

PRIETO RAMOS, Fernando, ed. (2018): *Institutional Translation for International Governance. Enhancing Quality in Multilingual Legal Communication*. London/New York: Bloomsbury, 228 p.

Oumarou Mal Mazou

Volume 65, numéro 1, avril 2020

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1073646ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/1073646ar>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal

ISSN

0026-0452 (imprimé)

1492-1421 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer ce compte rendu

Mal Mazou, O. (2020). Compte rendu de [PRIETO RAMOS, Fernando, ed. (2018): *Institutional Translation for International Governance. Enhancing Quality in Multilingual Legal Communication*. London/New York: Bloomsbury, 228 p.] *Meta*, 65(1), 261–263. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1073646ar>

- HOLMES, James S. (1972/1988): The Name and Nature of Translation Studies. In: James S. HOLMES. *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 67-80.
- KUNDERA, Milan (1993): Une phrase. In: Milan KUNDERA. *Les Testaments trahis*. Paris: Gallimard, 123-144.

PRIETO RAMOS, Fernando, ed. (2018): *Institutional Translation for International Governance. Enhancing Quality in Multilingual Legal Communication*. London/New York: Bloomsbury, 228 p.

Institutional translation has been garnering much interest in the field of translation studies, considering the increasing number of publications since the 1970s, though most of the research is carried out within national settings (Covacs 1979). In fact, translation studies in intergovernmental organizations remain limited and, in this regard, the book under review contributes to fill this gap.

Edited by Fernando Prieto Ramos, a leading scholar in the field of legal translation and international organizations, the book includes papers by a selection of guest authors as well as outputs from a Consolidator Grant project led by the editor. It consists of 13 interrelated chapters divided into three parts.

Part 1, entitled *Contemporary Issues and Methods* assembles three chapters. In the first one, Susan Šarčević (p. 9-24) focuses on the challenges that institutional translators face and their role as transnational multilingual communicators. The author takes examples from the multilingual text production in the European Commission to highlight the main task of translators, which is: “to preserve the unity of the single instrument with the ultimate aim of promoting its uniform interpretation and application in practice” (p. 13). We can thus say that the challenge of the translator of legal texts in institutional settings is to ensure consistency in terminology, i.e. internal harmonization of multilingual texts: “the greatest challenge to institutional legal translators is learning to go beyond surface-level similarity” (p. 23).

To overcome the above-stated challenge, the translator must have interdisciplinary skills and the mastery of the subject matter. In that regard, Šarčević encourages translation schools all over the world to provide necessary interdisciplinary training so that translators are equipped with the skills that enable them to become transnational communicators and bring quality to institutional multilingualism.

In the same regard, the second chapter (p. 25-36), authored by Łucja Biel, investigates corpora in institutional legal translation. She highlights the evolution and importance of using corpus and technological tools in legal translation both for the practitioners and scholars in generating resourceful terminological data. For practitioners, “corpus tool can improve the efficiency of the translation process thanks to fast information retrieval, precision of searches and contextualization of information with usage preferences” (p. 34).

Nonetheless, the author deplors the slow uptake of corpus tools by practicing translators as illustrated in the different surveys she presents. The chapter equally highlights some of the new corpus tools to be used by legal translators (especially JodGENTT and TermWise) which have already been tested and proven to be efficient tools.

The last chapter of this first part of the book focuses on comparative law and legal translation. The author, Jan Engberg, considers the two disciplines are complementary to each other when it comes to transferring knowledge. Based on frame semantics as an analytical framework, this last chapter describes and evaluates the terminological decisions the translator has to make when dealing with legal translation.

The second part of the book, entitled *Translation Quality Assessment in Law-and Policy-making and Implementation*, also the longest part –and the core– of the book, is divided into six chapters, all dealing with translation quality as explicitly stated in the title.

In the first chapter of this second part, Ingegar Strandvik takes a ‘journey’ into the Directorate-General for Translation (DGT) of the European Commission. As an insider and quality manager of this institution, the seasoned legal translator calls for a ‘more structured approach to quality assurance’ such that the EU “speaks with one consistent institutional voice in each of the EU’s official languages” (p. 51). In a ‘six-stop’ journey, the author maps out a thorough landscape of the institution, its mission as concerns translation (in-house and outsourcing) strategies of quality assessment in relation to the ever fast-growing of technology and machine translation, and the challenges that an institution like the European Commission faces.

After many questions raised with some proposed answers, Strandvik comes to the conclusion that “the translation industry and the translation profession at large are confronted with the same challenges, useful insights can be provided by the international standards on translation service provision” (p. 61-62).

For quality assessment to be more efficient in institutional translation, Anne Lafeber examines

the skills of translators and revisers at the EU and the United Nations (UN) in chapter 5. In a questionnaire-driven survey, she identifies the various skills that are required of new recruits. She comes to conclude that “skills required for achieving quality are more than just language skills; they include analytical and research skills, as well as procedural knowledge” (p. 79).

In chapter 6, Prieto Ramos and Diego Guzmán Bourdelle-Casals advocate legal terminology consistency and adequacy to be quality indicators of institutional translation. Their comparative method of analysis focuses on translation patterns into Spanish over a period of fifteen years (2000-2015) within the framework of the LETRINT project. Using a corpus-based, holistic analysis (combination of lexicometric, that is quantitative and qualitative methods), the authors examine how the term *due process* is translated into Spanish within the aforementioned interval of time. The findings of the analysis reveal that the use of a mixed-method corpus-based research can be useful in highlighting textual patterns and skills in an international organization like the EU and the UN.

Agnieszka Doczekalaska explores multilingual practices by comparing the EU and the Canadian legal systems through a comparative analysis in chapter 7. She focuses on the similarities and differences of legislative multilingualism and drafting processes in Canada and the EU in terms of terminological choices.

Chapter 8 is authored by Colin Robertson, whose main interest is in legal-linguistic profiling as a translation aid. He aims to provide a “method for analysing multilingual and multicultural legal environments in which a text to be translated forms part” (p. 113). As most of the previous contributors to the book, Robertson delves into one of the numerous EU agencies, namely the European Aviation Safety Agency, to carry out his research.

The second part closes out with chapter 9, authored by Mathilde Fontanet. The author discusses the translation of hybrid legal texts within the European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN) where she worked for more than two decades before switching to academics. After a presentation of some taxonomic considerations on specialized and legal discourse, Fontanet uses parallel corpora made of hybrid legal-technical texts (agreements, safety rules and contracts adjudication proposals) she compiled from the CERN. According to the author, the results of analysis of these texts reveal two possible situations: either one domain prevails, or both cohabit. She therefore concluded that “translators should ensure that there is absolute consistency between sub-technical vocabulary and terminology” (p. 138).

The third and last part of the book entitled *Translation and Multilingual Case Law*, brings together three chapters dealing with several international and European courts, including the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) and the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR).

In chapter 10, Susan Wright presents the multilingual system in which the EU judiciary functions and the impact that this multilingual system has on the judgements rendered. In keeping with the same judiciary system within the EU, Aleksandar Trklja investigates a corpus of translation-generated diversity in chapter 11. He operates under the assumption that “although EU law exists in different linguistic versions because of the ‘meta principle’ of uniformity (...), it is considered that all these linguistic versions have the same meaning” (p. 156). Therefore, according to Trklja, quality translation in the CJEU has been achieved. The above analysis is based on all the decisions of the Court published in the following three languages until 2011: French, English and German. The results of analysis bring about several important proposals.

In chapter 12, James Brannan is interested in the different characteristics of translation within the ECHR. He specifically examines the balance between the Court’s policy and practice and shows that such policies have advantages and difficulties due to having only two official languages (English and French).

The 13th and last chapter is written by Prieto Ramos and Lucie Pacho Aljanti, and in this chapter, the two scholars examine the interpretation of multilingual law in international courts in a comparative view, and its patterns and implications for translation. They start with the assumption that “the existence of authentic texts in two or more languages can either complicate or facilitate the interpretation of a multilingual instrument” (p. 181). It comes from the comparative analysis that law interpretation problems cannot be totally solved in a multilingual context of text production but translation can reduce divergences between different language versions “by ensuring accuracy and inter-linguistic concordance in the processes of multilingual text production” (p. 201).

The well-crafted structure and the variety of institutional translation aspects discussed in the book make it worth reading for scholars and professionals who are interested in how translation is carried out in the supranational institutions. To sum up, the book definitely discusses key issues on quality institutional translation also developed in a collective book entitled *Quality Aspects in Institutional Translation* edited by Svoboda, Biel, and Ľoboda (2017) from the same period, and the two

constitute major contributions to terminology and quality assessment as far as multilingualism and translation are concerned in leading international organizations like the EU and its various bodies.

OUMAROU MAL MAZOU
Université de Liège, Liège, Belgique

REFERENCES

- COVACS, Alexandre (1979): Bilinguisme officiel et double version des lois. Un pis-aller: la traduction. Une solution d'avenir: la corédaction. *Meta*. 24(1):103-108
- SVOBODA, Thomas, BIEL, Lucja, and LOBODA, Krzysztof (2017): *Quality Aspects of Institutional Translation*. Berlin: Language Science Press.

BADA, Valérie, LETAWE, Céline, PAGNOULLE, Christine et WILLSON, Patricia, dir. (2018): *Impliciter, expliciter – L'intervention du traducteur*. Liège: Presses universitaires de Liège, 273 p.

Le recueil de textes publié en 2018 aux Presses universitaires de Liège tente d'éclairer, mais aussi d'aborder sous un angle nouveau, voire déconstruire, les notions d'explicitation et d'implication. Ces deux stratégies sont mises en œuvre par les traducteurs lorsque l'écart entre les langues-cultures et les spécificités spatio-temporelles des textes à traduire s'avère trop grand. L'introduction de Letawe et de Willson recontextualise les deux concepts en soulignant d'abord que l'explicitation occupe une place de choix lorsque le « problème du "traduisible" » (p. 7) est soulevé. Face à l'intraduisible, le traducteur aura recours à cette stratégie universelle (Blum-Kulka 1986) ou déformante (Berman 1985). Puis l'implication viendra quand le traducteur pourra présupposer des connaissances du public cible ou lorsqu'il censurera le contenu de l'original pour des raisons idéologiques. Au cœur de l'ouvrage divisé en quatre axes (approches théoriques, productions artistiques, enjeux économiques et politiques et réflexions didactiques), deux questions implicites reviennent dans presque tous les textes: est-ce que l'interprétation du texte de départ effectuée par le traducteur affecte le produit final et quelles sont les conséquences de l'intervention du traducteur? En somme et selon nous, les auteurs de l'ouvrage tentent de justifier, à juste titre, pourquoi les traducteurs désirent se soustraire à la sacro-sainte fidélité lorsque l'acte de traduire se matérialise au bout de leurs doigts.

Un seul texte par section sera recensé puisque bien que les articles soient regroupés en quatre

axes de recherche, chacun d'eux explore un aspect particulier de l'implication et de l'explicitation et, par conséquent, il nous apparaît difficile de les faire dialoguer. Les textes retenus sont ceux qui nous semblent le plus avant-gardistes.

Le premier article à visée théorique rédigé par Hewson remet en question la validité de l'hypothèse de l'explicitation de Blum-Kulka pour qui cette stratégie semble inhérente à toute traduction. C'est en examinant la typologie de l'explicitation qu'Hewson s'intéresse à l'explicitation optionnelle dictée par les différentes manières de construire un texte et influencée selon les préférences stylistiques fondamentales des langues de départ et d'arrivée. Pour Hewson, le choix du traducteur, l'essence des traductions une fois publiées et la façon dont les textes sources et les traductions sont lus doivent se trouver au centre des préoccupations des traductologues. L'auteur souhaite ultimement poser les assises d'une théorie générale de la traduction au cœur de laquelle le texte source serait le point de départ d'analyses comparatives afin de déterminer les stratégies employées par les traducteurs. L'approche restrictive proposée par Hewson se concentre sur l'analyse de bonnes traductions (celles faites par des professionnels) dont des passages plus courts seraient extraits et qui formeraient un corpus cohérent. Le travail du traductologue s'opérerait manuellement et non selon un ou des algorithmes computationnels. Autrement dit, la comparaison des procédés créatifs présents dans le texte de départ et ceux choisis par le traducteur se révèle essentielle à l'approche de Hewson. Le but de l'approche restrictive n'est certes pas de stipuler comment le traducteur aurait dû accomplir son travail ni d'affirmer qu'il a failli à la tâche, mais bien d'illustrer ce qui a été fait et les répercussions qui en découlent.

La seconde section du recueil s'intéresse à l'explicitation et à l'implication dans les productions artistiques. Nous nous pencherons sur le texte de Bruneaud qui « aborde le défi majeur, tant sémantique que phonique et rythmique, qui consiste à recréer en français [de France] la langue d'une adolescente noire américaine » (p. 9), personnage principal du roman *Push*¹ de Sapphire publié en 1996 et traduit par Carasso² en 1997. L'étude de cas présentée par Bruneaud cherche à démontrer que les « stratégies rendent donc la démarche du traducteur *explicite*, pour le traductologue du moins, et pour le lecteur également, d'autant plus lorsque le traducteur recourt aux notes, à la préface ou à la postface » (p. 83; soulignement de Bruneaud). L'auteur mettra en lumière les choix faits par Carasso qui a su conserver l'oralité du registre de Sapphire, mais qui a tout de même opéré des transformations dans le texte traduit. Bruneaud souligne que la traduction est quelques