Miriam Shlesinger and Franz Pöchhacker, eds. *Doing Justice to Court Interpreting* (Benjamins Current Topics, v. 26). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2010 (pp 246). ISBN 978 90 272 22565

The *Benjamins Current Topics* series devotes its 26th volume to court interpreting, thus underlining the suggestion that "academic interest in court interpreting is on the rise, though lamentably less so among jurists and policy makers than among scholars" (1). The editors, Miriam Shlesinger and Franz Pöchhaker, two distinguished scholars and practitioners in the field of interpreting studies, have collected eight papers, initially published in *Interpreting* 10:1 (2008) and 12:2 (2010), and three book reviews. The nine authors, all women, represent only a few countries (Australia, Denmark, Israel and the USA), but cover several relatively unknown topics from various angles, such as linguistics, sociology and politics.

The first paper gives a very interesting overview of the interpreting arrangements at the International Military Tribunal for the Far East, which tried 28 Japanese war criminals from 3.5.1946 to 12.11.1948 (a topic that has not been discussed so far). Kayoko Takeda**,** who teaches English-Japanese interpreting and translation at the Monterey Institute of International Studies in California, focuses on the social, political and cultural context of the settings in which Japanese nationals acted as interpreters, Japanese Americans as monitors of the performance of the interpreters, and Caucasian US military officers as language arbiters who ruled over interpreting and translation disputes. She describes the strict hierarchical structure between these ethically and socially different groups, and discusses issues such as power relations, trust, control and negotiated norms in interpreting, with special reference to the tribunal's mistrust to the 27 Japanese interpreters. The interpreting was consecutive "because the tribunal had concluded that simultaneous interpretation between English and Japanese was impossible" (12). Apart from the two main languages, interpretation was also provided for six more languages when necessary, sometimes through relay interpreting. The behaviour of linguists is studied by the author in the case of the testimony of Hideki Tojo, Japan's wartime Prime Minister, who was considered responsible for Japanese war crimes.

The paper of the English-Hebrew freelance translator and interpreter Shira L. Lipkin deals with a contemporary military court. She presents the activities of military court interpreters at the Yehuda Military Court near Jerusalem over a pe-

riod of one year (2005). Israeli military courts try not only suspected terrorists but also Palestinians charged with regular criminal offences, and the interpretation provided is a combination of chuchotage and consecutive in Arabic-Hebrew. The research was based on eleven male soldiers doing their regular army service and acting as interpreters, while their duties also included translating documents, acting as ushers in the courtroom and handling logistic matters. They receive interpreting training only after having started to work as interpreters, but unfortunately the study does not give any information on their actual performance, with the exception of occasional references to it as lacking completeness and neutrality. Moreover, it focuses on the norms and ethical rules that guide their work, which is not only charged by the fact that they are often the only contact of the defendant in the court room, as in many court interpreting cases, but also by the fact that the interpreters are soldiers in a military framework.

The issue of performance is the focus of the paper by Bodil Martinsen and Friedel Dubslaff (Associated Professors in the Department of Language and Business Communication at the University of Aarhus, Denmark), which discuses a case study of a single interpreting event in a Danish Courtroom, when the interpreter fails to meet the goal of communication and loyalty despite the cooperativeness of the interactants. Although the National Commission of the Danish Police, which administrates the list of court interpreters, accepts only graduates from the two Business Schools of the Aarhus University with a Master's degree in translation and interpreting in one foreign language, and usually a Bachelor's degree in another foreign language, it does not distinguish between the two when assigning someone with the interpretation task. The interpreter in this study had a Bachelor's degree in French, which was the required language, which means that "her training did not include Danish-French or French-Danish interpreting" (131). Considering this, as well as the fact that this case study refers only to the proceedings of 90 minutes, the necessity of gaining more data before reaching any general conclusions regarding the influence of the non-normative behavior of the participants is obvious.

Bente Jacobsen, Associate Professor at the University of Aarhus, also deals with a single case study. She explores the factor of "face", i.e. the public self-image which the participants try to maintain in a criminal trial in November 1999. It is an interesting issue, as in a legal setting there are not only conflicting legal interests which influence the proceedings; there is also the attempt of the defendant to protect his "face", which is associated with cultural values that the interpreter should make transparent during her work, while trying to protect her own image and professional status.

Another contribution from Aarhus is the paper by the Assistant Professor Tina Christensen, which examines the proceedings of three criminal cases, focusing on the use of indirect speech by the judges, which is considered deviation according to the Guidelines for Interpreting in Court Proceedings issued by the Danish Court Administration in 2003. The Guidelines state that the participants should communicate as if the interpreter were not present, with questions and an-

swers addressed directly to the person referred to and not to the interpreter. The results of a larger scale research would be very useful in order "to prepare students and practising interpreters for real-life interpreter-mediated events by giving them useful insights into the different facets of the job of court interpreting" (164).

Jieun Lee, who teaches in the Program of Master of Translation and Interpreting of Macquarie University, Australia, also focuses on the subject of indirect versus direct speech in her article. She examines five Australian court proceedings involving Korean-English interpretation. The difference here is that indirect speech is used by the Korean witnesses as preferred over direct speech in languages such as Korean, Japanese and Chinese. The tendency among Korean interpreters is to convert indirect to direct reported speech in English, which might have implications for the accuracy of the interpreted evidence, and forms another indicator for the complexity of court interpreting due to linguistically and culturally diverse backgrounds in which an interpreter mediates.

The paper of Ruth Morris, freelance interpreter and lecturer at the MA Programme in Translation and Interpreting of the Bar-Ilan University, deals with the judicial attitudes to interpreting and partly translating in two countries, Canada and Israel, based on a number of case reports. The author examines the historical changes in the legal sphere of the two countries, dating back to the Talmud, and gives noteworthy data from juridical cases as well as from the literature on interpreting, law and bilingualism. She reaches the conclusion that "the resultant 'missing stitches' are likely to deprive those who do not speak the language of the proceedings of their fundamental rights" (55).

The realisation of language rights by the Quichua indigenous of Ecuador is the subject of the paper by Susan Berk-Seligson, Associate Professor at the Vanderbilt University, USA. Based on interviews with 93 Ecuadorians – jurists, interpreters, translators and political leaders – the author reveals the different views of Quichua communities and State justice providers regarding how justice is to be carried out; she also touches upon the role of Quichua language, which is a variant of Quechua, a language spoken by approximately ten million people in South America and regarded as their *lingua franca*. The paper discusses the relationship between language and the ideology of autonomy, the differences between the Quichua subgroups and the high monolingualism among indigenous women. The only agreement between the different participants of the study seems to be the use of untrained *ad hoc* interpreters in juridical settings, while there is only one accredited interpreter/translator in all of Ecuador, who has, however, been called to interpret in court only twice.

The volume also includes the reviews by Christiane J. Driesen of two books about the Nuremberg Trials by Martina Behr and Maike Corpataux (*Die Nürnberger Prozesse - Zur Bedeutung der Dolmetscher für die Prozesse und der Prozesse für die Dolmetscher*), as well as by Hartwig Karvelkämper and Larisa Schippel (eds.) (*Simultandolmetschen in Erstbewährung: Der Nürnberger Prozess 1945)*. It ends with the review by Cecilia Wadensjö of the annual journal *Linguistica Antverpiensia, 5/2006. Taking Stock: Research and Methodology in*

Community Interpreting by Erik Hertog and Bart van der Veer (eds.) and the review by Holly Mikkelson of the volume *The Critical Link 4: Professionalisation of Interpreting in the Community. Selected Papers from the 4th International Conference on Interpreting in Legal, Health and Social Service Settings, Stockholm, 20-23.5.2004* by Cecilia Wadensjö, Birgitta Englund Dimitrova and Anna-Lena Nilsson (eds.).

Doing Justice to Court Interpreting is doing justice to its title as it forms a very interesting volume that sheds light on court interpreting in very different places of the world, carried out in highly different historical, social, linguistic and ideological conditions. However, all contributions share a common idea, which Erik Hertog underlines, and to which the editors also subscribe: "No democratic country can afford to sustain a legal framework that does not support full and meaningful access to it across languages and cultures by all those who may become, or wish to become, involved in it" (4).

Anthi Wiedenmayer
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece