

BEEBY, A., D. ENSINGER and M. PRESAS (2000) (eds.):
***Investigating Translation*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John**
Benjamins, Benjamins Translation Library, vol. 32, xiii+294.

Bassey E. Antia

Volume 48, Number 3, September 2003

Traduction et enseignement
Translation and teaching

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/007613ar>
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/007613ar>

[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

Antia, B. E. (2003). Review of [BEEBY, A., D. ENSINGER and M. PRESAS (2000) (eds.): *Investigating Translation*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, Benjamins Translation Library, vol. 32, xiii+294.] *Meta*, 48(3), 472–474.
<https://doi.org/10.7202/007613ar>

d'exactitude, etc.), les fonctions associant des causes diverses (le mélange de sources, d'intentions, d'effets).

Que conclure d'un tel essai qui explore toutes les galaxies de la néologie? D'abord, dire que nous avons affaire à un puissant travail de recherche qui trace un portrait très actuel de la néologie de la langue générale. Ensuite, remarquer que la définition très large, très ouverte du phénomène de la néologie est si accueillante qu'en fin de parcours elle cerne mal la nouveauté par rapport au vocabulaire lexicalisé et par rapport à la norme. De ce point de vue, le livre laisse un malaise. Qui trop embrasse, mal étirent. Puis, constater qu'il n'est pas facile de vouloir réconcilier toutes les théories et toutes les dimensions plus ou moins étanches (la phonétique, le lexique, la syntaxe, la grammaire...) du problème. Le projet est défendable, ambitieux même, mais il possède les qualités de ses défauts et les défauts de ses qualités. J'ai des réticences à considérer que les écarts, les déviations par rapport à la grammaire, que les formes fautives soient des néologismes, du moins socialement parlant. Par exemple des conjugaisons comme *ils alleront* sont identifiées comme des néologismes. Or, il ne s'agit nullement d'une nouveauté, d'abord parce que c'est une forme ancienne de conjugaison qui s'est transformée en écart, ensuite parce que c'est une forme idiolectale employée par un chanteur. Autre exemple: l'auteur ne fait pas de différence entre un écart volontaire (*correct* qui est écrit *correqué* dans un magazine) et un écart involontaire conduisant à une faute (*acquérir* qui devient *acquir* dans un travail scolaire). Dans les deux cas, la nature du « néologisme » est fort différente, ne serait-ce que sur le plan psychologique.

Plusieurs coquilles ont été repérées dans le texte ainsi qu'un certain nombre d'autres écarts – je n'ose pas dire *néologismes*! Ainsi, pourquoi écrire *québecquoise* à la page 241 et *Québécois* à la page 382? Les nombreuses répétitions d'un chapitre à l'autre entravent la lecture. Ainsi, l'auteur reprend à plusieurs reprises la position théorique que défendait Danielle Corbin à l'égard des dérivés parasynthétiques. Il fait de même à propos de l'explication étymologique (la formation) du verbe *désagrément* ou d'autres mots. Quelques autres phénomènes sont aussi répétés périodiquement.

Au résultat, le lecteur a entre les mains un livre intéressant qui (r)amène la néologie dans la mire des linguistes et rappelle ce qu'affirmait déjà Louis Guilbert en 1973, à savoir qu'une « ère néologique est donc ouverte dans l'idéologie du moment ».

JEAN-CLAUDE BOULANGER
Université Laval, Québec, Canada

BEEBY, A., D. ENSINGER and M. PRESAS (2000) (eds.): *Investigating Translation*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, Benjamins Translation Library, vol. 32, xiii+294.

This book is a selection of papers presented at the 4th International Congress on Translation, which was held in Barcelona in 1998. The book is in some sense an account of Translation Studies these past 25 years, since a conference of the *Association internationale de linguistique appliquée* helped to put it on the map of Applied Linguistics. The book also provides insight into the research being conducted in

Spain, which in the view of one of the non-Spanish contributors can easily stake a claim to being the new reference point in the field. Contributions in the 25-chapter book revolve around one or a number of the following themes: theory, process, ideology and addressee in translation.

A first set of contributions deny the existence or bemoan the absence of a (general) theory of translation, one that integrates all that is currently known into a framework that has explanatory, if not also predictive, capacity as far as translation behavior or product is concerned. There is quite a bit of optimism on this score as witnessed by the proposals towards achieving such a framework.

However, a second set of papers, which investigate the translation process, suggest the tentativeness of any such general theory as there are as yet many unknowns of linguistic mediation in both its oral and written manifestations. The contributions here deal with: desiderata and opportunities in conference interpreting research; concerns about the validity of much of the process data generated from experiments and how new computational tools may improve the match between data and process; the nature of competence presumably underlying successful translation behavior; and how components of this competence may be taught.

In a third set of contributions, ideology in translation is addressed from a variety of interesting perspectives: the paradoxes of feminine identification and the opportunities these paradoxes present for projecting feminine subjectivity in translating and in theory-construction in translation; church censorship of translated film titles; the characteristics of translation as an ancillary to identity (re)construction in Catalonia, in post-Franco Spain; etc.

The addressee in translation comes under focus in a final set of papers. The thrust here is on the means for developing profiles of addressees or frames of addressee-expectations, either for refocusing translator-training programs, or for translating a variety of text types. With respect to the latter, interesting textual implications of the 'profiling' are shown. For example, besides many of the obvious points it needs to consider, the translation of advertisements associated with products meant for export would do well to promote or counter target-market stereotypes of the exporting country (e.g. rustic but efficient, not time conscious, etc.).

Theory construction, in the manner in which this desideratum is occasionally framed, is an extremely tall order, particularly when allowance for dynamism appears to be constricted by the assumption that enough is known to form the basis of an adequate theory. A useable theory is likely to be one that maintains some balance between generalization (translation is interlingual communication perceived as successful) and specificity (do's and don'ts). Every theory is in some sense reductionist, prototypicalizing a subset of the class of phenomena it is to account for. But, soon enough, phenomena initially regarded as marginal become too important to continue to retain that status.

As reflection proceeds on an integrated theory that would be explanatory and predictive of all translation behavior at a level intermediate between generalization and specificity, we would do well to factor in some current and not so current 'marginal' translation practices: translating in the software localization industry (where there could be some genuine confusion between translating and parallel authoring, besides other issues), self-translations, translations based on translations, multiple

authorship of translated texts, etc. Incidentally, these phenomena are addressed in this book. And of course, the cause of theory-construction would be helped by consistent use of common terms like strategy, method, etc.

BASSEY E. ANTIA

University of Maiduguri, Maiduguri, Nigeria

SARUKKAI, S. (2002): *Translating the World*, New York, University Press of America, XXI + 161 p. + index.

Translation Studies (TS) is a new kid on the academic block, still somewhat uncertain of her place in the academy. Precisely because her legitimacy as an academic discipline is still open to question, translation-scholars have been trying harder and producing some good work, though some of it may belong to TS only arguably. *Translating the World* (TW from now on) by Sundar Sarukkai (SS from now on) is a very good example of that work.

Given the contemporary modularization of knowledge and the consequent professionalization, increasingly mimicking the natural and life sciences, some would argue that TS is perhaps the only field in the human and social sciences that seems not to focus on questions of its own. Whereas the now relatively old contemporary linguistics, at least in its North-American *avatar*, established itself on the grounds of a maximalist insistence on its autonomy from other cognitive domains, TS seems to want to establish itself on grounds that can be said to be maximally non-autonomist. TW can be seen as the final step in that direction.

Arguments on behalf of TS provide a new window on the constant tension between the centrifugal and centripetal forces within the academy, and TW certainly invites some reflection on these forces. It is a sustained reflection on the nature of scientific discourse by someone who was trained in physics and philosophy. He tells us that in his enterprise he was helped by the vocabulary and the tools provided by modern theorizing in TS. The activity of science, he further claims, "shows striking similarities with that of translation (p. viii). Hence this review here.

Predictably SS defines translation as any activity undertaken in response to an original. For science, the original is the world; for translation in the ordinary sense, the original is the source text. Sure, there are differences between what is normally called translation and what is normally called science, but according to him, the similarities between them are, at the appropriate level of abstraction, overwhelming. The classical theories of both claim that they are quintessentially non-interventionist, but the author, drawing upon the work of contemporary continental thinkers, argues that in fact they are both necessarily mediated interpretations.

Just as the naïve view of science harbours the illusion that it can objectively transcribe the world, the naïve view of translation takes the position that translations only change the language of the text. These illusions have been shattered recently, and it is the instruments used for accomplishing that shattering that SS uses to begin an engagement where there has been almost none so far. He looks at how science constructs its meanings or embodies them in its discourses, how, in other words, theories are written in science. In order to accomplish his goal, he undertakes a detailed investigation of how science is written, read, and practiced.