Gea-Valor, Maria-Lluisa/García-Izquierdo, Isabel/Esteve, Maria-José (eds.) (2010): *Linguistic and Translation Studies in Scientific Communication.* Bern: Peter Lang. (Linguistic Insights 86. Studies in Language and Communication.) ISSN 1424-8689/ISBN: 978-3-0343-0069-8, 311 pages.

This is a welcomed book on scientific communication and translation. It is well organized in two parts and its fourteen contributions stem from two disciplines: linguistics and translation studies. The first part is called "Construction and Communication of Scientific Knowledge" and the second is called "Translation of Scientific Knowledge". We will argue that despite the fact that most contributors are hispanophones (mostly from Spain), the choice of contributions is fairly wide and varied. The reader will find that the emphasis is placed on the synchronic and diachronic aspects of scientific communication, on the resources for scientific communication and, most of all, on the several genres that constitute the field of scientific communication.

The first paper in 'Section I' is called "'Boffins Create *Supermouse*': The Role of the Popular Press in Creating the Public Image of Scientists and their Work". Martin Hewings compares the images of scientists and their work in the British press, so as to understand the lack of attractiveness of science as a career in Britain which led to a campaign by the British government to change public attitudes to science. The author examines two stories that were published in three kinds of press: tabloid press (*The Sun*), "intermediate" publication (*New Scientist*) and quality press (*The Independent*). He traces the journalistic history of the two stories back to the original research papers. In the British tabloid press, as represented in *The Sun*, the emphasis is placed on entertainment, on sensationalism as well as on the distortion of the researches that are reported. Here, scientists are called "boffins" and are projected as having unworthy motives. In contrast, the other two publications are more accurate and informative.

In the second article, "Academic Book Reviews and the Construction of Scientific Knowledge (1890–2005)", Françoise Salager-Meyer makes the point that the diachronic exploration of scientific discourse can be instructive. She illustrates her arguments with a study on the book reviews published in English medical journals published over the last two centuries. The differences over the time are clear in many aspects. For instance, in the 19th century, the book reviewer was almost always anonymous, whereas nowadays he is well identified. Also, reviewers have sugar-coated their critical remarks and reviews have become shorter and shorter. Interestingly, we also learn that book reviews are losing their importance in the medical field as they become secondary in the dissemination of knowledge, but that linguistic journals still publish more book reviews than economics and chemistry journals.

Luz Gil-Salom and Carmen Soler-Monreal contribute the third paper, "Appraisal Resources in Scientific Research Article Discussions", which focuses on the types of subjective language used in the discussion sections of engineering research articles, namely on Computing, Telecommunications, Nanotechnology and Robotics. The authors examine the adjectives and adverbs that express attitude, such as *significant* and *surprisingly,* as well as certainty and epistemology, such as *obvious* and *likely*, respectively, so as to contribute to the teaching of English for Academic Purposes. They use a methodology based on the concepts of "move" and "step" proposed by Swales (1990), which allow them to situate the occurrences of the items showing the writer's opinions. The paper could have benefitted here from clarification on the concepts of "move" and "step" because not all readers may be familiar with them. Also, the paper could have benefitted from a graph or table illustrating the moves and steps to which the authors refer. Although the analysis is well developed, this lack renders the methodology confusing.

Nevertheless, the authors successfully demonstrate several interesting findings, such as the differences in the distributions of the examined adjectives and adverbs across disciplines as well as the predominance of attitude markers over epistemic adjectives and adverbs.

In the fourth paper, "Hyponymy Relations in Construction Textbooks: A Corpus-Based Analysis", Concepción Orna-Montesinos analyzes the role of hyponyms in the discipline of construction and civil engineering in order to understand how experts lexicalize their disciplinary world. She uses a corpus of textbooks as well as WordNet to define what the concept of "building" is and why it can be referred to in so many different ways (*house, bungalow, club, school, cathedral*, etc.). Whereas WordNet lists four different definitions of it, in the specialized corpus of construction textbooks the author only finds the prevalence of one of them: "building, edifice (a structure that has a roof and walls and stands more or less permanently in one place)" (p. 99). Also, whereas WordNet lists a very high number of hyponyms for that sense of *building* that are distributed in five levels of hyponymy, in the specialized corpus Orna-Montesinos only identifies 27 % of the hyponyms described in WordNet. Although the most frequent hyponym found in the corpus is the first-level prototypical *house,* the historical predominance of religious construction is reflected in the corpus (e. g. *cathedral, chapel, basilica*). Interestingly, the hyponyms listed in WordNet that are not used in the specialized corpus correspond to buildings for keeping animals (e. g. *aviary*) as well as buildings not meant to be inhabited (e. g. *boat house*). This indicates that textbook authors prefer commercial and institutional construction, a choice that is reflected in the lexicon. Also, the comparison of the frequencies of the occurrences of hyperonyms and hyponyms reveals that experts prefer to use more specific words to noun phrases: "*health facility* (2) – *clinic* (4), *hospital* (38)" (p. 104).

Nuria Edo contributes the paper "The Creation of an Active, Corpus-Based Dictionary on Industrial Ceramics from Specialized Lexicography". The author describes the principles guiding the elaboration of an English-Spanish dictionary of ceramics that aims to meet the terminological needs of the professionals of ceramics in Spain for international marketing purposes. The dictionary is said to be "active" in that it is closer to works of specialized lexicography because it aims at meeting the translators' needs. The dictionary entries strangely vary from very technical terms such as *alligator* to less technical ones such as *abroad* and *agree*; they include several information fields (part of speech, equivalents, semantic field, collocations/collocates, examples, etc). However, the extent to which this dictionary is "active" could have been attested more convincingly.

Inés Lareo's paper ("New Trends Exploring the Language of Science: The Corpus of English Texts on Astronomy (CETA) and its Tool (CCT) in the Context of the *Coruña* Corpus") introduces the *Coruña Corpus: a collection of samples for the historical study of English scientific writing.* She lists the objectives of the research project, draws considerations on the selection criteria of the texts that the corpus includes, describes the methodology used to encode the texts as well as the metadata referring to both the texts and to authors, and presents the tool that allows users to access it. This is a very interesting resource that will surely help the linguistic community study the language of astronomy from a historical point of view.

Regarding the same subject field and thanks to the corpus described in the previous contribution, Gonzalo Camina ("New Words for New Ideas: Noun Formation in the Corpus of English Texts on Astronomy") analyzes the processes employed in the coining of nouns in scientific writing. He focuses specifically on affixation as a means to enlarge the vocabulary inventory and examines several text genres produced from 1200 until 1800.

In the last contribution of Section I, Estefanía Sánchez Barreiro ("Adjunctive and Disjunctive Lists in Modern English Scientific Discourse") presents a study on the most frequent phrases collocating with *and* and *or* (called *extenders*) that occur in the scientific writing of the eighteenth century. After defining what extenders are, differentiating between adjunctive and disjunctive constructions as well as between general and specific extenders, the author presents the methodology that she used to carry out her research. She uses part of the *Coruña* Corpus which was described in the previous two contributions. The selected samples of texts pertain to the subject matter of life sciences. She concludes that extenders serve a function that can vary according to the contexts of use, that they typically occur in clause-final position and that their basic form corresponds to a conjunction plus a noun phrase.

'Section II' opens with Tomás Conde's "Tacit Technique on the Evaluation of Technical Texts", a study on the differences in the evaluation of the translation of specialized and non-specialized texts. He uses four groups of evaluators: potential addressees of the texts, professional translators, translation teachers and translation students. The specialized texts correspond to technical procedures for painting and non-specialized texts consist of several news taken from *Economist.com*. Conde describes in detail the methods and parameters used by the evaluators to assess the translations. He concludes that evaluators made more changes on the non-specialized sets of texts because they felt more self-confident about the subject matter, and that regardless of the nature of the texts the behavior of teachers was more regular because they are used to evaluating series of translations.

The following article is written by Pilar Ordónez López ("The GENTT Corpus of Specialised Genres: A Valuable Tool for Professional Translators"). She argues that textual genres play an important role in the configuration of specialized languages and that they can therefore be a key tool in the analysis of specialized communication. The GENTT corpus covers three specialized fields: legal, medical, and technical. It is a multilingual and comparable corpus that allows translators to become familiar with the socio-professional conventions of these fields within different linguistic systems, thereby saving them from having to undertake a laborious documentary search. Each field of specialization is attributed a tree of genres for each language and each text is attributed a genre. The author explains that this allows translators to categorize texts conceptually, namely to anticipate equivalence gaps. The usefulness of the corpus is illustrated through the example of legal translation, which we thought was a little odd because this book deals with scientific and technical communication and not with legal translation. Nevertheless, the usefulness of the GENTT tool for legal translators is very convincing because each language version of the legal subcorpus has a tree of genres of its own due to the fact that law is a culture-bound subject field.

In "Metadiscursive Elements in the Translation of Scientific Texts", Francisca Suau-Jiménez compares the correspondence of metadiscourse in English and Spanish research articles and popular science. More specifically, she analyzes hedges and phatic elements, i. e. elements that assume vagueness or non-assertiveness of language and that therefore reveal the way in which the writer of the texts addresses the reader. She argues that the understanding of this phenomenon is very important for translation because metadiscourse assists in the accomplishment of prescriptive and communicative functions in scientific genres and should therefore be translated fittingly. This study is interesting because one usually believes that phatic elements are rare in pure sciences, but the author proves that the phenomenon does, in fact, exist in scientific communication as well.

The following contribution, "TRACE: Measuring the Impact of CAT Tools on Translated texts", was written by Olga Torres-Hostench, José Ramón Biau Gil, Pilar Cid Leal, Adrià Mor, Bartolomé Mesa-Lao, Mariana Orozco and Pilar Sánchez-Guijón. The authors describe the design of an experiment to compare translations made with and without the use of CAT tools, because, as they explain, "little research has been carried out to determine the differences that may exist between technical texts translated with or without CAT tools, or the impact that the practice of translating using CAT tools may have on developments in target language usage" (p. 256). They make the hypothesis that the phenomena of explicitation, of linguistic interference and of textuality are expressed differently in translations made with or without CAT tools. They use texts with indicators of these phenomena, translation memories, recordings of the operations carried out by professional translators as well as post-translation questionnaires to collect data for a pilot study.

Juan José Martínez-Sierra contributes the paper "Science and Technology on the Screen: The Translation of Documentaries". After defining what a documentary is, enumerating its main characteristics, and situating it in a classification of audiovisual genres, the author draws considerations on audiovisual translation, namely on the modalities for the audiovisual translation of documentaries. According to him, audiovisual translation has the appropriate modalities to make it possible for documentaries to cross language barriers, namely by using dubbing and voice-over, two popular modalities used in Spain. The audiovisual genre is presented here as being different from written and oral genres and the point is made that the translation of documentaries demands adequate training.

Finally, María Rosario Bautista Zambrana presents "Ontologies for Scientific-Technical Translation". She argues that ontologies can be useful for translators because these can provide them with "conceptual and terminological information" (p. 295) about a certain specialized field. Zambrana's ontology carefully delineates a methodology inspired by state-of-the-art work that aims at supplying the translation of terms from the domain of diabetes, at describing how the terms relate to other terms from the domain as well as the properties and characteristics that they have. As an attempt to meet translators' and terminologists' needs, the linguistic realizations of English, German and Spanish terms are offered. The starting language for this ongoing study was Spanish and the emphasis is placed on the fact that this ontology can help translators find the translation of terms. However, the reader may find that little indication is provided as to the extent to which the German and English equivalents were found and that there is no information concerning the syntagmatic contexts in which the equivalents can be used by translators.

Clearly, the reviewed contributions focus on three main aspects of scientific communication: textual genres, synchronic and diachronic studies, and resources for scientific translation. Firstly, the contributions selected by the editors focus on a panoply of textual genres in one way or another: popular science, book reviews, research articles, technical texts, documentaries. The contribution by Pilar Ordónez López emphasizes the importance of textual genres for the understanding of and dealing with scientific communication; Inés Lareo's paper stresses the importance of selecting different text genres when building a comparable corpus, such as the *Coruña corpus*. Secondly, although the majority of the contributions selected by the editors offers synchronic studies, there is an obvious effort to develop diachronic studies of scientific communication (Françoise Salager-Meyer; Gonzalo Camina, Sánchez Barreiro, Inés Lareo). Finally, most of them correspond to corpus-based studies or deal with the elaboration of corpora (there are at least three papers on the *Coruña Corpus of Early Scientific Writing)*; other

contributions describe two different resources for scientific translation: dictionaries (Nuria Edo) and ontologies (María Rosario Bautista Zambrana). The inclusion of more contributions on the resources for the field of scientific communication might have further enriched the coverage made by the editors. Nonetheless, the book offers teachers and students of translation a wide panorama of research in scientific communication. ◆

Janine Pimentel
Invited Professor, Département de linguistique et de traduction
Université de Montréal, Canada
E-Mail : janine.pimentel@umontreal.ca

Giannoni, Davide Simone/Frade, Celina (2010): ***Researching Language and the Law: Textual Features and Translation Issues.*** Frankfurt a. M. u. a.: Lang. (Linguistic Insights: Studies in Language and Communication). ISBN: 978-3-0343-0443-6, 278 Seiten.

The book contains 13 papers that were presented at the 2009 CERLIS Conference in Bergamo, divided into two parts, one with 6 chapters focusing on textual features of legal discourse, and the other with 7 chapters addressing issues in legal translation and interpreting.

Part 1: Textual Features

Estrella Montolío Durán discusses the importance of using conditional clauses to fulfill the communicative function of legal discourse, and provides examples drawn from Babylonian and present-day Spanish legislation. The value of the chapter lies in the detailed analysis of the clause order and discourse function of conditional structures in a historical perspective which compares the temporal extremes in the legal writing of statutory texts, i. e. the first recorded legal system in the world (Hammurabi's Code of Laws) and contemporary legislation (the Spanish laws passed in 2008). The study, though, does not provide any diachronic analysis, as the editors wrongly assume in the introduction; in fact, no evidence whatsoever is provided as to the recurrent use of conditional logical connectors in statutory texts between the mentioned temporal extremes.

In spite of the erudite reference to the Babylonian legal codes, the methodological approach of the research is rather weak for a number of reasons (inconsistency, incoherence, hyper-generalization, etc.). For instance, the first research question ("Why do conditional constructions recur with such frequency in the writing of legal texts?") would call for an intralinguistic comparison between legal texts and other text types – which is totally missing in the study – in order to verify the assumed higher frequency of conditional clauses in legal texts. The question remains unanswered. Furthermore, the assumption on which it rests can be easily falsified by quickly checking the occurrence of "if-clauses", for instance, in a technical text: a random check on a technical manual of 6,013 words came up with 15 of them, i. e. relatively much more than the 22 occurrences in Law 1/2008, which consists of 13,693 words (p. 21). Equally inconsistent is the comparison with the causal sentences within the same law, which returned 4 occurrences of causal structures. Again, if compared to the 0 occurrences in the technical manual above, it would not make a much more striking contrast.