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Citer ce compte rendu

succeeded in forming a locus that intermeshes ostensibly disparate topics into a consistent whole. Readers will gain a comprehensive idea of what expanded the current Egyptian ‘power vacuum’ (the abyss created between the people and their leaders), and will clearly see the roles played (and still being played) by translation in filling it. I recommend this book to academics working in the fields of linguistics, discourse analysis, and semiotics. But also to translation lovers, columnists, reporters and those who want to keep au fait with the subsequent developments and hopefully dénouement of Egypt’s twenty-first century r/evolutionary story.

SOUAD HAMERLAIN
University of Mostaganem, Mostaganem, Algeria
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The work here reviewed is divided into two parts. Part I, consisting of three chapters, and Part II, made of five chapters, amounting to eight contributions in all. Some information about the contributors follows (p. 203-204), and a language index (p. 205-206) completes the volume.

Part I, entitled “Psycholinguistic and cognitive intersections in translation and interpreting,” opens with the paper by Ferreira, Schwieter and Gile “The position of psycholinguistic and cognitive science in translation and interpreting: An introduction” (p. 3-15). The editors and Gile state that “The present collection highlights the input of psycholinguistics and cognitive science to TS through a scrutiny of recent findings and current theories and research” (p. 3). After recalling some historical and contextual background of Translation Studies, section 2 focuses on the interdisciplinarity associated to it, present since the very beginning of its existence. This book, whose content is summarized chapter by chapter (p. 7-12), is presented as an example of methodological innovation with the aim of improving translation and interpreting research through collaboration on an international and interdisciplinary level.

In chapter 2, “Translation process research at the interface: Paradigmatic, theoretical, and methodological issues in dialogue with cognitive science, expertise studies, and psycholinguistics” (p. 17-40), Alves looks at translation process research (TPR) and examines the contribution of disciplines like cognitive science, expertise studies, and psycholinguistics to its development. It provides a useful overview of the most recent publications on it and revisits some of the main assumptions of these three disciplines in order to discuss how they interface with TPR. The thoughts and considerations raised in this paper are not novel in TPR literature. However, the interesting point made by Alves is that TPR is now in a position to contribute to the development of cognitive science, expertise studies, and psycholinguistics, since its studies have the potential to corroborate theoretical assumptions by putting hypotheses to the empirical-experimental test. Therefore borrowing becomes bi- or multi-directional (p. 34).

In “The contributions of cognitive psychology and psycholinguistics to conference interpreting: A critical analysis” (p. 41-64), Gile focuses on the advantages of cognitive science for research into conference interpreting and on the somewhat complex attitudes of many practisearchers towards
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and information redundancy” (p. 67-100), who
reports a two-dimensional quasi-experimental
study which investigates high-level discourse
processes in simultaneous interpreting. The two
dimensions are expertise and text. The expertise
dimension involves two groups of participants,
experts and novices, and the text dimension is a
comparison of two texts, very similar in most ways,
but differing in their information redundancy. The
sampling methodology is adequately explained
and the results satisfactorily articulated, leading
to the conclusion that experts demonstrate
higher performance accuracy, being better able
to apply strategies which mediate higher-level
comprehension processes. The chapter is a valuable
contribution which generates new data about these
processes and the specific traits of expert interpreting.
However, in Hild’s words, it “is necessary to
take this research one step further” (p. 94).

In chapter 5, Timarová, Čeňková, Meylaerts,
Hertog, Szmałec and Duyck "Simultaneous
interpreting and working memory capacity" (p. 101-
126), present interesting findings regarding the
relationship between working memory capacity
(WMC) and simultaneous interpreting (SI). While
previous research correlates WMC and SI, the
results of Timarová et al.’s investigation, focusing
on age and general cognitive abilities, and their
interaction with experience and interpreting skills,
do not support a relationship between the two
constructs. This is an innovative study given that
there are important methodological differences
regarding previous research, such as the selection
of interpreting variables, i.e., participants who
consisted of a sample of professional interpreters
with age range spanning several decades. It would
have been interesting to include a control group
in the present study. Future studies will need to
target the exact role of WMC during interpreting,
a question that remains unresolved.

Vandepitte, Hartsuiker and Van Assche’s
contribution in chapter 6, “Process and text studies
of a translation problem” (p. 127-143), reports three
case studies which reveal that metonymic language
constitutes a translation problem, confirming the
preliminary findings in Vandepitte and Hartsuiker
(2011). They offer a detailed description of pauses
(more cognitive effort involved) in order to prove
if metonymic constructions slow down translation
and cause longer pauses. They conclude that“Itenonyms sentences had a lower number of
initial pauses than non-metonymic sentences,
but a higher number of medial pauses and final
pauses” (p. 131). Although the three studies require
further investigation, they are able to formulate
new hypotheses for translation process studies. In
the future research they suggest (experiments with
sentences in context, larger samples, eye-tracking
methodology, etc.), it would be interesting to ana-
lyze if there are differences regarding metaphoric
language, as proven in Brdar and Brdar-Szabó
(2013), who claim that metonymy translates more
easily owing to the shorter conceptual difference
between metonymic source and target (2013: 206).

In chapter 7, Carl, Gutermuth and Hansen-
Schirra “Post-editing machine translation:
Efficiency, strategies, and revision processes in
professional translation settings” (p. 145-174), pres-
ent a multi-method approach with the aim of ana-
lyzing human processes involved in post-editing
(PE) and typical PE strategies to shed light on the
question of how efficient post-editing machine
translation (PEMT) is. Among other things, the
novelty of this paper lives in the fact that, so far, the
language direction English-German had not been
studied in order to understand how post-editors
proceed in PEMT. Interestingly, even though PE
proves to be rather efficient, translators still prefer
to translate from scratch than to post-edit machine
translated output. A change in perspective could
help to improve the translators’ attitudes towards
MT in general and PEMT in particular. Conse-
sequently, “PEMT should be an essential part of
university curricula […] to better prepare students
for their professional lives” (p. 150).

Finally, da Silva offers another original study
that may help to evaluate translation problems
and strategies, “On a more robust approach to
triangulating retrospective protocols and key log-
ing in translation process research” (p. 175-201).
The chapter reports on an exploratory experiment
based on a combined analysis of key logging and
retrospective protocols in order to examine the
impact of domain knowledge on segmentation
and representation patterns. Contrary to the initial
assumption, the data of the pilot study show that
subjects tend to have a segmentation pattern at
word or group word regardless of task difficulty. Also, the analysis on translators’ representation provides new resources that help to enlighten the reader about how to understand translation expertise.

This book undoubtedly provides an invaluable source of information on current issues in translation and interpreting from psycholinguistic and cognitive domains. Along with state-of-the-art chapters, it offers new experimental designs that have been developed drawing on a variety of methodologies such as eye tracking, key logging, screen recording, retrospective protocols, and post-editing machine translation. The original investigations, which can be scrutinized in future studies, add important insights and contributions to the field of translation process research.
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