Helle V. Dam*/Anne Schjoldager*

Wadensjö, Cecilia: *Interpreting as Interaction. On dialogue-interpreting in immigration hearings and medical encounters.* Lindköping University, 1992.

1.   General introduction

In recent years interpreting has been subject to an increasing amount of interest from scholars worldwide. To a great extent, however, the scholarly attention has been directed towards the branch of conference interpreting, whereas the widely used type of interpreting usually referred to as community or dialogue interpreting - ie interpreting in bilingual conversations between two or more monolingual parties in institutional settings - has been less attended to, especially in European research on interpreting. The book under review, a Swedish doctoral thesis on dialogue interpreting defended in October 1992, is thus one of the first attempts to contribute to the exploration and understanding of this type of interpreting.

Given the newness of the research object, we have found that Cecilia Wadensjö's study deserves a rather thorough review, including a brief introduction to the field of interpreting and some of its fundamental problems in terms of research.

To many scholars, interpreting has strong conceptual links with translation. Not only are the two disciplines traditionally taught under the same roof, discussed at the same conferences and treated in the same journals. Also, research in the two disciplines is nowadays usually referred to by the common name of translation studies.

Along the same lines, interpreting and translation share a considerable amount of problems in terms of research. In our view, two of the most salient research problems within translation studies at present concern (1) the very research tradition of the field, and (2) the availabillity of appro-

_____

*   *Helle V. Dam, Department of Spanish*
*   *Anne Schjoldager, Department of English*
    The Aarhus school of Business
    Fuglesangs Allé 4
    8210 Aarhus V (DK)

priate analytical and theoretical apparatuses. Apart from these two re-search problems, which are shared by translation and interpreting, a third problem, which is peculiar to the field of interpreting, may be identified. This problem concerns (3) the accessibility of empirical data.

1.1. The research tradition within translation studies

The research tradition within translation studies is to a great extent deter-mined by its conceptual status prior to the 1970s. Until then, translation studies were generally perceived as a branch of applied linguistics in a very narrow sense. The status of the field as part of linguistics meant an extensive use of linguistics as the one and only operational as well as analytical tool when dealing with translations. Furthermore, the label 'applied' did not only relate to the affinity with linguistics, but seemed also to define the research programme of the entire field. Thus, there was a strong tendency to focus on applied, as opposed to pure, research, pri-marily as a consequence of translation scholars' overriding interest in the teaching of translation to future translators. On the one hand, this endow-ed the field with a *prospective* orientation, which implied a pronounced lack of interest in existing translations. In other words, many of the ear-lier studies suffered from a complete lack of empirical foundation and tended to indulge in pure personal speculation, which gave rise to theo-ries that were never tested against reality. On the other hand, the focus on the teaching aspect along with a certain interest in translation criticism resulted in a heated discussion of what a so-called good translation ought to be like and, consequently, in a certain normative orientation. Out of this discussion emerged concepts like translatability, equivalence and free vs. literal translation. Another typical feature of translation studies prior to the 1970s was a tendency to focus on the source text in a very narrow sense, more precisely on the linguistic signs that were supposed to constitute the message of the source text. Obviously, this implied a very narrow perception of the communication involved in translating, because it meant that communicative factors other than the linguistic signs constituting the message, like for instance situation, receiver, medi-um and channel, were not accounted for in earlier theories. Thus, trans-lating was seen as a unidirectional transfer of a message from a sender via a translator to a receiver, rather than as a complex act of communi-cation.

There is no doubt that the characteristics of translation studies outlined above have been changing over the last two decades. In the early 1970s,

some translation scholars, among them James Holmes, had realized that a more scientific approach to the field was needed, and they began to advocate a change in the prevailing paradigm. To some scholars, though not all, such a change in paradigm would imply a separation from the mother discipline of linguistics and the establishment of an independent discipline dedicated to translation studies alone, and to most scholars it meant abolishing the label applied *sensu stricto*. In any case, a consequence of the shift in orientation was a generalized change in the research perspectives and objectives of the field. Firstly, linguistic theories are now no longer seen as the only operational and analytical instruments to be applied in the study of translations. Rather, there has been somewhat of a shift towards an interdisciplinary approach with scholars applying analytical tools from a whole range of different disciplines according to their particular research objects and aims. This does not mean to say, of course, that linguistics has been abolished all together, just that it is no longer the only discipline that supplies analytical tools for studies in translation. Secondly, the label applied is no longer the only or even predominant one within translation studies, though one of the subbranches of the discipline is, of course, applied. This conceptual shift has given rise to a more *retrospective* orientation, ie an interest not only in future translations, but also in existing ones. In other words, it is now seen not only as acceptable, but also as necessary, to take into consideration existing translations, ie to describe empirical data, be this in order to generate categories or theories or in order to test existing ones. A third change within the field of translation studies is an orientation away from the narrow focussing on the linguistic signs of the source text towards a much broader view on the underlying communication. Consequently, a much wider range of communicative factors are now taken into account when describing translations. This means that translating is no longer necessarily seen merely as a unidirectional transfer of a message, but much more as a complex, social and interactive process of communication. This broader view is also one of the reasons why disciplines other than linguistics are often used as analytical tools in the description of translations.

These changes in research perspectives are no doubt reflected in some proportion in many contemporary studies in translation. But, at the same time, there is no doubt that the heritage of translation research, ie the normative, speculative, non-empirical, source-text-centered and simplified linguistic orientation, is indeed still present in a good many works pub-

lished in the field. Thus, translation studies have a serious problem in the very research tradition, especially because the tradition not only influences the work of scholars with a long background in the field, but seems also to have a strong impact on the way newcomers to the field proceed in their research.

1.2. Availability of analytical tools and theoretical framework

The second problem in terms of research that is shared by interpreting and translation concerns the availability of appropiate analytical and theoretical apparatuses. Due to the short history of the field as a more or less independent and truly scientific discipline, few appropiate analytical tools and hardly any comprehensive theories have been developed so far for translation studies proper. This lack of analytical and theoretical framework means that the scholars of the field either have to try to adapt available tools from other disciplines to their own purposes - ie apparatuses that they are not very familiar with - or they have to start from scratch, trying to develop their own tools. Obviously, the latter research procedure is only viable if the scholars of the field have access to sufficient and authentic data that they can explore and describe. This consideration leads up to a third research problem, this time one that is not shared by interpreting and translation scholars, but is peculiar to research on interpreting.

1.3. Accessibility of data

The third research problem within interpreting studies concerns the accessibility of empirical data. The access to empirical data from authentic interpreting performances is experienced by many scholars to be very limited indeed due to a series of special circumstances. One of them is a general prohibition in many countries against videotaping and/or taperecording in courtrooms and other public institutions where interpreting services are used. Another circumstance is the secrecy of many of the meetings in international and supranational organizations that make use of interpreters. A third factor is a rather pronounced reluctance among professional interpreters to have their output recorded and put into writing, which is, of course, quite understandable in view of their very difficult working conditions.

The above list of research problems within the field of interpreting is by no means exhaustive, but in our view it does pinpoint some of the most important problems that the scholars of the discipline encounter when engaging in a research project.

In *Interpreting as Interaction*, Cecilia Wadensjö has not only overcome the basic practical problems of the field, but also carried out her research in accordance with the new and more scientific orientation of the field of translation studies. In the following we shall see how she has proceeded in her work.

2. Summary

The perspectives on interpreting taken in the book under review are broader than those found in more traditional translation studies. In contrast to the earlier tendency to reduce the translator's/interpreter's work to a unidirectional transfer of a source text message, Wadensjö focusses on the *interactive* aspect of dialogue interpreting, and in the present work she sets out to account for some of the complexities stemming from the fact that interpreting is a social phenomenon that presupposes a certain reciprocity between the parties involved. Thus, the aim of the study is to provide a functional description of the dialogue interpreter's role through an investigation of all the participants' contributions to interpreter-mediated conversations. It follows that the theoretical framework of the book is derived not from traditional translation studies or linguistics, but primarily from discourse analysis within sociology and anthropology. The investigation is based on a solid corpus of empirical data and the approach is descriptive and exploratory, the intention being not to test *a priori* categories, but to generate categories from the corpus of data.

Apart from the introductory and concluding chapters (I and X), the present book is divided into two major parts. Part one, which consists of chapters II to IV, is essentially theoretical. It is mainly dedicated to discussions of dialogue interpreting as a theoretical concept, but it also contains a short presentation of how this activity is conceived and practised in Sweden. Part two, which consists of chapters V to IX, is the empirical part of the study. It discusses selected aspects of actual interpreting as it is documented in the corpus. Part two is by far the largest part of the total work.

In the following we shall give a summary of the ten chapters. We have found that the book deserves an extensive summary for two reasons. First, the book is one of the very first contributions to the field, and it is a

work that, through its well-documented results, provides new and interesting knowledge about the largely unexplored activity of interpreting. Second, the book reflects the whole range of features of the new paradigm within translation studies and may, therefore, be seen as a suggestion to other interpreting scholars of a way of carrying out interpreting research within this framework. However, we would like to stress that neither the informative nor the formal structuring of the book is always strictly logical or in other ways very clear. This sometimes makes it quite difficult to decipher the author's intentions, and the following summary therefore contains a certain interpretative element.

Chapter I (*Just an ordinary hearing*) is a general introduction to the study. In this chapter the task of dialogue interpreting is introduced by means of an example, some central considerations concerning the perspectives to be applied on the discipline of dialogue interpreting are presented, and the aims of the study are accounted for.

Chapter II (*On interpretation and translation*) is introduced by a rather lengthy discussion of the word 'interpreter/interpretation'. The discussion concerns the etymology of the word in different languages, its usage in a historical perspective, and the links between interpretation and hermeneutics. The second part of this chapter contains a short presentation of some of the issues traditionally dealt with in the field of translation studies, supposedly with the aim of showing how these relate to the present study. In her brief review, the author presents most of the notions and dichotomies traditionally considered to be central within translation studies, ie translatability, equivalence, faithful vs. free translation etc. These normatively oriented notions are apparently found to be irrelevant in a descriptive study like the present one, though this is not explicitly stated. Additional reasons are adduced why much of the literature on translation disqualifies itself from being relevant to the present study, for instance because of its written-language bias and because it implies that translating is basically a unidirectional transfer, completely ignoring the interactive aspect. Wadensjö also mentions the relatively new approach promoted by among others James Holmes and Gideon Toury, who reject the normativity of traditional translation studies, advocating a purely descriptive approach to the field. It is not mentioned explicitly whether or to what extent this latter trend has been a source of inspiration to the present work, but judging from the approach taken, this seems to be the case. The third and final part of chapter II is a short presentation of the theory of language and communication suggested by the Russian scholar Mikhail Bakhtin, who is explicitly stated to have been an important

source of inspiration. This is mainly due to his emphasis on the social aspect of communication, ie his *dialogic* view on discourse, and to his focussing on language usage, ie language in *actual* discourse contexts.

Chapter III (*Interpreting in dialogue: a cross-disciplinary issue*) outlines the basis for the interdisciplinary approach taken in this investigation. The first part of the chapter introduces the concept of intermediary as it is defined within sociology, social anthropology and social psychology. The point of departure of these disciplines is a rejection of the idea of an impartial intermediary and a claim that a third party who is present at a negotiation will always exert some influence on the process. The ensuing discussion is especially concerned with the intermediary's degree of independence in relation to the primary parties, his mandate to negotiate, his influence on the primary parties' exchange, his power to control the exchange etc., and the dialogue interpreter's role and functions are discussed in relation to these considerations. The second part of chapter III constitutes a review of a selection of the literature specifically dealing with dialogue interpreting. As Wadensjö points out, the amount of research in this field is indeed small and it has a rather strong orientation towards practice, but the most important research-based literature is presented and discussed here. All the studies reviewed in this chapter take an interdisciplinary approach, as does the present study, but whereas Wadensjö takes a purely descriptive stand, the studies presented in this chapter are more or less influenced by normative thinking.

In chapter IV (*Dialogue interpreting: Swedish practice and theory*) the reader is provided with a thorough description of the phenomenon of dialogue interpreting as it is practised in Sweden and as it appears in the corpus of the study. It is explained how this particular type of interpreting has become strongly institutionalized in Sweden, where it is regulated by an official code of conduct which any practising professional interpreter has to know about and suscribe to. The code of conduct essentially states that the interpreter should *only* interpret, ie relay *what* was said *as* it was said - no more and no less. Another cornerstone of the professional code is the principle of absolute neutrality and detachment. In the remainder of this chapter, some points about the image of the dialogue interpreter are made, both about the interpreter's self-image and the one held by people acquainted with interpreters and their work. These observations all concern the normative role of the interpreter, ie what the interpreter herself[1]

---

[1]   Following the usage in the book under review, we have adopted the female pronoun as the neutral form of reference to dialogue interpreters.

and other people think she ought to do when she does a good job. It appears that both the typical interpreter's self-image and the image of her as seen by others are deeply influenced by the rules and principles codified in the official code of conduct. Thus, frequent metaphors used about the interpreter are those of a 'copying machine' or a 'telephone', implying that she should not make contributions to the content of the interpreted conversation. Another logical implication of this image of the interpreter concerns the turn-taking pattern of the conversation, where the interpreter would be in charge of precisely every second intervention, following a different speaker for every turn.

Following these essentially theoretical chapters, chapter V (*Data and method*) introduces the second part of the study: the analyses of the empirical data. In this chapter the data and the general analytical approach taken in the investigation are described. The primary data consist of 20 audio-taped, actual encounters involving dialogue interpreting between Swedish and Russian. The encounters all took place in institutional settings, namely in medical and legal contexts. The interpreting was done by five different interpreters. Post-interviews with the primary parties and the interpreters involved in the encounters provide supplementary material. The basic analytical instrument of the empirical chapters is the role theory suggested by Erving Goffman. Likewise, the author finds the basis for her general approach to the study in some of the Goffmanian concepts of role, namely in the concepts of normative role and typical role. Thus, the focus here is on the dialogue interpreter's **typical role**, ie her typical behaviour when interpreting, whereas the **normative role**, as expressed primarily in the official code of conduct and described above, is used only as a contrasting point of departure. To focus on typical responses is, of course, the normal procedure in a descriptive study like the present one, but there is no doubt that the very choice of approach constitutes an improvement over the tendency to indulge in normative and/or speculative thinking that has characterized many earlier studies in the field.

In chapter VI (*Dialogue interpreting as relaying and co-ordinating*), Wadensjö deals with textual differences in her corpus. In order to define and explicate dialogue interpreting as opposed to other social activities, she explores how the interpreter's behaviour differs from that of the primary parties. Her aim is to discover tools that may be of use in an analysis of the *interactional order* accomplished in and by interpreter-mediated discourse. Thus, the analysis in this chapter is a descriptive, retrospective comparison of interpreter contributions and originals - the latter

defined as whatever primary-party utterance precedes the interpreter's contribution. In this exploratory study, Wadensjö operates with two categories of interpreter contributions: renditions and non-renditions. Though they may also have some coordinating function, **renditions** are basically representations of originals. Taking her point of departure in the empirical material, the author suggests that the various ways interpreters deal with primary-party utterances may be categorized as close, expanded, reduced, substituting, summarizing, or lack of rendition. Close renditions are informationally and interactionally equivalent with the original and approximately in the same style, which means that these renditions are in full accordance with the normative role. Expanded renditions contain more information than the original. They may, for instance, occur if the interpreter feels a need to enhance discourse coherence or to explicate. Reduced renditions contain less information than the original. They may occur due to lack of memory capacity, in order to save time, or if an utterance is deemed unimportant. Substituting renditions are a combination of expanded and reduced renditions. They occur, for instance, if the interpreter chooses to change the emphasis of a primary-party contribution. Summarizing renditions are, for instance, fake quotes, by which the interpreter summarizes a primary party's intentions rather than choosing to render the whole utterance. Finally, lack of rendition may, for instance, occur when an interpreter decides not to render off-the-record remarks. **Non-renditions** are interpreter utterances that have no counterpart in the preceding discourse and whose primary function is to coordinate, which means that they are generally contrary to the normative role. Wadensjö defines them according to different ways of coordinating: explicit or implicit. Explicit non-renditions could, for instance, be requests for clarification (a case which is peculiar to consecutive interpreting, as opposed to simultaneous interpreting), initiatives to influence the direction of the talk, or meta-comments explaining the intention of one of the primary parties. Implicit non-renditions could, for instance, be an unprompted repetition after an interruption.

Chapter VII (*Participation framework*) may in many ways be seen as the key chapter of the book, as it focusses on the way the interpreter participates in mediated conversation. Wadensjö's main analytical tool for this analysis is Goffman's **participation framework**, a (communicative) circle in which the utterance is received by anyone who happens to be within earshot and in which all parties acquire *participation statuses*. The relation between a party and an utterance may be referred to as his/her *footing*. When, as opposed to receiving solely a participation status, a

party perceives him/herself as speaker, his/her footing is also called **production format**. This term comprises the three senses of *speaker*: (1) animator, the sounding box, (2) author, the agent who organises the contribution, and (3) principal, to whose opinion the words attest. In line with Goffman's production format, Wadensjö suggests three listening roles comprising the **reception format**: (1) responder, who is expected later to react to the speaker's contribution, (2) recapitulator, who is expected to be able to repeat the speaker's contribution as if responsible him/herself, and (3) reporter, who is expected later to be able to repeat the speaker's contribution to somebody else. When speaking, the responder would speak as author and principal, the recapitulator would speak as author but not principal, and the reporter would speak as animator, but not author and not principal. However, as it is clearly emphasized throughout the book, the interlocutors (including the interpreter) are always - in Goffman's terminology - regarded as *multi-role-performers*, which implies that "different activity roles are actualized in different proportions as interaction progresses" (p.122). Thus, though the interpreter's normative role is to speak on behalf of others, ie to act as an animator-speaker and a reporter-listener, she may also - as shown in chapter VI - choose or be forced to participate in the interaction. The book cites various interesting examples of this change from animator to author/principal. This could, for instance, be when, in order to save a primary party's face, the interpreter carries out *remedial work* and accepts responsibility for a misunderstanding which was not her fault.

Chapter VIII (*Communication and miscommunication*) deals with the location of miscommunication events. Miscommunication occurs when the sense aimed at by one interlocutor does not match what is displayed by another as understood. Wadensjö uses various indicators, as developed by Linell (1992), for the detection of such events - for instance incongruent threads of discourse. As the interpreter's presence is supposed to guarantee that such miscommunication events do not arise, a lack of understanding between the primary parties is often blamed on the interpreter. This chapter explores to what extent this general assumption may be true. There are various sources of miscommunication, which often seem to be interlinked: local sources, which occur on a turn-to-turn basis and global sources, which are often due to social and cultural differences. Whereas local sources may be laid at the interpreter's door, global sources may be due to the primary parties' conceptual differences. The book offers many interesting examples of miscommunication: the primary party's mishearing of a single word, grammatical discrepancies,

the assymmetrical distribution of power and competence between the primary parties - to name but a few. Apart from the above sources of miscommunication, Wadensjö suggests a further explanation: Sometimes the miscommunication event may be due to the conditions of the mediated talk itself. This has to do with three characteristic features of dialogue interpreting: fragmentation into (often) decontextualised chunks, delayed or reduced comprehension of mutual feedback between the primary parties, and *extra discourse* - ie the way the interpreter changes the content of the utterance, the fact that utterances receive new context when rendered in another language by another person, and the fact that utterances are sometimes addressed directly to the interpreter and are not meant for the primary party. As she cites no examples from her corpus in connection with this last source of miscommunication, this part of the book is one of the few cases in which - we think - Wadensjö deviates from the descriptive approach.

Chapter IX (*When* I *say what* others *mean*) deals with one of the most characteristic features of the activity - as every practising dialogue interpreter will be able to confirm. We therefore find this part of the book particularly instructive. The problem dealt with is that the primary parties sometimes fail to realize that the interpreter (usually) speaks on behalf of others. Though the author does not explicitly say so, this discussion must be linked up with the concept of participation framework, dealt with in chapter VII. Thus, chapter IX explores the ways an interpreter can choose to mark responsibility for the utterance. Such explicit marking of responsibility is by many deemed to be contrary to the interpreter's normative role. In this analysis, Wadensjö uses Goffman's concept of **figure**, which is defined as the character animated when an individual distances herself from her own utterance. So, in order to avoid confusion as to whose intentions she is expressing, the interpreter may choose to make explicit use of a figure. This could for instance be done by breaking with the normative role of using direct speech - ie saying 'I' for both primary parties - and using indirect speech - ie saying "the lady says..". Further, the interpreter may also need to emphasize when a figure is not present, ie when she herself is responsible for the utterance. This could for instance be by means of lowering the voice and saying "here I [the interpreter] have to explain..". The interpreter's need for marking responsibility also has to do with the normative role of neutrality. Sometimes it is important for the interpreter to display impartiality by seeming detached. This Wadensjö denotes **relaying by displaying**, which means that the interpreter does not attempt to copy the primary party's choice of words,

style, and voice characteristics - perhaps for fear of appearing a parody or of being associated with one primary party rather than the other. In other situations, it may be more important for the interpreter to display impartiality by being visibly loyal to the way the primary parties have expressed themselves. This Wadensjö denotes **relaying by replaying**, which means that, as far as language, style and message are concerned, the interpreter attempts to speak as the primary party would have spoken had s/he been able to communicate directly. Though the latter principle is more in accordance with the interpreter's normative role - ie striving for the closest possible resemblance - it is in no way the only possibility; the dialogue interpreter's choice will always depend on the situation.

Chapter X (*The art of dialogue interpreting*) first highlights the main points of the book. Then a few more specific points, including some suggestions for further research, are discussed.

3.   Assessment

There is no doubt that Wadensjö deserves a lot of praise for the underlying research work. This book is definitely a ground-breaker within its field. The basic question of the research programme - do dialogue interpreters adhere to their normative role? - is both interesting, relevant and also thoroughly dealt with. The descriptive, exploratory approach is highly commendable and well-suited for the topic, even if the author at least once in chapter VIII indulges in pure speculation (as mentioned above in the summary). The interdisciplinarity of the work is certainly laudable, and, in this interdisciplinary framework, we find it wise of the author to have chosen one discipline as her primary source of inspiration and methodology, namely sociological discourse analysis. Furthermore, as dialogue interpreting is primarily defined as mediated conversation, it is undoubtedly an interesting and useful choice to employ and elaborate on Goffman's interactional framework. We are also very impressed that Wadensjö employs so many complementary and related research disciplines - such as sociology, anthropology, ethnography, communication theory, discourse analysis, sociolinguistics, and translation studies - though it may be said that Wadensjö deals somewhat summarily and unenthusiastically with the last discipline.

One indication of Wadensjö's disinterest in work done within translation studies is her choice of topics in chapter II, which, at best, seems somewhat accidental. Firstly, we fail to see the relevance of a lengthy discussion of the etymology behind the Swedish word "tolk" (interpre-

ter), just as we find the presentation of hermeneutics a bit far-fetched in a study on dialogue interpreting. Secondly, we wonder why prominent issues - such as Vermeer's skopos theory, Reiss's functional text typology, or Toury's study of norms - have not been discussed (even if Toury is briefly mentioned). Thirdly, we are surprised that Wadensjö's review of translation studies does not devote more than a few lines to research on conference interpreting. Seleskovitch, whose *théorie du sens* is still supposed to prevail in the interpreting community, is only mentioned once (p.20) and only with a brief reference to her one-page comment to an article by Hildegund Bühler (see Seleskovitch 1986). Shlesinger is merely mentioned (p.20) for an article in which she briefly discusses some methodological problems in connection with extending the theory of translational norms - in Toury's sense - to research on conference interpreting (see Shlesinger 1989) and her excellent, well-known work on intonation is not even hinted at. In other words, even if a few interpreting scholars are mentioned here and there, they are not mentioned for what is essential about their work. Fourthly, as there can be no doubt that translation studies also comprise Wadensjö's own object of analysis, we think it curious that the review in chapter II does not in any way deal with research on dialogue interpreting - this account is postponed to chapter III.

We are also surprised that linguistics apparently plays no part in the analysis. The author seems, for instance, rather disinterested in systematic semantic differences between her two languages, and she never explores to what extent some of her results could be determined by the languages involved. Wadensjö merely mentions that "there is no reason to assume that the results would be true of the Russian-Swedish data exclusively" (p. 57).

As far as Wadensjö's results are concerned, we find it difficult to assess their credibility, as she chooses not to include any statistical information concerning her examples - which, of course, has to do with her choice of methodological framework (generating categories, rather than testing already existing ones). However, as her work seems to be based on a sound theoretical framework and methodological expertise, and as we assume that the chosen examples express some form of regularity, we have no doubt that Wadensjö's conclusions are both plausible and well-founded in her own investigation. Generally, we find the book intriguing reading - especially when the author shows how an interpreter may *de jure* violate the official code of conduct (the normative role) in order *de facto* to stay loyal to her duties as mediator. We therefore particularly appreciated chapters VII and IX.

Especially in view of Wadensjö's excellent research work, it is regrettable that this book is neither well-written nor particularly reader-friendly. In fact, *Interpreting as Interaction* makes excessive demands on the reader's interpretative powers and enthusiasm for the subject. It is characterized by inadequate proof-reading, inattentive writing, puzzling and ambiguous language, and - perhaps as a consequence of the aforementioned factors - a structure which sometimes lacks logical stringency.

Regarding inadequate proofreading and inattentive writing, let us just cite a few random examples. Firstly, the book is full of confusing references - for instance on p.81, where the author refers to excerpt (7) and must mean excerpt (6), on p.89, where excerpt (14) is erroneously given number (18), or on p.103, where she refers to category "B, c" and apparently means category "A, c". Secondly, we often find that the author's use of transliterations is confusing. Of course, it is quite legitimate for the author not to refer to her examples in the original language but mainly to refer to her own translation of an utterance. However, the reader is excessively puzzled when the wording of this translation is not the same throughout the book - for instance on p.84 where the translation in the excerpt is "well", whereas the author refers to "so" in the text. Thirdly, the book has many examples of careless grammar - for instance on p.105 where a transliteration displays an interesting lack of grammatical concord: "does he/they regularly visit(s) him?".

A few lines from chapter VIII on p.189 may illustrate what we mean by puzzling and ambiguous language. It is the last sentence of this quotation that particularly puzzles us - and especially the meaning of *de-specify*:

> [..] As a matter of fact, in their training, police-interrogators are instructed to sometimes use a questioning technique which opens up a complex of issues: that is, to elicit a spontaneous narrative, on the basis of which more specified questions can be formulated. The interpreted conversation, as it seems, is somewhat resistant to this technique, partly due to the DI's [dialogue interpreter's] tendency to either specify or de-specify utterances which as originals are vague, thereby promoting from the interviewee specific answers, and/or eliciting a specification of questions from the interviewer (cf. chapter VII).

Our main reason for mentioning that the structure of the book sometimes lacks logical stringency is that we often find the author's train of thought hard to follow. One example of this is the fact that the introductory outline (in chapter I) does not always correspond to the actual content of the chapters. Thus, for instance, one can read in the outline concerning chap-

ter II that the chapter will contain a short presentation of some central questions dealt with in the field of translation studies, as it is to be expected that this field would be of interest to the present object of analysis (p.7). However, still according to the outline, the field of translation studies was found to be of "limited relevance for the present study" and reasons for this "will be accounted for". This is all very well and quite sensible - if only the chapter had in fact tried to achieve this objective. Instead of clearly trying to demonstrate the irrelevance of translation studies in the present work, chapter II takes the form of a somewhat random search for ideas to agree with. Only after very thorough consideration does the reader discover - as mentioned in the summary above - that it is the normative and text-bound (ie monologic) approach of traditional translation theorists that the author dismisses as irrelevant for her investigation, not the field as such. This point is perhaps all the more interesting as Wadensjö's own rejection of the normative approach fits perfectly into the current tendency in the field - as outlined above (in 1.1).

By means of conclusion, we would like to emphasize that we have found Wadensjö's doctoral thesis very interesting reading indeed. There can be no doubt that Wadensjö has described aspects of dialogue interpreting - and probably of interpreting as a whole, too - that have never before been pointed at empirically. Likewise, we would like to repeat that the choice of methodological framework of the book is equally laudable. Therefore - though bearing in mind what was said above about the book's excessive demands on the reader's interpretative powers and enthusiasm - we do not hesitate to recommend the content of this book to anyone interested in dialogue interpreting - theorists, practitioners, and users alike.

References

Delabastita, Dirk (1991): A false opposition in translation studies: Theoretical versus/and historical approaches. In: *Target* 3:2, 137-152.

Holmes, James S. (1988): The name and nature of translation studies. In: Holmes, James S. (ed.) (1988): *Translated! Papers on literary translation and translation studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Linell, Per (1992): Troubles with mutualities: Toward a dialogical theory of miscommunication. In: Graumann, C.F., Marková, Ivana & Foppa, K. (eds.) (1992): *Mutualities in Dialogue*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Seleskovitch, Danica (1986): Comment: Who should assess an interpreter's performance? In: *Multilingua* 5:4, 236.

Shlesinger, Miriam (1989): Extending the theory of translation to interpretation: Norms as a case in point. In: *Target* 1:1, 111-115.

Snell-Hornby, Mary (1988): *Translation studies: An integrated approach*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Toury, Gideon (1980): *In search of a theory of translation*. Jerusalem: Academic Press.