



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

This recently published volume edited by Fernando Prieto Ramos (University of Geneva, Switzerland) is part of the *Bloomsbury Advances in Translation* series. The aim of this volume is to provide an institutional translation research overview that covers a variety of institutional settings beyond the European Union (EU) (Koskinen 2008; Biel 2014; Šarčević 2015). The pluralistic character of the authors enables institutional translation to be examined from a variety of angles, including “insider” and “outsider” perspectives within the institutions scrutinized, and hence it incorporates both academics’ and practitioners’ views.

The book is divided into three parts and contains thirteen contributions. After the editor’s introduction, the first part of this monograph contains three chapters focused on current cross-cutting issues and methods in the institutional translation context. The second part comprises six chapters that explore different factors that impact on the quality of translations, such as the skills required, terminological decisions or specificities of the drafting and/or translation process. Lastly, the last four chapters included in its third part examine translation and multilingual case-law in a variety of judicial contexts.

In Chapter 1, Šarčević highlights the challenges translators face in institutional settings as transnational communicators, including institutional constraints and fidelities. Zooming in on the multilingual EU law-making process, Šarčević contends that, notwithstanding the institutional need to achieve “surface-level similarity” between EU-law versions (p. 20), this yardstick to measure acceptability of the text seems to reduce legal translation to mere *clonism* (Cronin 2003) and does not reflect the real major challenge institutional translators face in this context; to go beyond surface-level similarity, when needed, to achieve the required uniformity. In Chapter 2, Biel reflects on the usefulness of corpora for institutional translation from both a practical and a theoretical standpoint. The author argues that, on the one hand, corpora can be an invaluable resource for institutional translators, given the functionalities of corpus tools, and, on the other hand, they can also be an essential analytical tool in research which can contribute to the refinement of institutional translation. Closing part one, Engberg focuses on comparative legal analysis in Chapter 3. Considering that institutional legal translation is a form of knowledge communication, Engberg encourages working with a conceptual and cognitive frame-oriented approach, since he shows that frames can be a valuable descriptive instrument to make informed terminological decisions for translators.

Shifting our focus to the second part of the volume, in Chapter 4 Strandvik, as quality manager of the European Commission’s Directorate-General for Translation

(DGT), describes how quality assurance has evolved over time within the DGT and he concludes: “what we have witnessed over the last ten years is a move towards a more conscious, structured and systematic approach to quality assurance” (p. 52). However, although Strandvik recognises that a “quality management system has been put into place” (p. 61) he also outlines some future quality challenges for the DGT due to factors such as the need for cost-efficiency or the increasing level of outsourcing. The next contribution by Lafeber (Chapter 5) delves into the most relevant skills needed to achieve institutional translation quality at two of the largest employers of institutional translators worldwide, the United Nations (UN) and the EU. To do so, the author first conducts a survey among the UN and the EU translators and revisers and, after identifying the main skills required, she critically examines them. Her results show contrasting results between the EU and the UN skills-set, however, they also confirm that, at both institutions, the skills required go beyond languages skills. In Chapter 6, Prieto Ramos and Guzmán address an under-researched area of study, decision-making on legal terminology at international organizations. In order to tackle this research gap, the authors explore the consistency and adequacy of terminological decisions in the case of legal texts of the EU, the UN and the World Trade Organization (WTO) and their correlation with the recommendations of their corresponding terminological databases. To do this, they perform a comparative analysis of a ten-year corpus using a mixed-method approach that focuses on patterns of translation of the term *due process* into Spanish. Their findings indicate a similar intertextual consistency and adequacy level for *due process* at the WTO and the UN, with the level of the WTO the highest, while the EU corpus shows the lowest levels. Also resorting to comparative analysis, in Chapter 7 Doczekalska delves into the comparison of multilingual practices in the EU and Canada. After highlighting the main similarities and differences of EU and Canadian multilingual legislative drafting that impact on terminological choices, the author reflects on the terminological requirements needed to guarantee both Canadian bijuralism and the autonomy of EU law. Doczekalska concludes that, in the end, the main drafting challenge in both scenarios, from a terminological stance, is to recognise by whom the meaning of the concept is designated, or in other words, if the term has uniform meaning and therefore there is a legal concept under one term (as usually occurs in the EU context) or, on the other hand, if the term should have a provincial or national meaning, and therefore one term encompasses different concepts (as may occur in Canada). Moving on to more theoretical ground, Robertson in Chapter 8 posits that legal-linguistic profiling of organizations is a resourceful tool for translation considering that “The purpose of legal-linguistic profiling is to provide a method for analysing multilingual and multicultural legal environments in which a text to be translated forms part” (p. 113). Robertson showcases the usefulness of his proposal using the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) as a case study and he demonstrates how it helps to reveal factors that have influenced the organization and its texts, information that may favour the translation process. Closing part two of the volume, Fontanet approaches the translation of hybrid legal texts in the European Organization for Nuclear Research (Chapter 9). Fontanet analyses a corpus of texts with a technical and legal dimension —particularly cooperation and membership agreements, safety rules and contract adjudications proposals— finding that both technical and legal discourses cohabit in the documents studied, which seems to confirm that translators will be confronted with a high degree of hybridity in this context.

The final part of the volume presents four chapters on judicial matters. In Chapter 10, Wright deals with the impact of multilingualism on the judgements of the Court of Justice of the EU (CJUE). Wright describes the “mandatory language arrangements” (p. 142) this judicial body is subject to and how the outcome is a complex language regime that influences the different stages of the proceedings. For judgements this unique multilingual system means they are drafted in “Court French” (p. 154) while the other language versions are produced by “a specialized translation service staffed by lawyers from all the Member States’ legal systems” (p. 154). From a linguistic stance, in Chapter 11 Trklja focuses on CJUE case law to investigate semantic uniformity. With this goal in mind, the author highlights the assumptions on which the uniformity principle is based in this context to later demonstrate, from both a theoretical and empirical perspective, the inviability of uniformity in EU law if absolute uniformity requirements are considered. Moving on to Chapter 12, Brannan highlights the specificities of translation in the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR), which supervises the implementation of the European Convention of Human Rights in almost fifty States with a variety of legal systems. According to Brannan, translators in this context are faced with several challenges derived from conditions surrounding the internal translation process as well as from the broad ECHR jurisdiction. In the final chapter, Chapter 13, the editor and Pacho Aljanati present their comparative analysis of the patterns of explicit comparative interpretation of case-law in three international organizations: the International Court of Justice (ICJ), the WTO’s Appellate Body and the CJUE. Presenting their analysis and discussing said patterns, the authors empirically demonstrate considerable variations in comparative interpretation of multilingual law in rulings of all of the above judicial bodies.

In conclusion, this carefully edited volume is a valuable interdisciplinary contribution for academics and practitioners that sheds light on institutional translation in some of the most important translation services worldwide. It combines descriptive and empirical research that brings to the fore the need to continue researching across institutional settings to face the challenges surrounding institutional translation in international organizations. Undeniably, as demonstrated throughout this monograph, one of these current challenges is quality assurance.

## References

- Biel, Ł., *Lost in the Eurofog. The Textual Fit of Translated Law*. Frankfurt am Mein: Peter Lang 2014.
- Cronin, M., *Translation and Globalization*. London: Routledge 2003.
- Koskinen, K., *Translating Institutions: An Ethnographic Study of EU Translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome 2008.
- Šarčević S. (ed.), *Language and Culture in EU Law: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*. Farnham: Ashgate 2015.

Elena Ruiz-Cortés