominant positions in the literary polysystem with new, incompatible elements.

In terms of research interests, objects and methods, *Tracks and Treks in Translation Studies* covers a wide expanse of ground, and in so doing clearly reaches the objectives it expressly set out to achieve. The clearly written, well-structured and scrupulously researched articles are diverse, ranging across non-literary and literary translation, sight translation and interpreting, translation acts and events, didactics, workplace and reception studies, process- and product-oriented research, cognitive translatology, DTS and polysystem theory. As such, they constitute a collection that not only reflects the heterogeneity, dynamism and interdisciplinarity of TS at the time of the 6th EST Congress but also – with the exception of those specialised fields explicitly identified by the editors – anticipates many of the major directions and approaches taken in TS today. My only (minor) reservation concerns the volume's macro-structure: always a difficult undertaking with so many diverging treks to report, the ordering and grouping of the papers could have better reflected the authors' theoretical, teleological and methodological tracks.

## References

Bayer-Hohenwarter, Gerrit 2012: *Translatorische Kreativität. Definition – Messung – Entwicklung*. Tübingen: Narr.

Chesterman, Andrew 2013: Models of What Processes? In *Translation and Interpreting Studies* 8/1, 155-168.

Even-Zohar, Itamar 1978/2012: The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem. In Venuti, Lawrence (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*. 3rd revised edition. London/New York: Routledge, 162-167.

González Davies, Maria 2005: Minding the Process, Improving the Product: Alternatives to Traditional Translator Training. In Tennent, Martha (ed.), *Training for the New Millenium: Pedagogies for Translation and Interpreting*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 67-82.

Kiraly, Don. 2013: Towards a View of Translator Competence as an Emergent Phenomenon: Thinking outside the

Box(es) in Translator Education. In Kiraly, Don/Hansen-Schirra, Silvia/Maksymski, Karin (eds.), *New Prospects and Perspectives for Educating Language Mediators*. Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempo, 197-224.

Künzli, Alexander 2006: Translation Revision: A Study of the Performance of Ten Professional Translators Revising a Technical Text. In Gotti, Maurizio/Šarčević, Susan (eds.), *Insights into Specialized Translation*. Bern: Peter Lang, 195-214.

Künzli, Alexander 2007: Translation Revision: A Study of the Performance of Ten Professional Translators Revising a Legal Text. In Gambier, Yves/Shlesinger, Miriam/Stolze, Radegundis (eds.), *Doubts and Directions in Translation Studies. Selected Contributions from the EST Congress, Lisbon 2004*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 115-126.

Mossop, Brian 2007: Empirical Studies of Revision: What We Know and Need to Know. In *The Journal of Specialised Translation* 8, 5-20.

Toury, Gideon 2012: *Descriptive Translation Studies – and Beyond*. Revised edition. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

*Gary Massey*
*Institute of Translation and Interpreting*
*Zurich University of Applied Sciences*