

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, Barbara & Marcel Thelen (Eds.) (2008). *Translation and Meaning. Part 8. Proceedings of the Łódź Session of the 4th International Maastricht-Łódź Duo Colloquium on "Translation and Meaning", 23-25 September 2005. Maastricht: Zuyd University, Maastricht School of International Communication, Department of Translation and Interpreting. 441p.*

In her review of the preceding volume, i.e. Volume 7, of this series of proceedings of the International Maastricht-Łódź Duo Colloquia on "Translation and Meaning", which have taken place every five years since 1990, Leona Van Vaerenbergh announced that the areas of translation and meaning would again be present in Volume 8, the proceedings of the Łódź session, but with a "focus on the theoretical aspects" (2008, p.282). While it is true that the largest section of Volume 8 is, indeed, **Section II** 'The *theory* of translation' (my italics) and that it contains the works of ten contributors, numerous other topics in this volume resemble those in number 7. In addition, Volume 8 also includes a section with the vaguer title 'Translation Studies' (**Section III** in 7) and appears to include additional theoretical articles. Moreover, many of the remaining sections run parallel to those in Volume 7: **Section III** 'Media translation and interpreting' (cf. 'Audiovisual Translation' in 7), **Section V** 'Translation strategies and translation training' (cf. 'The training of translators/interpreters' and 'Translation strategies' in 7), **Section VI** 'Lexicology and terminology' and **Section VII** 'Language corpora and translation' (cf. 'Terminology/terminography' and 'Corpora/lexicology/lexicography' in 7) and **Section VIII** 'Translating literature' (cf. 'The translation of literature' in 7). All this goes to show that there is not much difference between Volumes 7 and 8. This is also confirmed by a look at the sections that are new in Volume 8: **Section I** 'Translation and cognition', **Section IV** 'Contrastive studies between pairs of languages and translation' and **Section IX** 'Translation quality management'. However, together with the sections on lexicology and terminology (**VI**) and language corpora and translation (**VII**), these new sections are the shortest of the volume, with only one, two or three papers each. Such short sections surely follow from a type of decision questioned by Van Vaerenbergh (2008, p. 280) and again raises suspicions about the breadth and depth with which the subject is treated.

The contents of the volume reveal a conglomeration of different author nationalities, although, as evident from the list of contributors, the majority are Polish. The myriad nationalities of contributors is further reflected in the examples presented in the texts. Unfortunately, as someone who does not know the Polish language, many of the examples are lost on me for lack of a back-translation into the language of the article itself. For

slightly over a quarter of the total 41 articles, that language is German; another quarter of the contributions are written in French and the rest are in English. Although I am not in a position to judge the quality of the German and French, the varieties of English in this volume are hard to pinpoint, unless they can be grouped under what Mary Snell-Hornby called “Globish American British (GAB)” in her presentation at the CETRA conference in Leuven in August 2009. Increasingly, editorial work seems to suffer from the time pressures under which academics must work, and this volume is not an exception: readers are, therefore, advised not to expect British or American English, but to have an open mind to different types of EFL, or English as a Foreign Language (i.e. the type of English that is being collected either in the International Corpus of Learner English or in VOICE, the Vienna Oxford International Corpus of English).

As with the previous volumes, Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk and Thelen have taken the trouble to compile a multilingual index, which is useful if readers want to know something about the topic. However, if readers are seeking every piece of information that the book holds about a particular topic, they should look at the topic’s translations in the index (e.g. both *translation competence* and *translatorische Kompetenz* are included in the index, but each refers to a different article). In addition, such readers should also leaf through the book itself. The reason for this is that a random test showed that the index is not complete: readers wanting to know more about studies based on *questionnaires* will be guided to Załawska-Okrutna, but not to Tomasziewicz, and readers interested in discussions of *(un)translatability* will be referred to Bogucki and Dynel-Buckowska, but not to Al-Salman, Tomasziewicz, or Plusa.

Leaving language and technical matters aside, the volume does present a broad range of ideas. The editors present the colloquium and its theme in the introduction and describe the articles individually in a survey that follows the categorization and order of the sections in the book itself (pp. X-XII). Since any categorization built on different criteria rather than just a single one inevitably leads to discussion, the division into sections of Volume 8 can be questioned in the same way that Van Vaerenbergh (2008) questioned the sections of Volume 7. Indeed, in looking at the section titles of Volume 8, one sees that some papers have been grouped together because they address a particular *element* of the translation situation, like the type of translated text in **Section VIII** ‘Translating literature’. Other studies constitute a section because of their *aim* (**Section II**, The theory of translation), and others because they describe a similar *mode* of translation (**Section III** ‘Media translation and interpreting). Such diversity of criteria in one and the same volume cannot but raise questions about the consistency of the categorization. Readers might, for instance, wonder why two articles that deal with a similar topic – Potok-Nycz and Sypnicki’s ‘Quelques observations sur la traduction des *stéréotypes*’ (my italics) and Dyoniziak’s ‘*Stéréotype, sens, traduction, approche générale*’ (my italics) – have not been brought together more closely, or why the contribution ‘Implicature

blocking strategies and translation problems' (Razmjou) has not been classed under 'Translation and cognition'. However, the field of translation studies has become so broad, and its topics and approaches so diverse, that a single categorization is bound to fail to pay respect to all features that a set of translation studies articles share with one another.

In brief, while readers can find one-line summaries of all articles in terms of the sections and themes offered by the editors at the beginning of Volume 8, this review will present a different categorization, with slightly different one-line summaries, because of the different focus adopted.

The survey below is based on a single criterion which is actually most relevant to Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk and Thelen's volume: the type of meaning which the article focuses on. Admittedly, most translation studies do not discuss or analyse only one type of meaning, so my classification should be seen as one that reflects those meanings that play the most central role in the discussion. The types of meaning that I distinguish (described in more detail in Vandepitte 2008) are as follows: propositional (or semantic or referential) meanings, such as predication, modification, quantification, reflexivity, embedding and coherence, and messenger-related (or pragmatic) meanings, such as the states of affairs to be communicated (cf. Lederer's synecdoche, 1976, p. 13ff), the propositions and the attitudes taken towards them, the addressee envisaged and how the messenger's knowledge about the addressee affects choices of expression, and, finally, the information that is conveyed about the messengers themselves.

In her discussion of the translation of culture-specific references (e.g. *macarons* and *sandwiches*) both in the real world and a fictional one, Mitura explores *predicational* meanings. Those constitute the main departure point for Zaliwska-Okrutna's outline of areas of cognitive and neuro-cognitive translation research and for Dybalska's analysis of the dubbed version of a film. Similarly, arguments are the main subject in Podhajecka's account of difficulties encountered in the compilation of a dictionary of lexicography and Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk's exploration of the differences between lexicology and terminology. A more contrastive-linguistic approach is taken by Kubacki in his examination of techniques to translate German deverbal nouns into Polish.

Both *predication* and *modification* are dealt with by Al-Salman, who discusses the translation of potentially ambiguous words and idioms (e.g. *the cranes were transported to Paris*) within a language acquisition and learning framework, and by Ríos Castaño, who looks at how intersemiotic translation of a text or a play into a film may change activities and personalities of characters. In her presentation of the problems encountered when translating iconic structures (onomatopoeia, repetition, etc.), Pieczyńska-Sulik points at similarities between the referential world and the language used.

Quantification is a topic that is not touched upon by this volume. However, a discussion of *reflexivity* is present, albeit only in Wertheimer's exploration of the translation of displaceable terms (such as *red* in '*Red*'

means red). Similarly, only one article deals with *embedding*: Senczyszyn examines what the audience can derive from *the way the information is structured* and studies the effect of ‘conceptual division’ on the audience. Finally, the only contribution to investigate *coherence* is Gumul’s analysis of the rendition of conditional conjunctive cohesive markers in consecutive and simultaneous interpreting.

As for pragmatic meanings, Filar examines perspective from a cognitive-linguistic viewpoint and analyses the parts of a particular *state of affairs* described in source texts and translations. Tomaszewicz points not only at intertextual references in films that may go unnoticed by an audience in the target culture, but also at connotations that are national (*patriotyzm* has a positive value for Polish people) and thus investigates *attitudes* that messengers may have towards certain *propositions*. Connotations are rife with stereotypical expressions, the central topic in Dyoniziak’s contribution. And many high-frequency words have connotations or ‘semantic prosody’, the topic of Oster and Van Lawick’s corpus-based contribution on phraseological units. Jereczek-Lipińska’s political discourse analysis of blogs that vulgarize the Treaty of the Constitution of the European Union reveals the negative values that readers associate with certain words (e.g. *bank* and *competition*).

The messenger’s (or translator’s) *knowledge of the addressee envisaged* is central to Mazur’s classification of translation procedures in terms of the globalization-localization dichotomy. It is also the topic of Jarniewicz’s ‘poetics of excess’, which explains how literary translators fill in source text indeterminacies and produce translations with fewer lacunae. The metaphor is a construction that always relies on the addressee’s knowledge, a subject taken up by Tamjid within a cognitive-linguistic framework. Within a more pragmatic yet still cognitive framework, Razmjou discusses the implicature-blocking strategies which the source text writer has employed and how a translator can deal with those. Every interpreter or translator plays an important role as addressee and their knowledge plays a central role in anticipating the source text messenger, the topic of Bartłomiejczyk’s article.

Whereas the previous contributions mainly consider envisaged or required *background knowledge* of a translation audience, Dynel-Buczowska’s topic, namely, the effect that translated humorous passages (e.g. *as wound as a Timex*) may have on their audience, deals with the messenger’s knowledge of the addressee in terms of its role in the *audience’s reaction* to a certain message. Similarly, Heltai explores explicitness and explicitation and looks at its effect on the reader. Translators may make judgement errors with respect to the functional or dynamic nature of their translated utterance; such errors are called ‘relative errors’ by Paprocka in her survey of translation errors categories. Gajewska, in her contribution on business letters and their translations, addresses politeness phenomena.

The final type of meaning, information about the *messengers themselves*, is present in Płusa’s reflections on Nietzsche’s view of adequate

translatability and in Feinauer's discussion of ideology in literary translation.

Finally, there is a set of articles that are difficult to assign into my classification, because they are of a more general nature: Blaskowska describes the job of an animator-interpreter among foreign exchange students; Bogucki discusses the translation unit; Borowczyk relates how inexperienced translators have used different understanding strategies; Étoré seeks to demonstrate that the translation process is governed by antonymic couples; Gawłowska looks for causes of consecutive interpreting errors in psycholinguistics and cognitive psychology; Jurewicz investigates oral features in consecutive interpreting such as self-corrections; Quentel adopts a sociolinguistic view in his survey of translation problems that arise with Celtic languages; Sitarek presents a typology of false friends, taking into account their frequencies; Thelen proposes a quality management and quality control system for monitoring the translation process and the translation service; Tirkkonen-Condit and Mäkisalo present the design of a subtitle corpus that covers various languages; Walkiewicz discusses the role of paraphrase in translation; Zaliwska-Okrutna inquires into (neuro)cognitive aspects of translation; and Żmudzki sets up a communicative model of consecutive interpreting.

This collection of proceedings is a clear continuation of the preceding volumes. For conference proceedings, editors have different options: they can present a particular interpretation of a conference and group together those contributions which communicate that interpretation; they can present a peer-reviewed qualitative selection of the contributions; or they can give everyone interested in writing an article the opportunity to present their work. Clearly, the editors have chosen the third option (and have done so for a long time). An additional result of the present volume is that it more than likely presents a comprehensive survey of Polish translation studies today.

Bibliography

- Lederer, M. (1976). Synecdoque et traduction. Traduire : Les idées et les mots. *Étude de linguistique appliquée* 24, 13-41.
- Van Vaerenbergh, L. (2008). Thelen, Marcel & Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, (eds) (2007). Translation and Meaning. Part 7. Proceedings of the Maastricht Session of the 4th International Maastricht-Łódź Duo Colloquium on "Translation and Meaning", 18-21 May 2005. Maastricht: Zuyd University, Maastricht School of International Communication, Department of Translation and Interpreting. 517p. [Review]. Looking for Meaning: Methodological Issues in Translation Studies. *Linguistica Antverpiensia. New Series – Themes in Translation Studies*, 7/2008, 280-282.
- Vandepitte, S. (2008). *Translating Untranslatability. English-Dutch, Dutch-English*. Ghent: Academia Press.

Sonia Vandepitte - University College Ghent/Ghent University