This article reviews a ground-breaking monograph on Legal Interpreting which recently appeared in TRANS: Revista de Traductología, an open access peer-reviewed Spanish scientific publication. Published annually since 1997 by the University of Málaga (Spain), TRANS monitors research progress in translation and interpreting, offering the latest information on international state-of-the-art findings in studies, case reports, theoretical analysis and review articles on a wide range of translation and interpreting-related topics. The journal has a significant impact on international research (it is listed in the FRANCIS, LATINDEX and SCOPUS indexes, and also in the principal Spanish Impact Indexes, including DICE, CIRC, FECYT, RESH and MIAR).

For its first issue of 2015 (2015 has a regular issue and a monograph), TRANS presents La interpretación en entornos judiciales, a monograph on interpreting in legal contexts containing a number of interesting articles in both English and Spanish. Each contribution to the volume is available online and throws useful light on recent developments in Court Interpreting in different European countries.

Guest editors Jesús Baigorri (University of Salamanca, Spain) and Maria Chiara Russo (University of Bologna, Italy) are researchers from the Alfaqueque Research Group at the University of Salamanca. The Alfaqueque Group is a team of researchers from four different countries (Spain, Germany, Chile and Italy) that focuses on interdisciplinary aspects of Interpreting and Intercultural Communication. Professor Baigorri has experience both as a prolific academic researcher and as a United Nations interpreter; likewise Professor Russo combines a high academic profile in Interpreting with a long career as a freelance conference interpreter. This combined professional/academic perspective defines the key issues and methods addressed in the contributions selected for publication in this issue of TRANS.

Legal interpreting is one of the most challenging fields for the professional Interpreting and research community due to its rapid evolution over the past few years. This monograph describes the current state-of-the-art in legal Interpreting at a key moment in Europe: the still recent Directive 2010/64/EU, adopted by the European Parliament and Council on 20 October 2010, for the first time explicitly envisaged a right to interpretation and translation in criminal proceedings within the European Union with a clear focus on quality. As highlighted by most of the contributions to this volume, EU members are currently working on safeguarding fair trial standards through the appropriate transposition and application of the 2010 Directive. However, early diagnoses presented here show that in some legal settings much still needs to be done, particularly in terms of interpreter training, recruitment, accreditation and service quality.
The volume starts with an overview by the guest editors, presenting the main topics of the seven different contributions selected and the thematic links between them. This introduction guides the reader throughout the volume in a clear, straightforward manner. The editors’ opening analysis concludes that, though there remains a lot of work to be done before the demand for qualified interpreters is adequately satisfied in legal settings in Europe, certain positive steps have already been taken in particular with regard to the interesting results of three major projects funded by the European Directorate-General for Justice (see the review of the fourth, fifth and sixth contributions below).

The first contribution is an interesting report by professor emeritus Erik Hertog (KU Leuven), suggestively entitled “Looking back while going forward: 15 years of legal interpreting in the EU”. The article provides a comprehensive history of the legislative regulations affecting legal interpreting in Europe between 1999-2015, together with an overview of the most significant research projects and conferences in this field. Hertog then goes on to analyze the key issues associated with the professionalization of interpreters, such as the importance of certification procedures and professional associations like EULITA, before concluding that legal interpreting has come of age and will continue to grow as a cornerstone of a just society.

Marina Pascual offers an account of her work as an interpreter at the European Union’s Court of Justice. Her paper, entitled “La interpretación en el Tribunal de Justicia de la Unión Europea”, starts by analyzing the institution’s regulatory framework and its application of the principle of multilingualism and goes on to look at key issues in this professional scenario, such as ethical considerations, user-types, and mediation as a field-specific service.

Parts four to six of the volume are composed of three reports which address initiatives funded by the European DG for Justice, namely the IMPLI project, the CO-Minor-IN/QUEST project and the Spanish SOS-VICS project. The first initiative, the ImPlI project (Improving Police and Legal Interpreting), focuses on the right to court and police interpreting in Italy, with emphasis on pre-trial contexts. It also analyzes how Directive 2010/64 EU has been implemented in Italy. Researchers Amato and Mack (University of Bologna) conclude that, despite some slight improvements, the transposition process has obeyed the letter rather than the spirit of the Directive and point out that Italian lawmakers have not been specific enough to effectively guarantee linguistic and procedural rights.

The CO-Minor-IN/QUEST project (2013-2014) focuses on the interactional dynamics of interpreter-mediated child interviews during the pre-trial phase in criminal procedures. Salaets and Balogh’s (KU Leuven) main motivation lies in the fact that interpreter-mediated pre-trial child interviews constitute a relatively unexplored area in interpreting studies. This project involved partner institutions from six different EU member states: Belgium (KU Leuven), France (ISIT), Hungary (Eszter Foundation), Italy (University of Bologna), The Netherlands (Ministry of Security and Justice) and the United Kingdom (Heriot-Watt University). Researchers and experts from the different disciplines involved (i.e., interpreting, justice and policing, psychology and
child support) were able to share their knowledge and thus improve interpreter-mediated child interview practices. The main aim of this project was to provide children with high quality interpreting services in the context of criminal cases. Mixed methods were used to analyze the results: a quantitative method to check the significance of correlations between data statistically and a qualitative method to analyze and categorize the remarks, comments, observations and answers to open-ended questions by the respondents in writing. To avoid possible questions regarding observer bias, it was clearly indicated at the outset that the interpreter was the interview participant with whom the other professionals involved in the criminal procedure were less acquainted. The CO-Minor-IN/QUEST consortium has made a sensible, significant move in this field by making proposals for a better and more professional environment for children who find themselves in a threatening and unfamiliar setting.

Abril Martí’s contribution titled “Interpreting in Gender Violence Settings: the Spanish Case”, reports on some of the most important results obtained in the SOS-VICS project. It reviews the main factors which increase non-Spanish-speaking foreign women’s exposure to GV (gender-based violence). The author emphasizes the negative impact of the existing language barrier on victims’ capacity to overcome the cycle of violence and then goes on to review current Spanish legislation regulating PSI (Public Service Interpreting) in Spain. Martí first focuses on the status in progress and the particularity of the actual interpreting services in GV contexts and then provides key professional standards that should be guaranteed for women in such situations. The contribution concludes by suggesting a number of mechanisms which might contribute to the professionalization of PSI.

The next two sections deal with language mediation in two specific Italian scenarios. Rudvin and Pesare (University of Bologna) look at interpreting for victims of human trafficking in Italy. They start by explaining the factors which lead to ‘emergency migration’ in Italy, describing the different detention centers to which undocumented migrants are currently sent (CIEs - Centros d’Identificazione e Espulsione) and the roles played by interpreters there, as language mediators, cultural mediators, intercultural mediators and language-cultural mediators –roles which become increasingly complex due to their linguistic-pragmatic, cultural, institutional, emotional and psychological implications. This article is based on the data collected during a 6-month internship by one of the authors at the CIE in Bologna and reflects the working relationship established between the main actors in the process: the victim, the institution and the interpreter.

The project called “Interpreting Wiretapped Conversations in the Judicial Setting: Descriptive Analysis and Operating Methodology”, was conceived as the result of a self-perceptive analysis of two telephone interpreting (TI) projects carried out in Italy by Maria Jesús González, author of the next article, who presents a descriptive analysis of the role of the TI and the operational methodology employed, and, more generally, of TI classification as a discipline. She then defines telephone wiretapping and describes its features and specificities in order to redefine TI in a judicial setting, outlining the
methodological complexity of a TI project and the different scenarios in which the interpreter may be involved.

The last contribution, by Ortega Herráez, entitled “Reflexiones en torno al binomio formación-acreditación como elementos constitutivos de la profesionalización de la interpretación jurídica”, examines the criteria underlying the training and certification of legal interpreters in different countries, and the relationships that may arise between these two elements, in order to present a critical analysis of the current situation in Spain and envision possible future developments. Different training and accreditation models are analyzed to justify the professionalization of interpreting as one means of guaranteeing the defendant’s right to due process and a fair trial. Taking Spain’s background and past experience of providing legal interpreting services, and the quality of those services, as a point of departure, Ortega Herráez also questions the potential efficiency of forthcoming official measures in Spain to create a national register of legal interpreters and translators given that no provisions are contemplated for obligatory previous professional training or appropriate accreditation testing.

The timeliness of this volume’s publication is beyond any doubt given the changing times legal interpreting is experiencing in Europe. Despite its recent publication, the monograph has already had an impact in several key Translation and Interpreting institutions and publications. Indeed, it was listed and recommended by the Translation Studies Federation and the European Society for Translation Studies as soon as it was published. Also reviewed by Intersect, a US publication on Public Service Interpreting, it was ranked “book of the week” during the first week of October, 2015.

The cutting-edge topic of legal interpreting has experienced a boom in terms of the significant research attention it has attracted in the past few years. This volume exemplifies the quality and the applicability of the research currently being carried out. Hertog’s work, in particular his thorough review of the European legislative background to legal interpreting, will become a must-read for any researcher in the field. The innovative projects and case-based analyses described in the monograph are key to an understanding of paramount emerging issues such as wiretapping interpretation, interpreter training, interpreting for vulnerable interest groups and interpreting within multilingual institutions such as the EU Court of Justice.