Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Palackého

Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Direkcionalita v simultánním tlumočení a kohezní vazby

Převod kohezních vazeb u tlumočníků pracujících v Evropském parlamentu do angličtiny jako do jazyka A a jako do jazyka B

Directionality in simultaneous interpreting and cohesive ties

Recreation of cohesive ties by European Parliament interpreters working into English A and English B

(magisterská diplomová práce)

Autor: Bc. Tereza Schleiderová

Vedoucí práce: PhDr. Dominika Winterová

Olomouc 2016

Prohlášení

Prohlašuji, že jsem diplomovou práci vypracovala samostatně pod odborným dohledem vedoucího diplomové práce a uvedl/a jsem všechny použité podklady a literaturu.

V Olomouci dne. …..………..   Podpis …………………………

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

A = A language

A>B = Direction of SI out of mother tongue into an active foreign language

B = B language

C>A = Direction of SI out of a passive language into one's mother tongue

CD = Cohesive device

CI = Consecutive interpreting

CoR = European Committee of the Regions

CT = Cohesive tie

EC = European Commission

EIB = European Investment Bank

EP = European Parliament

EU = European Union

INT. = Interpreter, interpreters

MEP = Member of the European Parliament

no. = Number of

SI = Simultaneous interpreting

SL = Source language

ST = Source text

TL = Target language

TT = Target text

LIST OF TABLES

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

One of the recurring topics in the theory of both translation and interpreting is that of directionality. The issue of whether interpretation into one's active *'B' language*, or *retour* interpreting, should be put on an equal footing with interpretation into one's mother tongue, has been disputed for years. Many researchers, theorists and interpreters themselves consider retour as an invalid mode of interpreting, while others argue with opinions as well as empirical studies suggesting contrariwise. The difference of opinions is not only shown in theory but also in practice. While interpreting into B has only recently become a necessity in the international institutions, such as the EU after the enlargements took place, retour interpreting had already been practiced in the Central and Eastern Europe for years.

As it was pointed out that the quality of retour and thus the overall view on interpreting into B is assessed solely on the basis of personal experience and subjective opinions, empirical research into retour was initiated, yielding results in favor of both directions. Several researchers have called for a more balanced approach towards retour interpreting.

Many have aimed at assessing interpreters' outputs according to different criteria. With our study, we would like to contribute in the field by shedding more light on directionality by taking it as a variable influencing cohesion in interpreter's output. Cohesion, as one of the seven standards of textuality helps the receivers perceive the texts in a coherent way. Therefore, our analysis will focus on cohesion as one of the interpreting performance quality criteria. This will be studied in the practical part of our thesis on the output by professional interpreters working in the European Parliament in the Czech-into-English direction.

The thesis is divided into two parts. The theoretical part consists of five chapters (1 to 5) and the practical part is represented by our empirical study the report of which is presented in chapter 6.

The theoretical part opens with a chapter providing definitions of working languages and definitions of a 'B' language as the mainstream view and as viewed by different authors.

The second chapter is dedicated to interpreting directionality and retour interpreting. Here we will introduce the topic by placing it into historical context. A brief history of retour interpreting will follow compared to the situation today. For the subjects of our analysis in the second part are EU interpreters, we add a subchapter on interpreting in EU institutions and on the role retour interpreting plays here. One subchapter is also devoted to the position of retour on the Czech interpreting market and the current situation of retour interpreters in the different associations they are members of.

To further contextualize our topic, an overview of research conducted in the field of directionality follows in the third chapter. Findings on directionality are often contradictory, largely owing to the fact that interpreting directionality is highly relevant on a number of variables. These variables related to interpreting situational context, wider context, users of interpreting or interpreters themselves, are discussed in the subchapters. Another subchapter is also devoted to quality of interpreting.

The fourth and fifth chapters provide context for the upcoming analysis of cohesive ties present in speeches delivered by MEPs and the source text cohesive ties renditions in the interpreters' output. The fourth chapter defines *political discourse*. In the subchapter there is a short characterization of political speeches as delivered in the European Parliament.

The last chapter of the theoretical part, the fifth chapter, is devoted to cohesion as one of the textuality standards, according to which we will assess the target text of our analysis. After defining cohesion in broader context, it is then discussed in context of simultaneous interpreting. A subchapter on research into cohesion in simultaneous interpreting follows with focus on junction as the type of cohesion analyzed in our practical part.

Following Dose's (2006) assertion that interpreting directionality does not seem to influence recreation of cohesive ties on the studied language combinations as rendered by interpreters passing exams of an intensive short course of interpreting, and following the proposition by Padilla (2005) that language specificity must be taken into consideration, we set ourselves our research question: *How does interpreting directionality influence the way ST*

cohesive ties are recreated in the TTs by EP interpreters working in the CZ-EN direction?

Based on findings by Gumul (2006), who found that student interpreters tend to explicitate connectives more often when interpreting into B language in the Polish-into-English direction than when interpreting into their mother tongue; and based on Padilla's (2005) call for language specificity consideration, we set ourselves a specific research question including professional interpreters and a different language direction: *How does interpreting directionality influence the way ST implicit cohesive ties are explicitated in the TTs by EP interpreters working in the CZ-EN direction?*

The aim of our analysis presented in the practical part of our thesis is attempting to answer our research question and our specific research question. Therefore, our objective is to determine the relationship between directionality and recreation of cohesive ties in the interpreters' output. We will focus on recreation of junctions in the TT of interpreters, namely on those establishing the adversative, causative, conditional and concessive relations present in the ST.

A parallel analysis will be made for this purpose, aligning political speeches delivered in the European parliament (source texts, STs) with professional interpreters' renditions (target texts, TTs) working out of Czech into English. It follows that two groups of interpreters will take part in our analysis: one interpreting into English A (their mother tongue) and another group interpreting into English B (their active foreign language). In this way, two corpora of Czech as source language and English as target language will be created, each interpreted in a different interpreting direction: one corpus containing texts interpreted out of Czech C into English A (C>A) direction and one corpus of texts interpreted out of Czech A into English B (A>B) direction.

The source texts (STs) used in our analysis were obtained from the database of the European Parliament speeches available to public[1] and were meticulously chosen to achieve comparability of the two corpora. Many variables were taken into account, relating to speakers and their prosody, the overall character of speeches in terms of whether they were read/unread, prepared/unprepared or

---

[1] http://www.europarl.europa.eu/ep-live/

delivered impromptu, their underlying structure, the speech level of redundancy, their length, or the speech delivery rate.

After transcribing the STs, a ST analysis will be made. The interpreted versions (TTs) of STs will also be transcribed and aligned with the STs in order to perform our analysis. Using both qualitative and quantitative methods, we will determine the way interpreters re-establish the ST cohesive ties and in what extent they employ explicit cohesive devices between segments where ST speakers leave them implicit. Using the classification put forward by Dose (2006) in her study as the base for our classification, with adaptations of the categories for the needs of our analysis, we will identify the individual types of interpreters' ST CD renditions.

The number of individual instances falling into the different categories of ST CD renditions will then be turned into percentage for the purpose of comparing the rate of the instances used in the two corpora. We will then evaluate our results on the basis of the percentage rate, attempting to make conclusions about directionality influencing the way source text cohesive devices are rendered by interpreters.

Let us now proceed to the main part of our thesis, which opens with the theoretical background of the issue, starting with definitions of a *'B' language* following by chapter on *directionality* and closing with chapters on *political discourse* and on *cohesion* as transition chapters leading to our empirical study in the practical part of our thesis.

1. What is a 'B' language?

Interpreters are able to express their ideas more fluently in some languages than in others. Consequently, their working languages are categorized according to their linguistic knowledge. Contemporary theory and practice draw on the classification of working languages by the International Association of Conference Interpreters, commonly known under the French acronym AIIC (*Assossiation d'Interprètes de Conférence*) associating professional conference interpreters from all over the world.

1.1 AIIC definition

As stated on the official AIIC website, "interpreter's working languages are classified into three categories – A, B, and C"[i]. According to the AIIC definition, an 'A' language is "the interpreter's mother tongue (or strict equivalent) into which they work from all their other working languages in both consecutive and simultaneous interpretation. It is a language they speak best, and in which they can easily express even complicated ideas." A 'B' language is "a language in which the interpreter is perfectly fluent, but is not a mother tongue. An interpreter can work into this language from one or several of their other working languages, but may prefer to do so in only one mode of interpretation, either consecutive or simultaneous". Both 'A' and 'B' languages are considered active languages for the interpreter. 'C' languages are those "which the interpreter understands perfectly but into which they do not work. Interpreters work from these languages into their active languages. These are therefore passive languages for the interpreter."

This thesis is preoccupied with interpreting from both passive and active language in simultaneous interpreting. In the empirical part we will analyze outputs of simultaneous interpreters working out of Czech C into English A and simultaneous interpreting out of Czech A into English B.

Having read the AIIC definitions while living in today's linguistically interconnected world, one might ask for further clarification. Indeed, the AIIC definition of a B language has been considered too vague by a number of theorists as well as interpreters (Adams 2002, de Fortis 2007).

1.2   Defining 'B' language

After brainstorming with a group of interpreters, Christine Adams elaborates on the AIIC definition by stating that a B language is "a language in which you can think – in a formal, structured (e.g. an interpreting) situation". They also agreed on that it is "a language in which you can deliver a clear and accurate message to conference participants, colleagues on relay and colleagues who share your 'A' language" (2002, 20).

One of the definitions proposed by Danica Seleskovitch and Marianne Lederer is through negation. According to them, a B language is neither an A language, as interpreters working into A don't have an accent and their verbal blunders remain idiomatic; nor is it a C language, as a C language is by definition a passive language.[2] However, they do precise the necessary linguistic competences of a an interpreter working simultaneously into his/her B language, often called a retour interpreter. They explain that simultaneous interpreting into B language requires a wide range of linguistic competences, which need to be mastered by the interpreter. They further explain that simultaneous interpreters working into B must possess a great richness of vocabulary and keep their grammatical errors to a minimum, their expression has got to be sufficiently idiomatic, and their pronunciation shall not irritate the native listener.[3] Additionally, they recommend that SI into B should not be introduced into the training of apprentice interpreters unless they have more or less mastered their SI into A. The process of learning simultaneous into B is facilitated once the SI methods into A have become natural (2002, 325).[4]

It is true that language competence is quite a problematic concept when it comes to measuring it. However, we do have some variables to work with. The expectations of the users of interpreting services differ, as proved by numerous studies (Donovan 2002; Szabari 2002); depending on circumstances such as the

---

[2] "Ce n'est pas un 'A' car l'interprète 'A' n'a pas d'accent et ses maladresses d'expression restent idiomatiques ; ce n'est pas non plus un 'C', car le 'C' est une langue passive" (2002, 324).

[3] "Le 'B' ne connaît en effet des variations considérables et correspond à un vaste éventail de compétences linguistiques. ... Les étudiants qui seront tenus de travailler dans leur langue 'B' en simulnanée et pas seulement en consécutive ... devront être en mesure de manier cette langue acquise avec une grande richesse de vocabulaire et des fautes de grammaire minimes. Leur expression sera suffisamment idiomatique pour ne pas trahir leur origine linguistique, leur prononciation ne devra pas agacer l'autochtone, ..." (2002, 324)

venue, type of event, conference topic or the audience itself. Naturally, depending on the institution they aspire to work for, interpreters have got to meet different requirements. There are different criteria for those who wish to work in the European Parliament than for those working on domestic market. The same applies to interpreter's competence in working into a B language.

A senior interpreter of NATO, Chris Guichot de Fortis believes that a mastery of a B language as practiced at the highest level of international conferences "can be assessed at a level slightly below that of a conference interpreter's mother tongue (say between 5 % and 15 %)." He adds that "this mother tongue should itself be exceptionally rich and flexible, clearly surpassing the quality offered by an average, even university-educated, mother-tongue speaker" (2007, 2). He classifies working languages into a continuum with the active A language on the one end, and an exclusively passive language, the C language, on the other. He divides the B language into a three-level continuum of linguistic ability: entry-level private market, mid-level private market, and highest level private market together with 'B' language required for interpreting for International Organizations (de Fortis 2007, Annex two).

However, excellent linguistic competence in B, sufficient knowledge of the topic and terminology together with mastery of the indispensable interpreting strategies are not the only criteria for a B interpreter to meet. The ability to convey cultural specifics represents yet another very important point. This point is incorporated in the definition of a B language by Alzbeta Malkovska: "Jazyk B je jazyk, který tlumočník ovládá na takové úrovni, že je schopen tomuto jazyku dokonale porozumět, převést do něj jasně a zřetelně sdělení s použitím odpovídající slovní zásoby, rozlišovat jednotlivé styly a převést či vysvětlit kulturní specifika dané jazykové oblasti" (2012, 22).[5] The inclusion of cultural knowledge in retour interpreters' competence is in harmony with Doubalova and others, who point out that *"we shouldn't overlook that linguistic competence goes hand in hand with cultural competence. An interpreter cannot afford to make intercultural errors"* (2010, 50). The cultural competence requirement is also

---

[5] "a 'B' language is a language mastered by the interpreter to the level of being able to understand it perfectly, render the message in this language in a clear and intelligible way using the appropriate terminology, distinguish the different styles and render or explain the cultural specifics of the language area" (Translation by TS)

in line with the actual system of recruitment of retour interpreters for EU institutions. Sally Bailey Ravet, the Chief of Interpreting Department, explains that one of the recruitment criteria for an EU retour interpreter is that they "must *absolutely* have lived in the country of the retour language" to understand "not only the language, but also the way people *think*" in order to be able to do retour and transpose a sentence "from one national setting into a completely different national setting, even if it is not their own".[ii]

While theorists generally agree about the superiority of A language over B language, as it also follows from the AIIC definition, there has been a major difference in views concerning the suitability of SI into one's B.[6] This controversial question of whether one should work into their A or B language is known in the interpreting field as the issue of *directionality*.

---

[6] Interpreting into B in consecutive has been practiced both in East and West, although not without objections by numerous theorists and practitioners

2. Directionality and Retour Interpreting

The issue of SI directionality, i.e. whether interpreters should work only into their mother tongue or also into their active foreign languages, a practice often referred to as "retour interpreting", has been a hotly debated topic by both theorists and interpreters, drawing a divide not only between the Western and Eastern approaches, but also among individuals.

Let us now make a brief introduction of retour interpreting by placing it into historical context. We will then talk about the current situation on interpreting market. As our analysis will be focused on interpreting output by interpreters working in the European Parliament, we also add a chapter on interpreting for EU institutions. We will deal with the way retour has gained its way to the European Union. We will briefly mention its important use in relay interpreting, i.e. a mode of interpreting when one interpreter (called pilot or pivot) interprets the source language into a language common to colleague interpreters, who render the pivot's output into other languages required by administrators. That is why relay is sometimes referred to as "indirect interpreting". As the subjects of our analysis will be Czech retour interpreters, we add a chapter about Czech interpreters working into B. Directionality will then be discussed from the two points of view by Eastern and Western interpreting schools.

2.1 Historical background of retour interpreting

In Ancient Egypt, interpreters were used during campaigns, commercial or diplomatic negotiations. At first, they were chosen randomly among slaves and prisoners, while later it was the sons of foreign princes who were sent abroad for education. They would thus cover for the less educated interpreters (see Čeňková 2001, 9). If asked to interpret into Egyptian, these interpreters would have to work into a foreign language.

On the other hand, Pharaoh Psammetichus (663 – 10 BC) had Egyptians acquire a foreign language (e.g. Greek), instead of having foreigners learn Egyptian, which was not an entirely new custom (see Hermann, in Pochhacker, 17).[7] Instead of using what we would today call retour interpreters when he had the opportunity to do so, the Pharaoh rather resorted to the use of Egyptians who would work into their mother tongue.

During the period of explorations of the Americas, Christopher Columbus encountered many new languages on the continent. These languages were unknown to the colonizers, even to Columbus' own interpreters he brought with him. He therefore decided to train the natives in the Spanish language by sending them to Spain so that they could eventually interpret for him not only out of Spanish into their own language, but also vice versa, into their newly acquired language. They would have to be at Columbus' service, interpreting into their second language.

Of course, interpreting into a B language in simultaneous interpreting emerged much later following the technical progress; although not very long after the invention of the necessary technology related to that mode.

2.1.1 Historical background of simultaneous retour

The first testing of both simultaneous and retour interpreting came shortly after the Second World War. During the Nuremberg Trials some of the interpreters would work out of their mother tongue. The direction from A to B was then

---

[7] "Herodotus reports that Pharaoh Psammeticus handed over the Egyptian boys to Hellenic settlers in the Nile Delta to learn the Greek language. These, he suggests, were the first recruits to what was to become the class of interpreters" (17).

thought preferable, because the interpreters would be familiar with every nuance of their mother tongue (Mackintosh 1999, 68). "Each national division of the International Tribunal provided interpretation into its native language. Interpretation into German was responsibility of US interpreters," (Shveitser 1999, 24). There was no relay system, and so interpreting from and into four working languages required 12 interpreters (Gaiba 1999, 15).[8]

During the Tokyo war crimes trials, the Russian interpreters worked in both directions, too – both from Russian into English and from English into Russian. Their Japanese and English colleagues worked from their native languages. This time, interpretation on relay was widely used (Shveitser 1999, 24-25).

During the International Economic Conference in Moscow in 1952, the greatest event on the conference interpreting scene up until then, each booth provided interpretation in both ways, from Russian to the different foreign languages and back into Russian. Even today, retour is not unusual in Russia, thanks to the "long-established system of training interpreters ... whereby interpreters are trained to interpret from one foreign language into their own and the other way around" (Shveitser 1999, 26).

Interpreting into B was common not only in Russia, but also in Central and Eastern European countries after the WWII. The fact resulted, besides other things, from the political situation: employing interpreters from Western European countries (i.e. A interpreters) for international conferences in this area was inconceivable. If not that, retour was necessary because there were no interpreters who would be able to provide a quality service into A other than the official language of the country (Čeňková 2011, 164).

2.1.2 Reality on national markets today

Even though the political situation is quite different today and we now live in a Europe with free movement, the need for interpreting into B in the Central and Eastern Europe actually hasn't passed since. Mostly, it is the second reason – the lack of A interpreters – which causes the situation. There are many languages

---

[8] Simultaneous interpretation at EU meetings into and out of 24 or more languages requires at least 72 interpreters.(Interpreting and Translating for EU)

which are not widely spoken. These are also known as "languages of limited diffusion". Among many other countries, it is for example the case of Hungary, and interpreters here are used to working in both directions. According to the results of a survey of conference interpreters of a Hungarian market (Szabari 2000, cited in Szabari 2002), the workload of interpreting direction was even for both directions. During 1980's the dominant direction of interpreting was into B (Ibid.), which may suggest that demand for interpreting into A language has been on the increase (or interpreting into B has been abating). However, whether it is interpreting into Hungarian by Hungarian interpreters or demand into other languages interpreted by A interpreters is not clear. The situation of the Czech market does not diverge much in terms of need of retour interpreting and will be dealt with in chapter 2.3.1

The situation on the Western European market, however, has been much different from that in the Eastern Europe. While at its very beginning, SI was carried out into the B language, the tendency got reversed after interpreters started working for international institutions (Mackintosh 1999, 68). Today, the prevailing view on directionality reflects the unequivocal superiority of interpreting into one's mother tongue. Interpreting direction into one's mother tongue reflects the official norm of AIIC as well as DG SCIC and DG INTE preferences.

However, with the accession of the new EU member states bringing all the new and rare languages with them, the need for retour interpreting reemerged and retour had to be reemployed even in international institutions.[9] Moreover, due to the nature of English language which has become an internationally used lingua franca, English retour becomes increasingly more common on the local markets. In most conferences around the world, English is used as either the source or the target language, even though the speakers (or even the listeners) are not English A speakers. "[I]n the majority of cases, there are fewer mother tongue English interpreters available close enough to the venue of the event; and organizers do not accept that interpreters have to be flown in when English is being interpreted to their satisfaction by local non-natives (and listened to by non-native addressees)" (Kalina 2005, 41). For example, it is the case of such large country

---

[9] This is being elaborated on in chapter 2.2

as Germany, whose language is by far not that of "limited diffusion".[10] Nevertheless, Germany's interpreting market finds itself too in a position where "working into the B language is deemed indispensable...as interpreters with the appropriate mother tongue are not necessarily available at all times and clients therefore do not have a choice" (Szabari 2002, 13). "Western European free markets are not quite so rigid in requiring interpreting into the A language. Interpreters with German, English and French for their mother tongue report that in local or regional markets they are often required to work into their learned language" (Ibid.).

We can see that retour interpreting seems to have become standard practice in many countries today. Retour is nowadays used and taught not only in countries where languages of limited diffusion are spoken, but also in countries with wider spoken languages, such as Germany. Teaching interpreting into B seems increasingly more important in France too. A very special place has got retour into English language, the demand of which is greater day by day due to the lack of A interpreters.

---

[10] On the contrary, German has been considered one of the great languages that are widely spoken, and that has been used as one of the pivot languages of the EU for many years.

2.2 Conference Interpreting in the European Institutions

After the enlargements took place in 2004, 2007 and 2013, the number of official languages of the EU more than doubled. The accession of Croatia in 2013 brought the number of working languages in European Parliament up to 24. Together with the linguistic diversity came also the need for interpreters providing interpreting services from and into all 24 languages. Depending on the number of passive and active languages used during a meeting, interpreting teams consist of either two or three interpreters. Therefore, for a session with 24 active and passive languages, 72 interpreters are needed.

Since each language can be interpreted into 23 other languages, interpreters working for EU institutions cover as many as 552 possible language combinations, a number that might increase in cases when candidate countries or other countries are invited for the meeting. Moreover, interpreting services are also provided into non-EU languages, such as Russian, Arabic or Japanese[11]; as well as when interpreting languages of candidate countries.[12] If we took the matter further and included also the *directions* into which it is possible to interpret the different meetings, the number would even increase twofold.

To this day, there are approximately 1,000 staff interpreters and 3,000 freelance interpreters working for the EU institutions. Working collaboratively, they have to cover the broad scope of languages used in EU. Because different EU meetings call for different needs, providing interpretation services in all those different languages is a highly complex task. Interpreters have to be chosen according to their language profiles to meet those needs, as explains Sjef Coolegem, the Director for Interpretation at EP.[iii] Jyrki Tuononen, the Head of Unit for the ACI Recruitment at DG INTE, explains that the ACIs are recruited based on three recruitment criteria: interpreting quality, language combination and professional domicile (i.e. the proximity to the meeting venue), prioritization of which depends on the recruitment stage, i.e. whether being in short-term, middle-term or long-term process.[iv] A computer program called EPICLES has been

---

[11] Olga Cosmidou, the former Director-General of DG INTE:
http://www.commonsenseadvisory.com/Default.aspx?Contenttype=ArticleDetAD&tabID=63&Aid=2094&moduleId=390

[12] As was the case of Croatian – interpreting services were needed during the negotiations preceding the accession of the country

developed for the purpose of bringing those three criteria together, to make the recruitment process work. In this program it is possible to see which languages are necessary for which meetings so that the necessary interpreting booths could be provided for to cover these languages.[v]

2.2.1 EU interpreting services

There are separate interpreting services for the different EU institutions. The European Commission, the Council of European Union, the European and Social Committee, the Committee of Regions, the European Investment bank and other bodies all use interpreting service by The Directorate General for Interpretation (DG Interpretation, also known as SCIC).[13] Interpreting for the European Parliament is provided by Parliament's Directorate-General for Interpretation and Conferences (DG INTE).[14] These organizations work in close co-operations with AIIC, the International Association of Conference Interpreters.

In 2015, DG SCIC provided 94,224 days of interpretation[15], 98 % of which were interpreted into English and 11 % into Czech. DG SCIC employs 560 staff interpreters, and over 3,000 accredited freelancers. In 2015, 67 of interpreters were English (12 %) and 14 were Czech (3 %) (*Interpretation in figures*, 2015). On average, SCIC staff interpreters can interpret from 4 foreign languages into their mother tongue. There is even one interpreter who can interpret from 9 languages and 7 others from 8 languages (Ibid.). Therefore, a team of 3 interpreters in one booth can cover on average 12 languages (cf. 4 languages covered by 12 interpreters during the Nuremberg trials).

There are different language combination requirements, depending on what interpreters have as mother tongue. For EU interpreters with a language of limited diffusion as a mother tongue, it is sufficient to have only two active languages or one active and two passive languages (i.e., AA, AB or ACC combination) (Diriker

---

[13] According to 2015 statistics, SCIC provides interpretation in meetings arranged by the European Commission (34 %), the Council of the EU (55 %), EESC (7 %), CoR (2 %), EIB and other bodies and agencies of the EU located in the Member States (2 %). (Interpretation in figures, 2015)

[14] the Court of Justice of the European Communities also has its own separate interpreting service (The Court of Justice's Interpreting Directorate)

[15] cf. 110,943 interpreting days in 2014 and 111,350 days in 2013 (2014 Annual Activity Report of DG SCIC); cf. 109,667 interpreting days in 2010 for DG INTE

2015, 178). However, "for an interpreter who wants to sit the inter-institutional accreditation test of the EU for the English, French, German, Italian or Spanish booths, the minimum requirement is to have one active and four passive languages or two active plus three passive languages (i.e., ACCC or ABBC)" (Ibid.).

The Parliament's interpreting service DG INTE is a relatively new directorate-general, existing in its present form since the beginning of 2008. DG INTE provides interpreting services for various meetings of EP, such as the committee and political group meetings or the plenary sessions.[16] All EU citizens have the right to use in Parliament the official language of their choice according to the principle of *controlled full multilingualism*.[17] Hence the need for interpreting services in all 24 official languages of the EU.

The obligation of ensuring the highest possible degree of multilingualism makes the European Parliament a unique institution: no other international institution disposes of such a linguistic diversity requiring so many simultaneous interpreters in order to cover such a vast array of language combinations and language directions.

World leader in conference interpreting provision,[vi] DG INTE currently employs 313 staff interpreters[18] and has at its disposal and reserve about 1,800 external accredited interpreters, known as ACIs, who are independent interpreters hired to do specific assignments and used by EP as needed.[vii] Staff interpreters have all passed a competition run by the European Personnel Selection Office (EPSO). External accredited interpreters have all passed an accreditation test. During the Strasburg plenary sessions, more than half of the interpreters needed are accredited external interpreters.[viii] DG INTE is currently engaged in extensive recruitment activities to prevent a critical shortage which had occurred before. They also help interpreters add more passive languages in order to increase the

---

[16] The total number of meeting sessions with interpretation in the three places of work of the EP in 2010 was 4.865; the total for 2011 was 5.263, representing an increase in activity of some 8.2%. (*DG INTE Annual Activity Report 2011*)
[17] as set out in *Rule 138 of the EP's Rules of Procedure*
[18] 8 of which are Czech

number of interpreters available for the different language combinations.[ix] "In 2011 interpreters added 122 languages to the global repertoire."[19]

Although EU interpreters need to be competent in a number of passive languages, they don't need to have a second active language: "Having a number of passive languages ... is deemed to be more important than having two active languages. This is because the more passive languages the interpreters know, the less they need to use an intermediary language (i. e. relay interpretation) to convey the speakers' messages" (Diriker 2015, 177).

However, in case of languages of limited diffusion, there is a shortage in the EU institutions for qualified A interpreters being able to interpret from these languages. In such cases, retour interpreting has to be put in place. Its employment generally continues until a sufficient number of interpreters in other booths learn these new languages and start interpreting from them into their mother tongue (Diriker 2015, 178). Until then, retour has got to be employed whenever necessary.

2.2.2 **Retour in the EU**

When a speaker delivers his or her speech in a language of limited diffusion, retour interpreting usually comes into play, unless a qualified A interpreter with the particular C language is at hand. Retour interpreters ensure immediate understanding for audience − who would not normally understand these minority languages − may it be directly, or via relay interpreting. In case of relay retour interpreters work out of the rare languages into a language shared by majority of interpreters. This *pivot* language is mostly English, French or German, and colleague interpreters work out of *pivot* interpreter's output in order to render the source message into the rest of the languages of that meeting.

It is without a doubt that retour interpreting plays an important role today during such meetings in order to ensure communication between Members. However, the position towards retour interpreting hasn't always been as acceptant as it is today.

---

[19] *DG INTE 2011 Annual Activity Report*

- **Retour in the EU before the enlargements**

Until the fourth enlargement in 1995, retour interpreting was considered unacceptable in the EU.[20] 1995 was the year of gradual enlargements bringing complications to the interpreting system, which would no longer provide services into four languages only, as it used to at the very beginning in the 1950's. Simultaneous interpreting was done exclusively into A language until 1995, when retour had to be introduced in case of Finnish due to the lack of non-native speakers of the language. The Finnish interpreters would thus perform retour interpreting for the very first time in EP back in 1995 and their colleagues from other language cabins had to take them on relay.[x]

Since 1998, the Directorate General for Interpretation (SCIC) had been building up in-house capacity in the new languages to come in 2004.[xi] Interpreters of the candidate countries would attend the meetings of European institutions in the course of 1990's (in order to prepare for the next expansion). During the accession negotiations only 4 to 6 languages were used. When speakers of a less widespread language ("language of limited diffusion") had the floor, their interpreters had to work as pivots for their colleagues taking relay from them. These interpreters of languages of limited diffusion had to do retour interpreting: they had to work from their mother tongue into the foreign language so that their colleague interpreters would understand (Čeňková 2011, 165).

- **Retour interpreting in the EU after enlargements**

After the 2004 expansion, also known as the "Big Bang", the number of official EU languages nearly doubled from 11 to 20. The need for relay (and therefore retour) interpreting became even more prominent due to the increase in languages and language combinations in the whole EU. Interpreters of the languages which were used prior to the 2004 enlargement (called "langues anciennes"[21] by Čeňková) would have to provide relay for their new colleagues who were lacking the necessary linguistic knowledge of some of the source speech languages. In other words, they did not have sufficient number of C languages (Čeňková 2011, 165). Interpreters of languages of limited diffusion,

---

[20] as was the case of Danish in 1973
[21] "old languages" (translation by TS)

on the other hand, would have to do relay interpretation into B (retour) for the interpreters of "old languages", who were not able to work from the languages of the newly accessed countries.

- **Retour in the EU today**

Today, the system of 24-24, covering all 552 language combinations, has become commonplace in the EP. Out of all the 313 staff interpreters currently employed by INTE working for the EP, 132 have a simultaneous retour (42 %). In order to provide a full language regime and to cover all possible language combinations, simultaneous interpretation into a retour language is used in plenary sessions, committee and political group meetings. Consecutive interpretation into a retour language is frequently used during missions.[22]

When putting together a series of simultaneous interpreting teams in EP, "the aim is to cover as many languages directly as possible," explains Rita Silva, the Director of Organisation and Programming.[xii] As a rule, interpreting teams consist of two to three interpreters working in one booth, depending on the number of passive and active languages used during a meeting. However, when there is a need for retour interpreting, three interpreters usually work in one booth, and that even in case of small meetings. A retour interpreter may also be put in the booth of their retour language, where they work out of their mother tongue exclusively. Another principle that has to be respected is that there cannot be a "pivot unique", i.e. only one person providing retour for relay. There must be either two retour interpreters in one booth of a language of limited diffusion; or one retour interpreter stays in their booth (e.g. a Czech A interpreter doing retour into English in a Czech booth), while another works from the booth of their retour language (e.g. a Czech A interpreter working into German in a German booth), or there may be an interpreter with the particular C language.[23] Moreover, "when putting together a large team, DG Interpretation always tries to provide relay through different language families (Germanic, Romance, Finno-Ugric) in order to distribute the work-load more evenly across the team."[xiii]

---

[22] Information gathered via electronic correspondence with Citizens' Enquiries Unit
[23] information provided by D. Winterová

Although retour interpreting continues to be a common practice in the European Parliament, retour interpreters are often called upon very short contributions due to the limited time allotted to the delegates' speeches. According to some interpreters' personal estimate, interpreting into B represents rather a modest share ("5 % at most") of their overall interpreting service for the European institutions. As a result, interpreters express the feeling of their B language deteriorating (Čeňková 2011, 165).

Nonetheless, EP interpreters are encouraged by DG INTE to constantly keep their B languages up to date: "specific in-house courses are developed to encourage interpreting staff ... to maintain the level of retour languages already acquired."[24] Moreover, DG INTE also provides C language enhancement for their interpreters: interpreters are systematically upgrading one of their C languages into a B language, in order to work from B into A.[25] The objectives for 2016 of Directorate A of DG INTE clearly state that all staff is invited to add a simultaneous retour into one of the 5 pivot languages (German, English, French, Italian and Spanish). Between 2011 and 2015, 31 interpreters added a new retour language to their portfolio.[26] The adding and maintaining of retour languages by interpreting staff is an essential element for optimizing resource management.[27]

On the other hand, those interpreters working from the "old languages" have added new C languages to their professional portfolio of working languages, so that nowadays retour interpreting from languages of limited diffusion may not always be necessary (Čeňková 2011, 166). For instance, many A interpreters are now able to work from the Czech language, including those working out of the English, French, German, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Slovak, Polish, Hungarian, Greek, Holland or Finnish booth (Ibid.). In AIIC, there are 10 interpreters with different A languages with Czech C's (although 4 of them are Slovak A's), one has got Czech B and one is bilingual.[28] C language enhancement in the EU institutions helps reduce the retours which are inevitable due to the lack of A interpreters, a trend which is in accordance with the expectations proposed by

---

[24] *DG INTE 2011 Annual Activity Report*
[25] Information gathered via electronic correspondence with Citizens' Enquiries Unit
[26] (ibid.)
[27] *DG INTE 2011 Annual Activity Report*
[28] see Appendix I

Seleskovitch in 2002 (313, 323-324), i.e. that once interpreters have mastered the necessary C languages, retour will not be imperative.

Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning in this connection that there is currently a shortage of English mother tongue interpreters in EP, resulting from a drastic drop off in the number of students learning modern foreign languages in the UK, as explained Alison Graves, a senior interpreter from the English booth (2011).[xiv] Moreover, she goes on explaining that interpreters of the "old languages" will soon retire and a new type of scarcity will occur: "In the next 5-7 years we will lose probably a third of our interpreters and we won't be able to recruit as many new ones, because they are just not coming through [the recruitment process]". This will possibly trigger the need for yet even more English retour interpreters.

In a questionnaire given to EU interpreters (n = 82),[29] 61 % (n = 50) of all respondents interpret in both directions.[30] Majority of these[31] do retour interpreting in EU institutions in less than 10 % of cases. Of all respondents, those who interpret into their A language only were mostly interpreters whose A language is a widely spoken language, such as English, French, Italian, Spanish or German, although there are some interpreters whose A is a language of limited diffusion who interpret into their A language exclusively (Kodym 2006).

Today, retour is used not only in the European Parliament, the most multilingual institution, but also in other institutions of the EU, such as the European Commission or the Council of Europe, which is a bilingual organization with English and French as working languages. Sally Bailey Ravet, the Head Interpreter and Chief of Interpretation Department of Council of Europe, says the Council disposes of a great number of AA interpreters, but uses also many AB interpreters, whose quality of interpreting "is exactly the same".[xv]

---

[29] 18 of which had Czech A, while the others had different A languages
[30] 50 % (n = 25) of which had English B
[31] (n = 34, i.e. 68 %)

2.3   Retour and Czech interpreters

We have mentioned the practice of interpreters of "old languages" in the EU. We have also mentioned the situation of the languages which are relatively new in the EU, some of which are often called "languages of limited diffusion", as not many people actually speak them. On interpreting markets of countries where these languages are spoken, the demand for retour is high, as we have discussed above. In general, studying languages of limited diffusion is not very popular. Consequently, not many interpreters can offer them as C languages, which then results in the lack of interpreters having an A language other than the one of the country. The situation forces the interpreters of the less widely spoken languages to having to work into their active foreign language, i.e. into their B language. This is a specificity of the national interpreting markets of all countries where a language of limited diffusion is spoken, and the Czech Republic is one of them.

2.3.1   Local Czech market

On the Czech market of conference interpretation, the highest demand is for the English language. Not many conferences take place in several working languages. In most of the cases, only one interpreting booth is used – the English booth. Czech interpreters work in both directions – into their mother tongue as well as into their B language. Retour interpreting is thus used systematically by the Czech interpreters (Čeňková 1999b, 37).

Retour interpreting is a well-known situation to all conference interpreters working on the Czech market, as a Czech interpreter working into his/her mother tongue exclusively (though from several foreign languages) would not earn a living on the local market (Čeňková 1999a, 237). A Czech person wishing to make a living as a professional interpreter on the Czech market will have to accept retour as an essential part of their profession.

When working as retour interpreters on the local market, the Czech interpreters work in a bicultural context for a foreign client, who might not be acquainted with the specifics of the Czech Republic. It is the interpreter's job to render the message in a clear and comprehensible way for their client to understand (Čeňková 1999b, 38).

In the Czech Republic there is an association grouping conference interpreters known as ASKOT. Many Czech interpreters are also members of AIIC. The two associations will now be described in more detail and we will also provide some statistics related to retour interpreters who are members of these associations.

Association of Conference Interpreters in the Czech Republic (ASKOT)

ASKOT is a leading association of top quality conference interpreters providing service in the Czech Republic. ASKOT members are recruited through a rigorous selection procedure. Membership is acquired through submission of an application supported by existing members' recommendations, guaranteeing the applicant's conference interpreting qualities. One-year trial period ensues before an applicant becomes a full member after proving themselves reliable. Many ASKOT members have been accredited to interpret in EU institutions.[xvi]

There are currently 92 full members offering interpreting service on the official ASKOT website.[32] All of them have Czech in their language combination. The most common language offered on the website by those with Czech A is English, followed by German and French. Of the 92 ASKOT members, 52 are Czech A interpreters with English in their combination, 40 of which do also retour (78 %) into English. 27 Czech A interpreters have German in their combination and 21 of these (78 %) do also retour into German. Similarly, 15 out of 21 (71 %) have retour into French, 7 out of 18 (39 %) into Russian and 6 out of 9 (67 %) into Spanish.[33]

At the moment, there are no English A interpreters in ASKOT working into Czech or into any other B or C language. However, there are some members of ASKOT who do offer retour into Czech, i.e. they are capable of interpreting from their mother tongue to Czech: German (3), Polish (2), Russian (2), Arab (1), Bulgarian (1), French (1), Slovak (1) and Ukrainian (1). Four interpreters with Czech A have another A language: Slovak (2), German (1) and Dutch (1).[34]

---

[32] data accessed 13th April 2016
[33] for comparison with Slovak and Maltese language combinations, see Appendix I
[34] data accessed 13th April 2016

Czech AIIC members

The International Association of Conference Interpreters (AIIC) brings together 3,000 professional interpreters from all over the world. AIIC "unequivocally considers translation into the A language to be superior" (Szabari 2005, 12). However, concerning interpreters of languages of limited diffusion, retour is today indispensable, as we mentioned earlier. There are currently 21 Czech AIIC members.[35] According to the official AIIC website, most of Czech AIIC members offer also professional retour interpreting services on top of interpretation into their mother tongue. They provide retour into B interpreting into English (8), French (6) and German (6). Two interpreters have two A languages and interpret between them. There are two interpreters working in C>B direction. There are no English A interpreters in AIIC working from Czech. However, 10 interpreters work out of Czech into their A language from German (3), Portuguese (1), Slovak (4) and Spanish (2).[36]

2.3.2 Interpreting for EU institutions

Above we have mentioned the inevitability of retour interpreting in the EU. Let us now provide more details about EU interpreting.

There are currently eight Czech A staff interpreters working for the European Parliament employed by DG INTE, all of whom have a retour from Czech, their B's being English and German (five of them have an English simultaneous retour).[37] Some Czech A interpreters have also Slovak in their language combination and are able to do retour out of this language.

There are three occasions in which a retour is needed in the EU institutions. First, it is interpreting for foreign Members while a Czech delegate is speaking. Second, a retour might serve as a feedback for the Czech delegate, who is speaking his mother tongue while at the same time listening to the English

---

[35] 9 have English in their combination, 7 have German, 6 have French, 1 has Russian (there are also interpreters with other A languages interpreting out of Czech language, although there are no English A interpreters working out of Czech) For more information see Appendix I

[36] data accessed 4th April 2016

[37] Information acquired through correspondence with DG INTE

interpretation to check whether they're being interpreted correctly. Third, retour interpreting is used for relay for other language booths (Čeňková 1999b, 39). Today, this last situation occurs very often in the EP, as it follows from its multilingual nature: retour for relay is needed every time when there is a Czech delegate speaking in the European Parliament in their mother tongue, while no English A interpreters are at hand.[38] However, some of the delegates choose to speak in a language other than their native tongue. In this case, most common language used is English, which may not always be easy to interpret from. While a Czech interpreter might cope with the imperfections in the fellow citizen's intonation, pronunciation or even syntax, it may not be so in the case of all the other interpreters who don't have Czech among their working languages, having to interpret the speech into 22 other languages of the EU.

As their colleague interpreters may not be experts on the Czech Republic, the Czech interpreters working as pivots must bear in mind the multicultural dimension and render the message more transparently for them. They may also initiate their colleagues into the necessary context before the meeting takes place (Čeňková 1999b, 39).

Some EU interpreters have admitted a personal feeling of their B language deteriorating as a consequence of small proportion of retour interpreting (Čeňková 2011, 165). However, a different situation occurred during the period of the Czech presidency in 2009, when the Czech interpreters enjoyed interpreting into B on a larger scale. The Czech speakers would mostly express themselves in their native language, and so retour was used much more frequently than it had been during the previous years (Čeňková 2011, 167). As some of the Czech interpreters do retour into English out of Slovak, they are likely to do more retour interpreting during the upcoming Slovak EU presidency in 2016.

To sum up, retour interpreting is sometimes inevitable for different reasons. Regardless the reality of the different translation markets as well as the current situation in EU institutions requiring retour, one of the issues most discussed among both translators and interpreters, is whether directionality impacts translators' and interpreters' performance.

---

[38] There is currently one staff interpreter (and at least one freelance interpreter) working for EP with English A interpreting out of Czech language (April 2016)

2.4 Directionality and the view of different schools

Concerning the written translation, Newmark says that "translat[ion] into your language of habitual use ... is the only way you can translate naturally, accurately and with maximum effectiveness" (1998, 3). He acknowledges that "most translators do translate out of their own language," which he calls 'service' translation.[39] He goes on to claim that translators working out of their mother tongue "contribute greatly to many people's hilarity in the process" (1998, 3). Indeed, there are cases of translation into a B language, the quality of which can sometimes get way below average. Nevertheless, the same holds true for the direction into one's mother tongue.

In consecutive interpreting, retour is generally accepted, as one can have their own pace when interpreting the source text ideas, in contrast to simultaneous mode. Actually, "[i]n the case consecutive interpreting, both the Paris school and the AIIC accept the possibility of bi-directionality into both the interpreter's foreign languages (the C language as well as the B language)" (Fernandez 2005, 105). There are some interpreters who offer retour in consecutive both out active and passive languages, whilst others only work into their mother tongue. A specific situation occurs on the markets of languages of limited diffusion. In countries where a minority language is spoken, the distinction of retour in consecutive or simultaneous is not made, as both modes are needed and interpreters have to work in both modes.

Also in court interpreting, one interpreter generally works into both directions. "The question of A-B seems never to have been raised with reference to TT quality," as for court interpreting (Kalina 2005, 37)

Translating into B language and interpreting in a consecutive mode into B seems today to be generally agreed as legitimate. The views of those interested in directionality in simultaneous interpreting, on the other hand, differ considerably. In the past, the views about directionality in interpreting were polarized into the Western European camp favoring simultaneous interpreting exclusively into 'A' language; and the Eastern European camp represented by the Soviet Union, where

---

[39] "a translation from one's language of habitual use into another language" (1998, 52)

interpreting from A into B language had been a standard mode of interpreting together with interpreting into the native language.

2.4.1 **Western model**

The Western camp has its roots in the 'Paris school', represented by D. Seleskovitch, M. Lederer, Déjean Le Féal and others. Maintaining close relations with the multilingual European institutions and with AIIC, the University of Paris School of Interpreters and Translators (ESIT) holds the opinion that a quality interpreting performance needs to be delivered in a spontaneous and idiomatic way, which is only possible in one's native language (Seleskovitch 1968, 1999, Seleskovitch and Lederer 2002).

In their collective work, Seleskovitch and Lederer claim that "dans une langue acquise, on peut arriver à comprendre beaucoup plus qu'on ne pourra jamais exprimer" (2002, 138). Indeed, while they do put the comprehension capacity in the acquired language on an equal footing with that of the native language, it is not so for one's oral expression: "L'expression en langue maternelle reste toujours supérieure à l'expression en langue acquise, quel que soit le degré de maîtrise de cette dernière" (2002, 138). They go on to apply the principle to the context of interpreting, explaining that the performance of the same interpreter working in both directions under the same circumstances will always be of a higher quality when working into their 'A' language than into their 'B' language: "Le même interprète travaillant en 'A' ou en 'B' à une même réunion, se trouvant donc placé dans une situation où seul le facteur sens linguistique jouera, toutes choses étant égales par ailleurs, fournira toujours en 'A' une prestation d'une qualité supérieure à ce qu'il fera en 'B'. Cette affirmation est vérifiée par la pratique" (2002, 138-139). Unfortunately, drawing from their own experience of observing interpreters' performance into 'B', they do not provide any data to support their assertion.

Similarly, Seleskovitch points out the obvious superiority of an 'A' language in SI:

> *Few interpreters working into and from widely used languages have a good enough working knowledge of their B languages to be able to perform equally well into both their 'B' and 'A' languages. When they work both ways, it is easy to note not only that the 'B' language is poorer but that it is subservient to the 'A' source language and that the efforts made to find corresponding expressions in 'B' distracts the mind from constructing sense.*" (1999, 62-63)

Working out of passive languages into the active language has been the norm for AIIC and international organizations like the UN and the EU (Mackintosh, 1999, 68). In the European institutions, there has always been the preference of working into A, avoiding retour unless absolutely necessary, as it is in case of relay interpreting when a pivot interpreter is employed to work out of less widely known languages. "However, with EU enlargement and the addition of 'rare' languages this principle [of working into A as a norm]is increasingly difficult to uphold." (Mackintosh 1999, 68). Mackintosh wrote that in 1999 and since that time other enlargements have taken place, such as the 2004 enlargement, which almost doubled the number of languages used in the European Parliament. As a consequence, many *languages of limited diffusion,* such as Czech, Estonian, Maltese, Latvian, Lithuanian, Slovak or Slovenian were brought into play. Even at times when there were only eleven working languages in the EU, interpreting into B was necessary during the debates, as it was not always possible to cover all languages in all interpreter booths should the interpreting be done in the A direction only, as was the case of e.g. Finnish or Greek.[40]

In their collective work from 2002, Seleskovitch and Lederer predicted today's need for retour interpreters in EU institutions for small-diffusion languages, such as Czech or Hungarian. They acknowledge the need of small-diffusion language interpreter training in retour, into their *langue véhiculaire*. However, having acknowledged both the fact that after EU enlargements retour interpreting would become a necessity together with the need of interpreter training into B, they

---

[40] see chapter about EU interpreting 2.2

continue to express their hope that neither of these situations will last very long: native interpreters will soon take over the reins and work into their 'A' so that the stylistic quality could be reestablished[41] (2002, 313, 323-324). Indeed, many (not only) EU interpreters have added Czech as C language since that time. [42]

An interesting fact to note is that the previous chapter of the same book concerns automation of B languages, where Seleskovitch and Lederer also list the necessary competences of a retour interpreter. There is also a chapter on activation of B languages with its methodology (2002, 319-321). Moreover, another subchapter is dedicated to educational training of SI into a B language (2002, 325). Indeed, some of those who rejected simultaneous earlier acknowledge the need of working into B now, as well as teaching retour, such as Claire Donovan (e.g. 2002) or Déjean Le Féal (e.g. 2002), both from Paris ESIT, an institution essentially favoring interpreting into A. Another ESIT instructor, Phillip Minns, has been also concerned with students' training of interpreting into B (Minns 2002). Retour seems to find its way through necessity in the West, too, as it has for long been the case in the East.

2.4.2 **Eastern model**

Working both out of and *into* their B language has long been a norm for the Russian interpreters, together with relay interpreting with Russian as the pivot language, despite the linguistic imperfections in the foreign target language. Here, being able to understand perfectly all the nuances of the source language in order to be able to render them correctly is more important than linguistically flawless performance.

According to Denissenko (1989, 155-157) and Chernov (1992, 151), it is the understanding phase in interpreting that is the most important: interpreters' perfect understanding of their mother tongue may help them produce a more complete and reliable outcome. Simultaneous interpreters "have only a few seconds to unravel the meaning of the source language" (in Fernandez 2005, 104). "The

---

[41] "il faut espérer qu'à plus long terme des interprètes autochtones d'allemand, d'anglais ou de français prendront la relève en 'A', et que la qualité stylistique nécessaire sera retrouvée." (2002,323-324)

[42] For more information, see chapter on Retour in the EU today 2.2.2

success of this endeavor depends to a great extent on the first step of the process, i. e. the analysis, synthesis, association, and recovery of information stored in memory, among other cognitive processes" (Ibid.).

Denissenko gives two arguments in favor of interpretation into B language. The first argument is that "comprehension in one's mother tongue is always better than comprehension of a foreign language, and any imperfection in the source message can have a negative effect on the interpreter, and consequently, be detrimental to the resulting product." (1989, cited in Fernandez 2005, 104) The second argument put forward by Denissenko is that "in the fraction of the second that the message is received by the interpreter, it is cognitively more economical for him/her to have fewer options to choose from. The range of such choices is always more limited in foreign language. Thus, ... what at first glance seems like a disadvantage is in reality just the opposite" (Denissenko 1989, 157, cited in Fernandez 2005, 104). As if to corroborate their argument, Sally Bailey Ravet, the Chief of Interpretation Department of the Council of Europe, confirms from her own experience that some AB interpreters may be better than some AA interpreters. [xvii]

In addition, there was also a political dimension to the Russian language and the interpreting policy in Russia. Moreover, "routing all multilingual communication via Russian would likely have given that language a special status also in terms of such as source-speech fidelity, perhaps over and above the requirement of fluent and idiomatic target-language expression" (Pöchhacker and Zwischenberger 2015, 271).

The East camp view – that the interpreter is in a better position to reformulate in their B language what they have fully understood in their A language that is understood faster and more intuitively – is challenged by the advocates of the mainstream AIIC view, saying that "[i]n practice, any comprehension advantage is probably only slight, as most professional interpreters are (or should be) fully proficient in B language understanding," (Donovan 2005, 151) and that "[s]uch a position reflects a less than sufficient mastery of non-native source languages by interpreters and is not relevant to linguistically qualified interpreters, whose non-native languages are understood 'completely'" (AIIC 1992, cited in Gile 2005, 10).

Similarly, one could counter argue with a proposition that this view, on the other hand, reflects an insufficient mastery of interpreters' active production knowledge of their non-native language, and is thus "irrelevant to linguistically qualified interpreters, who are able to express themselves 'completely' in their non-native language," to paraphrase and counter-quote the proposition above.

Whereas the Western camp stresses the advantage of working into an idiomatic native language from a perfectly understood 'B' language, the Eastern camp argues that the advantage lies in having fully understood every nuance of the mother tongue while working into one's passable 'B' language. Thus, the difference in views on directionality does not come from a disagreement about whether one's native language is superior over one's B language; that is something which is generally agreed upon. The core of the polarity lies in the disagreement over determining which of the interpreting phases is the more important one, or which of the phases takes up more processing capacity, whether the listening phase, or the production phase. There hasn't been much research done on this subject, although the number of empirical studies is increasing. Indeed, Gile says that "interpreting directionality preferences are contradictory and based on traditions rather than research" (Gile 2005, 9) (see chapter 3).

3. Research into retour and directionality

When listening to a foreign language and interpreting into your mother tongue, the main linguistic and intellectual problem you will have will be understanding the ideas expressed in the original. ... On the other hand, in retour the interpreter may sometimes find they have more difficulty in finding the best way to convey the ideas they have understood.

(Jones, 2002, 120)

3.1 Problems of interpreting into B

To put Jones' words in context of Gile's Effort theory, when interpreting into a B language, interpreters exert greater effort in the production phase and lesser effort in comprehension phase; and conversely in case of interpreting into their native language.

When having to interpret into B, many specific problems may occur. According to Seleskovitch (1989), the main problem is interference of A language on the B language output of an interpreter. This is echoed by Karla Dejean saying that B language is more exposed to interference and thus the tendency towards literalness is higher when working into B (2002, 28). It has also been found that interpreting into B is more tiring, taking up more interpreters' energies (e.g. Donovan 2003, Martin 2005), potentially leading to faster performance deterioration than when interpreting into one's mother tongue. Although one may seem proficient in their B language when using it only for their own communicational needs, it may not be so when there's the need to re-express someone else's ideas: "The interpreter may find himself in a situation where he has to express something for which he does not possess adequate tools in the B language" (Szabari 2002, 16).

3.2 Research

Some researchers provide empirical evidence in support of interpreting into A language on the grounds that retour interpreting results in more language errors (e.g. Darò et al. 1996, Chang 2005), or that it is during retour when major failures occur (e.g. Donovan 2004). However, it was also found that interpreting into one's mother tongue may lead to lower accuracy in content (e.g. Chang 2005). A number of recent studies revealed that the disparities between the two interpreting directions may not always be as clear-cut as it would seem (e.g. Al-Salmand and Khanji 2002, Bartłomiejczyk 2004, or Seel 2005).

We have mentioned the conflicting views on directionality by the two important schools of translation theory. More recently, however, the traditional binary opposition of interpreting directionality in terms of comprehension and production issues has been repeatedly challenged. More intermediate positions emerged on the grounds that the traditional divergence of opinion on directionality is rather trivialized (e.g. Opdenhoff 2011), is not based on sufficient empirical evidence (e.g. Gile 2005, Opdenhoff 2011) and needs wider context (e.g. Gile 2005, Seel 2005, Doubalova et al. 2010, Opdenhoff 2011).

Some recent studies on directionality provide evidence that one must take a more balanced approach when drawing any conclusions on directionality.

As Gile (2005, 9) points out, it is the *total* processing capacity (PC) requirements which have to be taken account of, i.e. not only those associated with interpreting direction, but also those determining whether production is assumed to require more or less PC than comprehension in general. He discusses directionality in terms of "comprehension load" and "production load". Sometimes, production phase may take up more processing capacity, sometimes it is the comprehension phase requiring more PC. According to Gile (13), it is the production phase that *generally* requires more attention; however, there are some who suggest contrariwise. There has been no clear-cut empirical evidence supporting either of the two assumptions. Gile goes on to consider both of the assumptions with illustrative calculations, supposing that both production and comprehension phase require less PC in one's mother tongue. This leads him to two opposing conclusions: if production takes up a larger proportion of the PC requirements than comprehension, it is better to work into one's A language and

vice versa. However, with relatively large difference in PC requirements between A and B language and with a relatively large difference between comprehension and production, the directionality difference was rather small (16 %). In case of smaller differences between A and B language and between production and comprehension requirements, the directionality difference in terms of cognitive load may be even subtler. Therefore, direction might not be the main factor influencing one's quality of interpreting (2005, 13). Additionally, it has got to be noted that sometimes it may even occur that comprehension in one's native language poses greater challenge than that of production in B language (e.g. interpreters might not be familiar with the subject, the source speech is delivered in a fast pace, or they are just not motivated enough) in which case even the assumption that all interpreting phases take up less processing capacity in one's A language, may not hold true.

There are many who suggest considering directionality in a broader context. Concerned with quality in the interpreting process, Kalina explains that directionality is "but one of the many aspects of interpreting quality" and cannot be dealt with independently of other factors (2005, 37). Among others, "conditions of work have to be taken into account when drawing conclusions as to the quality of A or B language target text" (40). Gile points out that "language-specific and language-pair specific factors, as well as variability in other relevant factors" play also a very important role and directionality may even "lose much of its importance", depending on circumstances (2005, 9). Additionally, different directionality principles depend on the type of conference and environment, on the type of speech, the type of speaker and the interpreter's personal cognitive style (2005, 22). Stressing the specifics of the source culture (in particular non-verbal discourse patterns), Seel also pleads for a more holistic approach to the issue of directionality: the features typical of the different modes and types of interpretation must be considered, such as the working conditions of the interpreter, specific situational, contextual and extra-linguistic factors, the sender and the receiver, the subject under discussion and cognitive demands on the interpreters (2005, 76-77). Opdenhoff (2011, 47, 312) also suggests considering directionality in a wider context, including aspects such as quality perception issues (both by listeners and interpreters), cognitive processes involved, working

languages and language pairs involved, features of the communication context, and characteristics of the interpreters' personal and professional profile. Doubalova and others (2010, 58) take into account factors such as training into 'B', the interpreter's motivation and preparedness, the specificities of the different interpreting markets around the world and the needs and opinions of clients.

3.3 Retour interpreting as legitimate mode of SI?

Some theorists and interpreters propose arguments in favor of interpreting into B and there have also been some empirical studies which support their arguments.

Kalina (2005a, 37) says that "trainees generally appear to find it easier to work from A to B in the simultaneous mode, but not necessarily in consecutive." Some studies also suggest that trainee interpreters make more errors of meaning when working into A (Lee Yun-Hyang 2003, cited in Gile 2005, 10) and that their performance is more accurate and complete when working into B (Färber 2002, cited in Gile 2005, 10; Tommola and Helevä 1998). However, it has been found that the gap disappears in case of professional interpreters, whose accuracy is usually equally high in both directions.

René Pinhas, a veteran conference interpreter, who interpreted simultaneously the communication between the Earth and the Moon during 1969 Apollo 12 landing, talks about the difficulties he encountered during his simultaneous interpretation of this event, namely the difficulties with the sound transmission. While repeatedly placing a strong emphasis on the condition that one's second active language command must be impeccable, he suggests that under poor sound conditions, it is better to work out of one's A language. Same holds true, according to him, for the case when interpreting highly scientific conferences (1972, 146). To put this in terms of cognitive load, difficult listening conditions – be it reduced sound quality or increased information or terminological density – increase processing capacity requirements in the comprehension phase of interpreting to the extent that interpreting out of one's A language may be cognitively less demanding (see Gile 2005 and his theory we described above).

Gile (2005, 14) says that there are also many interpreters who refuse simultaneous interpreting into B, while they do accept consecutive assignments in that direction (see Déjean Le Féal 2003, cf. Kalina 2005a). Moreover, he argues, many authors who speak against working into one's B in SI accept work into a B language in CI, while at the same time considering CI the noblest mode of interpreting. He suggests that these two facts imply that "there is nothing intrinsically wrong with the quality of one's linguistic output in a B language" and that interpreting into B is a valid mode of interpreting. "Their rejection of simultaneous into B seems to be associated with the perception of a deterioration

of such output due to the particular conditions of simultaneous" (Gile 2005, 14-15).

Seel (2005) challenges the view of the superiority of SI directionality into A language, taking into account the advantages of the mother culture when interpreting out of a mother tongue. He explains that interpreters are more culturally competent in their mother culture, and therefore more competent to interpret out of their mother tongue. Concerned with non-verbal discourse patterns in a source culture (in particular negation) and their verbal rendition in the target language in SI, he argues that a quality output in SI can only be achieved if the source culture is mother culture. Thus, according to Seel, the non-verbal means in the source culture actually determine SI directionality in favor of interpreting into B. He says that interpreting into B becomes "the lesser evil, despite potential verbal mother-tongue interference in the output" (2005, 76).

Lastly, there is the argument of better phonological short-term memory when working out of one's A language. This has been confirmed by some professional interpreters' personal opinion in a questionnaire by Kodym (2006)[43], although half of the respondents considered phonological memory to be equally made use of in both interpreting directions.

Simultaneous interpreting into A has many advantages, though the same may be claimed for interpreting into B under particular conditions, such as when there is problem with sound transmission or when the speech is filled with non-verbal elements which are better understood by natives. Moreover, it has also been found that interpreting into B is favored in case of certain language combinations or even directions.

---

[43] 43 % of respondents feel they make greater use of phonological short-term memory when interpreting out of their mother tongue, while only 4 % of interpreters said they use the phonological short-term memory when interpreting out of their B language. (2006, 60)

3.4 Language pairs

According to the Interpretative theory (*La théorie du sens*) developed by Seleskovitch and Lederer, interpreting process works on the basis of deverbalization. Deverbalization is the second phase in the process of interpreting: the formal structure of the source text is deverbalized and the sense of the message is the result of synthesis of language meanings and interpreter's knowledge. It is this sense only that is free of its verbal form, which may now be reformulated in any other language.

Application of this principle to all language pairs has been challenged by many (e.g. Gile 1990, Padilla 2005) and there are several empirical studies suggesting its non-validity for some language pairs. It has been argued that there are differences in difficulty of interpreting between cognate languages (e.g. Spanish and Italian or Czech and Polish) compared to interpreting between languages that are related more remotely or completely unrelated (e.g. between Czech and French or between Czech and Chinese). Interpreting between two Romance languages or between two Slave languages may become easier, if only because they share similar syntactic word order. There are also different cultures with their specificities which may not be unproblematic when expressing these in a remotely related language. It is clear that simultaneous interpreters cannot resort to using the same strategies for all language pairs.

Concerning the comprehension phase, there are some characteristics of certain languages which may ease the interpreting process. On the lexical level, for example, Gile mentions homophones. There are more homophones in certain languages than in others when the interpreter must rely on context more. It is the case of Japanese for instance, such as *kikai* wit four meanings: "machine", "opportunity", "destruction" and "strange". In practice, for a native speaker and a regular listener (i.e. not interpreter) it is not a problem. However, an interpreter must add extra processing capacity while differentiating between them. Concerning grammar, we would like to mention grammatical redundancy, as its level is in certain languages higher than in others, which may again help the interpreter in comprehension phase. Grammatical redundancies Asian languages are generally grammatically and lexically less redundant than European languages. For example, in Chinese, future tense is not expressed grammatically –

the mere mention of the particular lexeme (e.g. "tomorrow") suffices, whereas in English for example, the semantically redundant auxiliary "will" cannot be omitted. Gile says that there are languages which help the interpreter better anticipate due to their particular grammatical structure. Also the level of implicitness/explicitness in languages is very important in the comprehension phase, directly affecting the production phase.

As for the production phase in SI, problems arise concerning the explicitness or implicitness of languages. Some languages are less explicit than others. Thus for example, when an interpreter works out of English into Czech having to interpret the phrase "Dear Commissioner" without "Madam" or "Mister" (as English does not require the differentiation), they need to have the external contextual knowledge of the fact whether the commissioner is a man or a woman to be able to say "Vážený pane komisaři" for a man, or "Vážená paní komisařko" for a woman. While this particular case is taken from the situational context of a European Parliament where interpreters have (or should have) this knowledge automatized, it may not be so in other cases and in other situations, where they can't see the person the speaker talks about. Let us take a simple example of a case when a speaker mentions *a friend,* a lexeme which in Czech requires another seme "man" or "woman" in order to be interpreted: *kamarád* for "a boy friend" and *kamarádka* for "a girl friend". So, when such phrases as "One of my friends" crop up, they are problematic for a Czech interpreter who has to choose the gender on a make-or-break basis before the speaker gets to saying *he* or *she*. The potential faux-pas caused by the language difference is something a Czech interpreter has got to reconcile with, fixing the mistake as subtly as he/she can.

We have mentioned that interpreting between two cognate languages may facilitate the process of interpreting. Languages with similar word order may ease interpreting process by reducing interpreter's processing capacity, in the sense that their attention may be focused on other important (if not more important) aspects of their job.

Sometimes, however it is not only the particular language pair facilitating the process; sometimes, also a specific language direction is important. This is the case of the English-Polish language pair. Bartlomiejczyk (2006) found out that when interpreting into Polish, it is possible to copy the syntactic structure of the

original and the interpreter's outcome makes perfect sense. However, when interpreting in the opposite direction, such tactics cannot be applied, as the word order in English is more fixed than that of a Polish syntactical structure. Similarly, Al-Salman a Al-Khanji's (2002) findings showed that interpreters felt more comfortable when interpreting into their B language. These interpreters worked from Arabic into English B and it is suggested that the preference of SI into B is caused by the particular complexity of the Arabic language.

These propositions suggest that it may sometimes become more advantageous to interpret into a specific language, be it due to grammatical or lexical implicitness or due to higher language complexity. We can see that the principle of deverbalization for all language combinations in simultaneous interpreting has been open to doubt.[44] However, this fact does not mean that deverbalization is not important in the process of SI. Conveying the meaning of ST or rather the speaker's *intent*, not just the words, continues to be essential and needs to be stressed in the process of interpretation training. However, what should also be kept in mind and reflected in interpreters' training is that interpreting between different language pairs requires different interpreting strategies and that directionality may constitute a factor influencing the strategies to be used in the interpreting process.

---

[44] Others considering language pairs were e.g. Kalina, Opdenhoff or Gile.

3.5 Quality of interpreting

In general, those factors influencing quality of interpreting are: clients, technical equipment, speakers, and other factors depending on the interpreters themselves, such as internal or external motivation, state of health, the degree of preparedness, their proficiency connected to their experience and many others. The clients or administrators should ensure the necessary materials when the interpreter demands these, so that the content of speakers' message may be interpreted as faithfully as possible. Technical equipment must ensure adequate working conditions for the interpreters, meeting the international standards (ISO norms) together with the necessary technical staff. The key factor influencing the quality of interpreting is the speaker. The speakers should not be reluctant to meet with interpreters before delivering their speech in case they are asked to. They should also keep in mind that they are being interpreted at the time of speech delivery. This implies clear pronunciation, moderate delivery rate, pausing when necessary, maintaining coherence of their speech and, perhaps the most important point, in case their speech was prepared in advance, they should not read it. Additionally, a colleague interpreter noting important data may also become an important factor enhancing the quality of interpreting.

However, the reality of conference interpreting is not always as interpreter-friendly as one may wish for. Speaker racing through time, dense information content, frequent use of enumerations and numbers – these are all situations a conference interpreter is not unfamiliar with. Interpreters have got to deal with these situations and resort to different compression strategies, resulting in reduction of the ST content. Had some speakers realized that, they would probably have been more co-operative in this respect.

The quality of SI output can be evaluated with respect to the content correspondence to the original or with respect to the form of TT delivery. There have been many studies concerning the content correspondence to the ST with regard to directionality, as it is one of the most visible aspects for interpreting evaluators (which is, however, not visible to users of SI).

In case of the form of interpreters' output, it is another matter. To this category belong the following: grammar, terminology, style and register, fluency, accent, intonation, use of pauses, voice and others. It is not a subject of polemics to say

that one's mother tongue is more versatile than one's B language. While the proponents of both Eastern and Western schools have always realized that, the Eastern school took the imperfections in one's B as factor not impeding comprehension, whereas the Western school was strictly against interpreting into B for this particular reason, i.e. the imperfect form of the interpreters' output. This view is criticized by e.g. Martin (2002) who reminds that quality of interpreting should not be confused with success in interpreting: interpreting should be ranked higher than clients' satisfaction which results from convincing delivery of impeccable form with lower content fidelity (87).

3.5.1 Users' perspective

During the Nuremberg trials, "the best work was done when the interpreter listened to his native tongue and translated into the second language[45]... The interpreter first had to understand perfectly what was being said and then could usually find suitable words in the second language to express the thought" (Persico 1994, 112, in Gaiba 1998, 48). This view is in line with the proponents of the Russian school. Nevertheless, this may have been caused by the insufficient linguistic and cultural knowledge of interpreters' B language during the times of the dawn of simultaneous interpreting.

Today, it seems that users of conference interpreting do not mind whether they are listening to interpreters who are native speakers or whether they are non-natives, as long as the requirement of content fidelity is met – which in any case users take for granted (Vuorikoski 1995, 172) – and as long as they don't have strong accents. Regional accents of some native interpreters may result in displeasure by listeners and may not be well understood by non-native listeners (Campbell 1981). In European organizations, "Spanish participants seem to prefer a near-native Spanish interpreter to a native one with a strong Latin American Accent" (Kalina 2005a, 38).

"[A] number of non-native non-English participants at conferences appear to agree that it is easier for them to follow the pun-free, more explicit, less

---

[45] although "many interpreters preferred to interpret into their mother tongue from a foreign language" (Gaiba 1998, 48)

metaphorical and less idiomatic English version of a non-native interpreter than that of an English native interpreter who delves in the linguistic abundance of his/her mother tongue" (Kalina 2005a, 41). This may be seen as an argument in favor of interpreting into English B.

Donovan conducted a survey, finding that delegates "were only marginally more critical of the performance of interpreters working into their B language as opposed to those working into their A language" (2003, 372, cited in Gile 2005).

Some nationalities are more tolerant in terms of accents than others: "The French do not generally accept non-native French from interpreters, whereas the Russians do" (Kalina 2005a, 38). She further says that the linguistic performance of interpreters is viewed differently whether assessed by English-speaking conference participants or by French-speaking participants. This may be the result of the lingua-franca-nature of the English language today, as people are more used to the different English accents and maybe even to those linguistic imperfections resulting from poorer linguistic knowledge in some speakers or interpreters.

Kurz (1989) studied expectations of four different user groups: interpreters, delegates of Commission of Europe, medical doctors and engineers. It was found out that experienced conference interpreting users place greater emphasis on conveyance of the message and the logical cohesion of interpreters' output than on usage and grammar. We will elaborate on this study more in the chapter on cohesion.

Here we would like to interpose a paragraph on one important condition which must be met when assessing the quality of interpreters' by users of conference interpreting. In order to reach a successful communicative act, all communication participants, i.e. both the speaker and the recipient(s), must be willing to take part in it. However, this requirement may not always be met by either. R. Jones, a staff interpreter in the EU institutions, writes about the problem in the context of interpreting for EU institutions. He depicts the difficulties of interpreters' job of having to interpret in a situation when they are "striving to perform a communication function in a context where no communication is in any case absent" (2013, 6). EP delegates do not always wish to communicate anything to other MEPs and express a "formalised, set position, dictated by their instructions

from headquarters" sometimes in a written form, which is "unsuitable for oral communication". This results, on the other hand, in lack of interest in the subject from the part of the recipients, i.e. the rest of the MEPs (Ibid.). In cases where the condition of SI users' participation in communication is not met, interpreting performance assessment of any kind becomes futile.

Users of EU interpreting are not only delegates or those interested listening online. There are also important recipients of retour interpreting: relay interpreters who work out of pilot's output. In a questionnaire by Kodym given to EU interpreters, the respondents said that retour interpreting is in general better structured, although there are disadvantages to it connected with mastery of one's B language, ranging from syntax, accent to style and pragmatics. The advantage of a B interpreter also lies in the fact that it is less "grammatical" and better expresses the sense and pragmatics of the original. For the use of relay interpreting, 38 % of respondents prefer a pilot interpreter working into his/her A language, 16 % prefer a retour interpreter, while the rest of respondents (46 %) do not mind whether the pilot works into his/her A or B language (2006, 64-65).

To conclude this chapter, users of conference interpreting are not always as critical of linguistic quality as it may seem. Regular listeners' concern is rather oriented towards the pragmatic aspect of interpreting. They may not always be as competent in the language in which they receive the interpretation themselves and so sometimes interpreting into B becomes advantage in this respect: the outcome in B language usually results in somewhat simplified version compared to A language interpreters, enhancing comprehension of the less linguistically skilled users. The fact of reduced idiomaticity also supports the preference of some interpreters to work out of the output of a retour interpreter.

Interpreters evaluate during their work not only performance of the pivot interpreters, whose output serves them as source text for their own interpreting, they also assess their own performance. Let us now dwell on interpreters' perspective to see how they feel about retour interpreting.

3.5.2 **Interpreters' perspective**

In a questionnaire by Martin (2005), majority of respondents described retour interpreting as more tiring, with compromised quality, and impaired by foreign accent. Despite the fact, they ranked concerns with native production secondary to native-like comprehension.

Donovan found that interpreters with French and English in their language combination who do retour on a regular basis, working as much "if not more into B than into A" for many years, found "SI into B more tiring and stressful than SI into A" and that "[n]early all also felt that their interpretation into B was less satisfactory in terms of quality (including accuracy)" (2003 in Donovan 2005, 151).

In a questionnaire given to EU interpreters[46], a majority of respondents interpreting into B (71 %) said that retour is more demanding for mental efforts, while 27 % consider B interpreting equally or less demanding as interpreting into one's mother tongue and one mentioned dependence on other factors. One of the factors contributing to higher level of stress when interpreting into B is the responsibility towards colleague interpreters on relay and the delegates listening to them (Kodym 2006, 59-60).

Some interpreters favor working into their B language, either owing to A language complexity (see Al-Salman and Al-Khanji 2002) or for other reasons (see Szabari 2002[47]).

Above we have mentioned the situation on of national markets of countries where languages of limited diffusion are spoken. The situation forces interpreters to work into B whatever their interpreting direction preferences are. In these countries, interpreters have to work into B out of necessity, as there is either lack of A interpreters of the demanded language (see e.g. Szabari 2002 or Čeňková 1999), or the expenses required for the A interpreter's transport exceed administrators' budgetary limits.

Moreover, Gile says that "many colleagues do not mind interpreting technical speeches into their B language, but show a definite preference for work into their

---

[46] Out of 82 interpreters, 50 respondents work in both directions for EU institutions and 6 more in other environments (Kodym 2006, 59)

[47] 36 % of respondents (Hungarian conference interpreters)

A language as soon as 'flowery' speeches crop up." A possible explanation may be that "the lexical units and syntactic structures of technical speech are readily available in their long term memory in both languages, whereas they find it markedly easier to retrieve 'stylish' words in their A language" (2005, 21).

Lastly, it must be said that it has been suggested that most of the EU interpreters[48] consider interpreting into B legitimate interpreting direction, (Kodym 2006, 69) suggesting that the position of retour has now shifted towards more positive light than it had been before. Nevertheless, retour interpreters in the EU must constantly keep in mind that their performance is being used and evaluated by not merely one group of receivers: First, there are the direct recipients – MEPs who understand the pivot language; then there are speakers themselves who sometimes monitor the interpreter's output; and last but not least, the very important recipients are colleague interpreters on relay, to whom the pivot's output serves as source text for further interpretation. As our empirical study will focus on output by EU interpreters interpreting authentic political speeches delivered by MEPs, we append a short chapter on political discourse with a brief characterization of political speeches delivered during plenary sessions of the European Parliament.

---

[48] 93 % of Kodym's respondents; 5 % were of neutral attitude saying that retour should only be used exceptionally as a result of practical necessity, and 2 % of respondents did not consider retour interpreting as legitimate direction of interpreting

4. Political discourse

The source speeches to be analyzed in the practical part of this thesis are speeches delivered by Members of the European Parliament (MEPs) during plenary sessions of the European Parliament (EP). That is why we include a short chapter on political discourse.

4.1 What is political discourse?

It is not uncomplicated to define political discourse in general terms. However we will attempt at describing some of the common characteristics. First, we will clarify the term *discourse* and then we will specify *political discourse.*

The terms *text* and *discourse* have been used in an inconsistent way. Some theorists identify the term *text* with a written language communication versus *discourse* as spoken language communication. Others identify the term *text* with Saussure's *langue*, and *discourse* with *parole*, i.e. as the text's manifestation in a particular environment having a particular function. For some, *text* is viewed as product whereas *discourse* as process. Enkvist (1989) defines *discourse* as "text plus its situational context". In our view, the term *text* will be used as an umbrella term for both *text* and *discourse;* the term *discourse* will be used to identify spoken texts.

A discourse can be categorized according to the professional affiliation of its authors, i.e. it is defined by its actors, depending on whether delivered by politicians, doctors, scientists, managers or others (Kraus 2003, 19). Thus, we can define political discourse as *a discourse delivered by politicians*. Politicians in this sense are "a group of people who are being paid for their (political) activities, and who are being elected or appointed (or self-designated) as the central players in the polity" (van Dijk 1997, 13).

However, defining political discourse on the sole basis of its author is not sufficient. Political discourse depends on a complex interplay of many factors, such as the time, the communicative situation, the communication participants involved, the momentary state of the speaker (i.e. politician), and many others. The dominant communication function of a political discourse is mainly informative, but there may also be persuasive function involved. Depending on

situation, one may prevail over the other. Rather marginally, political speeches may also fulfill a poetic function, in cases of congratulatory or ceremonial speeches. When the informative function dominates, information density of the discourse is higher and less redundant in terms of content. In case when persuasive or poetic function prevails, the discourse becomes more redundant in content.

Political discourse may be realized as e.g. a debate, polemic or an individual public speech. As the source texts used for our analysis are individual speeches delivered by MEPs during plenary sessions, we will now shortly specify their character.

4.2 Political discourse in EP plenary sessions

The overall character of speeches delivered during plenary sessions in the European Parliament is quite specific in that the speakers are usually given a very short time to defend their position. This results in condensed speeches with complex structures of high level of information density. It happens quite often that MEPs have their position written on paper and present it in the plenary in reading. This, on top of high information density level, results in high speech delivery rate, lack of gestures and eye contact, and lack of prosodic features, such as intonation, pauses or stress. If not read out loud, MEPs' positions are usually prepared in advance to different levels of precision. The preconceived speeches are then presented with different degrees of spontaneity, with or without support. In any case, the character of speeches with content and register prepared beforehand does not facilitate the process of simultaneous interpreting. Rare are cases of completely unprepared, impromptu speeches during EP plenary sessions.

As mentioned above, during plenary sessions in the European Parliament, MEPs are allotted a very limited speaking time[xviii], and so the speech rate very often exceeds the 120 WPM limit of a "comfortable SI"[49]. Today, a speech delivered at rate over 150 WPM is, unfortunately, not an unusual situation for an EP interpreter to have to deal with (cf. speeches during the Nuremberg Trials uttered at the 60 WPM suggested for speakers – Gaiba 1998). EP interpreters may resort to pressing the slow button which they have in their interpreting booths in case the speaker decides to run against their time. Pressing the button, interpreters can send a message of distress to the president of the session, who can then alert the speaker to slow down.[xix] Nevertheless, this is usually only helpful for a short time after which the MEPs fall back into their former rate of delivery. Even though they are advised to bear in mind the fact their speech is being interpreted into other languages, some MEPs deliver their speech very fast due to inexperience or ignorance, it might be caused by nervousness, but mostly it is because they simply wish to transmit as much information as they can within the very limited amount of time available to them. High speed of delivery of the source speech might also occur when the speech is prepared beforehand and

---

[49] "At an AIIC symposium on interpreter training in 1965, a rate of 100 to 120 words per minute had been suggested as comfortable for SI." (Pochhacker 2004, 129)

subsequently read from a paper. In these cases also the density of information content reaches very high numbers. Consequently, it may get near to impossible to get the speaker's message across without abridging it considerably. The speed of delivery rate might also get higher while giving an impromptu speech with or without emotional appeal, in which case the information density is usually lower than that of a read speech. Gile says (1995) that in cases when speakers produce rapid speech but provide little information, the speech density remains low. Speech rate depends on many factors, which include inter alia the speaker, the topic, the situation, the type of event, or – maybe most importantly – the time available to the speaker. Fortunately, EP interpreters are professionals who have developed strategies to cope in most of such situations.

Another problem which sometimes occurs and which is relevant for our empirical study is that speakers of languages of limited diffusion (e.g. Czech) sometimes choose to deliver their speech in their foreign language (in case of Czech MEPs usually English, but also French), although they are discouraged from doing so. MEPs are advised to deliver their speeches in their mother tongue, not in their foreign language, as instead of expressing what they *want*, they express what they *can* in that language, which can be to their own detriment: interpreters may have hard time understanding them, especially those not sharing the speaker's mother tongue. Although their speeches may be thoroughly prepared, the intonation and wrong stress my impair comprehension – not only that of MEPs potentially listening to them, but mainly that of interpreters. Intonation is an important marker of cohesion of spoken texts and sometimes it may even occur that a monotonous speech results in a great persuasive speech thanks to a skilled interpreter. In our analysis made in the practical part of our work we will focus on recreation of source speech cohesion in interpreters' output. That is why we add a chapter on cohesion.

5. Cohesion in interpreting

"Cohesion and coherence are [...] very important evaluation criteria because any deviation from these principles constitutes a mistake which cannot be compensated for" (Hönig 2002, 42). The quality criterion according to which we will analyze our target texts in our practical part will be that of cohesion. That is why we add a chapter on cohesion. First, we will explain the term, after which a chapter on research into cohesion in SI will follow.

5.1   What is cohesion?

V soustavě argumentačních prostředků zaujímají zvláště důležité postavení konektory (spojky, spojovací výrazy, částice). V diskurzu tyto konektory plní funkci sémantickou i pragmatickou. Sémantická funkce konektorů slouží označování významových vztahů mezi konjunkty, díky pragmatické funkci konektory vyjadřují reakci na reálnou nebo potenciální repliku autora – souhlas, nesouhlas, přípustku, korekci, rozvedení pomocí příkladu apod.

(Kraus 2003, 33)

Cohesion is one of the seven standards of textuality and is closely related to coherence. *Cohesion* is considered the surface structure of the text, to be distinguished from *coherence*, representing an underlying connectedness of the text. Hoey (1996, 3) defines cohesion as "the way certain words or grammatical features of a sentence can connect that sentence to its predecessors and successors in a text" (cited in Tárnyiková 2001, 30).

Cohesive markers are important for understanding both written and spoken texts. Speakers (and also interpreters) make great use of cohesive devices to enhance coherence but also for language economy reasons, e.g. in case of pronouns. There are many types of cohesion which we will not deal with in our thesis. We will focus on one type of cohesion: *junction*.

Junction "'serves to signal the relations between spaces or between entities within spaces' and 'compatibility and relatedness of elements and configurations in the textual worlds'" (cf. de Beaugrande 1980:150, cited in Tárnyiková 2002,

42). Tárnyiková (2002, 42) explains that "the typical junctive devices are *conjunctions* and *connectives* (connectors), whose dual role is to create cohesive links and at the same time indicate a kind of semantic relation holding between the connected elements (be it a word, a phrase, or a sentence." She then gives examples of all the different semantic relations holding between segments, inter alia *adversative, causal, conditional* or *concessive.* In the empirical part of our study we will focus on these four aforementioned semantic relations.

5.2 Cohesion in SI and Users expectations

In her study "Expectations of different groups" (interpreters, Council of Europe delegates, medical doctors, and engineers) where users were asked to rank a range of criteria according to the importance they assign to them, I. Kurz found that logical cohesion was considered (on average) second most important quality criterion. Assessed on a four-point scale, the quality criterion *logical cohesion* received average rating of 3.3 among the Council of Europe delegates. While some criterions were ranked higher, such as *use of correct terminology* = 3.729, *sense consistency* = 3.6 or *completeness of interpretation* = 3.458, more were ranked lower, such as *correct grammatical usage = 2.688, pleasant voice = 2.396* or *native accent = 2.08.* For interpreters, it was *sense consistency* (3.957) which was felt most important conference interpreting quality criterion, closely followed by *logical consistency* (3.8) as second most important (Kurz 1993, 16). Vuorikovski found that sense consistency is taken for granted by the listeners (1995, 172). Based on these findings, *logical cohesion* is considered a very important criterion of conference interpreting quality both by Council of Europe delegates and colleague interpreters taking relay from the pivot interpreters.

According to Kurz' findings, conveyance of message and the logical cohesion of the text were the most important features for regular conference goers. We suppose the expectations of EP delegates would not diverge markedly from the respondents of Kurz' CE delegates and the cohesion criterion would still be ranked high by EP delegates. As we will further investigate interpreters' outputs serving for relay interpreting, i.e. outputs used by colleague interpreters, the interpreters' assessment is of great importance to us, too.

5.3 Research in Cohesion in SI

Little research has been done on how professional simultaneous interpreters maintain cohesion in their interpreting output. Categorial shifts of cohesive devices, as well as shifts from reiteration in the form of paraphrase or in the form of identical reiteration were studied by e.g. Øverås 1998; Gumul 2004; or Dose 2006. Many have studied explicitation of cohesive devices, which is dealt with in the next chapter. Shabani (2008) conducted a parallel corpora-based study on cohesion in interpreting on the Farsi-English language pair. Gumul (2006) found that cohesion of interpreters' TTs can be influenced by interpreting directionality.

Kodym's questionnaire on directionality with EU interpreters and respondents included an additional question concerning cohesion and coherence. 41 %[50] of his respondents consider the quality of interpreting performance in terms of coherence and cohesion to be higher when interpreting into one's mother tongue, 11 % feel it is higher when interpreting into B, and the rest of respondents (48 %) feel that the performance of interpreters in terms of coherence and cohesion is either of equally high quality in both directions or is dependent on other factors.

Interpreters' success with which they recreate ST cohesive ties is a highly relevant factor in determining the quality of the interpreted product as seen by both professional interpreters and SI recipients (Kurz 1993). This is echoed by Dose's (2006) research. She studied recreation of ST cohesive ties interpreters' output in context of directionality on the following language pairs: English-French (4 interpreters), English-Afrikaans (3 interpreters) and English-German (1 interpreter). All interpreters had English B. She found out that "interpreting direction *per sei* does not consistently affect the success with which interpreters recreate source speech cohesive relations in their target language output," (2006, 83) as cohesion of interpreters' output is "likely to be influenced more strongly by their familiarity with the specialized context of the source language speech than by interpreting direction" (2006, 86).[51]

---

[50] 22 of EU interpreters out of 54 respondents

[51] She also found out that "[the interpreters'] level of familiarity [with the interpreted subjects]has no interpreting direction-specific impact as far as the recreation of cohesive ties is concerned, as both interpreting directions similarly benefit from the interpreters' familiarity with the specialized context." (2006, 82)

5.4   Explicitation of cohesive ties in SI

Explicitation in translation has been studied by many researchers. It was Blum-Kulka (1986) who initiated a systematic research into cohesion in translation. She investigated the use of conjunctions creating cohesion in translation. On the basis of higher level of explicitness in conjunction and in cohesion Blum-Kulka put forward the hypothesis of explicitation in translation, saying that the process of translation itself would produce in the TT more redundant and complex compared to the ST. This is in line with Baker (1996) saying that translator tends to "spell things out rather than leave them implicit".

However, explicitation in SI has a different dimension than explicitation in translation, given the inherent constraints of SI (Gumul 2006). It was found that interpreters tend to explicitate implicit links by employing additional cohesive devices (e.g. Shlesinger 1995). Gumul's results (2006c) indicate that explicitation in SI is mainly cohesion-related. Among the six most common changes in her study, she also studied adding of connectives, which accounted for 38.8 % of all explicitating shifts (2006b, 182).

Using both product (TT) and process data (retrospective remarks) analysis, she found out that connectives were explicitated more often by interpreters working into B. She also found that most explicitations identified in both directions by student interpreters appeared to be subconscious or automatic and hardly ever attributable to any strategic behavior (1 strategic vs. 310 unconscious) (2006b, 182).[52]

Hu Kaibao and Tao Qink (2011) conducted a corpus-based study, analyzing explicitation of textual meaning in conference interpreting on a Chinese-English language pair. According to them, explicitation of textual meaning in interpreting refers to "the interpreter's effort to make explicit the implicit relationship between sentences or sentential components in the source language or replace covert cohesion with overt cohesion" (202). Textual meaning is explicitated in case of expressing the referent of pronouns and other cohesive devices; in explicitating the omitted components in the source texts and in making explicit the logical relationships between sentences and their components by adding extra

---

[52] subconscious explicitations: 93.15 % of all cases of explicitating shifts

connectives (Ibid). It is this last type of textual meaning we are also interested in. They found that logical connectives occur with a "higher frequency of interpreted English texts of Chinese-English conference interpreting than those in the original English texts and translated texts" (203).

The results of empirical studies on directionality are often contradictory, as there is evidence in support of interpreting in both directions, i.e. both *out of* and *into* one's mother tongue. With the analysis which will be made in the practical part of our study, we would like to make a modest contribution to the discussion on directionality by taking cohesion for the criterion determining interpreters' output quality.

5.5 Need for further research

Many interesting studies have been conducted in the past dealing with interpreting directionality, studying the issue from different points of view, while obtaining data from outputs of student interpreters in different stages of their training (e.g. Tommola and Heleva 1998, Gumul 2006).

However, when one wishes to obtain objective results on directionality, use of students as subjects of research instead of experienced practitioners may seriously undermine the results of otherwise well-conducted study. In case of conducting research on directionality, repercussions of e.g. insufficient linguistic knowledge or poorly mastered interpreting strategies into B by trainee interpreters may severely distort results. If one aims at studying directionality, professional interpreters must be taken as subjects in order to obtain objective results. Indeed, Gumul expressed the need for "further product and process-oriented large-scale research involving professional interpreters as subjects" (2006a, 187). Although our empirical study is not large in scale, it does include professional interpreters.

Dose (2006) conducted an interesting study (though smaller in scale) on interpreting directionality in context of cohesion, studying the way cohesive ties are recreated in the texts produced by interpreters with Afrikaans, French and German As who all shared English B language. Her analysis was based on their outputs when sitting an simultaneous interpreting exam following an eight-week course of simultaneous interpreting called "Introduction to Conference interpreting". However, her results cannot be extrapolated neither to professional interpreters working in the European Parliament, nor to other language pairs.

For this reason we wish to make a modest contribution with our empirical research including professional interpreters working in the European Parliament out of Czech into English.

Following Dose's (2006) results, who found (inter alia) that interpreting directionality does not seem to influence recreation of cohesive ties on the said language combinations in case of her subjects sitting an interpreting exam, and following the proposition by Padilla (2005) that "the importance of language specificity cannot be ignored" and that the quality of interpreter's output is influenced by language direction (48), we set ourselves our research question:

How does interpreting directionality influence the way ST cohesive ties are recreated in the TTs by EP interpreters working in the CZ-EN direction?

Based on the findings by Gumul (2006) who found that student interpreters explicitated connectives more often when interpreting into B language in the Polish-into-English direction than when interpreting into their mother tongue, we set ourselves a specific research question including professional interpreters and a different language direction: *How does interpreting directionality influence the way ST implicit cohesive ties are explicitated in the TTs by EP interpreters working in the CZ-EN direction?*

6. Empirical Study

The aim of this chapter is to answer our research question we set ourselves above, i.e. whether directionality influences the way professional EP interpreters recreate cohesive ties of source texts and the way they explicate these in their target text rendition on the interpreting combination out of Czech into English.

6.1 Research design

"A method that would be appropriate for verifying general assumptions on the quality of A into B vs. B into A would be to offer two booths covering the same language direction in a conference, one with native speaker interpreters and one with non-natives (...)," according to Kalina (2005a, 39). She further says that one has got to use authentic data when conducting research in conference interpreting.

However, these two conditions are hardly ever realizable at one time. Two professional interpreters interpreting the same speech into one language is nearly impossible in real-life conditions, especially if one takes as subjects EU interpreters, as it is in our case. For our study, we used a regular authentic setting of the European Parliament. We have thus ensured authenticity of both original speeches (STs) and their interpreted versions (TTs). The condition of studying the same language direction set out by Kalina is met in our research: the focus of our study is on the Czech-into-English interpreting direction.

In the next part, we will outline the design of our research, including subjects, plan, materials used and methodology.

6.1.1 Subjects

To avoid distortion of our results caused by lack of interpreting experience of subjects used, our experiment is grounded on data obtained from the output of seasoned professional interpreters who are well established in their profession: interpreters working for the European Parliament (both staff and ACI's).

The number of retour interpreters with Czech A and English B working for the European Parliament is relatively high compared to the number of those working from Czech into English A.[53] The fact is reflected in the number of our subjects.

Altogether, 16 professional EP interpreters participated in our study. Two interpreters have English A and Czech C and fourteen interpreters have English B and Czech A. Out of the two English A interpreters, one is a man and one is a woman. Out of the Czech A interpreters, four are men and ten are women. They are all accredited EP interpreters, who passed a rigorous selection process ensuring the same minimum level of interpreting qualification.

6.1.2 Plan

Our research is product-oriented and uses both qualitative and quantitative methods. As advocated by Kalina (2005), our research will be based on an analysis of both transcripts and audio-video recordings interpreted in one language direction: into English. The source texts (STs) will be analyzed from the point of view of frequency of cohesive ties used by the speakers. The interpreters' outputs – the target texts (TTs) – will subsequently be analyzed with regard to how the ST cohesive ties are rendered by interpreters working in A>B direction compared to those interpreting in C>A direction. For identification of the different transfers the categorization by Dose (2006) will be used, with adaptations for the purpose of study. The individual instances in of ST CD transfers in the target texts will be converted into percentage to see how the two corpora compare.

6.1.3 Source texts

For the purpose of our analysis, 29 source texts were extracted from the ep-live database. After careful selection, 8 STs were chosen for the creation of corpus of C>A interpreting direction and 21 STs were chosen for the A>B corpus. All STs used in our analysis are individual public speeches, particularly EP debates delivered by EP members (MEPs) during the plenary sessions.[54]

---

[53] For working languages classification and their definitions see chapter 1.1 AIIC definition
[54] For general specification of political speeches see chapter 4 Political discourse

To define our source texts in terms of van Dijk's (1997, 19) categorization, the political process involved in all STs is that of *legislation*, the political action taken is *political decision making,* and political cognitions are *attitudes about the relevant issue.* To narrow the scope of definition of our source texts, we define them as argumentative preconceived monologues with informative and persuasive function as the dominant communicative functions.

The parliamentary debate speeches we chose for our analysis were delivered between the years 2014 and 2016. They were delivered on topics from different areas, such as economy, human rights, welfare, security, environmental protection, or development aid. Economy and human rights were the dominant topics in both corpora.[55]

Concerning the ST length, only such speeches which did not exceed 2 minutes in length were chosen for our analysis to ensure the same ST character and thus comparability of the STs[56]. The average length of the STs for C>A corpus is 01:05. The average length of A>B STs is 01:14.

The recipients of the speeches are primarily other MEPs taking part in the debate, although anyone today may become recipient since the speeches are broadcast live online as well as stored in the archive available to public.

6.1.4 **Speakers**

Our STs were delivered by 6 MEPs. They are all native speakers of Czech. Five of them were men: Petr Mach , Stanislav Polčák, Jiří Pospíšil, Jan Zahradil, Tomáš Zdechovský; one was woman: Michaela Šojdrová. Petr Mach is an MEP from Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group; Jan Zahradil is EP member of European Conservatives and Reformists Group; and Michaela Šojdrová, Stanislav Polčák, Jiří Pospíšil and Tomáš Zdechovský are all MEPs from Group of the European People's Party (Christian Democrats).

---

[55] For detail information about our STs see Appendix II. For yet more detail information, see the source text information provided on our CD joined to our thesis with its respective video- and audio- recordings.
[56] for methodology of ST selection see subchapter 6.1.5 below

6.1.5 **Methodology**

"The complexity of the (conference) interpreting process already starts with the quality of the original speech" (Kalina 2005a). Indeed, the choice of source texts was a key part of our empirical study. Our STs are authentic recordings of plenary sessions and our TTs are their authentic renditions by professional EP interpreters. Both STs and TTs used in our study were downloaded from the EP website www.europarl.europa.eu/ep-live, where different EP meetings (e.g. plenary sessions) are broadcast online and are available for public.

Concerning the methodology of ST choice, we proceeded very carefully in this stage, as quality of source text is the key determinant for further analysis and for valid results. Close attention was paid to choosing STs which would be as similar in character as possible. Before considering the speech delivery rate of STs, other factors were considered first. The methodology of ST choice was partially based on Fernandez's findings (2015, 59) that "speech rate-linked difficulty appears to be more meaningfully measured if rate is considered as one of the components of a cluster of nonverbal and prosodic dimensions concomitant to speaker's communicative competence, such as strategic use of prosody, eye contact, gestures, pausing pattern and the desire to involve with the audience." They call this behavior "listener-oriented" (2015, 59).

The most effective method to extract "listener-oriented" STs was to consider the prosodic dimensions of speakers first, as it is possible to search speeches by speakers in EP live website and as the same speakers usually keep the same prosody throughout most of their speeches they deliver. Seven Czech speakers (MEPs) shared similar prosodic patterns, used gestures and paused when appropriate: Mach, Polčák, Pospíšil, Sehnalová, Šojdrová, Zahradil and Zdechovský. Eye contact was not considered relevant as this is a component which is usually not maintained by MEPs due to the character of parliamentary debates (unless they are addressing a specific person or group of people).

The individual speeches by these speakers were further analyzed with regard to whether they were read or unread. Read speeches are usually difficult to follow (both by listeners and all the more by interpreters) due to their high information density, low redundancy, complex syntactical structures, and last but by far not least, the high rate with which they are usually delivered. Consequently, all read

or half-read speeches were discarded.[57] The resulting STs were either preconceived or impromptu speeches[58]. We decided to use both, as both are considered "listener-oriented" and thus suitable for our research purposes.

Next, we considered the level of redundancy. By excluding the read speeches we also discarded many of those with high level information density (i.e. low level of redundancy). In this respect, two ST speeches were taken out, as one was of festive nature and the other was of a congratulatory nature, both with higher level of redundancy.

To ensure comparability of STs, the ST length was considered, too. Consequently, all speeches longer than 2 minutes had to be discarded, as the structure of one minute or two minute speeches differed in character from longer speeches.

Last but definitely not least, we considered the speech rate of STs. The rate of impromptu speech corresponds to the rate of one's ideas as they come up to one's mind. This is important from the standpoint of both recipients and interpreters as such speeches are easier to follow. All ST speech rates were analyzed and measured in words per minute (WPM) unit. As a result, we discarded those STs which were considered extremely fast (over 160 WPM) or extremely slow (under 100 WPM) compared to the rest of the speeches (2).

After discarding those STs which were not "listener-oriented" and at the same time beyond the 100-160 WPM scope, we obtained 29 STs with mean value of 133 WPM, ranging from 113 WPM to 153 WPM. Out of the 29 ST speeches extracted, 8 were interpreted in C>A direction and were delivered with mean speech rate of 122 WPM (115 WPM – 153 WPM). 21 speeches were interpreted in A>B direction and their mean speech delivery rate was 133 WPM (113 WPM – 152 WPM).

It must be stressed that the disparity between the individual speech rates is relatively small in our case, but may be highly relevant for some ST analyses which do not take into account all the necessary variables mentioned above which may be more important for comparability of STs. On the basis of Fernandez'

---

[57] In this respect, we eliminated one speaker (Ms Šojdrová)

[58] According to Nováková (1993), impromptu speeches account for only 20 % of all interpreted source texts.

findings[59] – where very fast speeches but which were "listener-oriented" were regarded "less difficult and slower than the slow ST speeches" – we place more weight on the overall character of our STs (taking into account all the relevant variables) than merely on the speech rate they are delivered with.

Having extracted STs which are "listener-oriented", we shall now proceed to the analysis of ST cohesive ties.

---

[59] "Speech rate as measured in words/minute seems to be an unreliable indicator of difficulty," as both interpreter trainees and trainers regarded fast and very fast ST speeches as "less difficult and slower than the slow ST speeches" (Fernandez 2015, 59)

6.2 Analysis of cohesive ties

All source and target language texts were transcribed according to EPIC transcription conventions. The paralinguistic features were excluded from transcription as these were not the purpose of our study. The STs were then analyzed manually with respect to occurrence of cohesive devices used to establish cohesive relations between ST segments. We focused on such cohesive devices contributing to the creation of adversative, causal, conditional and concessive relations present between segments of the STs. Those cohesive devices contributing to establishing cohesive relations in the STs were mostly conjunctions, but also a number of particles and phrases served that purpose.

6.2.1 Cohesive ties present in the source texts

In the 8 STs interpreted in C>A direction, 30 different cohesive devices, or CDs (conjunctions, connective particles or phrases) were identified. The incidence of CDs present in the STs in this direction was the following:

Adversative: 11

Causative: 15

Conditional: 4

Concessive: 0

As for the 21 STs interpreted in A>B direction, we identified 68 CDs. The incidence of CDs present in STs interpreted in this direction was as follows:

Adversative: 21

Causative: 30

Conditional: 14

Concessive: 3

After identifying all[60] the devices contributing to maintaining adversative, causative, conditional and concessive relationships between the ST segments, we

---

[60] For detailed overview of the connectives identified, see Appendix III

proceeded to analysis of the interpreters' output to see how these cohesive ties were rendered in the TTs.

6.2.2 Cohesive ties renditions by interpreters

Having aligned all the STs with their respective interpreted renditions, or target texts (TTs), we could now proceed to the analysis thereof. Attention was paid to the way the ST cohesive devices we identified in the first part were rendered in the corresponding TT segments. For the classification of the different interpreters' renditions of cohesive ties we used the categorization by Dose (2006) with our own adjustments for the purpose of our study. Dose proposes 6 categories:

(a) Retention of conjunction

(b) Use of a different conjunction with the same or similar cohesive function

(c) No conjunction

(d) Reformulation

(e) Omission of segment

(f) Different cohesive relationship

Dose's study concerned the recreation of cohesive ties which were explicitly present in the source speech. Our experiment, however, also includes cohesive ties which were implicit in the source text but expressed by the interpreters using an explicit cohesive device in their target output. For the purpose of our research, we adjusted some of Dose's categories and added four more to the classification:

(a) Retention of conjunction with the same function

(b) Use of a different device with the same or similar cohesive function

(c) Reformulation

(d) No conjunction (cohesive relationship implicit)

(e) Omission of a redundant segment

(f) Addition of an explanatory conjunction

(g) Use of a different conjunction with a different cohesive function

(h) No conjunction (cohesive relationship not maintained)

(i) Omission of an important segment

(j) Addition of a conjunction introducing a segment not present in ST

The first six strategies *(a)* to *(f)* were in our analysis considered successful renderings the ST cohesive ties. On the other hand, the last four categories *(g)* to *(j)* were deemed to be unsuccessful attempts at recreating cohesive relationships of the ST. The definitions of the categories accompanied by examples from our parallel analysis of STs and TTs are to be found further below.

We provide a verbatim translation of the Czech STs into English for the purpose of potential use to those unfamiliar with the Czech language. To serve their purpose, the translations provided by us were created in such a way as to follow the ST content *and* its structure (i.e. not in an ideal way). By no means is this translation intended to represent an ideal version of TTs. The interpreters' versions (TTs) are not to be judged by the reader on the basis of our translation. Our translation is placed in the middle column.

(a) Retention of conjunction with the same function[*]

The interpreter uses a direct TL equivalent of a conjunction or phrase used in the SL.

Ex.:

Original speech (ST)	*Our translation*	Interpreted version (TT)
Návrh usnesení rovněž požadoval vrátit se k starému návrhu směrnice, která je tady projednávána již více než sedum let, a ukazuje se, že je slepou cestou. //	*The draft regulation also demanded to go back to the old directive proposal, which has been discussed for more than seven years now, and it turns out that it has reached an impasse.*	The old directive has been around for seven years and amending it is just taking us into a cul-de-sac, //
Proto podporuji raději nový přístup Evropské komise, který přislíbila paní komisařka Věra Jourová. //	*That is why I support the new approach of the European Commission which was promised by Commissioner Věra Jourová.*	we **thus** need a new proposal from Commissioner Jourová. //

In this example, the Czech conjunction *proto* "therefore, thus" establishing a causative relationship in the ST is rendered in the TT version by its direct English equivalent *thus* maintaining the same cohesive relationship.

(b) Use of a different device with the same or similar cohesive function[*]

The interpreter does not employ a direct TL equivalent of the SL conjunction or particle. Instead, a different device is used, establishing the same or similar cohesive relation as the one present in the ST.

Ex.:

Original speech (ST)	*Our translation*	Interpreted version (TT)
[...] a **pokud** hovoříte o tom, že Komise připravuje definitivní režim DPH, //	*and if you talk about the fact that the Commission prepares a final VAT system,*	[...] So **when** you talk about a new VAT system, please, take a leaf of that book, //
tak abyste se z tohoto případu poučili. //	*then you should learn your lesson from this case.*	please learn your lessons, // [...]

The Czech conjunction *pokud* "in case" or "if" is not here intended to express a conditional relationship between the two segments. In this segment, it rather intends to express "when" or "as long as". The relation between the two segments is expressed in the English interpreted version by conjunction *when*, rendering the speaker's intention successfully. The interpreter here employs a perfectly functional solution which enhances listeners' comprehension.

(c) Reformulation[*]

The interpreter reformulates the SL segment containing the conjunction in such a way that the recreation of the conjunction in SL is unnecessary.

Ex.:

Original speech (ST)	*Our translation*	Interpreted version (TT)
[...] vím, že insolvenční právo může fungovat, pouze **pokud** jsou veřejné informace pro věřitele a pro dlužníky, //	*I know that insolvency law can only work if information is publicly available to creditors and debtors,*	[...] IL can only work **on the basis of** public information, //
a **pokud** tyto informace nejsou pouze pro jednotlivé státy, ale jsou vzájemně propojené, //	*and if this information is available not only to the individual states, but is mutually interconnected,*	and this information **shouldn't be** confined to the borders of one state, //
a mohou tak kterékoliv firmy se informovat o tom, jak jejich potencionální dlužník v jiné části Evropy na tom je, // [...]	*so that any company can gain information about how their potential debtors' situation in other parts of Europe*	and companies should be able to gain information about potential creditors in other member states of the EU. // [...]

The two ST conditional conjunctions *pokud* (2) "if" are paraphrased without using any conjunction in the TT while still maintaining the cohesive relationship of the ST.

In the first case the conjunction is expressed by English expression *on the basis of* creating the same cohesive function. As for the second incidence, the ST conditional conjunction *pokud* "if" is followed by a negative verb phrase *nejsou pouze pro jednotlivé státy* "are not for individual states only". The ST Czech conjunction is omitted by the interpreter as the conditional relationship between the two segments present in ST is paraphrased by the interpreter's phrase *shouldn't be confined to the borders of one state* – the relationship between the conjuncts remains implicit in the TT. Employing the strategy of segmentation and syntactic compression, the interpreter opts for an elegant solution which on top spares his/her processing capacity.

(d) No conjunction (cohesive relationship implicit)[*]

The interpreter does not employ any conjunction while the cohesive relationship present in the ST remains implicit and unaltered.

Ex.:

Original speech (ST)	*Our translation*	Interpreted version (TT)
[...] ta migrace z Afriky je trochu zastíněná migrací ze Sýrie, ale to neznamená, že je méně závažná, //	*the migration from Africa is a bit overshadowed by migration from Syria but that does not mean that it is less important,*	[...] migration from Africa is overshadowed by migration from Syria but that makes it no less important. //
a proto je dobře, že Evropská unie investuje do bezpečnosti a stability v Africe, //	*and that is why it is good that the European Union has been investing to security and stability of Africa,*	And that is why it is good that the EU has been investing in security and stability of Africa. //
~~protože~~ potřebujeme prevenci, potřebujeme předcházet migračním tokům, //	*because we need prevention, we need to prevent migration flows,*	We need prevention. We need to prevent migration flows, //
ale prevence sama by nestačila, [...]	*but prevention in itself would not be sufficient,*	but prevention in itself will not suffice. [...]

The Czech conjunction *protože* establishes a causative relationship between the two segments. Although it is not explicitly rendered in the TT, the relationship remains contextually implicit. The interpreter employs the strategy of segmentation and the omission of the conjunction does not inhibit listener's comprehension; moreover, the communication of the message becomes more forceful and effective.

[*] Paraphrased Dose's definitions

(e) Omission of a redundant segment

The interpreter does not use any cohesive device because the entire SL segment containing the conjunction was omitted due to its redundant character. There is no loss of important content information.

Ex.:

Original speech (ST)	*Our translation*	Interpreted version (TT)
[...] a jestli dokonce tyto finanční prostředky nejsou zneužívány těmi, kteří potom raketami útočí na stát Izrael. //	*and whether these financial resources are not even abused by those who then rocket-attack the state of Israel.*	[...] or could it be the case that that aid is being abused by those who are firing rockets at Israel? //
Protože ~~pokud~~ ~~by tomu tak bylo,~~ tak by to bylo skandální, // [...]	*Because if it were true, that would be scandalous,*	That would be a scandal, // [...]

The interpreter uses interpreting strategy of omission of redundant information and leaves out the Czech segment *pokud by tomu tak bylo* "if that indeed was the case". Therefore, the ST conjunction *pokud* present in the omitted segment is not rendered in the TT. As the segment was redundant, the omission of the cohesive tie does not inhibit comprehension while the TT rendition still remaining faithful to the ST content.

(f) Addition of an explanatory conjunction

The interpreter adds a cohesive device which was not explicitly present in the ST, but which was implicit.

Ex.:

Original speech (ST)	*Our translation*	Interpreted version (TT)
Je velmi důležité, aby Evropská unie, pokud má být silným sdružením států, //	*It is very important for the European Union, if it is to be a strong group of states,*	It is important if the EU wants to be strong group of nations to have their own finance at its disposal. //
měla vlastní finance a měla vlastní finanční politiku. //	*to have its own finance and to have its own financial policy.*	It must have its own financial policy. //
Já myslím, že vaše otázka je dobrá, ale je poslána špatným směrem, směrem ke mně. //	*I think that your question is good, but it is not addressed in the right direction, in the direction towards me.*	**Nevertheless**, I think that your question goes in the right direction. But I'm not the one who it should be addressed to. //
Já jsem federalista a chci mít silnou Evropu. //	*I am a federalist and I want to have a strong Europe.*	I'm a federalist and I want a strong Europe. //

In the ST there is no explicit conjunction contributing to the establishment of adversative relationship between the two ST segments. However, the adversative relationship is implicit in the ST and is rendered explicitly in the TT by employing the adversative conjunction *nevertheless* and thus contributing to higher comprehension of both listeners as well as that of colleague interpreters working out of pilot's output.

The relations between the individual segments falling into *(a)* – *(f)* categories were either rendered explicitly or implicitly by interpreters in their TTs, and so the ST cohesive relationships were maintained in the TT renditions. These categories were therefore all considered successful transfers of the ST cohesive ties.

However, the next four categories *(g)* – *(j)* were considered unsuccessful attempts at recreating ST's cohesive ties as the TT devices used by interpreters did not maintain the same cohesive relationship between the ST segments.

(g) Use of a different conjunction with a different cohesive function

The interpreter uses a different conjunction than the one present in the ST and the meaning is either altered or ambiguous.

Ex.:

Original speech (ST)	*Our translation*	Interpreted version (TT)
Stojí zde na místě kritizovat Saudskou Arábii, která **sice** spolupracuje s Evropskou unií, //	Here it is apropos to criticize Saudi Arabia, which does cooperate with the European Union,	We should criticize Saudi Arabia, because **on the one hand,** they cooperate with the EU, //
ale na poli humanity trestního práva nic neudělala a trest smrti je zde vykonáván středověkým, zvláště odpudivým způsobem. //	but it has not done anything in the area of criminal law and capital punishment is here being carried out in a medieval, extremely abhorrent way.	**and** they do very little in the area of criminal law and they carry out capital punishment in a medieval style // [...]

The Czech adversative conjunctions *sice – ale* are of doublet character: uttering the first requires use of the other. English expressions *on the one hand – on the other hand* work on the same basis. In our illustration, the interpreter starts with the adversative expression *on the one hand*, which requires its sequel *on the other (hand).*Yet, the interpreter continues with the conjunction *and* – probably intending to close the sentence with *on the other* – without uttering the necessary second part of the expression. Whereas the second part of the expression may be employed without uttering the first, it does not work the other way around. Listeners (as well as all the interpreters taking the pivot on relay!) wait for the second part of the expression *on the other (hand)*, but the interpreter never gets to it. Although the use of *and* instead of *on the other (hand)* may eventually be understood as adversative device by a regular listener, it remains ambiguous and therefore difficult to follow for all the relay interpreters who are working into their languages based on this pilot's output.

(h) No conjunction (cohesive relationship not maintained)

The interpreter does not use any cohesive device and the cohesive tie present in the ST is not maintained in the TT or the relationship between segments is left ambiguous.

Ex.:

Original speech (ST)	*Our translation*	Interpreted version (TT)
Izrael čelí a čelil v minulých týdnech zcela nepochybně útokům na svoji územní integritu a na samotnou podstatu své existence //	*In the last few weeks Israel has quite evidently been facing attacks on its territorial integrity and on the core of its existence,*	in the last few weeks Israel has faced attacks on its territorial integrity and its very future existence. //
a je to **protože** v Palestině máme dva proudy,	*and that is because there are two streams in Palestine:*	There are two streams in Palestine. //
jeden, který se dohodnout chce a je ochoten hledat mírové řešení, a druhý, který se dohodnout nechce a jehož jediným cílem je zničit stát Izrael [...]	*one which wants to agree and is willing to look for peace solution, and another one which does not want to agree and whose only aim is to destroy the state of Israel*	There are those who want peace and are ready to agree and there are those who don't want to agree, who just want to destroy the state of Israel [...]

Here the Czech causative conjunction *protože* "because" establishing an important relationship between the two ST segments is not rendered in the TT and the cohesive tie does not remain implicit.

(i) Omission of an important segment

The interpreter does not use any cohesive device because an entire important SL segment was omitted. Due to the omission, important content information was lost.

Ex.:

Original speech (ST)	*Our translation*	Interpreted version (TT)
~~Takže~~ ~~já jsem pro ten návrh, //~~ ~~ale je nutné říci, že~~ je třeba zajistit, aby tyto informace byly využívány pouze v případě, že dojde k vyšetřování podezřelého // a že je zde podezření ze spáchání, řekněme, (ehm) závažné formy trestné činnosti. //	*So, I agree with the proposal,* *but it has to be said that it must be ensured that this information is used only in case when it comes to investigation of suspects and in case when there is a suspicion of, say, a serious crime.*	We have to be sure that (ehm) this information is used in the investigation of suspects who are suspected of serious (ehm) offences. //

The Czech conjunction *takže* "so" introduces a segment, which is crucial for the ST speaker's position. The segment was omitted by the interpreter together with the conjunction establishing causative relationship. The same is true for the Czech adversative conjunction *ale* "but" in the following segment. However, we did not count it as two separate incidences as both conjunctions were attached to the same omitted segment. Therefore, in this particular segment, only one incidence falling into the *(i)* category was counted.

(j) Addition of a conjunction introducing a segment not present in ST

The interpreter adds a cohesive device which was not explicitly present in the ST and which introduces a segment which was not present in the ST.

Ex.:

Original speech (ST)	*Our translation*	Interpreted version (TT)
Nedávno, během podzimu tohoto roku ústavní soud Malajsie řekl, že tento zákon je v pořádku, že je v so- že je v souladu s malajsijskou ústavou.	Recently, in the autumn of this year, the Malaysian institutional court said that there was nothing wrong with the act; that it was in accordance with the Malaysian constitution.	very recently their constitutional court actually said that it was a act that was in line with the constitution,
Vidíme, že to je zcela ~~jasné politické rozhodnutí tamního ústavního soudu.~~	We see that this is a clear political decision of the national Constitutional Court.	**so** we see that this is really unbelievable and unacceptable

The explicitation of the cohesive tie implicit in the ST by adding the conjunction *so* in the TT would normally fall within the (f) category, had the following segment been rendered correctly as far as content is concerned. However, the TT segment introduced by the conjunction *so* was not present in the ST while at the same time the information present in the ST was omitted.

6.3 Results

In the STs which were interpreted in C>A direction, 30 cohesive devices (CDs), i.e. conjunctions, particles and connective phrases, were identified. Out of the 30 CDs, 21 were rendered in the TTs using either the same CD *(a),* a different CD *(b),* or were reformulated *(c)* while still maintaining the same cohesive function of ST; 8 CDs were omitted for different reasons *(d), (e), (h), (i);* and 4 CDs were added in the TTs, i.e. the relationship between segments which was implicit in ST was made explicit in TT. Overall we identified 33 cohesive relationships in the interpreters' texts (TTs) which were either expressed explicitly using various CDs (mainly conjunctions, but also particles or phrases expressing connective relation), or which were rendered implicit.

The TT renditions falling under categories *(a)-(f)* were considered successful transfers of ST cohesive ties. We identified 30 CD renditions of ST CDs which belong to these categories. To put this in percentage terms, English A interpreters working out of Czech C transferred ST cohesive ties successfully in 90.9 % of cases. **(30/33)**

The C>A interpreters explicitated ST cohesive ties, i.e. added explanatory CDs which were implicit in ST, in 12.1 % of cases **(4/33).**

C > A interpreting direction	no.	%
(a) Retention of conjunction with the same function	18	54.6
(b) Use of a different device with the same or similar cohesive function	1	3.0
(c) Reformulation	2	6.1
(d) No conjunction (cohesive relationship implicit)	3	9.1
(e) Omission of a redundant segment	2	6.1
(f) Addition of an explanatory conjunction	**4**	**12.1**
Total	**30**	**90.9**

Table 1: Successful transfers of ST cohesive ties by English A interpreters working in C>A direction

Interpreters working in C>A direction employed unsuccessful strategies in 9.09 % of cases **(3/33)**.

C > A interpreting direction	no.	%
(g) Use of a different conjunction with a different cohesive function	0	0.0
(h) No conjunction (cohesive relationship not maintained)	1	3.0
(i) Omission of an important segment	2	6.1
(j) Addition of a conjunction introducing a segment not present in ST	0	0.0
Total	**3**	**9.1**

Table 2: Unsuccessful transfers of ST cohesive ties by English A interpreters working in C>A direction

In the STs which were interpreted in A>B direction, 68 cohesive devices (conjunctions, particles and connective phrases) were identified. Out of the 68 CDs present in STs, 59 were transferred by interpreters using CDs with same or similar cohesive function *(a), (b), (c)* and 1 was transferred with a different cohesive function *(g)*. 8 CDs present in STs were omitted in TTs for different reasons *(d), (e)*. 9 CDs not present in STs were made explicit in TTs *(f), (j)*. All in all, 77 instances of CD transfers were identified in the TTs.

As 75 instances of CDs in TTs were considered successful renditions of ST CDs, the Czech A interpreters working into English B were successful in rendering the ST cohesive ties in 97.4 % of cases **(75/77)**.

Out of the 77 instances of CD transfers, 8 were explicitated in TTs by Czech A interpreters. In percentage terms, explanatory conjunctions were added in 10.4 % of cases **(8/77)**.

A>B interpreting direction	no.	%
(a) Retention of conjunction with the same function	50	64.9
(b) Use of a different device with the same or similar cohesive function	3	3.9
(c) Reformulation	6	7.8
(d) No conjunction (cohesive relationship implicit)	4	5.2
(e) Omission of a redundant segment	4	5.2
(f) Addition of an explanatory conjunction	**8**	**10.4**
Total	**75**	**97.4**

Table 3: Successful transfers of ST cohesive ties by English B interpreters working in A>B direction

Interpreters interpreting in A>B direction were unsuccessful in rendering the ST CDs in 2.6 % of cases **(2/77)**.

A > B interpreting direction	no.	%
(g) Use of a different conjunction with a different cohesive function	1	1.3
(h) No conjunction (cohesive relationship not maintained)	0	0
(i) Omission of an important segment	0	0
(j) Addition of a conjunction introducing a segment not present in ST	1	1.3
Total	**2**	**2.6**

Table 4: Unsuccessful transfers of ST cohesive ties by English B interpreters working in A>B direction

In general, the most widely used strategy of ST CD recreation was *(a) Retention of conjunction with the same function*. Interpreters working in C>A direction employed this strategy in 54.6 % of cases and A>B interpreters in 64.9 % of cases.

In the C>A direction, the ST CDs were recreated in the TTs explicitly[61] in 75.7 % of cases. The CDs were omitted[62] in 9.1 % of cases.

In the A>B direction, the ST CDs were reestablished explicitly in the interpreted texts in 87.0 % of cases. The CDs were omitted in 5.2 % of cases.

Interpreting direction	C>A	A>B
Percentage **(Number of CD renditions)**	**%** **(33)**	**%** **(77)**
(a) Retention of conjunction with the same function	54.6 % (18)	64.9 % (50)
(b) Use of a different device with the same or similar cohesive function	3.0 % (1)	3.9 % (3)
(c) Reformulation	6.1 % (2)	7.8 % (6)
(d) No conjunction (cohesive relationship implicit)	9.1 % (3)	5.2 % (4)
(e) Omission of a redundant segment	6.1 % (2)	5.2 % (4)
(f) Addition of an explanatory conjunction	12.1 % (4)	10.4 % (8)
Total	**90.9 %** **(30)**	**97.4 %** **(75)**

Table 5: Successful transfers of ST cohesive ties by English A interpreters (C>A direction) aligned with successful transfers of ST cohesive ties by English B interpreters (A>B direction)

---

[61] The *(a), (b), (c), and (f)* categories
[62] The *(e)* category

As concerns the unsuccessful strategies, it must be said that these were rare in case of our subjects, regardless the directionality, as only 5/100 instances of unsuccessful strategies were identified in both directions: 3 instances in C>A direction and 2 instances in A>B direction. The types of unsuccessful rendition strategies were different in each group of interpreters: One C>A interpreter omitted the ST CD and did not recreate the ST cohesive relationship, and two omitted an important ST segment containing a CD; one A>B interpreter used a different conjunction with a different cohesive function and one added a conjunction introducing segment which was not present in the ST. The results are below:

Interpreting direction	C>A	A>B
Percentage (Number of CD renditions)	% (33)	% (77)
(g) Use of a different conjunction with a different cohesive function	0.0 % (0)	1.3 % (1)
(h) No conjunction (cohesive relationship not maintained)	3.0 % (1)	0.0 % (0)
(i) Omission of an important segment	6.1 % (2)	0.0 % (0)
(j) Addition of a conjunction introducing a segment not present in ST	0.0 % (0)	1.3 % (1)
Total	**9.1 % (3)**	**2.6 % (2)**

Table 6: Unsuccessful ST CD transfers by English A interpreters (C>A direction) aligned with unsuccessful ST CD transfers by English B interpreters (A>B direction)

6.3.1 **Conclusions**

In our analysis of TTs produced by English A and English B interpreters we found out that English A interpreters working out of Czech C (C>A direction) were successful in recreating ST cohesive ties in 90.9 % of cases. Czech A interpreters working into English B (A>B direction) reestablished ST cohesive ties successfully in 97.4 % of cases.

English B interpreters reemployed the same ST CDs in their TT more often than English A interpreters (difference = 10.3 %). English B interpreters also reformulated the ST CDs slightly more often than English A interpreters, although the difference is near to negligible (difference = 1.7 %). In all, English A interpreters recreated the ST CDs present in the STs explicitly[63] in 63.6 % of cases, and English B interpreters in 76.6 % of cases (difference = 13.3 %). English A interpreters successfully omitted CDs in 9.1 % of cases and English B did so in 5.2 % of cases (difference = 3.9 %).

As for the unsuccessful strategies, it must be stated that these were very rare in both groups. Unsuccessful ST CD renditions were identified in both interpreting groups, each interpreter group showing different unsuccessful transfers. Unsuccessful strategies employed by English A interpreters accounted for 9.1 % of cases, while the Czech A interpreters employed unsuccessful strategies in 2.6 % of cases.

Concerning the extent to which interpreters explicitated cohesive ties which were present in the source texts only implicitly, interpreters working in the C>A direction added 4 explanatory conjunctions, accounting for 12.1 % of cases of all renditions of cohesive devices (CDs). As for interpreters working in A>B direction, they made explicit 8 ST cohesive ties, which accounted for 10.4 % of cases (difference = 1.7 %).

---

[63] They retained the same CD or reemployed a different CD with the same or similar cohesive function, or paraphrased the ST CD

6.4 Discussion

Through our parallel analysis we aimed at answering our research question: *How does interpreting directionality influence the way ST cohesive ties are recreated in the TTs by EP interpreters working in the CZ-EN direction?* and our specific research question: *How does interpreting directionality influence the way ST implicit cohesive ties are explicitated in the TTs by EP interpreters working in the CZ-EN direction?* Let us first deal with the specific research question and further on with the main research question.

The explicitation strategy (i.e. CDs implicit in the ST were added in the TT)[64] accounted for a larger proportion in the group of C>A interpreters than in the group of A>B interpreters, although the incidence was higher in the A>B direction (difference = 4). The discrepancy is caused by smaller incidence of CDs in the STs interpreted in the C>A direction. Proportionally speaking, the rate of ST cohesive ties explicitation in the output of interpreters working in the C>A direction did not differ markedly from that of interpreters working in the A>B direction (difference = 1.7 %). To answer our specific research question, directionality in the CZ-EN direction does not seem to influence the way professional EP interpreters tend to explicitate the cohesive ties which were only present implicitly in the ST.

Let us now proceed to attempting answering our main research question. First, we will take a look at the success with which interpreters dealt with recreating ST cohesive ties. The success rate of recreating ST cohesive ties was higher in case of interpreters working into English as their B language than the success rate of C>A interpreters, suggesting that retour interpreters dealt with the task better. However, the divergence between the two success rates (difference = 6.5 %) is not prominent to make any conclusions about directionality influencing the success with which the ST CDs are reestablished in the two directions. Directionality does not seem to have great influence on the success with which the ST cohesive ties are recreated by EP interpreters in the CZ-EN direction.

Next, let us investigate the way ST CDs were recreated in both interpreter groups. The ST CDs were rendered explicitly[65] (i.e. the same/different/or

---

[64] Falling into the *(f)* category
[65] Falling into the *(a), (b), (c)* categories

reformulated CD was used with the same cohesive function) more often by English B interpreters than by English A interpreters (difference = 13.3 %). English B interpreters paraphrased[66] slightly more often than English A interpreters (difference = 1.7 %). English A interpreters omitted the ST CDs[67] more often than English B interpreters, although the difference is not prominent (difference = 3.9 %) to make any conclusions. It is also interesting to note that the unsuccessful ST CD renditions employed by English A interpreters and those used by English B interpreters fell into mutually exclusive categories. However, the incidence of unsuccessful strategies was so low that it is impossible to draw any conclusions in this respect.

To answer our research question *"How does interpreting directionality influence the way ST cohesive ties are recreated in the TTs by EP interpreters working in the CZ-EN direction?"*, English B interpreters tend to retain the ST CDs in their TTs more often than English A interpreters. Both groups seem to use different CDs with same cohesive function or paraphrase ST CDs in nearly equal measure. The success rate with which interpreters render the ST cohesive ties does not seem to be influenced by directionality either.

However, the C>A interpreters were lower in number, resulting in a smaller C>A corpus, a shortcoming of our analysis stemming from the actual situation of availability of English A interpreters in the European Parliament. The results of our analysis that: a) Interpreters explicitated in equal measure in both directions, b) English B interpreters retained ST CDs more often than English A interpreters, and c) Interpreters were equally successful in recreating cohesive ties, regardless the interpreting direction – may have been influenced by the fact. The fact that English A interpreters working out of Czech are not large in number may have lead to individual aspect dominance in certain cases.

We believe that our method of parallel analysis of authentic political speeches by MEPs and their renditions by professional interpreters working into English (i.e. in the same language direction) in C>A direction and into A>B direction was appropriately adopted, as it gave answers to our research question.

---

[66] Falling into the *(c)* category
[67] Falling into the *(e)* category

Our findings on explicitation of cohesive ties, which were gained from the output of professional EP interpreters working in the CZ-EN direction differ from findings by Gumul (2006), who analyzed explicitation of connectives on student interpreters in the PO-EN direction. Whereas the students with Polish A and English B tended to explicitate connectives more often when interpreting into B, the explicitation of connectives by the two groups of professionals in our study did not seem to be influenced by directionality, as they made ST cohesive ties explicit in nearly equal measure.

The fact that English B interpreters retained ST CDs more often (employing their exact equivalents with same cohesive function) than English A interpreters may give support to the theory that B interpreters tend to follow the ST structure more than A interpreters. Nevertheless, the fact remains that there were successfully transferred.

Employing a different conjunction and paraphrasing ST CDs[68] were types of CD renditions which did not differ markedly in measure in the two groups, suggesting these are not influenced by directionality. This may challenge the view that interpreting performance is more prone to language interference in B interpreting (e.g. Seleskovitch or Dejean) and that the tendency towards literalness is higher in B interpreting than in A interpreting (Dejean)

The fact that success rate of ST cohesive ties recreation did not differ markedly in the two directions is in line with Dose's findings of her study on recreation of cohesive ties on different language pairs, as she also concluded (inter alia) that "interpreting direction *per sei* does not consistently affect the success with which interpreters recreate source speech cohesive relations" (2006, 83).

According to our findings, the success rate with which interpreters recreate the ST cohesive ties does not seem to be influenced by directionality. The quality criterion of cohesion measured by recreation of cohesive ties in interpreters' TTs was high in both directions, with A>B direction success rate being even slightly higher than that of interpreters working in the C>A direction. This fact places retour interpreting, or interpreting into B, on a par with interpreting into one's mother tongue as concerns recreation of cohesive ties by interpreters. This finding

---

[68] Falling into the *(b)* and *(c)* category

contributes to the arguments opposing the prevailing opinion on directionality, which considers interpreting into one's mother tongue as unequivocally superior in quality to retour interpreting (e.g. AIIC).

However, it must be stressed that cohesion is a highly relevant factor when it comes to evaluating quality of interpreters' output. Many variables must be considered, such as interpreter's familiarity with the subject, which is also connected to preparedness; or the interpreter's momentary state and motivation. Moreover, while cohesion in written texts is maintained mainly through syntactic surface structure, in spoken language other cohesive devices come into play, such as rhythm, intonation or pauses.

Further large-scale parallel analysis is required involving more professional interpreters and a larger number of language pairs to shed more light on the issue of influence of directionality on cohesion in simultaneous interpreting.

CONCLUSION

The aim of the present study was to make a modest contribution to the issue of directionality in simultaneous interpreting in the context of cohesion as one of the seven standards of textuality determining interpreters' quality output.

After giving the necessary definitions related to the topic in the theoretical part of our thesis, we provided an overview of research conducted into retour interpreting and directionality. Given the topic of our empirical study, one chapter was then devoted to political discourse following by a chapter on cohesion. We briefly explained the two terms. An overview of research into cohesion was made, following by subchapter on explicitation in simultaneous interpreting.

In order to determine the way source text cohesive ties are re-established by professional interpreters on the Czech-English language pair, we conducted a product-based parallel analysis in the second part of our thesis. To see the influence of directionality on recreation of cohesive ties, we analyzed the output by English A and English B interpreters working in Czech-into-English direction in the European Parliament. The source texts meticulously chosen for the purpose of our study were all political speeches delivered in the European Parliament by six different speakers. Having transcribed the source language speeches (STs) and their interpreted versions (TTs) we first analyzed the STs. We focused on the incidence of cohesive devices establishing logical cohesion of the texts, namely on the devices creating adversative, causative, conditional and concessive relations between the ST segments.

Having identified all the cohesive devices establishing the above mentioned relations between ST segments, an alignment of the original speeches with interpreters' versions was made. The TTs were analyzed to see how the ST cohesive ties were re-established by interpreters in their outputs. Two corpora were thus created, both covering the Czech-into-English interpreting direction, though each with different directionality: one corpus aligning STs with TTs which were interpreted in C>A direction and another corpus aligning STs with TTs interpreted in A>B direction.

Following the analysis of interpreters' outputs, we ascertained that language direction does not seem to influence the success with which ST cohesive ties are

re-established by professional interpreters working in the European Parliament. Secondly, our results suggest that English B interpreters tend to retain the ST cohesive ties more than English A interpreters. And thirdly, the results of our parallel study also indicate that interpreting directionality does not influence the way professional interpreters working in the European Parliament render ST cohesive ties explicit in their TT renditions, as both groups of interpreters explicitated in equal measure.

The results of our analysis indicate that EP interpreters working in the Czech-into-English direction are mostly successful at recreating ST cohesive ties, regardless the directionality, a finding supporting those studies challenging the view of SI into A as unequivocally superior to retour interpreting. The secondary finding that unsuccessful renditions fell into mutually exclusive categories may be studied further in the future.

The fact that the corpus of texts interpreted in the C>A direction was smaller in scale than the A>B corpus as a result of the actual situation of the number of English A interpreters in the EU may have influenced the results. A larger-scale study conducted in the future is needed to shed more light on the issue of directionality influencing cohesion of outputs of professional interpreters working in the Czech-into-English direction as well as in other directions.

The fact remains that cohesion is a highly relevant factor when it comes to evaluating interpreting quality, depending on a number of variables. Furthermore, directionality is not a sole factor influencing cohesion in interpreting output and a whole range of variables should be always considered in this respect as well.

Appendix I

AIIC interpreters currently offer professional interpretation service
in the following language pairs (inter alia):

FROM	INTO	A >A	B > A	C > A	A > B	C > B	# INT.
Czech (CES)	English (ENG)	-	-	-	**8**	1	9
Czech (CES)	French (FRA)	-	-	1	**6**	-	7
Czech (CES)	German (DEU)	1	1	3	**6**	-	11
Czech (CES)	Portuguese (POR)	-	-	1	**-**	-	1
Czech (CES)	Russian (RUS)	1	-	-	**-**	-	1
Czech (CES)	Slovak (SLK)	-	-	4	**-**	1	5
Czech (CES)	Spanish (SPA)	-	-	2	**-**	-	2

FROM	INTO	A >A	B > A	C > A	A > B	C > B	# INT.
Slovak (SLK)	Czech (CES)	-	-	16	**-**	-	16
Slovak (SLK)	English (ENG)	-	-	-	**3**	3	6
Slovak (SLK)	French (FRA)	-	-	-	**1**	1	2
Slovak (SLK)	German (DEU)	-	-	1	**1**	2	4
Slovak (SLK)	Portuguese (POR)	-	1	-	-	-	1
Slovak (SLK)	Russian (RUS)	-	-	2	-	-	2
Slovak (SLK)	Spanish (SPA)	-	-	1	-	-	1

FROM	INTO	A >A	B > A	C > A	A > B	C > B	# INT.
Maltese (MLT)	English (ENG)	1	-	-	**1**	-	2
Maltese (MLT)	Italian (ITA)	-	-	-	**1**	-	1

Appendix II

Source text speeches interpreted in the C>A direction

SPEAKER	TOPIC	DATE	TIME	WPM	INT. (2)
Pospíšil	Prevention of the use of the financial system for the purposes of money laundering or terrorist financing	20.05.15	00:59	141	Int1
	Insolvency proceedings	20.05.15	01:05	153	Int1
	Information accompanying transfers of funds	20.05.15	01:03	133	Int1
	Human rights situation in Crimea, in particular of the Crimean Tatars	04.02.16	01:03	152	Int2
Šojdrová	Maternity leave	20.05.15	01:06	115	Int1
	Commercial relationship between EU and China and market economy status (debate)	01.02.16	01:14	122	Int2
Zahradil	Israel-Palestine after the Gaza war and the role of the EU (debate)	17.09.14	01:11	136	Int1
Polčák	Objection pursuant to Rule 106 on emissions from light passenger and commercial vehicles (Euro 6) (debate)	18.01.16	00:59	143	Int2
Mean value			00:58	122	

Source text speeches interpreted in the A>B direction

SPEAKER	TOPIC	DATE	TIME	WPM	INT. (14)
Pospíšil	Rules on VAT and VAT mini one-stop shop (MOSS) for digital services, books and papers in the EU (debate)	18.05.15	01:38	148	Int9
	Insolvency proceedings	19.05.15	01:33	142	Int6
	UN International conference on financing for development (13-16 July 2015) - Tax avoidance and tax evasion as challenges in developing countries (debate)	07.07.15	01:10	140	Int16
	European Agenda on Security (debate) (Právo, Islámský stát, terorismus, zahr. bojovníci)	07.07.15	00:58	146	Int10
	Annual report on human rights and democracy in the world 2014 and the EU policy on the matter (debate) (Saudi Arabia criticism)	16.12.15	02:01	148	Int15
	Malaysia (Human rights in Malaysia, criminal law)	17.12.15	01:08	152	Int8
	Annual report 2014 on the Protection of the EU's financial interests - Fight against fraud (debate)	07.03.16	01:04	137	Int8
	Freedom of expression in Kazakhstan	10.03.16	01:07	145	Int5
Šojdrová	Maternity leave (debate)	19.05.15	00:58	134	Int6
	EU Strategy for equality between women and men post 2015 (debate) (without last 17s - READ)	08.06.15	02:00	116	Int4
	Humanitarian situation of refugees within the EU and neighbouring countries (continuation of debate)	06.10.15	01:02	113	Int12
	Outcome of the Valletta summit of 11 and 12 November 2015 and of the G20 summit of 15 and 16 November 2015 (debate)	25.11.15	00:59	125	Int13
	Aid scheme for the supply of fruit and vegetables, bananas and milk in the educational establishments (debate)	07.03.16	01:07	134	Int7
Zahradil	Human rights in EU-Vietnam trade negotiations (debate)	23.11.15	01:10	136	Int11
	Outcome of the Valletta summit of 11 and 12 November 2015 and of the G20 summit of 15 and 16 November 2015 (debate)	25.11.15	01:12	130	Int13
	Refugee emergency, external borders control and future of Schengen - Respect for the international principle of non-refoulement - Financing refugee facility for Turkey - Increased racist hatred and violence against	02.02.16	01:06	141	Int14
Zdechovský	Annual report 2013 on the protection of EU's financial interests - Fight against fraud (debate) (2nd part - IMPROMPTU)	10.03.15	00:33	113	Int5
	Prevention of the use of the financial system for the purposes of money laundering or terrorist financing - Information accompanying transfers of funds (debate)	19.05.15	01:40	117	Int3
	Anti-Semitism, Islamophobia and hate speech in Europe (debate)	14.10.15	01:08	114	Int12
Mach	One-minute speeches on matters of political importance: Corruption	18.01.16	01:11	115	Int5
Polčák	Stocktaking and challenges of the EU Financial Services Regulation (debate)	18.01.16	01:05	141	Int5
Mean value			01:14	133	

Appendix III

Incidence of adversative, causative, conditional and concessive devices in the source texts interpreted in the C>A direction (30)

	Adversative (11)	Causative (15)	Conditional (4)	Concessive (0)
Zahradil 17/09 '14	*a ne*	*a je to protože* *protože* (2)	*pokud*	-
Pospíšil I 20/05 '15	-	*protože* *tedy*	-	-
Pospíšil II 20/05 '15	*na druhou stranu* *ale*	*a proto* *takže*	-	-
Pospíšil III 20/05 '15	*ale bohužel* *ale*	*proto* *a tak*	*pokud (2)*	-
Šojdrová 20/01 '15	-	*proto*	-	-
Pospíšil IV 4/02 '16	-	*takže*	-	-
Šojdrová 1/02 '16	*ale (2)* *a přitom*	*proto, že* *tedy* *k čemu*	*když*	-
Polčák 18/01 '16	*nicméně* *naopak* *ale*	*protože*	-	-

Incidence of adversative, causative, conditional and concessive devices in the source texts interpreted in the A>B direction

	Adversative (21)	Causative (30)	Conditional (14)	Concessive (3)
Pospíšil 18/05 '15	-	*protože tedy (2)*	*pokud (5)*	-
Pospíšil 19/05 '15	*nicméně*	*tak*	*pokud*	-
Pospíšil 7/07 '15	-	*proto a tak*	-	-
Pospíšil 7/07 '15	-	*tedy*	-	-
Pospíšil 16/12 '15	*ale*	-	-	-
Pospíšil 17/12 '15	*ale*	*tedy*	*jenom v případě, že*	-
Pospíšil 7/03 '16	*ale*	*totiž proto*	-	-
Pospíšil 10/03 '16	-	*pak*	*pokud jinak*	-
Zahradil 23/11 '15	*nicméně*	-	-	-
Zahradil 25/11 '15	*ale (2)*	*proto protože*	*jestli pokud*	-
Zahradil 2/02 '16	-	*takže protože*	*pokud*	-
Šojdrová 8/06 '15	*ale*	*protože (2) tím pádem výsledkem proto proč (2)*	-	*přestože (2)*
Šojdrová 6/10 '15	*ale*	*proto proč*	-	-
Šojdrová 25/11 '15	*ale (2)*	*protože*	-	*přesto, že*
Šojdrová 19/05 '15	*ale*	*a proto i proto, že*	-	-
Šojdrová 7/03 '16	*ale (2)*	-	-	-
Mach 18/01 '16	*a stejně*	-	-	-
Polčák 18/01 '16	*a zároveň*	*protože*	-	-
Zdechovský 10/03	*ale*	-	*pokud (2)*	-
Zdechovský 14/10	*ale*	-	-	-
Zdechovský 19/05	*ale (2)*	*proto (2)*		

SHRNUTÍ

Tato diplomová práce se věnovala direkcionalitě v tlumočení a jejím vlivem na zachovávání koheze zdrojového textu v textu tlumočníků. Práce si kladla za cíl přispět do diskuze o direkcionalitě v simultánním tlumočení, a to v oblasti koheze. Koheze byla jakožto jeden ze standardů utvářejících textualitu zvolena jako kritérium hodnocení kvality výkonů tlumočníků. Koheze je totiž úzce spjata s koherencí, tedy druhým standardem textuality, a společně tak výrazně přispívají k celkové kvalitě tlumočení.

Výzkum o direkcionalitě v simultánním tlumočení a jejím vlivu na kohezi v tlumočnickém výkonu není rozsáhlý a jednotlivé studie jsou pouze malého měřítka. Dále ve výzkumu chybí studium výkonů profesionálních tlumočníků. Jen malá hrstka autorů v této oblasti se zabývala jediným jazykovým směrem, tedy například směrem CZ-EN z pohledu direkcionality. Praktická část práce si proto vytyčila za cíl přispět do diskuze o direkcionalitě analýzou autentických tlumočnických výkonů profesionálních tlumočníků, kteří pracují v Evropském parlamentu ve směru z češtiny do angličtiny, a to jak ve směru do angličtiny jako mateřského jazyka, tak ve směru do angličtiny jako do jazyka B.

Na základě teoretických i praktických poznatků jsme na začátku práce formulovali výzkumnou otázku: *Jaký vliv má direkcionalita na způsob, jakým tlumočníci Evropského parlamentu zachovávají kohezní vazby zdrojového textu ve směru tlumočení z češtiny do angličtiny?* Jako doprovodnou otázku týkající se strategie explicitace jsme si položili následující: *Jaký vliv má direkcionalita na způsob, jakým tlumočníci Evropského parlamentu explicitují kohezní vazby zdrojového textu ve směru z češtiny do angličtiny?*

Po formulaci výzkumných otázek v úvodu práce jsme také vymezili postup a metodologii budoucí analýzy. Dále následovaly dvě hlavní části, tvořící stěžejní obsah naší práce. Teoretická část se skládá z celkem pěti kapitol. Praktická část je tvořena šestou kapitolou. Tato kapitola je věnována analýze, která si kladla za cíl zodpovědět výzkumné otázky, které jsme formulovali v úvodu.

První kapitola teoretické části je věnována definování *jazyka B*, jelikož s tímto termínem pracujeme v průběhu celé práce. Nejdříve je jazyk B definován

z pohledu mezinárodní asociace AIIC, který je všeobecně uznáván. Další podkapitola přispívá definicemi různých autorů. Druhá kapitola pak definuje další důležité termíny pro naši práci: *direkcionalita* a *retour*. Po vymezení obou termínů následuje krátké pojednání o historii retouru ve srovnání se současnou situací na trhu tlumočení. Několik podkapitol je také věnováno tlumočení v institucích Evropské unie, jelikož v praktické části budeme analyzovat výkon tlumočníků pracujících pro Evropský parlament. Dále je vysvětleno postavení retouru v jednotlivých institucích EU a níže role retouru v České republice. Poslední podkapitola slouží jako úvod ke třetí kapitole o výzkumu a vymezuje dnes již poněkud překonané bipolární názory na retour, které jsou reprezentovány dvěma hlavními translatologickými školami.

Třetí kapitola poskytuje náhled na direkcionalitu z pohledů teoretiků i praktiků. Mnohé výzkumy zabývající se direkcionalitou dokazují nesporné výhody tlumočení *do* mateřského jazyka, avšak někteří také ověřili praktičnost tlumočení ve směru *z* mateřského jazyka do aktivního cizího jazyka. Přestože se výsledky výzkumu zdají být protichůdné, mezi teoretiky i praktiky dnes platí, že na direkcionalitu je třeba nahlížet ze širšího kontextu a že je třeba brát v potaz více proměnných. Tyto proměnné jsou podrobněji rozebrány v podkapitolách.

Pro uvedení našeho výzkumu do užšího kontextu jsme do naší teoretické části zařadili kapitolu o politickém diskurzu a kapitolu pojednávající o kohezi. Kapitola čtvrtá tedy vysvětluje pojem *politický diskurz* a dále definuje charakter politických projevů pronášených na půdě Evropského parlamentu. V podkapitole diskutujeme jednotlivé problémy, se kterými se musí potýkat čeští retouristé (a nejen ti) při tlumočení velmi specifických projevů přednášených členy Evropského parlamentu během plenárních diskuzí.

V poslední, páté kapitole naší teoretické části je vysvětlen pojem *koheze*, jelikož se jedná o stěžejní termín prostupující naší praktickou částí. Uvedeme několik studií, které byly provedeny na poli simultánního tlumočení na téma koheze a připojíme kapitolu o explicitaci kohezních prvků v cílových textech tlumočníků. Na základě poznatků Doseové a Gumulové jsme formulovali výzkumnou otázku, na kterou jsme se pokusili odpovědět pomocí analýzy provedené v praktické části.

V praktické části diplomové práce byla provedena paralelní analýza, založena na metodě výzkumu direkcionality doporučované Kalinovou. Dle této metody se má nejprve zvolit zkoumaný jazykový směr, ve kterém budou výchozí nahrávky tlumočeny současně do jazyka A a do jazyka B. Kalinová dále zdůrazňuje, že pro objektivní výzkum direkcionality je třeba zkoumat výkon profesionálních tlumočníků. Jazykový směr zvolen pro naši analýzu byl směr z češtiny do angličtiny. Požadavek zkoumání výkonu profesionálních tlumočníků byl také zajištěn. Z praktických důvodů vyplývajících z efektivity tlumočení v Evropském parlamentu však nebylo možné zajistit přetlumočení stejných nahrávek. Tento požadavek by byl jistě relevantní pro studium např. tlumočnických strategií. Naše analýza však byla zaměřena na zachovávání kohezních prvků, což bylo možné měřit poměrově. Srovnatelnost výchozích nahrávek však byla zajištěna díky pečlivému výběru, založeném na řádce proměnných. Pro srovnatelnost výchozích nahrávek jsme vzali v potaz řečníky a jejich jednotlivé řečnické styly společně s prozodickými prvky. Zdrojové nahrávky jsme dále vybírali na základě jejich celkového charakteru, jmenovitě zda se jednalo o projevy čtené, předem připravené či pronesené spatra. Mezi další proměnné, na základě kterých byly zdrojové nahrávky vybírány, patří například míra redundance, délka projevu či tempo řeči.

Finální autentické nahrávky, které jsme vyextrahovali z databáze ep-live dostupné on-line, byly tlumočené v obou tlumočnických směrech, tedy jak do jazyka A, tak do jazyka B. Po vyřazení všech nevhodných nahrávek nám zůstalo 8 nahrávek tlumočených do jazyka A, zatímco nahrávek tlumočených do jazyka B bylo celkem 21. Tlumočnické výkony byly transkribovány a posazeny vedle textu přepsaných výchozích nahrávek. Vznikly tak dva korpusy zdrojových a cílových textů, z nichž každý byl tlumočen ve stejném jazykovém směru (do angličtiny) avšak v jiném směru tlumočení: jeden korpus se sestával z nahrávek tlumočených do angličtiny jako do jazyka A a druhý z nahrávek tlumočených do angličtiny jako do jazyka B.

V této fázi již bylo možné provést nejprve analýzu zdrojových textů za účelem identifikace jednotlivých kohezních prvků, které vyjadřují logické vztahy mezi jednotlivými segmenty zdrojového textu. Jmenovitě jsme se zaměřili na prvky

vyjadřující poměr odporovací, poměr příčinný a důsledkový, poměr podmínkový a poměr přípustkový.

Dalším krokem bylo zjištění, jak jsou tyto kohezní prvky převáděny v cílovém textu tlumočníků, dále pak identifikace typu převedení za účelem kategorizace, která byla provedena na základě klasifikace Doseové a adaptována pro naše účely.

Výskyty jednotlivých kategorií pak byly převedeny do výsledné tabulky a v případě obou korpusů byla výsledná čísla následně převedena do formy procentuální, abychom mohli provést srovnání obou korpusů. Na základě výše zmíněného postupu jsme obdrželi následující výsledky:

a) Skupina tlumočníků tlumočících do angličtiny jako do jazyka A a skupina tlumočníků tlumočících do angličtiny jako do jazyka B vykazovaly obě stejnou míru explicitace.

b) Tlumočníci tlumočící do angličtiny jako do jazyka B zachovávali kohezní prvky zdrojového textu častěji (v různých podobách) než tlumočníci pracující do angličtiny jako do jazyka A.

c) Úspěšnost, s jakou tlumočníci zachovávali kohezní prvky výchozího textu, byla vysoká u obou směrů tlumočení. Procentuelně se lišila jen marginálně. Dle našich výsledků byla úspěšnost tlumočníků s angličtinou jako jazykem B mírně vyšší než u tlumočníků s angličtinou jako jazykem B, ale ne natolik, aby bylo možné utvářet závěry.

Výsledky jsou projednávány v diskuzi, která následuje po této kapitole. Výsledky naší analýzy naznačují, že úspěšnost převodu kohezních prvků u tlumočníků Evropského parlamentu, kteří tlumočí ve směru z čeština do angličtiny, není ovlivněna direkcionalitou jako takovou, což souhlasí s poznatky Doseové. Co se týče míry explicitace kohezních vazeb v cílovém textu tlumočníků, zdá se, že profesionálové EP ve směru CZ-EN explicitují ve stejné míře v obou tlumočnických směrech, tj. do jazyka A i do jazyka B. Tyto výsledky nepotvrzují poznatky Gumulové, která zjistila podstatně vyšší míru explicitace kohezních prvků u studentů tlumočení. Důraz je však v naší práci kladen na fakt, že výsledky mohly být ovlivněny menším korpusem textů tlumočených ve směru C>A a stejně tak i nižším počtem tlumočníků C>A, což mohlo vést k dominanci individuální složky.

Přestože naše výsledky naznačují, že direkcionalita jako taková na úspěšnost udržování kohezních vazeb tlumočníky nemá vliv, určité rozdíly jsme identifikovali, jako např. ten, že tlumočníci A>B mají vyšší tendenci zdrojové prvky zachovávat explicitně v různé podobě, ať už anglickým přesným ekvivalentem či jiným ekvivalentem vyjadřujícím stejný vztah mezi segmenty. Tento fakt může být spjatý s teorií, která naznačuje, že tlumočníci pracující do jazyka B více kopírují zdrojovou strukturu a méně využívají strategii deverbalizace. Ať to tak je či není, skutečnost je taková, že tlumočníci, kteří tlumočili ve směru A>B volili neúspěšné strategie převedení kohezních prvků jen v malém zlomku případů, stejně jako tlumočníci, kteří texty tlumočili ve směru C>A. Co je však zajímavé je to, že jednotlivé neúspěšné strategie spadaly do vzájemně výlučných kategorií u každého ze směrů tlumočení.

Naše výsledky naznačují, že na kvalitu tlumočení profesionálních tlumočníků hodnocenou z pohledu převodu kohezních prvků direkcionalita nemá vliv. Práce tak přispívá do diskuze o direkcionalitě argumentem, že tlumočení do jazyka A nemusí být vždy vyšší kvality a že oba směry si mohou být rovny, minimálně co se týče zachovávání kohezních prvků. Je však třeba držet na paměti, že výsledky jsou relativní a jejich platnost je třeba ověřit na výzkumu provedeném ve větším měřítku.

REFERENCES

Adams, Christine. "What Is a B language?" *EMCI Workshop: Teaching Simultaneous Interpretation into a "B" Language*, 2002, 20-22.

Al-Salman, S. and R. Al-Khanji. "The native language factor in simultaneous interpretation in an Arabic/English context." *Meta* 47, no. 4 (2002): 607-626.

Bartłomiejczyk, Magdalena. "Simultaneous interpreting A-B vs. B-A from the interpreters' standpoint." In *Claims, changes and challenges in translation studies: Selected contributions from the EST Congress, Copenhagen 2001*, edited by Hansen, Malmkjaer & Gile, 239-249. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2004.

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. "Shifts in cohesion and coherence in translation." In *The translation studies reader,* edited by L. Venuti, 290-305. London: Routledge. 1986/2002.

Campbell, Stuart. *Translation into the Second Language*. London/New York: Longman, 1998.

Čeňková, Ivana. "Les interprètes de langue tchèque au sein des institutions européennes." *Studia UBB. Philologia* 56, no.1 (2011): 163-174.

Čeňková, Ivana. "Retour et relais : deux techniques en interprétation de conférence pour les langues de faible diffusion." *Folia Translatologica* 6 (1999): 37-40.

Čeňková, Ivana. *Teorie a didaktika tlumočení I*. Praha: FF UK DTP, 2001.

Chang, Chien and Diane L. Schallert. "The impact of directionality on Chinese/English simultaneous interpreting." *Interpreting* 9, no. 2 (2007): 137-176.

Darò, V., S. Lambert and F. Fabbro. "Conscious monitoring of attention during simultaneous interpretation." *Interpreting* 1, no.1 (1996): 101-124.

Denissenko, Jevgeni. "Communicative and Interpretative Linguistics." (1989) In *The Theoretical and Practical Aspects of Teaching Conference Interpretation*, edited by Gran, L. Taylor, Ch., 155-158. Udine: Campanotto Editore, 2004.

Diriker, Ebru. "Conference Interpreting." In *The Routledge Handbook for Interpreting,* edited by Holly Mikkelson and Renée Jourdenais, 171-185. Routledge Handbooks, 2015.

Donovan, Clare. "Survey of Users expectations and needs." In *EMCI Workshop: Teaching Simultaneous Interpretation into a "B" Language*, 2002, 2-11.

Donovan, Clare. "Teaching simultaneous interpretation into B: A challenge for responsible interpreter training." In Godijns, R. & M. Hinderdael (eds.) *Communication & Cognition* 38, no. 1 & 2 (2005): 147-166.

Enkvist, Nils. E. "Connexity, Interpretability, Universes of Discourse, and Text Worlds." In *Possible Worlds in Humanities, Arts, and Sciences. Proceedings of Nobel Symposium 65*, edited by S. Allen, 162-186. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1989.

Gaiba, Francesca. *The origins of Simultaneous Interpretation: The Nuremberg Trial.* Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1998.

Gile, Daniel. "Directionality in Conference Interpreting: A Cognitive View." In Godijns, R. & M. Hinderdael (eds.) *Communication & Cognition* 38, no. 1 & 2 (2005): 9-26.

Gile, Daniel. "Scientific Research vs. Personal Theories in the Investigation of Interpretation." In *Aspects of Applied an Experimental Research on Conference Interpretation,* edited by L. Grand and C. Taylor, 28-41. Udine: Campanotto Editore, 1990.

Godijns, Rita, and Michaël Hinderdael. "Directionality in Interpreting: The 'Retour' or the 'Native'?" *Communication & Cognition* 38, no. 1 & 2 (2005): 3-8.

Gumul, Ewa. "Explicitation & Directionality in Simultaneous Interpreting." (2006b) Available online: http://www.emcinterpreting.org/?q=system/files/Explicitation%20Directionality%20SI%20Gumul.pdf (Accessed 24 April 2016)

Gumul, Ewa. "Explicitation in Conference Interpreting." In *Translation and Meaning,* edited by Thelen, M. & Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. Part 7. Maastricht: Department of Translation and Interpreting, Maastricht School of International Communication, Zuyd University, 2006c.

Gumul, Ewa. "Explicitation in Simultaneous Interpreting: a Strategy or a By-product of Language Mediation?" *Across Languages and Cultures* 7, no.2 (2006a): 171-190. DOI 10.1556/Acr.7.2006.2.2

Hönig, Hans G. "Piece of Cake – or Hard to Take?" In *EMCI Workshop: Teaching Simultaneous Interpretation into a "B" Language*, 2002, 38-50.

Hu, Kaibao. "Corpus-Based Interpreting Studies." In *Introducing Corpus-based Translation Studies,* edited by Kaibao Hu, Shanghai and Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg: Shanghais Jiao Tong University Press. 2016. DOI 10.1007/978-3-662-48218-6_8.

Huddleston, Rodney, and Geoffrey K. Pullum. *A Student's Introduction to English Grammar*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Jones, Roderick. *Conference Interpreting Explained*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 1998.

Kalina, Sylvia. "Measure for measure – Comparing Speeches with their Interpreted Versions." In *Interpreting Quality: A Look Around and Ahead,* edited by Zwischenberger, Cornelia & Behr, Martina, 15-34. Berlin: Frank & Timme (RBD), 2015.

Kalina, Sylvia. "Quality in the Interpreting Process: What can Be Measured and How?" In Godijns, R. & M. Hinderdael (eds.) *Communication & Cognition* 38, no. 1 & 2 (2005): 27-46.

Kraus, Jiří. "Vyjadřování polemičnosti a významových opozic v politickém diskurzu." In *Jazyk, média, politika,* edited by Čmejrková et al. 13-39. Praha: Academia, 2003.

Kurz, Ingrid. "Conference Interpretation: Expectations of Different User Groups." *The Interpreters' Newsleter* 5 (1993): 13-21.

Le Bart Christian, "L'analyse du discours politique : de la théorie des champs à la sociologie de la grandeur." In *Mots. La ville, entre dire et faire*, edited by Olivier Ratouis, 97-110. no. 72, July 2003.

Mackintosh, Jennifer. "Interpreters are Made not Born." *Interpreting* 4, no. 1 (1999): 67-80.

Martin, Anne. "Interpreting from A to B: A Spanish Case Study." In Godijns, R. & M. Hinderdael (eds.) *Communication & Cognition* 38, no. 1 & 2 (2005): 83-100.

Minns, Philip. "Language interpreting into B." In *EMCI Workshop: Teaching Simultaneous Interpretation into a "B" Language*, 2002, 35-37.

Newmark, Peter. *A Textbook of Translation,* Shanghai: Shanghai foreign language education press, 1988.

Øverås, L. "Search of the Third Code. An Investigation of Norms in Literary Translation." *Meta* 43, no. 4 (1998): 571–590.

Padilla, Presentación. "Cognitive Implications of the English-Spanish direction for the Quality and the Training of Simultaneous interpreting." In Godijns, R. & M. Hinderdael (eds.) *Communication & Cognition* 38, no. 1 & 2 (2005): 47-62.

Pavlović, Nataša. "Directionality in translation and interpreting practice. Report on a questionnaire survey in Croatia." *Forum* 5 (2007): 79-95.

Pöchhacker, Franz and Zwischenberger, Cornelia. "Quality and Role in Conference Interpreting." In *Interpreting Quality: A Look Around and Ahead*, edited by Cornelia Zwischenberger and Martina Behr, 7-14. Frank and Timme. Berlin, 2015.

Pöchhacker, Franz. *Introducing Interpreting Studies*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Pym, Anthony. "Explaining Explicitation." In *New Trends in Translation Studies. In Honour of Kinga Klaudy*, edited by Krisztina Károly and Fóris A., 29-34. Budapest: Akadémia Kiadó, 2005.

Seel, Olaf-Immanuel. "Non-verbal Means as Culture-specific Determinants that Favour Directionality into the Foreign Language in Simultaneous Interpreting." In Godijns, R. & M. Hinderdael (eds.) *Communication & Cognition* 38, no. 1 & 2 (2005): 63-82.

Seleskovitch, Danica, and Marianne Lederer. *Pédagogie raisonée de l'interprétation,* Luxemburg: Opoce, 2002.

Shabani, Karim. "Investigating cohesion in simultaneous interpretation: A parallel corpora-based study." *Translation Studies* 6, no. 22 (2008): 23-38.

Shlesinger, Miriam. "Corpus-Based Interpreting Studies as an Offshot of Corpus-based Translation Studies." *Meta: Translators' Journal* 43, no 4. (1998): 486-493. DOI: 10.7202/004136ar

Shlesinger, Miriam. "Shifts in Cohesion in Simultaneous Interpreting." *Translator* 1, no. 2, (1995): 193–212. DOI 10.1080/13556509.1995.10798957

Shveitser, Aleksandr. "At the Dawn of Simultaneous interpreting in Russia." *Interpreting* 4, no. 1, (1999): 23-28. . DOI 10.1075/intp.4.1.04sve

Szabari, Krisztina. "Interpreting into the B language." In *EMCI Workshop: Teaching Simultaneous Interpretation into a "B" Language*, 2002, 12-19.

Tommola Jorma and Marketta Helevä. "Language direction and source text complexity. Effects on trainee performance in simultaneous interpreting." In *Unity in Diversity? Current Trends in Translation Studies,* edited by Bowker et al., 177-186. Manchester: St. Jerome, 1998.

van Dijk, Teun A. "What Is Political Discourse Analysis?" In *Political linguistics*, edited by Dins Blommaert, J. and Bulcaen, Ch., 11-52. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1986/1998.

Vuorikoski, Anna Riitta. "Simultaneous Interpreting as Experienced by the Audience." In *Connections. Proceedings of the 36th Annual Conference of ATA,* edited by P. Krawutschke, 165-174. Medford: Information Today, 1995.

Dissertations:

Chang, Chien. "Directionality in Chinese/English Simultaneous Interpreting: Impact on Performance and Strategy Use." PhD dissertation, University of Texas, 2005.

Gumul, Ewa. "Cohesion in Interpreting." PhD dissertation, University of Silesia, 2004a.

Kodym, Jakub. "Zkušenosti se simultánním tlumočením do jazyka B v institucích EU." Master's thesis, Charles University, 2006.

Malkovska, Alžběta. "Strategie tlumočníka při simultánním tlumočení do mateřštiny a do aktivního cizího jazyka." PhD dissertation, Charles University, 2012.

Niska, Helge. "Text Linguistic Models for the Study of Simultaneous Interpreting." Stockholm University, 1999.

Opdenhoff, Jan-Hendrik. "Estudio sobre la direccionalidad en interpretación de conferencias: de las teorías a la práctica profesional." PhD dissertation, University of Granada, 2011.

Other sources:

Zpráva Evropského účetního dvora. Zvláštní zpráva č. 5/2005. Výdaje na tlumočení. Úřední věstník EU1 C 291.

Internet sources:

http://www.askot.cz/

http://aiic.net

http://ec.europa.eu

http://www.europarl.europa.eu

---

[i] http://aiic.net/page/4004/working-languages/lang/1

[ii] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fuzztez8dtE

[iii] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Drj3ltsEriU&nohtml5=False

[iv] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ahgj65-3B1M&nohtml5=False

[v] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Drj3ltsEriU&nohtml5=False

[vi] In 2010 it oversaw 109,667 interpreting days, which cost each EU citizen 2.3 EUR,
http://www.commonsenseadvisory.com/Default.aspx?Contenttype=ArticleDetAD&tabID=63
&Aid=2094&moduleId=390; (cf. 0.28 EUR per citizen a year in 2003, i. e. = 105 million EUR)

[vii] http://www.europarl.europa.eu/aboutparliament/en/20150201PVL00013/Multilingualism

[viii] http://www.europarl.europa.eu/interpretation/en/the-interpreter.html; (in 2012 video the
Acting Director Responsible for Recruitment ACI, J. C. Jimenéz Marín, says 2/3 are covered by
freelance)

[ix] http://www.commonsenseadvisory.com/Default.aspx?Contenttype=ArticleDetAD&tabID=63&Ai
d=2094&moduleId=390

[x] http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+IM-
PRESS+20060403FCS06935+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN

[xi] http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-05-9_en.htm (Memo, February 17, 2004)

[xii] that's why interpreters are systematically learning new C languages,
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Drj3ltsEriU&nohtml5=False

[xiii] http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/scic/what-is-conference-interpreting/pivot/index_en.htm

[xiv] 2011, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bzqIu0FOp8U&nohtml5=False

[xv] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fuzztez8dtE

[xvi] information gathered from the official ASKOT website and the application form is available on
http://www.askot.cz/custom/memberAskotNew.aspx?itemID=0&languageID=2

[xvii] 2013, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fuzztez8dtE

[xviii] see More than Words: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=IM-
PRESS&reference=20060403FCS06935&format=XML&language=EN

[xix] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bzqIu0FOp8U&nohtml5=False

ANNOTATION

Author	Tereza Schleiderová
Department	Department of English and American Studies, Faculty of Arts, University Palacky
Czech title	**Direkcionalita v simultánním tlumočení a kohezní vazby:** Převod kohezních vazeb u tlumočníků pracujících v Evropském parlamentu do angličtiny jako do jazyka A a jako do jazyka B
English title	**Directionality in simultaneous interpreting and cohesive ties:** Recreation of cohesive ties by European Parliament interpreters working into English A and English B
Supervisor	PhDr. Dominika Winterová
Number of pages	115
Number of characters	184 980
Number of Annexes	3
Key words in Czech	simultánní tlumočení, tlumočení v Evropském parlamentu, koheze, kohezní vazby, kohezní prvky, konektory, spojky, převod kohezních vazeb, explicitace v ST
Key words in English	simultaneous interpreting, interpreting in the European Parliament, cohesion, cohesive ties, cohesive devices, connectors, conjunctions, transfer of cohesive ties, explicitation in SI

Annotation in Czech	Tato magisterská práce se zabývá direkcionalitou v simultánním tlumočení a jejím vlivem na udržování koheze zdrojového textu tlumočníky Evropského parlamentu, kteří texty tlumočí z češtiny do angličtiny.
	Následně je provedena paralelní analýza autentických projevů a jejich tlumočených textů, které byly tlumočeny do angličtiny ve směru C>A a ve směru A>B. Analýza se zaměřuje na způsob, jakým tlumočníci zachovávají kohezní vazby zdrojových textů, zejména pak na strategii explicitace.
Annotation in English	The present master thesis deals with SI directionality and its influence on maintaining source language speech cohesion by interpreters working in the European Parliament in the Czech-into-English interpreting direction.
	A parallel analysis of authentic STs and TTs is carried out to see the way English A and English B interpreters recreate source language speech cohesive relations in their target language rendition. Attention is paid to the strategy of explicitation of source text cohesive ties.