There is an acknowledgment found in the dicta and anecdotes in these papers by translation educators; it is alternately anxious and confident: Language is dynamic. So translator training must not be static. Norms change; it is as simple - and threatening - as that. “Norms” include semantic shifts, accepted neologisms, new conventions, idioms, and borrowings. Even acceptable syntactical arrangements change. And if this inexorably happens within a single language, then it certainly happens in interlanguage transfers as well. This means, of course, that translators, and, above all, those training future translators, have not only a veritable mission to be current- and future-oriented. They also, like all teachers, have a more serious mission to be exemplars of appropriate professional behavior. Perhaps the professional motto should be Henry Jarnes’s advice: “Be a person on whom nothing is lost”.

Although each of the writers acknowledges this to a greater or lesser extent, they do so with a mixture of confidence and anxiety. Changing norms can cause anxiety in some educators who are afraid of seeing standards undermined. Or changing norms may bolster the confidence of educators who see validated their belief in a freer classroom atmosphere and less restricted research. “Rule-governed”, it can be argued, is not the same as “rule-bound”, and there is a great deal in language that will probably always elude empirical investigation, including descriptive translation studies. Transfer procedures which rely too much on empirical investigation may even induce a false sense of security. In time, the way a word in language X is habitually or traditionally translated into language Y may become the wrong way. Wrong for a while. And in some circumstances. Indeed, in a profession committed to getting things right, language change often elicits apprehension and resistance.

Translators and interpreters tend to be hyper-conservative in language usage. Understandably so. Theirs is not to find irresistible new ways to say things (the infinitive “to say” denotes the present as future). On the contrary, theirs is to reproduce the way things are said (the passive “are said” denotes the present as immediate past). Thus, it is customary in conferences like this to receive a great deal of good advice, both anecdotal and semi-systematic, simultaneously prescriptive and liberating. If a product does not fit specifications, how can we call it good? However, refreshingly, these contributors for the most part recognize that as translation specifications inevitably change, so will what we call “good” translations, hence, how we train our
successors is not only a matter of encouraging them to be effective now but also encouraging them to be receptive to change later.

Most of these 31 essayists from 19 political states have decided to turn change to their advantage. The three expected givens are present. First, the content is common sense writ large. A reader may be taken aback to see what the essayist thinks readers will need repeated for the record. Geoffrey Kingscott (England) actually has to state (but he states it well) that technical translation “involves a lot more than introducing a Languages for Special Purposes element” (p. 295). Second, international English occasionally differs from native English; the computerized translation manager software promoted by Janet Ann DeCasaris (Catalonia) might have favored more collocation conformity. Those for whom English is native should be thankful that a felicitous accident brought about their birth in an English-speaking milieu. These essays are all well-written, a credit in many cases to both their writers’ second-language acquisition and to Dollerup and Appel’s careful editing. Still, there are instances where the departure from a current “native” norm may confuse readers, at least native English readers. Third, translator training is institution-dependent or institution-specific. Even the languages in chief use may be less determining than the type of institution and its particular student body. Thus, the applicability of a strategy successful in one program may be inappropriate or irrelevant in another. However, readers who want to learn from their peers will be able to do so.

The aura of awareness becomes focused in “Postmodernism and the Teaching of Students” by Rosemary Arrojo (Brazil). After paying her respects to Jean Delisle, Juliane House, Eugene A. Nida, Theodore H. Savory, and H. Stephen Straight and their search for a pedagogical model based on general laws and principles, Arrojo calls on Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, and Jean-François Lyotard for authority in recommending a more open attitude and “relentless” self-awareness in text analysis. Arrojo uses most of her space to point out the political risks of essentialist approaches which - in a translation workshop, presumably - can lead directly from outright error detection to totalitarian forms of government. She saves until the last two paragraphs her plea that teachers of translation practice not abuse their “textual authority” but work with students to “organize strategies” to “improve working conditions and their societal context”.

Her plea is expanded into a practical implementation blueprint in the penultimate essay by José Lambert (Belgium), “Language and Translation as Management Problems: a New Task for Education”. Lambert argues persuasively that “theory is ... the research-based wisdom of experts formulated as a synthetic set of hypotheses. This implies that universalistic claims are probably never justified in research” (p. 271). (Lambert’s argument is counterpointed by Peter Florentsen’s masterly graphics that are worthy of Escher and require fully as much “translation” experience on the readers' part.) In training this means that instructors help students see “possible options” and “probable consequences” (p. 272). Lambert then proceeds to remind readers of the differences between private and public discourse and oral and written discourse, and,
above all, the function of translation in cultures where either oral or written texts dominate. From this framework, Lambert moves on to management and the mechanics of communication. He concludes with the inarguable prediction “the only training that has any chance to survive ... will be open to continuous revision, adaptation, tests, research, and discussion” (p. 291).

The editors have arranged a smooth progression in content. Readers are led up to Arrojo's thesis essay by means of Judith Woodsworth (Canada) who uses translation history in the classroom, Cay Dollerup (Denmark) who traces the emergence of pedagogy in translation studies, case studies by Eva Hung (Hong Kong), Christopher Larkosh (USA), Adolfo Gentile (Australia), Heidrun Witte (Canary Islands) and Alexandr Krouglov (New Zealand), and case-study-derived concepts presented by Andrew Chesterman (Finland) and Antonina Badan (Ukraine). Following Arrojo's contribution, we branch out with case studies covering subtitling (Irena Kovačič, Slovenia), dialogue interpreting (Leong Ko, Australia), literary translation (Silvana Orel, Slovenia; Riitta Oittinen, Finland; Martha Cheung, Hong Kong; Attila Barcsak, Hungary), simultaneous interpreting (Anne Schjoldager, Denmark and Alessandra Riccardi, Italy), community interpreting (Courtney Searls-Ridge, USA), and assessment (Maria Julia Sainz, Uruguay; Heulwen James, lan Roffe and David Thorne, Wales; Kinga Klaudy, Hungary; Ghelly Chemov, Russia; Janet Fraser, England; Margherita Ulrych, Italy). The volume also contains essays on how to improve students’ analysis by Li Yuxing (China), Stella Tagnin (Brazil), and Deoborah D.K. Ruuskanen (Finland).

A volume on pedagogy is meant for two sets of readers: those already engaged in translator training and those expecting to be. Regardless of the variety of institutions represented, the first set will find corroboration for what they do and what they would never do. The second set will find something useful in nearly every essay. Further, inasmuch as both sets of readers may have to justify what they do to a larger public, they will find here good arguments for translator training, persuasively presented. Only translation studies, professionally carried out, can accommodate the changes continually and predictably occurring in language.

Marilyn Gaddis Rose (Binghamton)
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[Benjamins Translation Library, 16.]
Selected papers from the Third *Language International* Conference on Translator and Interpreter Training. Capping the series of conferences on this theme in Denmark, the present volume brings together a choice selection of the papers read by scholars and teachers from five continents and within all specialities in Translation Studies. In combination with the two previous volumes of the same title, the book offers an up-to-date, comprehensive, representative overview focusing on main issues in translation teaching. (JB)