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A Review Essay
Translation is no more an activity of literary scholars, freelancers, or part-time amateurs; it is a distinct and autonomous profession, an academic discipline, demanding more respect and recognition. It is basic to social equilibrium in several bilingual-multilingual countries [as in Canada, Belgium, Finland, Romania, countries of erstwhile Yugoslavia (Bosnia, Croatia), South Africa, and in bodies like the UN, EEC, SAARC, Commonwealth, etc.], where interlinguistic communication is not possible without adequate translation and interpretation. Even if English is the lingua franca in a great part of the world, translation and interpreting are indispensable for integrating and preserving multilingual societies; for developing understanding and peace among individuals, groups, and nations; for exchanging ideas and knowledge; for technology transfer and international trade and commerce; and for cultural cooperation and assistance.

However, despite understanding the importance of translation and interpretation, and some improvement here and there, I suspect that people in India have not been forward-looking in their approach to developing facilities for translators’ and interpreters’ education and training. Nor have many scholars shown serious interest in examining their problems empirically or reflecting on their profession with an awareness of the perspective of cross-cultural communication. Obviously, not enough research has been done even to develop a viable translation theory (based on grammatical, lexical, cultural, and discourse structures) for use in Indian contexts.

Understanding the professional problems of world workers is the raison d’etre of Cay Dollerup and Loddegaard’s book: the editors are aware of the importance of academic training programs for professional translators and interpreters in Europe. Organizing 36 articles into nine sections, they deal with certain central issues in translation and interpretation ranging from culture-specific
problems to internationalization of the profession. The contributors examine various problems related to teaching translation for general and specific purposes, knowledge of translation theories, technical and literary translations, dubbing and subtitling, consecutive and, simultaneous interpretation, evaluation, etc.

*Teaching Translation and Interpreting*, the book version of the papers presented in the first “Language International” conference held at Elsinore, Denmark, from May 31-June 2, 1992, provides a broader state-of-the-art view of interest to common readers and language professionals concerned with teaching translation and training interpreters. It is rich in teaching ideas and approaches, just as it explains without much jargon and acronym intricacies of the translator’s and interpreter’s job as specialists across the world. The editors, leaders in Copenhagen Studies in Translation, rightly call the book an “enduring monument” of international debate and shoptalk with “descriptions of the present and visions of the future.”

The book opens with three articles that provide a general, but significant, perspective to translation as a profession. Mary Snell-Hornby (Vienna) explains *a la* Alexander Tytler (1791) that, though a good translator must demonstrate mastery of both the source and target language, knowledge of the material concerned, ease of style, and understanding of the author’s message, to be effective today, he must also be proficient in the source and target cultures: translation, according to her, is not a mere bilingual activity and, therefore, a professional translator must be an interdisciplinary specialist with expertise in language, culture, and communication. Delineating an advanced training program for the professional translator at the Institute of Translation and Interpreting in Vienna, she emphasizes that academic institutions should develop a flexible modular system allowing for different types of combination (p. 15), rather than a narrow-minded specialization, so that the translator of the future could be an intellectual polymath and polyglot.

Brian Smith, providing an overview of translation activities in Brunei, which, albeit poor, furthers the argument of Mary Snell-Hornby and notes that there is not only conflict between the language users and language policy planners, but also lack of commitment from the government, with the result that there is a high degree of “artificiality” about the role of translators and their training in modernizing the country.

Anne-Marie Beukes reflects on changes in translation activities in the post-Apartheid democratic South Africa, a polyglot society, where most people habitually use two or more languages on a daily basis. It is expected that English will continue to remain a major language in the future colinguistic configuration of South Africa *vis-a-vis* the ANC’s declared policy for expression of the “full humanity of all our people.”

The second section (seven articles) focuses on teaching translation. Christine Nord (Germany) deals with translation-oriented text analysis based on the functional approach (“Skopos theory”). In her concept, the translator is called upon to produce a “functional target text” which conforms to the requirements of “translation Skopos” i.e., the intended target function determined by the addressees of the translation. Her model of translation training addresses itself to four specific translation problems: pragmatic, cultural, linguistic, and text-specific.
Rune Ingo (Finland) draws attention to four fundamental aspects of translation theory: grammatical structure, linguistic variety (style), semantics, and pragmatics (i.e., functional and situational determinants). Ingo’s concern is: “The translated text must function pragmatically in its new cultural context, and it must generally also semantically convey the right information.”

The next three articles deal with ways, means, and perspectives in teaching and classroom work. Patricia Hörmann (Chile) presents her case study of introducing theory in a translation course: she discovers that theoretical concepts are better grasped when preceded by practice. Gabriella Mauriello (Italy) offers certain practical suggestions for teaching translation based on text linguistics, emphasizing syntactic structure, semantic aspects and style, LSP, and terminology. Maria Sainz (Uruguay) reports a few interesting techniques that can be followed for developing translation skills at the university level.

Riitta Ottinen (Finland) describes some special courses developed for teaching translation of fiction with a dialogic point of view. She particularly mentions her experience of translating Anita Desai and Lee Kingman in class, combining theory and practice, on the one hand, and closely collaborating with publishers, on the other.

The section ends with Brian Mossop’s (Canada) suggestion for a course in revision training with orientation at three levels: (i) professional preparation for work as a translator, (ii) professional preparation for target-language editing work, and (iii) the theory of rewriting.

Several scholars consider translation as an interdisciplinary practice. Hannah Amit-Kochavi (Israel) reports a Hebrew University case study of moving translator training from the humanities to the social sciences department, while Gustav Winkler (Germany) presents an unorthodox course in Flensburg Polytechnic, combining engineering with translation.

In the fourth section (four articles), J. Sager’s (Manchester) expert article deals with teaching terminology as part of degree courses in translation, as he believes that translation is a decision-making process, and knowledge of terminology can help a translator in deciding “whether to create a neologism or whether to provide a paraphrase of the not-found word or term.”

Miriam Shlesinger’s (Israel) empirical study deals with the process of lexicalization vis-a-vis the eradication of certain features of “translationese” whereas Arnt Jakobsen’s (Denmark) article explores possibilities of teaching the translation of technical compounds in Danish and English, as compounds are difficult in Germanic languages.

Seed-Ali Miremadi (Iran) suggests that a native speaker’s linguistic ability to produce words can be used when one needs equivalents for new foreign words or concepts.

The fifth section, “New Media and Teaching,” opens up the possibility of teaching translation at a distance (a Spanish case study), of using computers in translation training, even if it is expensive(Germany), and of teaching television subtitling, a new university discipline in Denmark.

Henrik Gottlieb’s article is important in that there is a surprising shortage of scholarly studies of dubbing (covert translation) and subtitling (overt translation), despite the fact that these have come to be increasingly used with the development of TV broadcasting all over the world. I believe that
serious scholarly discussion of sound-track translation and subtitles should go a long way in improving the quality of TV programs and in raising the status of subtitlers everywhere. It should make a good study to examine, for example, the semiotic impact of screen translation on the total message and the effect on audience of dubbing versus subtitling.

The four contributors in the next section address themselves to interpretation and translation training activities in Switzerland, France, Spain, and the UK, examining, in the main, the similarities and differences between the two modes, possible models for their teaching and learning, usefulness of theoretical input in developing appropriate professional skills, and the common ground provided by discourse analysis in the pedagogics of interlingual transmission and intercultural exchange.

The authors make several valid observations besides presenting the rationale behind the curricula developed in their respective institutions. They are all guided by the readers’ and listeners’ expectations and requirements just as they understand the need for translators’ and interpreters’ ability to render the flavour of the original and the original author’s intention. Since it is common to find practicing professionals, freelancers, and self-made translators often questioning the relevance of translation theory in teaching courses, they effectively explain the communicative aspects of translation and interpretation, clarifying the concept of language interpretation, and communication. They analyse translation and interpretation as language processes, as communicative activities and as discourse and dynamic systems. The teaching courses they propose are built upon general competence of learners to meet the job-specific requirements in varying contexts.

The seventh section, with seven articles, highlights simultaneous and consecutive interpreting exclusively: Franz Pöchhacker (Austria) argues in favour of a general theory of translation and interpretation, which can be integrated into the training program for conference interpreters.

Bistra Alexieva (Bulgaria) discusses textual combinations which create difficulties in simultaneous interpreting: the author pleads for using language and culture-specific application of cognitive and experiential models in a workshop to train interpreters.

Kambiz Mahmoodzadeh (Iran) reflects on the characteristics of a good interpreter, “an anonymous middleman in meetings,” whose consecutive presentation in the target language is a creative exercise.

Ana Ballester and Catalina Jiménez deal with teaching analytic and mnemonic strategies to first-year students of interpreting at the University of Granada (Spain).

Ingrid Kurz (Austria), who stresses consideration of the findings of neuropsychological research on the psychological structure of speech processes, presents a critique of the use of “shadowing” exercises in interpreter training. But shadowing, howsoever necessary, is a controversial issue.

Sylvia Kalina (Germany), who believes that a text or discourse is processed in a strategic manner, pleads for a “differentiated approach” to the teaching of consecutive and simultaneous interpretation, as different strategies are adopted in monolingual and bilingual discourse processing.

The last article in the section describes the methods tried to generate
interpretational competence through participation in a real conference situation in Canada, where French and English coexist as official languages.

The two articles in the “Assessment” section deal with testing learners’ achievement in translation classes (an Iranian case) and exploitation of the concept of error analysis in translation and foreign language teaching (a Spanish case).

The last but one section with three articles focuses on a world for the student translator beyond school. Gerard McAlester discusses from a Finnish angle the possibility of including a course in translation in the foreign-language teaching program, using the concept of needs analysis.

Giovani Pontiero (UK) points to the practical realities of literary translation, revealing how ivory-tower attitudes can be self-defeating.

I agree with the view that an exceptionally good knowledge of the target language, rather than the original language, is essential for a literary translator to be effective. A literary translator should be able to use his art and craft with responsibility to capture the spirit of the original: one can avoid both under-translation and over-translation with recourse to appropriate dictionaries, reference works on synonyms, idiomatic phrases and proverbs, encyclopedia articles, and, above all, constant touch with the native speakers-users of the target language. The problems of translating metaphors, alliteration, collocations, puns, word-play, proper names, neologisms, cultural words, eponyms (like Gandhism, Thatcherism), non-equivalent words (like jaunty), acronyms, imagery, symbols, and even problems of timbre, register, rhythm, and tone of a given text are genuine, just as finding exact “communicative equivalence” across different languages is challenging. Academically trained and university-based translators can respond to these problems, if they are not “obsessive” about what they call dose textual renderings. Giovani Pontiero decries inflexible attitudes of certain literary translators and quotes the Argentinian writer Jorge Luis Borges to drive home his contention: “Don’t translate what I’ve written but what I wanted to say.”

The section ends with Sergio Viagio’s (UN) argument for training interpreters in such a way that they are able to understand well, analyze intelligently, and write or talk with a reasonable degree of competence.

The editors dose the book with an impressive list of “works cited,” which should help teachers, researchers, and policy planners to move in the right direction.

I wish there had been some study on translation in advertising for products meant for global consumption, since translation of advertisements often involves more than just language: sight, sound, and other non-linguistic features: symbol, and cultural artifacts, or iconic elements of advertising interpretable in terms of cultural codes in a given context. Translation of advertisements on TV and cinema screens, and cross-cultural print advertising (which are complex social events, as Marshall McLuhan noted once), seems to be a potential area of deeper study. I expect that in the next “Language International” conference, Cay Dollerup will also try to include a paper on translation of legal texts, an important area of LSP practices.

All the same, despite the European bias, which is understandable as translation and interpretation have been, not only rediscovered in Europe for several utilitarian reasons, but also for European geopolitical and
historical facts, the informed views and opinions of the contributors to the book of Cay Dollerup and Anne Loddegaard should help translators and interpreters gain the recognized status of an expert.

_Teaching Translation and Interpreting_ is a significant record of the current concerns of translation and interpretation as disciplines. The book tastefully produced, provides an essential overview of the broad issues’ concern to all those professionals and practitioners involved with language and translation teaching, training, and research. The articles in the volume with their diverse but complementary perspectives, not only add to the growing corpus of empirical studies in translation and interpretation in the West, but also clear the cobwebs that undervalue the profession. It is indispensible both for practicing translators and interpreters and all those supporting staff professionals-librarians and reference workers, language data bank specialists, policy planners, terminologists, and editors who assist them.

********

Review by
Rachel Weissbrod,
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem,
Israel


This volume, edited by Cay Dollerup and Anne Loddegaard of the University of Copenhagen, consists of 35 articles on the teaching of translation and interpreting, a selection of the papers presented at the first Language International Conference held in Elsinore, Denmark (May 31 to June 2, 1991).

Unfortunately, the formal organization, which could have served as a guide to the foci of such a large volume, seems somewhat vague. It is not clear why, for instance, the first section, titled “National Perspectives and the Future”, includes three articles as it does, when others would fit there just as well. Then, the term “New Media” in the title of another section refers to different things altogether: using new media - mainly the computer - to teach translation, and translating for new media (subtitling). Perhaps it would be clearer to describe the various articles as advancing from a “micro” to a “macro” level. Thus, the volume may be seen as starting with information on - and suggestions for - specific courses and methods of teaching. Articles on this topic include the impressive presentation of a cognitive approach to interpreter training (Bistra Alexieva) and the introduction of strategies for improving students’ skills of comprehending and memorizing (Ana Ballester and Catalina Jiménez). The volume then proceeds to examine the course and structure of Translation Studies as a whole in various institutions. In this category I found most interesting the attempts to combine language proficiency and translation theory and practice with specialization in a specific area of knowledge - from acupuncture and whaling (as Mary Snell-Hornby relates about her students in Vienna) to engineering, which is taught together with trans-
lation at Flensburg Polytechnic (Gustav Winkler). It then goes on to discuss the relationship between Translation Studies and the department, faculty or institution to which they belong. In this context Hannah Amit-Kochavi examines the implications of moving Translation Studies from the humanities to the social sciences at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Finally comes the question of the role of translating and translators in various places around the world and its bearing on teaching. This issue is highlighted by e.g. Gerard McAlester, who stresses the importance of teaching translation into a foreign language in a “minor language” community (Finland, in this case) trying to “export” itself to the world.

The heterogeneity of issues discussed is paralleled by the heterogeneity of approaches to these issues, and this is not always for the better. In their foreword the editors emphasize the importance of an “open dialogue between colleagues, between various nationalities and cultures, between inquisitive novices and experienced hands. Such meetings, indeed clashes, of opinions, views, and experiences make for mutual inspiration” (p. 1). They further claim that “papers have been chosen because they represent different voices ... as in real life, in teaching, in professional life, and in research” (p. 2). In fact, there is more here than a chorus of voices. Progressing from one article to another sometimes makes one feel like a time-traveller. In an era when research in psycholinguistics and neuropsychology is applied to increase the efficacy of teaching (as Ingrid Kurz and Sylvia Kalina show so convincingly), and when modern technology is employed for the same task (see Willi G. Scherf’s contribution), it is embarrassing to find a mystical approach to the discipline, which is presystematic, if not entirely unsystematic. Speaking of translation in terms of a miraculous process and a great adventure (as Giovanni Pontiero does) sounds rather odd in such company.

Consulting up-to-date research does not ensure that it will be used where it is most needed by the teacher of translation. This problem is exemplified in Gabriella Mauriello’s article, in which she complains that “there is plenty of good literature on the theory of translation, but very little, as far as I know, on the practice of translation and on how to teach it. Most works deal with the final result of the translation process” (p. 63). Her solution is “using myself as a guinea pig during the translation process” (p. 66). Other participants in this volume prove how unwarranted this approach is by exemplifying the application, in teaching, of research on the process of translation (e.g. Willi G. Scherf who relies on the work of Wolfram Wilss and others for that purpose). A similar void is felt in Anthony Pym’s article. The writer convincingly describes translational competence as the union of two skills - the ability to generate a series of target texts and the ability to select only one of them. According to him, the answer to the question of how to select is open to debate and negotiation, since there is no single correct answer. Indeed, there is none, but it can be argued that attention should be paid (particularly in class) to the principles - not just ad hoc considerations - which, as abundant research has shown, affect translators’ decisions in real life (e.g. cultural norms, the universal tendency to explicitate while translating, and the tendency - discussed by Miriam Shlesinger in this volume - to preserve the structural patterns of the source text).

Most disturbing, however, is the confusion of theorizing with dictating rules. It is open to debate if the teacher’s role is to preach his or her stand to the students as, rather, as Margaret Lang suggests (p. 206), to acquaint them with various ways of translating and help them assess the merits and weaknesses of each. But even if rules are dictated, should they not be presented as such rather than as theoretical pronouncements, i.e. generalizations about translation reality? When, for instance, Rune Ingo declares that “language-specific structure rules should, of course, be respected” (p. 51), or that “the translator ought to respect the traditions and conventions observed in the target language when rendering different types of
text” (p. 55), is he still following his intention - to deal with fundamental aspects of translation theory? In this same volume, Gerard McAlester comments on the problem while raising the question: “To what extent should such programmes [i.e. training programmes] be dictated by the prescriptive statements of translation theory (which often focuses on what the activity of translation should be rather than what it is) ... ?” (p. 293; italics in the original). Unfortunately, detachment from reality also leads to idealization of what can be achieved in translating: students “must make the translation sound like a text written in the target language, but without changing the message contained in the source text” (María Antonia Alva-rez, p. 152). But is it a realistic requirement or should we accept, as Toury (1991: 190) puts it, that “every decision made in the course of translation has its price somewhere else”?

Despite these problematic aspects, the volume is a valuable source of information which offers inspiring ideas for both teachers of translation and designers of translation programmes in schools of translation and interpreting and in academic institutions. The reader also benefits from its insights into recent theoretical and empirical translation research. Another merit of this volume is that it leads the way to further discussion of the many troubling questions raised:

Being an interdiscipline, what is the proper place for Translation Studies in academe? Should it be part of the humanities, of the social sciences or of any other faculty (as in Montevideo, where translation - according to María Julia Sainz’s report - is taught at the School of Law and Social Sciences)? And what should be the scope and function of a single course, or of any combination of courses, in another department (communication, linguistics, literature)? How is the training of translators to relate to the training of a new generation of teachers (and researchers - which often amounts to the same thing)? In some schools for translators (in Vienna, for instance, as reported by Mary Snell-Hornby) one can build one’s way up the pyramid to the PhD degree. But what about university departments which offer just a single course in translation, or schools which grant a diploma and not an academic degree? Should the teachers - and the researchers - come, then, from other disciplines, as they did in the past? All these questions call - cry! - for further discussion.
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Review by
Jean Deslisle,
Université d’Ottowa
Canada


Cet ouvrage réunit les trente-cinq communications présentées à Elsinore (Danemark) lors du premier congrès organisé sous les auspices de Language International, dont Geoffrey Kingscott est le rédacteur en chef, et de la maison d'édition John Benjamins (Hollandse). Ce congrès eut lieu du 31 mai au 2 juin 1991. C’est donc un véritable tour de force qu’on a réalisé, par deux directeurs de cet ouvrage en publiant ce recueil de textes dans l’année qui a suivi le congrès, mais il faut les féliciter aussi et surtout pour l’exceptionnelle qualité de leur travail d’édition. Chacun sait que préparer les actes d’un congrès en vue de leur publication est une tâche ingrate, mais dans ce cas-ci, les responsables ont eu d’heureuses initiatives.

En effet, dans un souci fort louable de clarté et de lisibilité, ils ont extirpé «merci-lessly» (p. 1) presque tout le jargon et tous les acronymes des communications. Il faut leur savoir gré d’avoir ainsi produit un ouvrage d’une grande clarté et qui se caractérise par son unité de style. Il s’en dégage une étonnante homogénéité ; on a l’impression qu’il est l’œuvre d’une même plume. Même s’ils n’ont pas opéré un choix parmi les communications présentées, toutes méritaient d’être publiées. Aucune ne «réinvente la roue», même si certains auteurs apportent une contribution plus originale que d’autres. On peut même dire que, dans l’ensemble, cet ouvrage trace un bilan fidèle et assez complet de la situation actuelle de l’enseignement de la traduction et de l’interprétation dans le monde, en Occident tout au moins.

Bien que toutes les communications soient rédigées en anglais («English is the language of exchange of ideas, not of power and oppression (p. 2)», précisent les directeurs en guise d’excuse), un large éventail de pays sont représentés : Danemark, Royaume Uni, Israël, Allemagne, Espagne, France, Autriche, Canada, mais aussi des pays dont on conçoit moins la situation de l’enseignement de la traduction comme l’Iran, le sultanat de Brunei, l’Afrique du Sud, la Finlande, le Chili, l’Uruguay et la Bulgarie. Par ailleurs, les directeurs ont eu la bonne idée de regrouper en fin de volume tous les ouvrages cités, ce qui allège considérablement la présentation. Enfin, chose rarissime dans des actes de congrès, ils ont ajouté un index des sujets traités ce qui transforme ce recueil de textes en ouvrage de référence facile à consulter. Détailé et tres bien fait, cet index de douze pages découle l’utilité de la publication. Vraiment, il faut le répéter, Cay Dollerup et Anne Loddegaard ont accompli un travail remarquable dans un temps record. D’une présentation impeccable, cet ouvrage est un modèle du genre, un exemple à imiter. Ma seule réserve d’adresse à l’éditeur. Le prix de l’ouvrage (79 $ US) me semble quelque peu élevé. Cela risque de faire reculer certains acheteurs potentiels et de restreindre la diffusion du livre. La couverture rigide était-elle indispensable? Vise-t-on surtout le marché des bibliothèques?

*Teaching Translation and Interpreting* est un heureux mélange de considérations théoriques et pratiques sur l’art (ou la technique) de l’enseignement de ces deux professions-sœurs. Tous les principaux aspects de cette problématique y sont abordés : méthodes d’enseignement, composition des programmes, apport des autres disciplines, intégration des nouveaux diplômés au marché du travail, évaluation des apprentissages, rôle de la théorie, etc. il est impossible de résumer le contenu de chacune des communications, dont plusieurs présentent des points de vue originaux. À la lecture de cet ouvrage, on note certaines lignes de force, certaines idées qui reviennent comme des leitmotive sous la plume des auteurs, pourtant venus d’horizons très différents. Plusieurs exposés reaffirmant la nécessité de dispenser un enseignement *sui generis* de la traduction professionnelle, distinct de la formation donnée en linguistique ou en langues étrangères, ce qui amène ces auteurs, dont Mary Snell-Homby, à préciser la nature exacte de la traduction professionnelle: «Thus translation is primarily a sociocultural activity which presupposes not only language competence but also extensive factual and encyclopaedic knowledge as well as familiarity with the everyday norms and conventions of both source and target culture (p. 11)». Et plus loin elle ajoute: «This culturally base d theoretical approach [ ... ] has enabled us [Translation and
Interpreting Institute (Vienne)] to emancipate our concept of translation from the constraints of the linguistic approach and to view our subject as an interdisciplinary field of study in its own right (p. 21-22).» Pour sa part, Christiane Nord, dans un excellent article qui resume l’optique de son livre Text Analysis in Translation (1991), et numere les competences propres du traducteur, et celles-ci sont loin de se limiter à une simple competence linguistique.

Trois tendances de fond se degagent de la trentaine de communications presents :

1) le role et l’utilite de la theorie dans les programmes de formation; 2) le desir des pedagogues de structurer leur enseignement de facon plus systematique, et 3) la place grandissante qu’occupe l’analyse du discours en theorie comme en pedagogie de la traduction. Voyons brievement chacun de ces trois points.

1. Eternel sujet de controverse, l’utilite de la theorie dans les programmes de formation semble encore poser probleme. Les praticiens et les pedagogues ne voient pas les choses du meme oeil, sans parler des etudiants eux memes qui, universonellement, semblent avoir une aversion innee pour les considerations d’ordre theorique. Les etudiants du niveau du baccalauréat tout au moins. «And there still exists a barrier of suspicion between theorists and practising translators (Gerard McAlester, p. 293).» L’arrimage de la theorie et de la pratique n’est pas facile: «How does one strike the right balance between theory and practice?», se demande Giovanni Pontiero (p. 199). Si, aux yeux des etudiants, on peut apprendre a traduire sans connaître la theorie, pour leurs professeurs, il est absoluument essentiel de proceder a une reflexion theorique dans le cadre d’une formation de niveau universitaire car, comme le dit fort judicieusement Brian Mossop «we do not want to be preparing unthinking language engineers or human word processors (p. 88)». Un des roles de la theorie, selon ce pedagogue, est de fournir le metalangage de la discipline: «Students need to learn a vocabulary for talking about translation problems (p. 84).» Pour sa part, l’interprete Ingrid Kurz rappelle que «any sound pedagogical approach requires more than a ’gut feeling’ (p. 247)».

En outre, la theorie se revele utile en traduction comme en interpretation non seulement pour comprendre le processus de cette operation mentale complexe, mais aussi pour fournir un fondement raisonne aux exercices pratiques d’apprentissage. Elle est indispensable egalement en docimologie: «Critics often judge translations in terms of personal taste, rather than of concrete criteria. But this subjective approach cannot be used by a teacher of translation who has to evaluate and score students’ work on the basis of concrete criteria during a course and at the finals (p. 271)», ecrit avec beaucoup d’à propos Farzaneh Farahzad dans un bon article «Testing Achievement in Translation Classes». Anthony Pym abonde dans le meme sens: «The identification and analysis of translation errors requires a strong conceptual framework before it can ensure any heuristic validity (p. 279).» Juan C. Sager considere lui aussi «that an understanding of terminology requires a minimum of theory (p. 113)». Selon Rune Ingo, «translation theory is important because it offers us a chance to rise above grass-root level, to see the wood and not just the trees, to understand how phenomena are connected, to establish principles [ ... ] p. 49)». Maria Antonia Alvarez exprime un point de vue tout a fait identique dans sa communication (p. 151). En somme, pour reprendre la formule de Sergio Viaggio citee par Franz Pöchhacker «translatology, like any science, should be “experience made awareness” (p. 220)». Mais Margaret F Lang pose la condition suivante: «Success of any theoretical component in vocational training is judged, by student and teachers, by its relevance and applicability to the skill being acquired (p. 207).» Et elle ajoute a la page suivante: «It would be regrettable if the only reason to acquire a theory of translating were to bestow on the discipline some sort of respectability. Rather, the theory should be looked on as providing a conceptual basis for practical application in the classroom and in professional life (p. 208).» Jamais on aura autant parle de theorie dans un ouvrage traitant de pedagogie de la traduction. N’est ce pas au fond parce que l’un et l’autre sont indissociables?
2. Le désir des pédagogues d’organiser leur enseignement pratique de façon systématique ressort de bon nombre de communications. «I realized, confie Patricia Hörmann, it was not university-like to have students confronted with only translation exercises in a first course of translation (p. 59).» Pour organiser l’enseignement de façon méthodique et progressive, Christiane Nord propose de s’élérer au-dessus des difficultés particulières propres à un texte donné pour traiter plutôt des grandes catégories de problèmes: «In translator training, we are not interested in the individual translation problem arising in a particular translation task but in categories of translation problems which can be expected to arise in other translation tasks as well (p. 45).» La présentation systématique des difficultés récurrentes de traduction s’accompagne aussi d’un reel souci de la part des pédagogues de varier la présentation de la matière en salle de classe afin d’optimiser l’efficacité de l’enseignement. María Julia Sainz présente à cet égard plusieurs techniques «to depart from the classic Teacher-Student ping-pong class (p. 70)». Et ce qui s’applique à la traduction vaut tout autant pour l’interprétation. 

[...] simultaneous interpreting should be taught by progressing from easy to more difficult, isolating problems and focusing on variables one at a time and, at a later stage, combining them into progressively more intricate structures (p. 245)», écrit Ingrid Kurz dans son article «’Shadowing’ Exercises in Interpreter Training».

3. Enfin à la lecture de Teaching Translation and Interpreting on ne manque pas de remarquer que les pédagogues et les théoriciens prennent leur distance par rapport à la linguistique (ses méthodes et ses concepts). L’analyse du discours ou, de façon plus générale, les modèles qui prennent en compte la totalité du texte gagnent leur faveur. Gabriella Mauriello l’affirme explicitement: «At our school [Civica Scuola Superiore per Interpreti e Traduttori (Milan)], we have based our approach on text linguistics. [...] we tend to treat the text as a whole [...] (p. 63).» C’est le cas aussi dans plusieurs autres écoles de traduction. À maintes reprises, les auteurs citent les travaux des théoriciens Hotz-Manttäri, Reiss & Vermeer, Christiane Nord, Mary Snell-Hornby, Basil Hatim & Ian Mason. La «scopos theory» semble avoir le vent dans les voiles. Mary Snell-Hornby constate dans la communication: «The study of translation gained real impetus in the early 1980s, when the focus was shifted from the sentence to the text, from the language system to language use [...] (p. 21).» La réflexion sur la traduction semble enfin engagée sur la bonne voie.

Au-delà de ces trois grandes tendances, le recueil de communications sous recension nous renseigne sur la situation de l’enseignement de la traduction dans le sud-tanat de Brunei (B. D. Smith), en Afrique du Sud (Anne-Marie Beukes) et au Canada (Brian Harris). Dans ses trois pays, la traduction a partie liée avec la politique. Est aussi traité l’enseignement de la traduction technique (Gustav Winkler), du sous-titrage (Henrik Gottlieb) et de l’interprétation consécutive (Kambiz Mahmoodzadeh). Comme on le voit, cet ouvrage couvre une grande variété de sujets. Nous n’en avons donné qu’un bref aperçu.


***************

Review by Jean-Pierre COLSON

In Le Langage et L’Homme. Recherches Pluridisciplinaires sur le langage Vol. XXIX N° 1 (Mars 1994) (Canada)

C. DOLLERUP & A. LODDEGAARD, RED.
Teaching Translation and Interpreting. Training, Talent and Experience.
Ce volume se compose des actes de la "First Language International Conference" qui s’est tenue à Elsinore, au Danemark, du 31 mai au 2 juin 1991. Les nombreuses contributions ont été classées par thèmes, avec pour fil conducteur la didactique de la traduction et de l’interprétation.

Il est intéressant de noter que plusieurs points de convergence peuvent être dégagés sur la base des différentes recherches présentées dans cet ouvrage. Il y a par exemple quasi unanimité sur le bien-fondé d’une formation théorique à la traductologie dans les écoles de traduction et d’intérpretation. Comme le remarque M. Snell-Homby, il ne faut toutefois pas confondre traductologie et linguistique. Cette confusion, qui peut s’expliquer historiquement, mène parfois à un enseignement trop théorique dont les étudiants ne perçoivent pas l’utilité pratique.

Autre traductologue de renom, C. Nord présente dans un brillant article un résumé des différents facteurs externes et internes au texte (les fameuses macro- et micro-structure) avec lesquels les étudiants en traduction doivent pouvoir jongler. Selon l’auteur, ces facteurs sont connus depuis l’antiquité, Nil novi sub sole!

L’apport de la terminologie dans les études de traduction est abordé par J.C. Sager. Selon lui, il est indispensable de fournir aux étudiants une approche théorique et pratique à la terminologie. Toutefois, il ne faut pas confondre le traducteur avec un terminologue : "the roles of terminologist and translator are quite different" (p. 112).

Plusieurs autres communications reprises dans les actes méritent également toute l’attention des lecteurs. Outre les descriptions de programmes des cours à l’étranger on y trouve de nombreuses propositions originales pour améliorer et systématiser l’enseignement de la traduction.