Tang, Fang (2018) *Explicitation in Consecutive Interpreting*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 230 pp., ISBN: 9789027258823 (Hardbound)/ISBN: 9789027265111(e-Book), EUR 99.00/USD 149.00.

Explicitation is a translation shift found common in interpreting and is frequently used as an interpreting strategy to make what is conveyed in the source language (SL) more explicit in the target language (TL). How explicitation is performed in interpreting, however, is not fully understood. *Explicitation in Consecutive Interpreting* is a descriptive and exploratory study on how explicitation is performed in consecutive interpreting (CI) and how the pattern of explicitation differs when two factors (interpreting expertise and interpreting directionality) vary. Furthermore, the book is intended to unveil interpreters' motivations to perform explicitation and how the pattern of explicitation may change when the motivation varies.

In the first chapter, the author begins with the rationales for her research on explicitation, among which the primary rationale is to find out why in an activity as cognitively-demanding as interpreting, interpreters still make the extra effort to explicitate SL information. These are followed by three corresponding research questions about the patterns of explicitation in CI, the potential influence of interpreting expertise (professional interpreters, student interpreters) on the pattern of explicitation, and the potential influence of interpreting direction (English-to-Chinese, Chinese-to-English) on the pattern of explicitation.

In Chapter 2 and 3, the author mainly illustrates the theoretical framework of her research. In Chapter 2, the author reviews previous studies on six key issues concerning explicitation in interpreting, including the definition, typology, motivation, potential relationship between explicitation and interpreting expertise, potential relationship between explicitation and interpreting directionality, and difference between Explicitation Hypothesis and explicitation as a Translation Universal. The author's critical review on previous typologies of explicitation is particularly informative and inspiring to future research, primarily because the review explains: (1) how vaguely the categories in these typologies were defined, (2) how the

categories overlapped within each typology, and (3) how these typologies, which as claimed were based on the three metafunctions of language (i.e., ideational/experiential, interpersonal, textual) proposed by Halliday and Matthiessen (2004), in fact changed the working definition of the terms they borrowed from this theory. Based on the critical review, the author introduces in Chapter 3 the working definition of explicitation adopted in her study, and she proposes a new typology of explicitation, with three primary categories in accordance with the three metafunctions of language and ten sub-categories based on how each metafunction can be instantiated via explicitation.

The fourth chapter mainly presents the research design and the data collection procedure. The author reports how she identifies explicitation shifts via triangulation of data collected with different tools (retrospection, interview, and notes taken in interpreting), especially when the data collected with these tools seem contradictory with each other. Her account of the triangulation conducted provides guidelines for the research design, data collection, and data analysis of future studies on explicitation or other translation shifts. Moreover, the author states in this chapter how the effect size in her data analyses is computed and evaluated, which is scarcely reported in interpreting studies but in fact warranted if the inferential statistics involved are to be properly interpreted (Hojat and Xu 2004).

From Chapter 5 to 7, the author reports results of a number of comparisons conducted from four dimensions: primarily, *between two interpreting directions* and *between two groups of interpreters*; secondarily, *across different sub-categories of explicitation* and *across different motivations of explicitation.* In each of these three chapters, the author reports the results concerning one metafunction-based explicitation, within which the results concerning *Chinese-to-English* CI is reported first, followed by the results concerning *English-to-Chinese* CI. When the explicitation of each metafunction is described and analyzed, the sub-category explicitation shifts of the same metafunction are reported successively. These sub-categories are further divided into sub-sub-categories in the light of motivation (e.g., modifier-based experiential explicitation for *clarifying*), before comparisons are made *between professional interpreters*

*and student interpreter*s. Not all of these sub-sub-categories of explicitation, however, are compared between the two interpreter groups in the study. No comparison is reported between the two groups in the experiential explicitation for *reinforcing* or in the interpersonal explicitation for *clarifying*, irrespective of the interpreting direction. It could be more reader-friendly if the author reported reasons for these missing comparisons. Besides, further research is needed to see whether the absence of these explicitation shifts out of the particular motivation is totally coincidental or indicating a certain pattern of explicitation made by either interpreter group in CI but not observed yet. With the results of either interpreting direction reported, the author adds up the frequencies of all the explicitation shifts out of the same motivation (and under the same metafunction-based category) and then compares the added-up frequencies *between professional interpreters and student interpreters*. Near the end of each chapter, the author compares the pattern of explicitation *between the two interpreting directions*, with data of the professionals and the students collapsed together. On the whole, an effect of interpreting expertise and an effect of interpreting directionality are observed in three respects, that is, in the pattern of explicitation of each metafunction (i.e., each primary category), in the pattern of explicitation fulfilling a metafunction via some particular means (i.e., some sub-categories), and in the pattern of most of the reported motivation-based explicitation (i.e., most of the reported sub-sub categories).

In Chapter 8, the author mainly compares between the professionals and the students in the notes-related explicitation. Without inferential statistical analysis, however, it is hard for readers to know whether the differences found are statistically meaningful, particularly when the sample size in either group is no larger than 15 (Creswell 2015). Besides inferential analyses, an answer to the following question is also called for: where the note-related explicitation locates in the tripartite classifying framework of explicitation, or whether the note-related explicitation can find a proper position in the framework at all. The answer is significant not only to the systematicity of the argument and the presentation of the whole research, but also to the generalizability of the proposed typology of explicitation in future studies.

In Chapter 9, the author mostly accounts for the differences found in the pattern of explicitation *between the professional and the student interpreters* and *between the two interpreting directions*. Following Chapter 9, Chapter 10 offers conclusions of the whole research, summarizing all the findings, discussing their implications (methodological, empirical, and pedagogical), stating limitations of the study, and offering suggestions for future research.

To gain more insight about explicitation, the present review suggests further discussion and empirical studies addressing at least three issues of the study reported. First, there is a need for a more operationalizable definition of explicitation. The author states in the book that the translation shift leading to semantic deviations from the SL is not taken as explicitation (41). Meanwhile, the definition of explicitation (esp. the working definition of the explicitation for gap-filling) highlights that the explicitated information is inferable from SL context (33, 50), indicating that explicitation can be inference and the information explicitated can to some extent deviate from the original SL message. A question that arises is: to what extent TL output can be deviated from SL information until it is denied as an explicitation shift as defined. The answer is important particularly when we need to distinguish the explicitation shift for gap-filling from the coping tactic called 'parallel reformulation' (i.e. inventing information that is more or less related to SL context when failures in SL comprehension and/or in TL reformulation happen, see Gile 2009: 211). In fact, the current review proposes to exclude the translation shift for gap-filling and the one for time management from the explicitation as defined. The major justification is that explicitation is performed with an initial intention to deliver information more explicitly (though there is no guarantee for this intention to be realized), while the translation shifts performed out of the two aforementioned motivations do not aim for explicitating information but mainly for interpreters to maintain the fluency of TL output and to protect their public image as interpreters. By excluding these translation shifts from explicitation, we may be able to attain a more precise and neater pattern demonstrating how interpreters convey information explicitly in CI.

Second, there is a need to further discuss the (im)possibility of preventing overlaps among the

three metafunction-based categories of explicitation. According to Halliday and Matthiessen (2004: 58-63, 118-120, 168-169, 328-329), the three metafunctions of language (ideational: to construe human experience and transform it into meaning; interpersonal: to enact or act out our personal and social relationship with others; textual: to construct text for enabling and facilitating the performance of the other two metafunctions) are unified within a clause, with either the clause or each of its constituents/elements performing *more than one metafunction* in communication. As interpreting is in its essence 'a service activity with a communication function' (Gile 2009: 26), there is no reason for explicitation in interpreting to differ from any other instance of language use in the sense of realizing double or even triple metafunctions simultaneously. In other words, classifying explicitation on the basis of the metafunction fulfilled inter alia entails category overlaps (Becher 2011). The author claims to solve the problem of double counting by proposing and following specific rules in classification (e.g., 44-48), and yet these deliberately-established inclusionary criteria along with the counting do not help unveil but further obscure/distort the pattern how each metafunction of language is achieved via explicitation in interpreting. Acknowledging that one explicitation shift can have multiple metafunctions, the current review proposes that the three metafunction-based categories of explicitation could be abandoned, while the original sub-categories based on how each metafunction is instantiated could be combined into compound categories according to how multiple metafunctions are realized via the same explicitation (e.g., *modifier-attitude*-based explicitation, *process-attitude*-based explicitation), before the concerned quantitative analysis is conducted.

Third, there is a need to further explore the possible reason for the stable and high frequency of explicitation for clarifying. As reported from Chapter 5 to 7, the frequency of the explicitation shift for clarifying is found higher than the frequency of the explicitation shift for any other motivation, no matter from which dimension the comparisons are made. In the conclusion (Chapter 10), the author attributes this pattern of results to the interpreters' tendency for clarification, but she does not explore the possible reason/cause for that tendency if it does exist. Given that the pattern is stable and unlikely to be incidental, the issue is worth further empirical

investigation.

To sum up, the book contributes both to the translation and interpreting studies and to the practice of interpreter training in two ways. First, owing to its combination of the quantitative research approach and the qualitative one, the research reported in the book not only explores *how* but also *why* explicitation is performed in CI, which is rarely explored in the existing literature. Second, with empirical evidence demonstrating how explicitation is performed by interpreters of different interpreting expertise levels and in opposite interpreting directions, the study showcases to both interpreting trainers and trainees what a relatively successful performance of explicitation is like in English/Chinese CI and in what respect novice interpreters can make more effort to improve.

Yinghui Li

School of English and Education/Bilingual Cognition and Development Lab, Center for Linguistics and Applied Linguistics

Guangdong University of Foreign Studies

References

Becher, Viktor (2011) 'Explicitation and Implicitation in Business Translation: A Corpus-Based Study of English-German and German-English Translations of Business Texts', PhD dissertation, University of Hamburg.

Creswell, John W. (2015) *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (4th ed.), Boston: Pearson.

Gile, Daniel (2009) *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Halliday, M. A. Kirkwood and Christian M. I. M. Matthiessen (2004) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, London and New York: Oxford University Press.

Hojat, Mohammadreza and Xu Gang (2004) 'A Visitor's Guide to Effect Sizes—Statistical Significance versus Practical (Clinical) Importance of Research Findings', *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 9(3): 241-249.