SIL Global
Language and Culture Archives

Journal of Translation
ISSN 1558-7282 (online)
https://siljot.org

Book review

Review of: Translation: The Basics by Juliane House

Ernst R. Wendland

Journal of Translation 16 (1), 2020: 57–66.
https://doi.org/10.54395/JOT-J83X9

License

©2020, SIL Global

Made available under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0

More resources available at:
https://sil.org/resources/language-culture-archives

Book Review

Translation: The Basics

by Juliane House

London & New York: Routledge, 2018. 222 pages. Paper $28.95. ISBN: 978-1-138-01641-5.

Reviewed by Ernst Wendland
University of Stellenbosch

This introductory but extremely thorough and well-written text is included in the ever-growing Routledge *The Basics* book series. The author, Dr. Juliane House, a world-recognized figure in the field of translation studies, is emeritus professor of Hamburg University and Distinguished University Professor at Hellenic American University of Athens. The book under review consists of 210 pages, including an Introduction, four major topical sections, a Glossary of key terms, an extensive Reference section, and an Index of subjects and personages. The following content summary and evaluation will focus on subjects, methods, and issues of special interest and relevance to the teaching and practice of Bible translation.

In the **Introduction**, House states as her primary aim the desire to familiarize readers "with some basic ideas and trends in the field of translation studies" (1). This is followed by a handy summary of the book's twelve chapters, each a paragraph long except for the first, which is somewhat more extensive. An exemplary feature of the entire text is the transparent, easy-to-follow manner in which it is organized and signposted throughout with helpful sectional summaries and in-chapter subheadings.

Part I of this book consists of four chapters that deal with **Basic Issues in the Field of Translation,** with chapter 1, "What is translation?" effectively laying the foundation for what is to come. First and fundamentally, "How can we define translation?" (9, cf. ch. 3). However, from the perspective of Scripture translation, I found the initial definition rather too general: "Translation is a procedure where an original text, often called 'the source text', *is replaced by* another text in a different language, often called 'the target text'" (9, added italics).[1] It would be more precise to state that this process of textual "replacement" includes the necessary qualification or proviso that any target text should bear a significantly identifiable linguistic relationship with its source. The author goes on to provide positive as well as negative perspectives on the work of translating. Positively, "translators are valued because their act of mediating between different languages, cultures, and societies proves an important service for people who speak only their mother tongue" (9). Negatively, however, translation is sometimes viewed as a type of "secondary communication" that "clearly lacks originality" (10). Now in a sense this is, and must be, true—that is, generally speaking with respect to overall semantic content. However, in terms of target language (TL) form (stylistics) and occasionally communicative function (rhetoric) as well, a translation may, depending on its purpose and desired setting of use as well as the translator's abilities, exhibit a great deal of artistic originality, even in the case of sacred Scripture.[2] House calls attention to this dimension when discussing two principal types of "equivalence."

Thus, translation, properly understood (as an interlingual, intercultural process) manifests a vital "double-bind relationship" involving "semantic equivalence" as well as "pragmatic equivalence" (10). The former, a "backwards orientation," has reference to "the content of the original text [that] needs to be kept equivalent in the translated text"; the latter, on the other hand, is a "forward orientation" that "takes account of the style of the translated text, its level of formality and the way its different parts hang together" (10). In short, "the translated text is a [close] rendering of an [carefully] interpreted version of the original" (10, *my additions in brackets*), which is a convenient way of putting it. We note in passing the prominence of the notion of

[1] For a more detailed attempt at defining this discipline, see Ernst Wendland, "Translating 'Translation': What do Translators 'Translate'?" in Said Faiq, ed., *Discourse in Translation* (London: Routledge, 2019).
[2] For an elaborations of this theme, see Ernst Wendland, *Translating the Literature of Scripture* (Dallas: SIL International, 2004), 1–28.

equivalence in House's discussion of these core concepts of translation; this emphasis continues throughout the book and is a welcome departure from some contemporary treatments of this subject.[3]

House then offers "a brief glance at the history of translation theory and practice," which considers "the development of translation practices and theories from a Western perspective" (10–11). In addition to covering some familiar ground (Cicero, Horace, St Jerome, Luther, Schleiermacher), she importantly points out that "the same concerns about 'literal' and 'free' translation can also be seen in the rich ancient translation tradition in China and in the Arab world" (14).

Regarding "some recurrent issues: translation as art or science, and product or process" (15, cf. ch. 7), House makes a rather sharp division between "literary texts," where "the linguistic form and the content are seen as a single inseparable unit," and "'pragmatic' or non-literary texts" (15). But many types of modern advertising would appear to disprove that distinction, especially in short graphic ads displayed via public media such as on highway billboards or in television commercials. Thus, many decorative popular adverts capitalize also on linguistic-literary form in order to draw the attention of readers and viewers to the content being simultaneously exhibited. In her presentation of interlingual communication, House notes the distinction between "[written] translation and [oral] interpreting" (16), but she views the latter as a topic best treated as a separate discipline (2).

We move then from a helpful initial survey of "Human and computer-mediated translation" (17, cf. ch. 12) to "translation as a cross-cultural and an intercultural phenomenon" (20, cf. ch. 4). Indeed, "computerized translation programmes can relieve human translators of repetitious, boring and time-consuming tasks by giving them access to large translation corpora and a variety of reference works and terminological dictionaries" (18), while translation assistants like Google Translate and the Bing Translator are continually being improved and "assisted by 'deep learning' from digital neural networks" (19). However, the human controller and corrector cannot yet be done away with, especially when attempting to deal effectively with stylistics and the crucial cultural component, where translators constantly need "to be aware of differences in conventionalized meanings that derive from their cultural embeddedness" (21). While it is true that "the idea of 'difference' lies at the heart of translation" (20), the concept of similarity with regard to form, content, and function is equally important, especially in the search for suitable translational equivalents.[4]

The chapter concludes with a glance at "the growth of translation practices worldwide" (21, cf. ch. 10), being stimulated by worldwide globalization on the one hand, coupled with localization on the other (22–23).

Chapter 2 considers the diverse dimensions of "Translation competence," the first aspect being its components (24). Three fundamental skills are needed for competent translating: "Source text processing skills, transfer skills and target-related skills," with the "core translation competence" being that of message "transfer," including "knowledge and awareness of the equivalence relationships between the two languages" (25).[5] "A bilingual person is not automatically a competent translator," since such an interlingual wordsmith must possess the gift of maintaining "a constant mental interaction of two linguistic systems" in one's mind with the ability to carry out "a constant monitoring of the similarities and differences at all levels of language" (26).

Furthermore, translation competence is highly "context- and situation-dependent" (26) since it "needs to be judged with reference to the demands made by the context of the translation situation" (26), which "covers a

[3] "The notion of equivalence is undoubtedly one of the most problematic and controversial areas in the field of translation theory. The term has caused, and it seems quite probable that it will continue to cause, heated debates within the field of translation studies" (Vanessa Leonardi, "Equivalence in Translation: Between Myth and Reality," *Translation Journal* 4:4, 2000, online at www.translationjournal.net/journal/14equiv.htm). More recently, Anthony Pym, *Exploring Translation Theories* (London: Routledge, 2010) states: "Equivalence went out of style" (64). Pym, who supports the notion (chs. 2–3), describes "a group of theories that have been generally opposed to the equivalence paradigm" in chs. 4–8 of his book.

[4] On this issue, see further discussion at: www.academia.edu/34871506/Whats_the_Difference_Similarity_and_Dissimilarity_from_a_Cross-Cultural_Perspective_Some_Reflections_on_the_Notion_of_Acceptability_in_Bible_Translation).

[5] Regarding the conceptual mediating activity of "transfer" in the translation process, see E.A. Nida and C.R. Taber, *The Theory and Practice of Translation* (Leiden: EJ Brill, 1969), 99–119.

multitude of items that can have an influence on the act of translation and its reception by addressees" (27).[6] The factor of knowledge also enters into the assessment process in relation to both the source and target settings—technical, practical, socio-cultural, general, and field-specific (27). House breaks the field of knowledge into a number of sub-categories: declarative (what-is), procedural (how-to), explicit (theoretical and technological), implicit (experiential), intuitive (*Schprachgefühl*), and meta-cognitive (the ability to self-monitor and correct one's errors) (28–29). The ideal outcome is a multifaceted, "highly developed strategic competence" based on personal intelligence, learning, and experience that allows a translator "to make optimal use of a combination of the different knowledge types in the target text production in a specific translation situation" (29). The various components of a dynamic (textual, communicative, and functional) competence are currently being experimentally researched by the PACTE (Process of Acquisition of Translation Competence and Evaluation) Group (30), presumably for inputting into current training programs and vetting systems.[7]

In chapter 3, House is concerned with "Looking at translation from different perspectives" with regard to theory and practice (31).[8] To begin with, she surveys some of the main contributions of linguistics to the field of translation, mainly in the latter half of the 20th century: Roman Jacobson and his intersemiotic approach within the Prague School of Functional Linguistics (31, 34); the Leipzig school of translation science, which developed the fundamental concept of equivalence (32); the pioneers of text linguistics such as de Beaugrande & Dressler and Hatim & Mason (33); J.C. Catford and the notion of "translation shifts" (35); Nida & Taber's "influential early functional-linguistic theory of translation" (35–36). Most of this is familiar ground, but situating this overview within a larger framework of the development of translation studies is helpful, as is the concluding summary: "In linguistically oriented translation approaches, the original text is important in that one needs to analyse it in detail and systematically link its forms and functions to reveal the original author's motivated choices" (36).

The focus of attention then shifts to a concern for the influence on translation practice by "literary and cultural systems," as exemplified by approaches such as Even Zohar's polysystem theory (37); Gideon Toury's descriptive translation studies (38); Theo Hermans' "manipulation" of literary translation (39); and the George Steiner's hermeneutic school of translation (39). We turn next to theorists and practitioners that emphasize the socio-cultural context of translation, that is, to "post-modernist, post-colonial, post-structuralist, and functionalistic views" (40). The ideas of Venuti, de Campos (40), Benjamin, Derrida, Foucault, and von Flotow (41) are briefly reviewed, along with a somewhat longer description of the more important *Skopos* functionalist approach, where "function" is defined as "the real-world effect of a text in a certain context" (42). To conclude this chapter, the view of "translation as an act of re-contextualization" is considered from several perspectives, namely Malinowski's notion of a text's enveloping context of situation (43); speech act theory (43), in my opinion, another sub-type of functionalism (42); contrastive discourse analysis (44); and early British contextualism, which developed the familiar situational parameters of field, mode, and tenor (44–45).

Chapter 4 surveys the important role that is played by "Culture and ideology in translation" (46). In discussing the question of "What is culture?" two basic views (humanistic, anthropological) and four analytical levels (general, national, social, personal) are distinguished (46–47). House focuses on the anthropological concept of culture, which "refers to the overall way of life of a community or society…a group's dominant and learned set of habits," involving its fundamental "presuppositions, preferences, and values" (47).[9] More specifically then, in relation to a traditional approach to "culture and national characters, mentalities, stereotypes" (47), two dominant aspects of culture are highlighted, with representative examples: "the *cognitive* one guiding

[6] Various aspects of these contextual factors are discussed and exemplified in Timothy Wilt and Ernst Wendland, *Scripture Frames & Framing* (Stellenbosch: African SUN Media, 2008).
[7] For a perspective on competency in relation to Bible translators and translation teams, see Eugene A. Nida, *Toward a Science of Translation* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1964), 150–155; Katharine Barnwell, *Bible Translation: An Introductory Course* (Fourth Edition, Dallas: SIL, 2020), 301–305.
[8] From the perspective of Bible translating, see Philip A. Noss (ed.), *A History of Bible Translation* (Rome: Edizioni di Storia et Letteratura and Manchester: St. Jerome, 2007, 2011), chapter 10.
[9] For a corresponding overview from the perspective of Bible translating, see Ernst Wendland, *Contextual Frames of Reference in Translation* (Manchester: St Jerome, 2008), chs. 2–3.

and monitoring human actions and the *social* one emphasizing traditional features shared by members of a society" (48, added italics).

In more recent post-modern times and a globalized world, greater attention is being given to "small cultures, communities of practice, [and] superdiversity" according to the understanding that "the very idea of 'culture' is an unacceptable abstraction" (50). "Cultures themselves are, on this view, mere ideologies," and within any group there exists a multitude of different mental representations on several levels of generality: individual, public, and cultural (50). In any case, whether one happens to agree with these modern distinctions or not, human language remains the most prominent exponent of cultural expression, for it is "the prime means of an individual's acquiring knowledge of the world, of transmitting mental representations and making them public and intersubjectively accessible" (51).

Zeroing in then on the role of ideology in translation, House points out the "recent focus on culture as a site of ideological struggle, a view of translators as stimulators of 'resistance' of hegemonic influence, and a focus on how 'meanings' in texts serve to set up and maintain relations of power and domination" (52–53).[10] This is a subject of special interest in so-called "critical discourse analysis" (e.g., Fairclough 1995), where the practice of translation "is regarded as a process that is inevitably influenced by the power differences between [among?] participants" (53). Disparate ideological opinions may also be abundantly manifested in the "paratextual material that is used to frame the text, such as prefaces, afterwords and other interpretive 'aids'" (53). The issue of ideology also becomes important when initially planning the various aspects involved in "audience design" and the extent to which a translator (or team) needs to accommodate, adapt, or annotate a given source text message in keeping with the needs, expectations, and world-view of the intended target group (54–55).[11] House observes that "many literary and scientific texts of historical importance may need to be translated in such a way that their meaning is translated faithfully" (55)—a position that would naturally also apply to a community's sacred scriptures.

Part II of *Translation—The Basics* deals with **Some Much-Discussed Concepts in Translation Theory** (57), and the first of these (ch. 5) concerns "The possibilities and impossibilities of translation," in other words, "when and why is translation impossible" (59). In my opinion, this is perhaps the most insightful chapter in the entire book, for it discusses a subject that is not often treated in such depth and detail, namely, the practice of translation in relation to the theory of linguistic relativity—the belief that "language in its lexicon and grammar has an influence on its speakers' thinking, their 'world-view' and on their behavior" (59). House begins with "an historical overview" of linguistic relativity, surveying the ideas of early thinkers such as Wilhelm von Humboldt, Edward Sapir, and Benjamin Lee Whorf (60–61). Then some more "recent research on linguistic relativity and its impact on translation" is traced (62). In an important discussion, House develops a credible argument that, contrary to the relativist position, "translation is still possible," for "all languages have the resources to express any experience or state of affairs in a comparable manner" (63). Though linguistic relativity certainly influences certain aspects of our thinking and behavior, including verbal expression, it does not predetermine or overly delimit these human capabilities. On the contrary, "there is always an escape from the trap of one's language – through language itself, through the creativity, dynamism, flexibility, as well as complexity and basic similarity of individuals and of languages" (65).

In an interesting section on culture, context and translatability, the notion of linguistic-cultural relativity is described, which refers to a normal person's "knowledge of the *application* that linguistic units have in particular situational and socio-cultural contexts which makes translation possible" (65, original italics). Thus, "even if the cultural distance between languages is great, cultural gaps can always be bridged via ethnographic knowledge and insights or, stated negatively, untranslatability only occurs whenever such knowledge, such insights, such reflection is absent" (66). Translation then involves a "bilingual [add 'bicultural'?] mode" of thinking and a process of re-contextualization, whereby an understanding (or, the

[10] Ideology is a matter of concern also in modern Bible translation studies (a field that is largely ignored in House's presentation); see, for example, Timothy Wilt, ed., *Bible Translation: Frames of Reference* (Manchester: St Jerome, 2003), ch. 5; plus many references in Noss, *A History of Bible Translation*, as well as several related entries in P. A. Noss, ed., *A Guide to Bible Translation* (Xulon Press, 2019).

[11] See also Lourens de Vries, "Bible Translations: Forms and Functions" (Wilt & Wendland, *Scripture Frames*, 178–189).

intended message) of the original text in its sociocultural context is restated in another (target) language and situational setting. Furthermore, it is only by means of a covert (functionally-sensitive) approach "that linguistic-cultural relativity is built into the translation process itself" (67).

With regard to the limits of translatability, then, House feels that there are but few exceptions to the principle of universal translatability (68), one being the use of social and regional dialects (69). However, I would go even further and remove her apparent exception of connotative meanings with particular reference to the use of recognized literary forms (68). Why can these features too not be reproduced in translation through creative transposition and a dynamic application of functional equivalence? To be sure, such artistic forms and their associated connotations would not turn out to be *the same* in another language-culture, but why not *sufficiently similar* in terms of both impact and appeal? However, any determination of the degree to which such translatability is possible and successful (or not) would depend on the theoretical perspective of the evaluators as well as the type of assessment model being applied (cf. ch. 7).

From the possibilities of translation, House moves in chapter 6 to the question of whether or not there are universals of translation (70). But first, a related issue must be addressed: Are there more general universals of language? After a consideration of the typological empiricist universalist tradition represented by scholars like Joseph Greenberg and Uriel Weinreich (71), the generative model of grammar is discussed with reference to Noam Chomsky and so-called Universal Grammar (72). House turns next to her preferred functional perspective, where "the universals posited…are used to represent bottom-up generalizations across languages," with special reference to "the two essential functions of language," namely, "to convey information and to establish and maintain social relations between human beings" (73). One might question, however, why only these two functions—the informative and the relational—are deemed to be essential, to the exclusion of other possibilities, such as expressive and affective functions?[12]

In any case, this survey concludes with a summary of Halliday's influential systemic-functional method, "which has proved to be most useful for the study of translation" (73). His three proposed metafunctions are described in some detail: the ideational, interpersonal, and textual. Thus, "*ideationally*, language reflects our human experience, our interpretation of all that goes on around us, outside and inside" (73) and everything associated with this cognition-generating and language-mapping capability. "*Interpersonally*, language is a way of initiating and maintaining social relationships," while "*textually*, language involves the creation of information," that is, "discourse, the patterned forms of wording that constitute meaningful semiotic contexts" (74, added italics). I wanted to suggest an additional necessary function, the "contextual," but Halliday (and House) apparently feel that this is still part of the "textual" dimension, which includes the linguistic resources for "ensuring that each instance of text makes contact with its environment," whether cultural, situational, or co-/inter-textual (74).

House then turns to a stimulating discussion of translation—as distinct from language—universals, the former referring to various postulated "universal tendencies of the translation process, laws of translation and norms of translation," for example, explicitation, simplification, disambiguation, conventionalization, standardization, the avoidance of repetition, and so forth (75). Her perhaps surprising conclusion is that "there can be no universals at the level of performance [parole], i.e., no translation universals" (75), and she proceeds to give four reasons for adopting this exclusive theoretical stance. For one thing, the types of linguistic phenomena listed above are "NOT universals of translation per se, or sui generis universals, but simply universals of language [langue] that apply to translation" (76). The other problem for such supposed universal features is "that candidates of universality suggested for one particular translation direction need not necessarily be candidates for universality in the opposite direction" (76), and House submits her own extensive corpus-based research into the "translations of children's books from English into German and German into English" to back up these claims (77).

Chapter 7 addresses the crucial issue of evaluation and the question of how we know when a translation is good (78).[13] This assessment process must be carried out with respect to three distinct areas of relationship, namely, that between (a) macro-structural features of the original source text and its translation; (b) micro-

[12] See, for example, Wendland, *Translating*, 215–217.
[13] Regarding the issue of Bible translation assessment, see Wendland, *Contextual Frames*, ch.10.

structural features of the source text and its translation;[14] and (c) the translation and other types of multilingual text production in the TL (79). House then presents a review of the various approaches that are explicitly or implicitly related to translation: psycho-social (79); response-based (80–81); and text- and discourse-oriented views, including descriptive-historical translation studies (82), post-modernist, post-structuralist, and deconstructionist approaches (83), and linguistically-oriented approaches (83).[15] While all the main schools of Translation Studies appear to be included here, I found the categories as described to be rather blurred and somewhat debatable, for example, why would a post-modernist methodology be combined with linguistically-oriented approaches and listed under the general category of text- and discourse-oriented views rather than response-based approaches?

We then move to House's own model of translation quality assessment, which she asserts as still "the only fully formulated one in existence" (79). This is preceded by a detailed discussion of "the single most important concept in translation theory, that of 'equivalence'" because it "is also a fundamental notion for translation quality assessment" (84). Though discounted by some modern theorists in translation studies, as noted earlier, the concept is strongly upheld in several recent studies, including the rigorous research of House.[16] For example, "Equivalence is the fundamental criterion of translation quality—one of the aims of an adequate assessment is to specify the equivalence relations by differentiating between different equivalence frameworks" from semantic, pragmatic, and textual perspectives (85). In particular, the shifting pragmatic context of situation (field, tenor, mode, 87) is documented as a source text passes from one language and sociological setting to another, and the overall "textual profile" of the former is systematically and critically compared with the latter in order to reveal any significant mismatches. These may be dimensional (pragmatic) in nature or non-dimensional, that is, "errors with regard to denotative meanings in the translation as well as breaches of target language norms" (86). In addition to register, which "captures the connection between texts and their 'micro-context'," another important component of the House quality assessment model is genre, which "connects texts with the 'macro-context' of the linguacultural community in which a text is embedded" (88).

In conjunction with her method of evaluating translated texts, House discusses several other important concepts, such as the difference between overt (more literal) and covert (more idiomatic) translations (89–91); a cultural filter, that is, "a means of capturing socio-cultural differences in expectation norms and stylistic conventions between the source and target linguacultural communities" (whether textually or para-textually, 92); and the use of corpus studies in translation related research (96–97). Several componential, flow-chart diagrams help readers to fit some of the key pieces of her assessment model into place (for example, the following flow chart from p. 97),[17] but it would greatly help one to follow this rather thick procedural description if specific examples to illustrate the various aspects or parameters were periodically inserted into the discussion—or a single all-inclusive practical illustration provided at the end.

Part III of this book considers **Some Important New Trends in Translation Studies** (99), beginning with a survey of several popular methods for investigating "What goes on in translators' heads when they are translating" (chapter 8, 101).[18] The first type of translation process research that is considered involves "studies using introspection and verbal reporting" based on "interviews with translators, questionnaires or surveys" (101) as well as the analysis of "thinking-aloud protocol (TAP) data" (102). House then raises a number of "still unresolved questions with regard to translation-related introspective and retrospective research methodology" (101), the most important issue being the nature of consciousness and the initial need for a comprehensive theory that is capable of dealing with the results that stem from research in this field (102).

---

[14] These descriptions are my own; I am not sure that I have clearly understood the distinction between categories (a) and (b) as stated in the text since no clarifying examples are supplied.
[15] See Wilt, *Bible Translation*, 10–25.
[16] See also her books *Translation* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009); *Translation Quality Assessment: Past and Present* (London: Routledge, 2015).
[17] House's translation model may be compared with the recent Frames of Reference approach in Bible translating, as outlined in Timothy Wilt, "Translation and Communication," in Wilt, *Bible Translation*, 27–80; cf. also Wilt and Wendland, *Scripture Frames & Framing*, passim.
[18] This issue is not a very great concern in Bible translating since most work is done as interactive teams.

Next, "translation process research using behavioral experiments" is described, namely, computer-related technological data derived from "experiments using keystroke logging (or keylogging), screen recording, eye-tracking and various other physiological measures" (104). One central research objective is "the quest for the 'translation unit' associated with cognitive effort expended during a translation task" (105). However, important questions remain concerning such experimentation, for example, "Can measurements of observable behavior (as provided in key-logging, eye-tracking, etc.) [*reliably*] inform us about cognitive process that occur in a translator's mind?" (106).

Finally, bilingual neuro-imaging studies are discussed (107), but once again, there is need for "theory with enough descriptive and explanatory potential before expecting enlightenment" from such research (108). House concludes by pointing to a promising "neuro-linguistic theory of the functioning of two languages in the brain" (108). In the absence of some illustrative examples or a case study, it is difficult to comprehend this rather complex theoretical discussion, the aim of which is to investigate how the bilingual person's "implicit linguistic competence ('the grammar') constrains the encoding of the [translated] message and the pragmatics component makes selections in terms of styles, registers, discourse norms, speech act directness, politeness, etc." (110). Although I do not fully understand all of the components of this intricate theory, intuitively I felt the urge to query these interrelated conclusions: "Expert translators often do not need to access the conceptual system as they move [*how?*] directly from the source language to the target language" (111), and therefore, the claim can be made that "covert translation is psycholinguistically simple since only one pragmatics-cum-linguistics representational network—the one for the *target language*—is being activated in translation" (112, added italics). But how can this be so if in covert translation "the function of the *original text* is maintained" (178), presumably also the function(s) of literary form in the source text?

In chapter 9, House presents a more detailed description of using corpora in translation studies—"corpus" being defined as "a body of computer-readable texts analysable (semi-)automatically and sampled in a principled and transparent way" (113). Two basic types of corpus are productive in translation studies: "comparable corpora consisting of two collections of texts in the same language"—original texts and translations from other languages (113). On the other hand, "parallel corpora [consist] of original source language texts in one language and their translated texts in another language" (114).[19] Such translation-oriented corpora "provide a reliable tool for clarifying hypothesized equivalences and for establishing reliable patterns of translation regularities"; in other words, "equivalence in translation can be made open to generalization and intersubjective verification through the use of parallel corpora and comparable corpora" (114). Corpus-based data can then be used along with other qualitative and quantitative tools, such as introspection, observation, textual and ethnographic analysis to "provide a [research] framework for finding out what sort of questions should be asked about translation and about language used in different ways" (115).

The chapter concludes with two examples of the use of corpora in conjunction with "House's translation quality assessment model" (117, cf. 96–97). The first, a corpus-based *translation project* (115), investigated the degree to which "English-German translations in the field of popular science would allow more and more importations of conventions and norms from the English source text, which would then also gradually find their way into German comparable, monolingually produced (non-translated) texts" (119). The second example is that of a corpus-based case study of *translation*, one carried out by the author herself involving several aspects of discourse differentiation between German and English texts with respect to "linking constructions" (e.g., "for example," "for instance") (120–121), devices indicating "spokenness" or informality in popular science texts (122–123), and a comparative study of the use of the transitional particle "so" in corresponding German and English texts (124–126). In conclusion, House observes that "much more longitudinal corpus-based research is needed, taking account of a host of different factors that influence language variation and change through language contact in translation" (127).

[19] Corpus text analysis is a field that would be worth exploring more fully with reference to Bible translation in conjunction with electronic software such as ParaTExt (https://paratext.org/).

"Translation in the age of globalization and digitalization" is the heading for chapter 10, which also considers "the role of English in its function as a global lingua franca" (128).[20] Globalization "involves a variety of processes—economic, technological, social, cultural and political—which have for some time now denationalized" (129) many different types of international engagement and exchange throughout the world—mostly for the better (e.g., commerce and communication), but in some respects also for worse (e.g., global terrorism). The linguistic aspects of globalization occur at different levels of language, which are then briefly described; for example, "at the pragmatic and discourse level, globalized norms of written discourse in various genres seem to 'drift' towards English-based rhetorical structures" (130), undoubtedly greatly facilitated by computer-mediated communication and internet domains (131). Globalized linguistic signs "lead to the creation of new globalized multilingual landscapes" (130) and translation-oriented initiatives, such as "eco-translatology" which originated in China (132).[21]

The remainder and bulk of this chapter takes up "the role of English as a global lingua franca for translation…[and] the use of which in different locales results in the employment of different, particular forms of discourse" (133). "The most important features of English as a lingua franca [ELF] today are its enormous functional flexibility, its immense variability and its spread across many different linguistic, geographical and cultural areas, as well as the readiness with which linguistic items from different languages can be, and in fact are, integrated into the English language" (134). The use of ELF is especially prominent in domains such as science, technology, engineering, medicine, academics, and scholarly publications,[22] but speakers tend to strongly prefer their own mother tongue [MT] for more affective, culturally-based purposes and in more informal, domestic settings. Thus, the "globalization process that boosted ELF use have led to a continuing massive increase in translations worldwide," both into and out of English (135). With regard to the latter, there is "a growing demand for translation in localization industries," for the production of a "localized, i.e., culturally filtered and translated, version of a product is essential for opening up new markets," whether through some type of printed version or via the World Wide Web (136). The converse of this would be internationalization, where businesses and other agencies design their products, including texts for advertisements, in a more generalized manner that is more readily adaptable to different linguacultures (138, 182). Furthermore, as globalization and translation become even more closely and widely intertwined around the world, there is a concomitant "increase in translation projects in the digital economy, which are carried out by teams of professionals under the supervision of a project manager," but involving the participation of ELF translators alongside MT editors (139–140).

Part IV, **Translation in the Real World** (141), leads off with a consideration of "The role of translation in language learning and teaching" (chapter 11, 143). The discussion begins with an overview of the history of translation in foreign language learning and teaching (144), beginning with the traditional grammar-translation method (145). The long-standing control of the classical pedagogy of language learning was finally broken in the 20th century and almost completely overtaken by the so-called "direct method" of instruction, which features "the exclusive use of the foreign language and the abolition of any form of translation" (145), more recently enhanced by the dialogue-based audio-lingual method (146). Today, however, another turn has been taken in the preferred approach, namely, a bilingualization process, in which "foreign language learning and teaching is no longer seen as an entirely monolingual undertaking, but a bilingual one" (146) that features a significant use of translation and pragmatic inter-cultural sensitization in the methodology. House presents several good reasons from this major shift in perspective, the major one being that "translation promotes explicit knowledge about the foreign language and awareness of similarities and differences [*including relevant form-function equivalences*] between the native and foreign language systems as well as conventional uses of these situations in different situations, genres and text types" (147).

---

[20] For a somewhat corresponding perspective from the field of Bible translation, see Edesio Sánchez-Cetina, "Word of God, Word of the People: Translating the Bible in Post-Missionary Times," in Noss, *A History*, 387–408; cf. Simon Wong, "Digitization of Old Chinese Bibles (pre-1950s)," *The Bible Translator* 68(1):11–19.

[21] Unfortunately, I cannot further describe this particular enterprise, since its description—in the absence of any examples—was difficult to comprehend.

[22] We might add the great influence of English and English versions in worldwide Bible translation work. I am not necessarily endorsing this phenomenon; it is simply a fact of the modern age.

The second half of this chapter is devoted to a survey of some "New alternative uses of translation in pedagogic contexts," thus making "a virtue out of what has often been considered a vice in language teaching circles" (149).[23] For one, when teaching any foreign language, it is advisable that "a whole range of 'para-translation activities' should be included," especially for more advanced learners, for example, the "explicit comparisons of linguacultural phenomena in the source and target languages" (148). House then offers a helpful sample of the various types of translation-based exercises that might be incorporated within such a pedagogical program, in particular, language-cultural contrastive activities, which are "useful for sensitizing learners to the different repertories of linguistic means through which a particular textual function is realized in learners' mother tongue and in the foreign language" (149), as well as learning how to effectively recognize and correct linguistic "mismatches" (150). Even in the teaching and learning that occurs in other academic disciplines, "translation is now more often seen as an omnipresent general interpretative activity that plays an important role in realizing pragmatic meaning within and across languages" (152).

Finally, in chapter 12, House considers "Translation as a social practice in real-life situations," first of all then in multilingual institutions such as the European Union (154).[24] "Institutional translation concerns organizational, ideological and historical aspects of an institution in which translations habitually occur, as well as the impact of an institution on translators and the process and product of their professional output" (154). In terms of practice, institutional translations "routinely involve teams of translators who draft the translations collectively [and anonymously!] in working groups and committees" (156) in an effort to create "the illusion of equality" (155). In order to promote such equality, the EU has idealistically adopted "the principle of equivalence…to make EU texts function smoothly in the discourse of the institution, both internally and externally with the public at large," a policy that does not often work out as intended in actual practice due to various other inequities within the organization (155).

With regard to "Translation in multilingual and multicultural societies" (156), it is now recognized that "a monolingual perspective is no longer tenable and should be replaced by a multilingual perspective in education and many other domains of contemporary life" (157). This trend is being manifested in societies all over the world with the result that "translators and interpreters are now in more demand than ever before [since] they play a crucial role in avoiding linguistic and cultural misunderstandings" (157), for example, in settings where migrants seek to adapt to a foreign environment and host societies are under pressure to try to understand and accommodate them.

This final chapter concludes with a survey of a diversity of other technical as well as practical service areas in today's world where translation is either developing new skills and practices, or where the field is facing ongoing challenges: "Micro-history in translation," where the work of past and present translators is more thoroughly documented (157); "The working environment of translators," which nowadays "is characterized by an intensive interaction with a computer" (158) and "computer-assisted tools" (CAT) along with the increased practice of cultural adaptation, or localization (159); "Ethics in the practice of translation," including the development of a "heightened transcultural consciousness" (160) that "takes [greater] account of the norms and conventions of the culture into which the original's translation is 'entering'" (161); "Translation and conflict in the practice of translation" (167), especially in settings of warfare and social or inter-ethnic strife, where the politics of translation becomes relevant and the ideological framing of news and other crucial information (168); "Audiovisual translation as a site of collaborative practice," due to the complex multimodality and orality of the texts involved and their "semiotic complexity" (170),[25] for example, with respect to practices such as subtitling and revoicing (171); finally, "Digitalization and the rise of a new participatory culture in translation" (173), where digital, especially audio-visual and interactive web-based technologies are currently "effecting lasting changes in the production, distribution and consumption of

[23] This is an important caveat for many modern instructors of biblical languages, namely, those who promote the exclusive use of a direct method in the teaching of ancient Hebrew and NT Greek, which, at least in my teaching experience, produces inferior exegetes of the text of Scripture—good speakers or readers, perhaps, but rather poor grammarians! See *Contextual Frames*, ch. 12.

[24] Surely, all worldwide Bible translating organizations and agencies should be included here, for example, those listed as members of the Forum of Bible Agencies International (https://forum-intl.org/).

[25] This complex communicative dimension applies to many new Bible translation products as well (Ernst Wendland, *Orality and Scripture: Composition, Translation, and Transmission*, Dallas: SIL International, 2013, 49–52).

digitized media," often involving the participation of ordinary citizens, active consumers, and volunteer or amateur translators (174) in what may be viewed as "co-creational, networked cyber communities" (175).

As already noted, in addition to a listing of References (189) and a subject-person Index (200), *Translation—The Basics* concludes with a helpful Glossary of key terms and concepts (176–188); several salient examples follow:

> **Connotation**: Cultural and/or affective shades of meaning carried by a word or phrase (see also **Denotation**) (177)
>
> **Cultural filter**: A procedure used in covert translation (see above) by a translator in order to make the translation compatible with target culture discourse norms and preferences (178)
>
> **Framing**: A process of embedding events, themes and texts in a subjective frame of interpretation (180)
>
> **Intentionality**: Refers to the purpose of a text's author (182)
>
> **Localization**: A procedure in which a translated text is adapted to the local, socio-cultural norms of the target culture (183)
>
> **Overt translation**: A type of translation in which the original text is, as far as possible, preserved such that the linguistic forms and structures of the original often "shine through" the target text (184)

I can highly recommend this book to all theorists, translators, teachers, and trainers as being a thorough general introduction to the contemporary field of translation studies. While I would have appreciated more illustrative examples to clarify some of the more technical issues, along with a selection of references to what is currently going on in what we might term "*biblical* translation studies,"[26] I recognize that when one is dealing with "the basics," a rather difficult decision must be made regarding what information on the subject to include or leave out. Perhaps to fill these occasional gaps the author might in future consider preparing a workbook to accompany the present instructive text, one that would elucidate and/or provide practice exercises for the more difficult concepts discussed and guide readers into additional relevant publications in the field.

[26] For starters, see Noss, *History*; Noss, *Guide*.