

JIHOČESKÁ UNIVERZITA V ČESKÝCH BUDĚJOVICÍCH

FILOZOFICKÁ FAKULTA

ÚSTAV ANGLISTIKY

BAKALÁŘSKÁ PRÁCE

“LOST IN INTERPRETATION” – REDUNDANCY AND FORWARD  
INFERENCE IN SIMULTANEOUS INTERPRETING (SI)

Vedoucí práce: Mgr. Helena Lohrová, Ph. D.

Autor práce: Nela Kratochvílová

Studijní obor: Anglický jazyk a literatura – Francouzský jazyk a literatura

Ročník: 3.

2018

Prohlašuji, že svoji bakalářskou práci jsem vypracovala samostatně pouze s použitím pramenů a literatury uvedených v seznamu citované literatury.

Prohlašuji, že v souladu s § 47b zákona č. 111/1998 Sb. V platném znění souhlasím se zveřejněním své bakalářské práce, a to v nezkrácené podobě elektronickou cestou ve veřejně

přístupné části databáze STAG provozované Jihočeskou univerzitou v Českých Budějovicích

na jejich internetových stránkách, a to se zachováním mého autorského práva k odevzdanému textu této kvalifikační práce. Souhlasím dále s tím, aby toutéž elektronickou

cestou byly v souladu s uvedeným ustanovením zákona č. 111/1998 Sb. Zveřejněny posudky

školitele a oponentů práce i záznam o průběhu a výsledky obhajoby kvalifikační práce.

Rovněž souhlasím s porovnáním textu mé kvalifikační práce s databází kvalifikačních prací

a systémem na odhalování plagiátů.

České Budějovice

.....

Nela Kratochvílová

### **Acknowledgments**

I would like to thank to my supervisor Mgr. Helena Lohrová, Ph. D. for her patience, positive attitude and thorough guidance through my work. Also I would like to thank all interpreters who kindly participated in the experiment and patiently responded to all my questions.

## **Anotace**

Tato bakalářská práce se zaměřuje na průběh simultánního tlumočení (SI). Zabývá se vším, s čím se musí tlumočnický potýkat, aby byl schopen zprávu věrně převést z jednoho jazyka do druhého. Konkrétně zkoumá, co tlumočnický při tlumočení vynechá nebo naopak přidá a jaký okamžitý dopad by tento proces mohl na sdělení mít. Výchozím bodem mé bakalářské práce je dílo Chernova (1994) a jeho zdůraznění problematiky nadbytečnosti jako klíčového prvku jak v porozumění simultánního tlumočení, tak i v jeho zaměření na psychologický proces předvídání “pravděpodobnosti” následného sdělení (prognózování). Nashromáždila jsem a provedla analýzu několika přetlumočených textů, na kterých jsem se snažila ověřit, zdali se dá Chernova teorie aplikovat na simultánní tlumočení z angličtiny do češtiny. Následně jsem udělala rozhovor s několika tlumočnickými s praxí, abych svojí analýzu obohatila o jejich úhel pohledu na problematiku a o jejich zkušenosti v oboru.

## **Abstract**

The bachelor's thesis focuses on the process of simultaneous interpreting (SI). It addresses the issues an interpreter has to tackle in order to transfer the message from the source language to the target language accurately. It specifically examines omissions and inclusions made by the interpreter and the impact these may have on the communication at hand. The departure point for my thesis is the work of Chernov (1994) in particular, his concept of redundancy as a key factor in SI comprehension as well as his emphasis on the psychological process of 'probability' anticipation (forward inferencing). I collected and analysed a set of interpreted texts in order to demonstrate the applicability of Chernov's theory to simultaneous interpretation from English to Czech. A number of practicing interpreters was interviewed in order to triangulate my analysis against their perspectives and experience in the field.

## Contents

<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>2. Methodology</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>3. Data</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>4. Interpreter's multiple task performance</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>5. Semantic redundancy and its role in SI</b> .....	<b>23</b>
5.1. <i>What is redundancy</i> .....	23
5.2. <i>Semantic redundancy in discourse</i> .....	26
5.3. <i>The importance of sense in the discourse</i> .....	29
5.4. <i>Implicit and explicit sense in the discourse</i> .....	30
5.5. <i>Word meaning – the semantic structure of discourse</i> .....	31
5.6. <i>Redundancy as a factor facilitating inferencing</i> .....	33
5.7. <i>Compression</i> .....	34
<b>6. Anticipation and forward inferencing</b> .....	<b>39</b>
6.1. <i>Linguistic inference or syntactic anticipation</i> .....	47
6.2. <i>Cognitive inference or extralinguistic anticipation</i> .....	48
6.2.1. <i>Contextualisation</i> .....	50
6.3. <i>Situational inference</i> .....	51
6.4. <i>Pragmatic inference</i> .....	52
6.5. <i>Interdependence of semantics and background knowledge in inferencing</i> .....	53
6.6. <i>Probability anticipation as a step-by-step process</i> .....	54
6.7. <i>Theme, rheme and their role in comprehension during SI</i> .....	56
6.7.1. <i>Theme</i> .....	56
6.7.2. <i>Rheme</i> .....	57
6.8. <i>Ear-voice span (EVS)</i> .....	58
6.9. <i>Anticipation as psychological aspect of SI</i> .....	59
6.10. <i>Memory in SI</i> .....	61
6.11. <i>Speech rate</i> .....	63
6.12. <i>Attention in the process of SI</i> .....	64
6.13. <i>Self-monitoring and feedback</i> .....	65
<b>7. Omissions and additions in interpretation</b> .....	<b>66</b>
7.1. <i>Omissions</i> .....	66
7.2. <i>Additions</i> .....	68

<b>8. Conclusion.....</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>List of References .....</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>Appendices .....</b>	<b>77</b>

## 1. Introduction

Simultaneous interpreting, further referred to as SI, is a complex activity and requires various skills and abilities from the interpreter. In order to be able to render a message successfully (s)he has to go through a number of phases. (S)he has to linguistically decode the message in order to arrive at an understanding of the meaning of speaker's talk in the source language (SL) Then the interpreter is required to encode the talk into the target language (TL) while preserving its meaning. To do that, the interpreter employs a range of strategies to be as accurate as possible.

Simultaneous interpreting as a linguistic field of study is relatively young and therefore a body of research is yet to be developed. One of the first linguists to study and contribute to this field of research to better understand SI, was the Russian linguist Ghelley V. Chernov (1929-2000). His work focused mainly on the phenomenon of semantic redundancy and on probability anticipation in the act of simultaneous interpretation. His goal was to demonstrate the importance of both of these factors to the work of an interpreter and to show what role semantic redundancy and probability anticipation is playing in SI. The research was underpinned by Chernov's experimental work the main aim of which was to provide support to his theory of message probability anticipation.

The current thesis is based on Chernov's hypothesis described in his work *Inference and Anticipation in Simultaneous Interpreting (2004)*. Favouring psychological and empirical approaches, Chernov (2004) highlights the importance of semantic redundancy in interpreting; in the experimental part of the work, he then infers that differences in speech tend to be ignored by the interpreter if they contradict an expectation based on previous occurrence or background knowledge.

Chernov (2004) describes redundancy as a key factor in an interpreter's work. For him, the essential factor of human communication is that all languages are in their nature redundant thus our communication is always redundant to some extent as well. This redundancy then allows for the probabilistic prediction which makes it easier for the interpreter to grasp the meaning and to leave out any irrelevant or extraneous information. Chernov regards this process as the crucial mechanism in SI.

In his work, Chernov (2004) developed a probability prediction hypothesis demonstrating that message comprehension and reproduction by the interpreter are in



direct relation to the theme-rheme structure of the given message, and that redundancy of the source language (SL) message permits the interpreter to introduce various degrees of comprehension. He undertakes a complex analysis of SI while drawing on linguistic notions of theme and rheme as well as the cognitive structural concepts which are related to the organisation of semantic information stored in memory.

The main purpose of my thesis is to introduce Chernov's concepts of redundancy and probability anticipation and to demonstrate them in action. As a part of my own research, I conducted an experiment trying to determine what role redundancy and probability anticipation play in interpreting and how they are employed by an interpreter.

Going forward, Section Two introduces the methodology employed to present Chernov's theory and explains why and how a simultaneous interpretation experiment was undertaken. Section Three sets out the collected data, their organisation and structure. Section Four presents an overview of the tasks that an interpreter must perform if they are to be considered to be competent in their work role. Section Five, Six and Seven then return to Chernov's theories and address in greater detail the issues of semantic redundancy, anticipation and forward inferencing, and omissions and additions. The data from the experiment are used to illustrate key points in each section. Conclusions are drawn on the basis of the discussion presented.

## **2. Methodology**

To complement and support the theoretical part of the thesis, an experiment was conducted. Chernov's theory expanded in Chapters Five, Six and Seven was applied to simultaneous interpretation from English to Czech. A controlled experiment was designed and undertaken. Its purpose was to ascertain which strategies the interpreter employs when (s)he is interpreting. A further subset of the enquiry was how the interpreter deals with SI when they have prior understanding of the speaker and the context compared to that when interpreting a speech when it is completely unfamiliar to him/her.

Both SI tasks were selected from recent speeches made by politicians. This ensured that they both came from the same genre in order to generate the potential for similarity in the language used. Both speeches were uncomplicated and employed non-specialised vocabulary for ease of comparison. The vocabulary present in both texts would normally be used as part of each interpreter's lexicon. This approach was taken in order to demonstrate the importance of anticipation in SI which is dependent on many aspects including context, background knowledge, and prior preparation of the interpreter.

In order to test Chernov's theory, extracts from two political speeches were chosen to be translated by the interpreters.

### **1. Speech One**

*So I just want to thank – but you know my first major speak was at CPAC and – probably five or six years ago. First major political speech. And you were there. And it was – I loved it. I loved the people. I love the commotion*

*And then they did these polls where I went through the roof and I wasn't even running, right?*

*But it gave me an idea. And I got a little bit concerned when I saw what was happening in the country. And I said, "Let's go to it."*

## 2. Speech Two

*Thank you*

*Good afternoon to all of you*

*It's a great pleasure to be back after two years. When I was last here two years ago, I talked about Britain and why I believe it is better for the UK and certainly the EU that Britain is an engaged and active member of the club. Let's get one thing clear at the start, as we're at the beginning of an election campaign in this country I'm not going to engage in the debate about what fans of The Clash would know as "should I stay or should I go?"*

Speech One was delivered by the current American President Donald Trump at the annual Conservative Political Action Conference (CPAC) outside Washington D.C. in 2017. In the speech, President Trump first talked about his very first experience at CPAC five or six years ago. He then continued talking about his plans and projects with the country restating what he has already promised in his presidential campaign. This extract was taken from the Time magazine website where the speech was published in its entirety.

Speech Two was excerpted from the speech of Frans Timmermans, First Vice-President of the European Union Commission was entitled "A Fresh Start" and was delivered to the Policy Network in London on 6th March 2015. The speech addressed the current political situation in Europe and the relations among the respective EU countries. It was a speech defending the European Union and reacting to discussions about Britain leaving the EU. The speech dates to what may be termed the "pre-BREXIT period". The text was taken from the speech transcript available from the European Commission's website in the Press Release Database.

To test Chernov's theory emphasising the importance of anticipation and his/her overall prior preparation in practice, Speech One was provided to the interpreters with no further context. The interpreter thus had no background knowledge on the subject whatsoever and (s)he had to deal with the raw text, trying to render it as well as (s)he could. Speech Two was however already provided in advance with further information about the speaker, the place and purpose of its delivery, and the interpreters were also

told what the speech would deal with. This approach was adopted in order to see the contrast between the two interpretations. The other reason of choosing the approach was to see how the interpreter will employ anticipation and redundancy in both speeches.

The literature review and Chernov's theories were then presented in the thesis, Chapter Five, Six, and Seven, and complemented with the examples from the experiment to discuss Chernov's theory and to support or challenge this.

Three interpreters participated in the experiment (see in Appendix 2 and 3). All interpreters were experienced in interpreting, this ranged from five to thirty years. All of them were engaged in interpreting various topics, they had no particular specialisation even though each claimed to have one field they felt most comfortable in and which they preferred to interpret; medicine, real estate interpreting, and the judiciary respectively. All of them received university education in the English language although none of them was specialised in interpreting in particular. They started to work as interpreters sometime after they had completed their university studies. All of them wished to remain anonymous.

As part of the experiment, each of the three interpreters was interviewed and further and further core data were collected by means of a semi-structured interview presented in its entirety in Appendix 5. In addition, they were asked to interpret two speeches read to them, one with context provided, the other with no further context at all. They had to simultaneously interpret these speeches from the English language to the Czech language with no further preparation.

Their simultaneous interpretations were recorded then the programme Audacity was used to work with these recordings. Drawing on conversation analytical conventions (Edwards Lampert), transcripts were then produced and were subject to a more detailed analysis to determine what was occurring and to what extent Chernov's theory was applied. The transcript (see in Appendix 5), written representations of the speech employed a selection of transcription markers to encode some of the important features of interpretation, such as hesitations, prosody, pauses and transcriber's comments.

Two types of transcript representations were produced (see in Appendix 4). One providing a record of each interpreter's individual performance, when a chart was created for every interpretation with the Czech version of the text being supplemented

with an interline English translation. In total, six charts following this structure were designed. These transcripts visualise the flow of the interaction in real time, encoding possible overlaps and other relevant aspects of speech. They were instrumental in providing a comparison of the interpreters' individualised interpretation styles. The second type of data presentation takes form of a "parsed transcript" in which the interpreters' utterances were segmented to identically long speech parts. The text interpreted is then presented in one chart, with the speech segments being aligned for all three interpreters. This type of data presentation assisted in comparing the lexical realisation of how the three interpreters undertook the interpretation task.

All charts were labelled with utterances being numbered to enable cross-referencing in the theoretical part of the thesis where the analysed utterances were used as examples. Each chart field consists of three transcription lines. The first line belongs to the speaker and is marked by "S", the second line is then interpreter's rendition of the original text to the Czech language marked as "I1", "I2", or "I3" identifying interpreter one, two or three, and the third line provides an interline translation of the Czech translation into English by the author of the current thesis.

Finally, the interview responses and further data that were collected by means of a semi-structured questionnaire were used to inform the claims made in the thesis. They provided information which enabled easier comprehension of the work of a real interpreter and how (s)he undertakes his/her work and copes with its day-to-day challenges.

### **3. Data**

Chernov's theory was the main keystone to the experiment although other literature sources were used. Works as *Self-Preservation in Simultaneous Interpreting, Surviving the Role* by Claudia Monacelli and *The Interpreting Studies Reader* by Pöchhacker Franz, and Miriam Schlesinger were thoroughly studied and contributed to a comprehension of the anticipation process and its application in the experiment. In addition, publications and articles were studied for a better comprehension of the process and aspects which are included in it. The key publication which contributed to the understanding of the subject of additions and omissions was *The interpreting studies reader* edited by Pöchhacker Franz; Shlesinger Miriam. *Simultaneous interpretation: a cognitive-pragmatic analysis* by Robin Setton was studied in order to arrive at better

comprehension of the issue of context and contextualisation. The relevant key ideas and thoughts contributing to the main focus of the thesis were then described and demonstrated.

Consequently, the relevant literature to the subject was studied and then the data were produced for the analysis. The translations were put into two types of charts presenting two different points of view on the issue.

The first data table is presented below (see Appendix 2 for a full transcription of the data). The table was designed to visualise the lexical aspects of the interpretation to assist in the analysis of how the interpreter undertook the interpretation of the individual utterance produced by the speaker. Both the SL speech and its rendition to the TL can be compared using the interline translation. These data when analysed highlight a number of subsets of Chernov's theory as well as other important strategies in SI such as omissions or additions.

Interpreter one (I1)	
Transcript Line	
(1) S:	<b>So I just want to thank =</b>
I1:	Chci Vám poděkovat = <i>(I want to thank you)</i>
(2) S:	<b>= but you know my first major speak was at CPAC =</b>
I1:	= ale jak víte = <i>(but as you know)</i>

The second data table presents the interpreters' renditions of the original text segmented and aligned.

<b>Speech 1 transcript - president Trump's speech with no context provided</b>			
<b>Original Text</b>	<b>Interpreter 1 (I1)</b>	<b>Interpreter 2 (I2)</b>	<b>Interpreter 3 (I3)</b>
So I just want to thank	Chci vám poděkovat (I want to thank you)	Chtěla bych jenom poděkovat (I just would like to thank)	Chci jenom poděkovat (I just want to thank)
but you know my first major speak was at CPAC	ale jak víte (but as you know)	chtěla bych Vám říct, že můj první velký veřejný projev byl v ... CPAK (I would like to tell you that my first major speak was at CPAC)	... a můj- moje první hlavní řeč byla u {hesitation} CPAC (And my first major speak was at CPAC)

The design of the table was selected in order that the researcher could undertake a lexical comparison of the three renditions. This enabled a comparison of the extent to which the interpreters employed Chernov's theory in practice.

The final part of the experiment represents data gathered from the semi-structured interview which provided additional information about the interpreters' own point of view and opinions regarding SI interpreting. An example of questions asked is provided below. The questionnaire in its entirety is to be found in Appendix 5.

	<b>Interview question</b>	<b>Interpreter One (I1)</b>	<b>Interpreter Two (I2)</b>	<b>Interpreter Three (I3)</b>
Gained experience	How long have you been interpreting?	I started when I was 12 years old. (The interpreter is about 40 years old)	I have been interpreting for 9 years.	I have been interpreting for 5 years.
	What are the topics you interpret most often?	Mostly for real estate agencies, when foreign people want to buy a house.	I often interpret for Škoda company so mostly processes of production. And I interpret for real estate agencies as well.	I interpret for the court and weddings.
	Who do you usually interpret for? (companies/organisations/individuals)	In majority of cases, I interpret for companies.	I mostly interpret either for companies or for individuals.	Usually organisations and individuals.
	Do you interpret on a regular basis?	It depends, but usually twice a week.	Not really. Usually three times a month.	Not really. It is usually two times a month.

The interpreters' responses contributed to the analysis providing interpreters' own point of view and experience in SI. This provided an insight into an interpreter's work and his/her perception of the processes employed during SI.

The analysed data were used in the thesis to support the discussion of Chernov's concept. They were integrated into the thesis by using Data Samples which integrated



examples taken directly from the experiment into the discussion. These examples complement the theoretical part of the thesis everywhere where it was possible.

Specifically, the theoretical part of the thesis is concerned with strategies which can be employed by the interpreter during SI. First, the thesis provides an insight into a demanding work of an SI interpreter and shows the complexity of various processes and strategies employed by the interpreter before focusing on redundancy and anticipation in particular.

#### **4. Interpreter's multiple task performance**

The SI interpreter is required to perform multiple tasks while interpreting. (S)he must divide his/her attention between many aspects demanded by interpreting such as comprehension, planning, task switching, or reasoning while employing general cognitive abilities. This chapter addresses interpreter's multiple tasks (s)he undertakes while interpreting. It provides an introduction of various strategies an interpreter employs during the process of interpretation which have to be explained in order to fully understand what interpretation demands from the interpreter.

Simultaneous interpreting is often referred to as an oral translation which is treated as an act of communication. As two interlocutors are part of a communication, the interpreter becomes its member as well as (s)he significantly affects the translation process between two parties of the communicative act. This can be observed by examining transcripts of the communication act and in how the interpreter conveys the message in the TL. His/her interference changes the hierarchy and the roles of interlocutors. (S)he plays both the role of a receiver and a sender of the message at the same time. In SI the interpreter's job is to grasp the meaning and arrive at its comprehension while keeping in mind the complete context of the foregrounded part of the utterance. During these ongoing processes, the interpreter also anticipates the emerging message.

To have a successful conversation one assumes a cooperative listener, in our case the interpreter, who is prepared to render the point of view of the speaker to the audience but at the same time, there has to be a cooperative speaker as well. The assumption that the speaker behaves rationally and cooperatively was put forward by Grice's theory of Cooperative Principle which suggests four conversational "maxims" (Quality, Quantity,

Relevance, and Manner) to explain what rationality and cooperativeness are (Portner 172-174). During a conversation, it is unconsciously anticipated that interlocutors will behave according to these rules. It is also a part of interpreter's anticipation process. (S)he relies on the speaker to provide the information required for given purposes of the speech/conversation, that the contribution will be relevant, clear and the contribution will be rather true than false. These assumptions assist the interpreter in their comprehension of the conversation. They help the interpreter figure out what the other person means by their talk.

The SI interpreter is then required to alternately activate and suppress the production of the two languages, (s)he has to analyse the speaker's goals, inferences and subtleties and finally (s)he has to make instantaneous decisions on how to convey the meaning in a different language not forgetting to take into account cultural nuances and differing communication rules.

Being burdened by these multiple tasks, the interpreter operates under extreme pressure whilst at the same time being faced with external environmental conditions or time limitations. These impose limits on the available cognitive processing time and create restrictions concerning the amount of information which can be communicated. The interpreter's work is to render the message correctly when the communicative activity is being performed concurrently with audio perception of an oral discourse. This multiple task consists of listening, perception, speaking, anticipation and many other activities being performed at the same time.

The listening consists of all mental operations in between the perception of a given discourse by auditory mechanisms and the moment at which the interpreter either assigns or decides not to assign a meaning or several meanings to the segment (s)he has just heard. (S)he then has to make an effort to arrive at production which includes all the mental operations between the moment at which the interpreter decides to convey an idea and the moment at which (s)he articulates the prepared form. Not only does the interpreter make effort in production but (s)he also retains them in memory which is assumed to stem from the need to store the words of a proposition in order to deliver the message verbally. Short-term memory is used for storage of heard segments of discourse until either their restitution in the TL, their loss if the interpreter chooses not to interpret them or they are simply forgotten.

Chernov (45) divides the verbal communicative function into three levels. The first level being “sensorimotor” which is responsible for analysing the acoustic input and for synthesising the output signal. At the second level, he defines an analysis of the entire hierarchy of sense relations which comprises comprehension and non-comprehension of the speaker’s thought. And at the third level, Chernov defines a spatial synthesis of the internal program of utterance. In other words, the interpreter as a participant of the communication goes through number of phases when first (s)he decodes what (s)he hears, then in order to arrive at comprehension,(s)he analyses the heard chunk and finally (s)he transforms the message and produces the TL output.

This synthesis points to a process of expression relating to the content of thought for the listener. As the interpreter is considered to be a part of communicative process, (s)he has to go through all the three levels.

During SI the interpreter does not hear the whole speech segment and then interpret, (s)he translates the segment in small chunks building up the entire message without the benefit of knowing the point of the message. That is why SI has to be assumed to be a continually developing process, one that is fundamentally different from consecutive interpreting.

In order to be successful in his/her work, the interpreter has to make use of certain strategies to make the process easier for himself/herself (Setton 42 – 45)

#### 1. Waiting

(S)he has to wait for certain constituents (for example for a verb), or more context to grasp the meaning of an utterance. In this case, the interpreter may pause for a few seconds without making participants of the conversation uncomfortable, especially when it comes to the “ideal” breaks in the speaker’s own discourse.

In the experiment, one of the interpreters used the strategy of waiting.

**Data Sample 1: Waiting (1a)**

S: So I just want to thank – but [you know my first major political speak was at CPAC and – probably five or six years ago.]

I2: [Chtěla bych jenom poděkovat, ... chtěla bych Vám říct, že můj první velký veřejný projev byl v ... CPAK ] {rising intonation, more of like a question} ... {hesitation} asi před pěti lety.

*(I just would like to thank, I would like to tell you that my first major speak was at CPAC probably five years ago.)*

The example demonstrates a part of the speech where utterances of the speaker and the interpreter overlap. The highlighted pause demonstrates where the strategy of waiting was used in order to wait for the rest of the sentence to be produced. The interpreter most likely waited for the verb to come since it is the main determinant of the sense of the sentence.

## 2. Stalling

Stalling is a strategy used by the interpreter when (s)he needs to delay the output by slowing delivery. (S)he then produces a string which contributes to new information but at the same time it fills a silence. This strategy can be used when waiting for the verb in a sentence (which is for example in German the last component in a sentence) and thus it creates time for the interpreter some time without exposing the participants of the discourse to a long and uncomfortable silence.

An example of stalling can be demonstrated in the experiment on the rendition of the interpreter three.

**Data Sample 2: Stalling (3b)**

S = and probably five or six years ago.

I3= to bylo asi tak {slight hesitation} před pěti nebo šesti lety.

*(That was probably five or six years ago)*

The interpreter employed the strategy of stalling (highlighted) most probably in order to gain more time before interpreting the final part of the sentence. Producing this additional material and having more time to process the given message, (s)he

then rendered the final part of the message correctly even though with a slight hesitation.

In addition to this example, the same strategy can be illustrated on the data already used above to describe the strategy of waiting.

**Data Sample 3: Stalling (1a)**

S: So I just want to thank – but [you know my first major political speak was at CPAC and – probably five or six years ago.]

I2: [Chtěla bych jenom poděkovat, ... chtěla bych Vám říct, že můj první velký veřejný projev byl v ... CPAK ] {rising intonation, more of like a question} ... {hesitation} asi před pěti lety.

*(I just would like to thank, I would like to tell you that my first major speak was at CPAC probably five years ago.)*

Here one can see both strategies working jointly together. Both waiting and stalling were successfully used in order to delay the speaker's output. This created enough additional time for the interpreter to wait for the verb to be uttered and for the consequent rendition of the remainder of the sentence.

3. Chunking or “saucissonnage”

This strategy is being presented as a “cornerstone” of SI technique. This tactic is used when the interpreter faces with major syntactic differences in between the two languages with interpreter producing sentence openings without waiting, or uttering neutral, non-committal material.

4. Anticipation

Anticipation is a strategy widely used among SI interpreters. As they do not hear the complete utterance before they start the interpreting and they are provided only with parts of it, they need to think of what will follow. It is certain prediction of forthcoming developments based on many aspects as interpreter's skills, experience, his/her background knowledge, etc.

#### **Data Sample 4: Anticipation (1)**

**S: So I just want to thank =**

II: Chci Vám poděkovat =

*(I want to thank you)*

This example taken from the experiment demonstrates interpreter's anticipation. This is a rendition of Speech One which was originally made by American President Trump and interpreters were provided with further information to the subject.

Interpreter one employed anticipation already in the first sentence of the speech where (s)he added "you" referring to an audience even though there is no such pronoun present in the original speech. Since (s)he knew who made the speech, (s)he anticipated that it was probably delivered for the audience and that anticipation made her refer to this audience.

This particular type of strategy will be dealt with in a more detail later on in the thesis.

All of these strategies are employed by the interpreter when needed. They do not exist in isolation, they cooperate and help in rendering the message. Waiting, Stalling and Chunking can be all used in the anticipation process. These strategies were described here to show the multitude of tasks the interpreter undertakes and to demonstrate that even though important, anticipation is not the only one employed in the SI process.

Finally, interpreters in order to understand utterances make use of knowledge traditionally divided as non-linguistic and linguistic knowledge. Linguistic knowledge is assumed to consist of grammar and lexicon from which the sense of the whole utterance is decoded. Non-linguistic knowledge on the other hand represents the information beyond the language boundaries. It is the "extra" knowledge of the context. Both linguistic knowledge and non-linguistic knowledge when working together make it possible for the interpreter to use the strategy of anticipation. The strategy of anticipation is heavily underpinned by the role of semantic redundancy in SI of talk. Without the strategy of redundancy the ability to anticipate emerging talk would be a much harder process to employ. The following chapters expand on the role that semantic redundancy and anticipation play in producing simultaneous interpretations.

## **5. Semantic redundancy and its role in SI**

This chapter focuses on the role of redundancy in SI. It describes its various functions and what these functions allow the interpreter to do during the process of interpreting. Redundancy is presented as a keystone in the anticipation process without which it would be much harder for the interpreter to render the meaning of a message. The concept of redundancy is explained first, after which discourse redundancy and its role during interpreting are introduced, forming the main focus of this chapter.

### **5.1. What is redundancy**

Redundancy is a multifaceted phenomenon deeply rooted in language, which is, by its nature, redundant. Redundancy refers to the phenomenon when an information or an element in the text is iterative. A text is redundant when the same information is repeatedly stated using various forms of expression. One can find its many features within grammar, syntax and other aspects of language.

Advising writers to eliminate wordiness and repetitions that clutter one's writing and one's speech, redundancy may be viewed as a rather negative quality of creativity and the deliberate choices of authorship. However, this is not the case when interpreting, redundancy plays an important role. When information is repeated, the repeated text becomes redundant. This creates space for the interpreter and makes the transfer of the message easier allowing him/her to infer the ongoing message.

In the highly pressurised environment of SI interpreting, redundancy thus becomes a valuable feature of language, enabling the interpreter to form his/her thoughts and providing him/her with a better opportunity to understand and communicate the message.

Two linguists Wit and Gillette define two types of redundancy: grammatical and contextual redundancy (Wit, Gillette 4-9). Grammatical or semantic redundancy is obligatory. Its elements are generated systematically and it is not possible for one element to be arbitrarily omitted. When a text is grammatically redundant, it means that two or more of its features serve the same function.

This can be demonstrated on an example taken from the conducted experiment. Here the original speech in the SL is redundant; two elements serving to the same function.

Let's first see how would the absence of impact on the grammaticality and subsequent interpretation of the text in hand.

**Data Sample 5: Redundancy (5b)**

S: When I was here two years (...)

One can see that the sentence does not make sense and simply does not work when it is created in this way.

S: When I was here last two years (...)

When one element referring to the past is added, it still is not right.

S: When I was here last two years ago (...)

But when the other element is added, it works. Here, the underlined elements "last" and "ago" from the sentence both serve the same function; referring to the past. Presence of an adverbial phrase of time is partly required by the tense used. In majority of cases, past simple demands a precision of time. However, owing to the presence of two elements serving to the same function, the sentence is redundant.

This kind of redundancy is independent of any situational, contextual and non-linguistic considerations. It is truly redundant since it serves only to repeat information already stated by another feature previously in the text.

However, what is important is how the interpreter deals with redundancy of the text. Does (s)he treat the text redundant or does (s)he omit the redundant elements? It can be demonstrated on the following example of interpreters' renditions of a redundant sentence.

**Data Sample 6: Redundancy (c)**

S: When I was here last two years ago, =

I1: Když jsem zde byl před dvěma lety, =

*(When I was here two years ago)*

This is an example of a redundant text in the SL which is being translated into the TL with lower degree of redundancy than the original. That is because the interpreter drops "last" in his/her translation and thus makes the sentence less redundant while keeping the meaning of the sentence effectively unchanged.



**Data Sample 7: Redundancy (c1)**

I2: A když jsem tady byl před dvěma lety

*And when I was here two years ago*

The second interpreter omits “last” as well and thus makes the sentence less redundant.

**Data Sample 8: Redundancy (c2)**

I3: Když jsem tady byl naposledy před dvěma lety, =

*(When I was here last two years ago)*

It is only the third interpreter who keeps the sentence redundant, translating both “last” and “ago”.

Contextual redundancy on the other hand relates to the repetition of information that is, in a grammatical sense, non obligatory and which is influenced by socio linguistic and psycho linguistic factors. It is a type of repetition that consists of the reproduction of identical elements of information or of elements that are only apparently identical and it is not systematically generated by grammatical rules.

An example of such redundancy, a sentence from one of the speeches used for the experiment is provided below.

**Data Sample 9: Redundancy (1a)**

S: “So I just want to thank – but you know my first major speak was at CPAC and – probably five or six years ago.

**Data Sample 10: Redundancy (2a)**

S: First major political speech.”

The underlined parts both point to the same information and are thus potentially redundant. The interpreter is thus provided with the same information twice so (s)he has a better chance to grasp it and comprehend it. They however translate the message succinctly dropping all unnecessary or repetitive discourse. One statement or its gist needs to be retained.

Following the criteria listed above, Chernov identified two redundancy categories: objective and subjective redundancy. They correspond to grammatical and contextual

redundancy with the objective redundancy being created by both the interdependence of discourse components and their repetition. The additional redundancy arises from the interaction between the semantic structure of a discourse on progress and general interpreter's knowledge of the world or his/her familiarity with it. The main focus of the thesis will be on the theory proposed by Chernov and will draw on the terminology developed and defined by him.

## **5.2. Semantic redundancy in discourse**

This section considers the redundancy of natural languages as an essential factor of human communication. It is redundancy which allows for the probabilistic prediction of the incoming message which is a crucial mechanism in the process of SI. Redundancy means an iteration of components in a message. If there is an iteration of a component, it means that the text is redundant. The speaker employs number of means to mark co-reference, (s)he can for example use the same word throughout the text, or its synonyms and paraphrases. Redundancy is typical both for isolated utterances and coherent discourse. One has to bear in mind that all the units of the text are interdependent, linked together.

In order to comprehend the semantic structure of a discourse and thus the interdependency of its units, first one question should be posed; what is sense?

Sense represents the contextual meaning of a discourse, it is a distinct of meaning and its "distinction" is defined only within an utterance. When an element of a sentence is taken in isolation, it has no sense. Only when it is presented it in the context and further information is provided, one can comprehend the meaning, only then there is a chance of retrieval of the sense of the utterance. This can be clearly seen in the experiment where interpreters were asked to translate a message with no further context provided. This prevented them from detecting the true sense of the speech and brought the incapability to render certain thoughts present in it. As in rendering the following utterance:

### **Data Sample 11: Redundancy (9)**

S: „And then they did these polls where I went through the roof and I wasn't even running, right?"

Here, the interpreter admitted that (s)he was not able to translate it with no further context provided to him/her, adding that (s)he can think of three different possible

translations of the given utterance but as they are very different (s)he is unwilling to commit to a particular translation until (s)he has further information about the subject available. The situation when the interpreter translates phrase like this becomes a nightmare for the interpreter who is not provided with background knowledge. In this case “going through the roof” has multiple meanings. It can be taken literally in which case the speaker would move himself/herself on the roof. But there again raises another question. Is (s)he climbing on the roof or is (s)he falling down from it? The ambiguity can only be resolved with further information or a personal understanding of this stylised lexis. In that case the idea of a poll suggests some type of election and that the speaker is doing very well in the poll.

Further ambiguity is contained in “and I wasn’t even running, right?” which can be possibly rendered in a way that is that (s)he was running for the office. This solution would be most likely chosen by the interpreters if at least they knew who is speaking.

These ambiguities are very common in the English language where one word has many meanings and those meanings are then narrowed down and the meaning is determined according to the context, and to the elements surrounding the particular word. When a verb “love” is borrowed from one of the texts **Data Sample 9: Redundancy (6)** in the experiment for example, one has to know the context in order to choose its correct equivalent in the TL. Translating to Czech, this verb has two main meanings “milovat” and “mít rád”. In English, “love” is used in very many contexts and one can say it almost about everything to what one feels some positive affection. However, in Czech there is a much stronger distinction and when you say “love” meaning “milovat” it is already a very strong emotional word and you do not say it just to anybody and it is used in intimate situations. In order to translate it correctly, the interpreter thus has to know some context or the relation between the speaker and the listener, possibly between the speaker and the thing/person the verb “love” refers to.

It can be demonstrated on an example from the experiment.

**Data Sample 12: Redundancy (6)**

S: **And it was – I loved it.**

II: A já, mně se to opravdu líbilo.

*(And I, I loved it)*

This demonstrates how the original sentence was rendered by the interpreter one. The interpreters two and three came up with different solutions.

**Data Sample 13: Redundancy (4a)**

I2: A bylo to s ... CAPS kvěly.

*(And it was great.)*

**Data Sample 14: Redundancy (6b)**

I3: A bylo to, ... moc se mi to líbilo.

*(And It was, I loved it.)*

In this case, all interpreters felt the verb “milovat” is too strong for the text so they all choose less strong version which would do no harm to the text. In two cases they used verb “líbit se” but its meaning was strengthened by an adverb put before it. They were not provided with further context and they did not know who the speaker was. If they knew that the speaker was American president Trump who is known for his expressive speeches, maybe they would choose a more superlative rendition of the sentence. Their renditions contained less emotion than the original one. This can have an impact on the end listener. The aim of political speeches rendered to the audience is usually to persuade them and to attract their attention. This could be harder to achieve in the emotionless speech which makes the impression of neutrality.

Chernov (45) presents his own example of a word “problem”. This word, standing by itself has no meaning. The hearer cannot know what it is being talked about, what it is being referred to by using this particular word. But if the word is put into the context using Chernov’s example: “I would like to touch on a serious problem bedeviling the developing countries...” Suddenly the word “problem” is presented in a certain context, thereof a hint at the communicative situation which refers to the fact that it is probably a public statement and one can also presume the theme of the discourse which is most possibly the situation of developing countries. Only now it is possible to understand that there is a problem requiring a solution that the problem is serious, and that it means difficulties of the developing countries and the speaker intends to discuss it. Discussing role of the sense in discourse, one comes across the extra-linguistic factor of the interpreter which is linked to his/her background knowledge of the world. Using this knowledge, (s)he can decode the content of a word which is related to a certain

topic and it gives him/her essential clues for determining what the sense of the utterance might be.

**Data Sample 14: Redundancy (5a)**

**S: I loved the people. I loved the commotion.**

I2: ... {longer hesitation} Lidi mě podpořili a ... užila jsem si i tu atmosféru.

*(People supported me and I enjoyed the atmosphere)*

This is an example from rendition of Speech One by the second interpreter. Even though (s)he was not provided with any further information prior to interpretation, (s)he inferred the sense of discourse from the previous sentences of the speech where (s)he learnt that it is a political speech and the speaker gives thanks to the audience for something happening in the past referring to it in a very positive way. That gave him/her essential clues for determining the sense of this utterance.

As it was already mentioned in the previous passage, the components in the discourse are interdependent and they constantly interact with each other thus allowing the redundancy which consequently allows the inferencing. There can be seen an interaction between linguistic factors, extralinguistic factors and between verbal mental processing and non-verbal processes involving in the interpreter's knowledge of the world and the communicative situation which is based on the hint at a typical, standard situation of communication. The sense goes beyond purely linguistic concepts and emerges as an extra-linguistic factor. It is a result of interaction between the contextual meaning of the word in a discourse and cognitive factors, such as interpreter's knowledge of the world and familiarity with the communicative situation.

Lederer (cited in Chernov 45) suggests that sense is formed as a result of interaction between the "pragmatic meaning" (contextual meaning) and cognitive information to be found in the interpreter's long-term memory.

**5.3. The importance of sense in the discourse**

Sense is a result of iteration of the significant content of a sentence along with the situational requirements of the act of communication. Sense of the discourse is influenced by the interlocutors, their role in the society, by the place and also by the time in which the act of communication takes place. It is a result of human verbal and

mental activity and understanding of sense is the manifestation of ordinary human mental function.

The sense being formed in a unique situation is always a result of a creative mental effort and embodies the correlation of the given situation with the internal mental model of the external world. It liberates human thought from the restrictions of linguistic meanings and even from the structure of the language as a whole since only by an exchange of a person who communicates it for another, the sense can change. It leaves the language structure invariable while enabling one to build knowledge systems above and beyond language barriers. As the meaning, the sense is built up, all the building blocks successively disappear as the process goes on. Sounds go first, then semantic traits, then conceptual units, which all melt into the overall sense of the discourse. Generally speaking, more redundant the text is, the better an interpreter can infer the incoming chunk of the discourse and it is easier for him/her to decode its overall sense. An isolated word is senseless, but a word combination starts a sequence, in a continuation of which sense may be obtained.

#### **5.4. Implicit and explicit sense in the discourse**

Having discussed the importance of sense in the discourse and the indispensability of finding it and rendering it correctly, two kinds of sense appearing in the text should be distinguished. Linguistics deals with only one kind of sense and that is the explicit term of relation either the antecedent, or the consequent. If the explicit term is the antecedent, one can therefore draw the implicatures from it; implicature referring to a meaning which differs from the semantic one. It is a meaning beyond the language, the “extra” meaning which goes beyond of what is literally said.

The implicatures inferred from the text are usually much poorer than the set of presuppositions because they do not cover the whole possible range of inferences, but only the necessary ones in order to comprehend the message in a certain context and communicative situation.

The explicit sense is stated directly in the text and it is easier for the interpreter to render it.

If there is for example a sentence:

**Data Sample 15: Redundancy (a)**

**S: Thank you, good afternoon to all of you.**

It is easy for an interpreter to render its meaning, there is no implicit sense hidden there, it is just a greeting, the beginning of the speech and in this case it can be rendered literally.

But not every sense of the utterance has to be stated explicitly. There are also many hints and references presented conveying the implicit meaning. Meaning which is somehow hidden and much harder for the interpreter to decode from the source language and then to encode it again to the target language. The implicit sense is usually closely linked with inferencing because in order to uncover the implicit sense of the text, one has to infer the meaning and (s)he needs to have a good background knowledge and some awareness of the speaker as is his/her social role for example in order to detect the implicit sense, to understand it, and to render it correctly to the TL.

**Data Sample 16: Redundancy (6b)**

**S: And it was – I loved it.**

At first sight, a simple sentence like this bears an explicit sense for the interpreter. It seems to be simply stating that the speaker enjoyed the thing (s)he is talking about. But there can be hidden much more than that. The interpreter has also to take into account other aspects of the speech.

If this sentence were presented in an ironic or sarcastic tone or it were accompanied by over dramaticism of body language, it would mean a change in comprehension of it and one would have to search for the implicit sense. Using irony in this kind of sentence would mean the quite opposite explanation than one would draw if it were meant frankly by the speaker. Ironically saying “I loved it” conveys an implicit sense that the experience was not really enjoyable for the speaker and one cannot rely on the explicit sense of the sentence since the rendition of it to the TL would be erroneous.

### **5.5. Word meaning – the semantic structure of discourse**

The interpreter’s aim is to render the meaning conveyed by discourse in the SL that is to render its semantic and also its pragmatic structure. Any given communication must

reflect a fragment of the overall “picture of the world” and a value judgement of an entity or a proposition by the speaker presenting it in a certain way. Without this component, from the speaker’s point of view, there is actually no message worth communicating to the hearer. The speaker presenting a certain fragment of the world only has some sense if the speaker wants to express some kind of a personal attitude to this proposition. In discourse, there is always a pragmatic framework present pointing to the relations of the speaker and the hearer through the proposition.

Basic components or substructures of the text play different roles in its semantic structure and from the communicative point of view they tend towards one of the two poles distinguished by Chernov (45) as the act of reference and the act of predication. The act of reference points to the existence of the referent or assigns it to a category or class of objects, or properties, or events. The act of predication is on the other hand the act which states something about a referent, ascribes a certain property to it. As it was stated previously in the text, the various components and structures of discourse are interlinked. So the appearance of a certain referential or propositional structure presupposes the occurrence of other related structures. For example “an invitation” presupposes an event which is to come at some time in the future. This interrelatedness of structure significantly helps the interpreter when (s)he has to process the general referential structure of the discourse under severe time constraints imposed on him/her during SI.

In the experiment, interpreters were told that the second speech was given by First Vice-President Frans Timmermans in the European Commission. This information presupposes that the issue the speaker will be dealing with will probably concern the political situation in Europe and the EU. Given further information that the subject of the speech will be about possibility of Britain leaving the EU, an interpreter has another source for presuppositions and (s)he can easily predict what will be the speaker’s communicative point of view when he represents the European Commission and will talk about a country thinking about leaving the EU.

During a process when a speaker is producing a discourse, (s)he also communicates something about the subject of the communication which amplifies the hearer’s knowledge of the topic of discourse and (s)he also expresses his/her belief in respect of the relation of the topic to the external world. This is done by him/her marking the



reality/irreality of the propositions expressed as factivity/counter-factivity/non-factivity representing them as either fact, possibility or necessity.

Factivity refers to the assertion of the truth of the proposition by the speaker, counter-factivity on the other hand refers to the speaker's negation of this truth and its unreality (Chernov 50). These two notions do not explicitly assert or negate but rather presuppose the assertion or negation of the fact. They are said to presuppose the truth or falsehood. Modal verbs of commanding, permitting or forbidding contain semantic components as well and they indicate superior-subordinate relations between the speaker and the hearer.

Non-factivity refers to a situation when the speaker is not committed to the truth or falsity of the proposition. It is simply the absence of a presupposition of a fact. It can be seen for example in expressions as "It is possible, it is probable that...".

All this shows how the speaker establishes his/her attitude or relationship to the hearer's in a way in which (s)he formulates the proposition while at the same time (s)he conveys an attitude and a value judgement about the subject of communication, either explicitly or implicitly. These factors combine to form the semantic structure of discourse.

An SI interpreter's job is deemed successful when the message is rendered correctly. But it is only the semantic structure not the discourse as such in its totality which should stay the same during the transfer from SL to TL. Only the semantic structure is regarded as an invariant. The primary goal of SI is to render the overall sense of the discourse and to keep its message invariant. Semantic structure of the SL discourse is the goal of SI activity, and an equivalent semantic structure in TL is its product.

### **5.6. Redundancy as a factor facilitating inferencing**

The iteration of information introduced to the hearer gives a basis to the anticipatory reflection of reality. Message development through the probability anticipation becomes possible only in conditions of speech redundancy. Generally, more symbols are being used to encode the message than are theoretically necessary and the message source is repeating itself through contextual dependencies. Typically, one meaning is repeated by phrases with different though semantically similar words. If one looks at a text, leaving out the redundant parts of it, there can be seen that the amount of information is quite low. In other words, when there is a rapid growth of semantic redundancy in the text,

the amount of information per unit of human perception shrinks rapidly with increasing levels of perception.

Speech One can be taken as an example. When one takes out all the redundant parts and keeps only the core information, the text significantly shrinks.

*So I just want to thank – ~~but you know~~ my first major speak was at CPAC and – probably five or six years ago. ~~First major political speech.~~ And you were there. And ~~it was~~ – I loved it. I loved the people. I love the commotion*

*And then they did these polls where I went through the roof and I wasn't even running, right?*

*But it gave me an idea. And I got a little bit concerned when I saw what was happening in the country. And I said, "Let's go to it."*

When the redundant parts are taken out, the interpreter has fewer opportunities to grasp the meaning and it is more likely that some information will not be obtained.

It should be noted that the extent of semantic redundancy correlates with the topic discussed. In other words, the narrower the topic of discourse, the higher is the redundancy of the message. To achieve even higher semantic redundancy, one needs to have a text/discourse with a greater thematic, contextual and situational interdependency among symbols presented in the text. This reduces the amount of information per unit of the message presented to the hearer thus leading to a higher level of message redundancy. The success of the SI process is necessarily conditioned by the coherence of the SL discourse which is generated by the unity of the speaker's topic and communicative intent.

Semantic redundancy, repeating the same information in a different way thus facilitates inferencing giving the interpreter time to process the information and to comprehend it. With a text being redundant, it is more likely for the message to be rendered correctly without any bias. The interpreter is also given an opportunity not to miss any relevant information presented in the text because (s)he can hear it more than once.

### **5.7. Compression**

With the discourse being highly redundant, the interpreter as it was already stated in the previous passage has a greater chance for a successful anticipation and rendering the

message correctly from the SL to the TL. But that does not necessarily mean that (s)he should keep the TL discourse redundant as well. This high redundancy in the SL discourse provides the interpreter with opportunities for compression. Compression is expressing a given content presented by a (redundant) discourse but in an economical way. In other words, the interpreter makes from a highly redundant text one with lower level of redundancy, presenting the key information but using fewer words than in the redundant discourse. Compression is made possible by linguistic redundancy in the thematic component of discourse. The interpreter uses the compression as a “labour-saving” device in the extreme conditions of SI when there is a very limited time in which the interpreter has to comprehend and then render the message.

There are several types of compression being used depending on what element of the speech is being reduced (Chernov 45).

#### 1. Syllabic compression

This type of compression reduces the overall number of syllables of the TL discourse as against the corresponding input. In order to achieve the syllabic compression one has to find a shorter synonym for an idea wherever possible. Having accomplished this, the interpreter can speak more slowly and comfortably than the original speaker. The skill of making such compressions depends on the level of interpreter’s proficiency and it is mainly being used by professionals.

#### **Data Sample 16: Compression (4a)**

**S: And it was – CAPS I loved it.**

I2: A bylo to s ... CAPS kvěly.

*(And it was great.)*

Here the interpreter chose to translate the original passage containing 3 syllables to the TL as a single adjective comprising of only 2 syllables.

#### 2. Lexical compression

Interpreter employing lexical compression uses fewer words in his/her TL discourse than it was used in SL discourse while expressing the same idea.

To see the economy of the lexical compression, an example from the experiment can be used.

**Data Sample 17: Compression (a1)**

**S: Thank you, good afternoon to all of you.**

I2: Děkuji vám, přeji vám všem {slight hesitation } dobré odpoledne.

*(Thank you, good afternoon to all of you)*

**Data Sample 18: Compression (a2)**

I3: Děkuju, pěkné odpoledne vám všem.

*(Thank you, good afternoon to all of you.)*

Two examples of translations were provided in order to make a comparison. One can see on them that I3 used lexical compression, using only 5 words to 8 words in the original text to communicate the message which gave him/her the precious time before interpreting another utterance. I2 on the other hand rendered the message using 7 words and hesitating a little bit which deprived him/her of time.

Lexical compression can be also used in translating various expressions which cannot be rendered literally.

**Data Sample 19: Compression (h)**

**S: (... ) what fans of The Clash would know as “should I stay or should I go“.**

I1: = ... nebudu - nebudu se zabývat tím ... {asking for repetition of the end of the sentence} ... co by ... {hesitation} - ovlivnilo voliče.

*(I am not going to, I am not going to engage in anything that would influence voters)*

The first interpreter translated the message successfully using lexical compression. (S)he was able to compression because of her background knowledge (s)he was provided with. (S)he was told that the speech would concern “BREXIT”, a question whether Britain should or should not leave the European Union. Making use of this particular knowledge (s)he could make compression reducing 15 words from the SL to only 8 words in the TL and thus buying the precious time before the next interpretation.

Even though compression is a very helpful strategy used in interpretation it is not always easy to make it successfully. As it was already stated, it is a skill mainly used by

very experienced interpreters and it requires an absolute comprehension of the subject as the message has to stay invariable.

**Data Sample 20: Compression (d1)**

**S: (...)** country I'm not going to engage in the debate about what fans of The Clash would know as "should I stay or should I go?".

I2: (...) nechtěl bych se dostat – dostat do debat na téma, jestli má - máme zůstat nebo máme jít.

*I wouldn't want to get myself into debates about whether we should stay or we should go.)*

**Data Sample 21: Compression (h2)**

I3: = nechci se pouštět do debat o tom, jestli je otázka o tom, jestli zůstat nebo odejít.

*I am not going to engage in debates about whether there is a question about whether we should stay or we should go.)*

Here neither of the interpreters used any compression and they rendered the message copying the SL structure of the sentence. However there are some signs of the knowledge of the subject visible. Both interpreters knew they were translating speech dealing with Britain's situation and its possible leaving the EU. It can be seen on their translation of "should I stay or should I go" where they do not talk about an individual "I" but they both talked in a more general way. Referring to the whole nation by "máme zůstat nebo máme jít" or "(...) otázka o tom, jestli zůstat nebo odejít", they used their background knowledge of the subject. The fact that they did not use the compression may point to the possibility that they were not experienced or sure of themselves enough to do so or it was simply their choice not to make it. From the original utterance comprising of 15 words, (s)he translated the message using only 8 words.

### 3. Syntactic compression

Syntactic compression allows the interpreter to use shorter and simpler construction than the one used in the original discourse, for example from a complex sentence making a simple one.

#### Data Sample 22: Compression (6a)

S: **And then they did these polls where I went through the roof and I wasn't even running, right?**

I2: ... {long silence and hesitation} skrz půdu?, na- na střechnu?, myslela jsem si, že to nezvládnou?

*(through the attic? On the roof? I thought I was not going to make it.)*

After a long hesitation and trying to translate the sentence as correctly as possible, the interpreter chose to translate it as follows

The interpreter tried to translate the sentence as correctly as possible even though (s)he was struggling with it. (S)he chose to use a syntactic compression here making from a complex sentence consisting of three propositions a complex sentence consisting only of two propositions thus making it syntactically simpler. It should be also noted that with a syntactic compression goes hand in hand also lexical compression as fewer words was used in order to make the syntactic structure simpler.

#### 4. Semantic compression

The last type of compression relates to both the utterance and the discourse as a whole reducing the number of iterative semantic components and their configurations.

As an example of this type of compression, Chernov (45) uses the interpretation of a French text into English resulting in this particular kind of compression.

“Les essais d’armes nucléaires dans l’atmosphère, dans l’espace cosmique et sous l’eau” being translated by the English interpreter as “nuclear test in the three media” summing up the three components stated in the SL utterance into two words and thus saving precious time while communicating the same message in TL as was communicated in the SL.

Even though Chernov distinguished the compression into these four types it does not mean that they would be standing by themselves. All four types are closely interrelated with syntactic compression resulting in lexical compression and hence the syllabic compression.

Compression makes the message clearer with smaller occurrence of ambiguities. Compression is allowed only with SL discourse being redundant otherwise there is not much to compress.

It assists the interpreter in making the best use of the time limits imposed on them. Being able to interpret and deliver the message efficiently creates space in which the interpreter can focus on incoming message.

## **6. Anticipation and forward inferencing**

Every SI interpreter has to anticipate what will come next in the conversation. (S)he has to draw inferences from the chunks and messages (s)he is listening to in order to be prepared for what will follow. This chapter deals with anticipation and what role plays during SI. It focuses on when and how it is used by the interpreter, what it is, and its importance for the interpreter during interpretation.

The act of anticipation is based on extralinguistic knowledge of the world and of the communicative situation including its pragmatic dimension. As the interpreter does not hear the whole discourse and (s)he can hear only chunks of it, (s)he retrieves the sense of the discourse from the result of subconscious inferencing which is based on language knowledge and the cognitive thesaurus, including background knowledge and awareness of the communicative context. That is why it is so important for the interpreter to prepare before the act of interpretation, to know for who (s)he will be interpreting, where and what the topic is going to be. In the experiment all interpreters confirmed that it was indispensable for them to know in advance some information about the job in order to get prepared for it. Even from the slightest information provided in advance, the interpreter can already draw some inferences.

In the semi-structured questionnaire, the interpreters were asked to report on their experience in SI and whether they undertake any preparation prior to interpreting work. All of them claimed that the most important thing in the preparation for them is to know who the speaker is, where they will interpret and what will be the subject of interpretation. Only then they can get prepared and gain the background knowledge.

A simple utterance such as. “Tom’s elder daughter is moving to London to study at university there” consists of many presuppositions not explicitly expressed. Even from this short sentence it can be anticipated that Tom has more than one child and he has at least 2 daughters. One can say that he is an adult man as he has a daughter who will go to university. One can infer that his daughter is no longer a child because she is a

student and she must have successfully graduated from high school since she will be attending university.

Prior preparation is a key tool in the interpreter's arsenal. By understanding the topic, the speaker and how they deliver speeches, the interpreter can create the cognitive time and space to deliver the best message possible.

Inferencing is activated already at the moment of giving the relevant information to the interpreter. If an interpreter undertakes no prior preparation, (s)he risks making mistakes and even changing the meaning of the speech and (s)he has to rely more heavily on inferencing from the current situation.

As an example one can make use of the interpreted texts from the experiment. Interpreters had no time for preparation and they were not familiar with the topic or given any further information that could help them while interpreting. Here they had to deal with an abbreviation "CPAC" (Conservative Political Action Conference) rendering it to the Czech language with no background knowledge on the subject.

**Data Sample 23: Anticipation (1a)**

S: **So I just want to thank – but [you know my first major political speak was at CPAC and – probably five or six years ago.]**

I2: [Chtěla bych jenom poděkovat, ... chtěla bych Vám říct, že můj první velký veřejný projev byl v ... CPAK] {rising intonation, more of like a question} ... {hesitation} asi před pěti lety.

*(I just would like to thank, I would like to tell you that my first major speak was at CPAC probably five years ago.)*

**Data Sample 24: Anticipation (2b)**

I3: ... a můj- moje první hlavní řeč byla u {hesitation} CPAC =

*(And my first major speak was in CPAC)*

Interpreter One omitted the abbreviation which (s)he did not understand and continued interpreting without mentioning it. Sometimes omitting words can be acceptable, helping the interpreter not to lose face translating something (s)he is not familiar with. In other cases, however, as in this for example, the information cannot be omitted without a change of meaning; the information is simply too important to be left out.



In this case, omission of the abbreviation is a mistake and it is really important that it should be stated since there are further references to it later in the speech. Without this knowledge, the hearer would not know about what is the speaker talking.

Lacking the preparation and knowledge of the subject, this utterance posed problems. Without previous preparation, interpreters did not know that CPAC is the abbreviation that stands for a Conservative Political Action Conference. All of them hesitated before interpreting this particular part except for interpreter one who omitted the abbreviation in his/her rendition.

**(1a) Data Sample 25: Anticipation (1a)**

**S: So I just want to thank – but [you know my first major political speak was at CPAC and – probably five or six years ago.]**

I2: [Chtěla bych jenom poděkovat, ... chtěla bych Vám říct, že můj první velký veřejný projev byl v ... CPAK] {rising intonation, more of like a question} ... {hesitation} asi před pěti lety.

*(I just would like to thank, I would like to tell you that my first major speak was at CPAC probably five years ago.)*

**(2b) Data Sample 26: Anticipation (2b)**

**S: = but you know, my first major speak was at CPAC=**

I3: ... a můj- moje první hlavní řeč byla u {hesitation} CPAC =

*(And my first major speak was at CPAC)*

As the abbreviation stands for the name of a conference, the appropriate preposition should not be “v CPAC” or “u CPAC” but “na CPAC”. In all interpreters’ renditions, longer pauses were noticed before translating this part of utterance. Two of them then decided to leave the abbreviation as it is adding the preposition.

Every utterance consists of what may be described as “implicational potential” which refers to a theoretically possible set of presuppositions of a given utterance. This underlies the potential set of implicatures which the ideal hearer would be able to infer from the utterance. Implicatures help the interpreter to understand the chunk and put it in the context while the speech is developing. It is important to note that the hearer retrieves only subjectively relevant conclusions which depend on his/her own cognitive thesaurus and knowledge of the situation. These conclusions do not necessarily have to

be those intended by the speaker. On the other hand, a speaker is not necessarily aware of all the possible presuppositions of his/her utterance.

It is possible that the interpreter infers more than the speaker actually communicates to him/her while relying on their mutually shared background information. Generally, inferencing for comprehension is a fast and subconscious process and people do it every day without even realising it.

This, however, is the case only when redundancy of the message is sufficiently high. Text with low redundancy is slowing the comprehension or makes it difficult to grasp the meaning. One of the core features of natural language is context-dependence. All unspecified meanings become specific in the context. Even direct meaning is not context-free and it too depends, no less than indirect meaning, on the contextual or background knowledge of the communicative participants.

Without such extralinguistic resources (cognitive, situational and pragmatic), comprehension has the potential to be incomplete, defective and deficient. Chernov (73-74) differentiates 8 identifiable factors in communicative situation. All those factors play important roles in comprehension and enable inferencing of the interpreter while listening to the discourse.

#### 1. Factor S

Factor S is concerned with the characteristics of the message source, or speaker. Who is speaking?

It is always important to know the speaker for who one will interpret. Being familiar with factor S can provide the interpreter with other relevant information. It can already give us clues about what the topic is going to be. If one interprets for a politician for example (s)he can already predict whether (s)he would be exposed to formal or informal atmosphere where it could take place as well as (s)he can narrow down the choice among topics.

It can be again demonstrated on one of the interpretation from the experiment. There one can see how important it is to know factor S when interpreting. Two short speeches were presented to interpreters but background knowledge was provided only to one of the texts and the other one had to be translated without any

knowledge of the topic whatsoever. Exactly this speech with no further information posed most problems and interpreters had a hard time while rendering the message as they were not familiar with the context. They did not know whose speech it was so when they were presented with the context-free text, one of them translated it as follows:

**Data Sample 27: Anticipation (1a)**

**S: So I just want to thank – but [you know my first major political speak was at CPAC and – probably five or six years ago.]**

I2: [Chtěla bych jenom poděkovat, ... chtěla bych Vám říct, že můj první velký veřejný projev byl v ... CPAK] {rising intonation, more of like a question} ... {hesitation} asi před pěti lety.

*(I just would like to thank, I would like to tell you that my first major speak was at CPAC probably five years ago.)*

Lacking the additional information about factor S, the interpreter chose to translate the sentence originating from a speech of American President as it would originate from a woman translating it as “chtěla bych je poděkovat” instead of “chtěl bych jen poděkovat”. Not being familiar with this factor can in some cases impose real problems and make the translation erroneous.

## 2. Factor Th

This factor focuses on the theme of a message, what the speaker is talking about? It provides the interpreter with a potential thematic framework for expected contributions and assigns them a certain degree of probability to their occurrence. This factor however will become fully and specifically known to the interpreter only at the conference or a place where interpretation takes place.

Preparing for this thematic message can assist the interpreter to interpret utterances where the speaker hints to something which is generally known by the audience familiar with the subject but which does not necessarily have to be familiar to the interpreter.

In the experiment, interpreters had to interpret Speech Two concerning the “BREXIT” situation. They were provided with this background knowledge knowing who is speaking, where, when and what about.

## **(h2)Data Sample 28: Anticipation (h2)**

S: = I'm not going to engage in the debate about what fans of The Clash would know as "should I stay or should I go?".

I3: = nechci se pouštět do debat o tom, jestli je otázka o tom, jestli zůstat nebo odejít.

*(I am not going to engage in debates about whether there is a question about whether we should stay or we should go.)*

## **Data Sample 29: Anticipation (d1)**

I2: /?/ Díky tomu, že jsme na začátku politické kampaně, tak chci rovnou říct, že se v tom nebudu angažovat a ... nechtěl bych se dostat – dostat do debat na téma, jestli má - máme zůstat nebo máme jít.

*(Owing to the fact that we are at the beginning of an election campaign I want to say straight away that I am not going to engage in it and I wouldn't want to get myself into debates about whether we should stay or we should go.)*

## **Data Sample 30: Anticipation (h)**

I1: = ... nebudu - nebudu se zabývat tím ... {asking for repetition of the end of the sentence} ... co by ... {hesitation} - ovlivnilo voliče.

*(I am not going to, I am not going to engage in anything what would influence voters)*

Interpreters were provided with the factor Th that is that Speech Two is about "BREXIT" which help them in the translation but none of them thought of another implicit sense of the message. The sentence is ambiguous where the second meaning refers to a British punk band The Clash and their song *Should I Stay or Should I Go*. Jokes like this which are to be translated are a risky business for interpreters. In this case, in order to detect the implicit meaning the interpreter needed to be thoroughly acquainted with British culture.

### **3. Factor E**

It deals with the relation of the act of speech to the event that provoked it. It basically asks itself a question "in what connection is the speaker speaking?" It points both to outside and inside events that occur during the conference itself. Knowledge of factor E may help the interpreter to predict the thematic framework, or even a specific topic which will be discussed next at the conference.

#### 4. Factor A

Factor A focuses on whom is the speaker addressing. It is interested in the message recipient, or audience. When the interpreter is familiar with the factor A, (s)he can deduce the formality/informality of the event. The type of audience can help him/her to anticipate what the subject of the speech is likely to be discussed.

#### 5. Factor F

This factor is concerned with the place, or forum, where is the speaker speaking?

Knowledge of the place where interpreting will take place consists of information about various external environmental factors. It informs the interpreter whether (s)he will interpret from a closed booth or whether (s)he will stand next to the speaker. In the booth there (s)he makes use of microphone and headphones and since the booth is closed, the occurrence of noises is minimal. This possibility can also bring some disadvantage like the impossibility to see the speaker and read their non verbal signals. When standing next to the speaker, (s)he more integrated into the conversation and (s)he can more easily read speaker's non verbal signals. But there is also bigger chance that (s)he will be disturbed by external noises.

#### 6. Factor M

Following the other factors, Chernov also differentiates Factor M which focuses on the speaker's motive, why is the speaker speaking? This factor is never explicitly stated. It could be defined as a combination of values shared by the speaker that lead him to act in a certain way in a given situation. It is determined by various aspects as for example by social environment, behavioural norms in that environment, and the speaker's role in society and even in the given environment. Knowing the motive can help the interpreter to recognize where is the speaker using satire or irony and when is (s)he being serious.

#### **Data Sample 31: Anticipation (6a)**

**S: And then they did these polls where I went through the roof and I wasn't even running, right?**

I2: ... {long silence and hesitation} skrz půdu?, na- na střechnu?, myslela jsem si, že to nezvládnou?

*(through the attic? On the roof? I thought I was not going to make it.)*

This is an example of a hidden motive which the interpreter did not detect because (s)he was not familiar with the speaker and his role in the society.

#### 7. Factor P

It points to the purpose of the speech which is very often stated in the discourse itself and can be easily anticipated from the total sum of the situational factors. An interpreter who has knowledge of the purpose of the speech prior to its interpretation can use it in order to prepare for the event. Knowledge of the purpose also assists him/her in detecting the implicit sense of the message, possible jokes or employment of irony.

#### 8. Factor T

It refers to time of the event taking place. Time at which an event takes place can have a symbolical meaning and can be important at determining the purpose and the overall meaning of the speech. Sometimes, it can also indicate speaker's social role and his/her importance in the society depending on whether (s)he speaks as a first or a last one.

If the interpreter takes maximum advantage of all these factors (s)he has the potential to translate effectively.

This claim can be easily supported by an example from the experiment.

#### **Data Sample 32: Anticipation (8a)**

**S: And I got a little bit concerned when I saw what was happening in the country.**

I2: A začala jsem se trochu obávat, když jsem zjistila, co se děje v zemi.

*(And I started to be a little bit concerned when I found out what was happening in the country.)*

This is the example of a rendition of Speech One where interpreters were not provided with any factors. Lacking the knowledge of factor S, the interpreter rendered the message as it would be delivered by a woman.

When one focuses on renditions of Speech Two which when interpreters were provided background knowledge along with the factor S, there is no mistake made with regard to the speaker.

### Data Sample 33: Anticipation (c)

S: = I talked about Britain and why I believe it is better for the UK =

I1: = {slight hesitation} mluvil jsem o Británii a taky proto, proč je to lepší pro Spojené království =

*(I talked about Britain and also because, why it is better for the UK)*

Without knowing where, when, why and about what is the speaker speaking, the interpreter would have no background knowledge whatsoever and his/her ability to translate effectively and correctly would be significantly lowered. These factors represent sources for inferences of different types. Combining factors Th and E allows the interpreter cognitive inferences while combination of F and T factors allows situational inference and pragmatic inferencing is accomplished by a combination of factors A,S,P, and M.

An interpreter can also get help during his/her work from “behavioural environment” (Monacelli, Simultaneous interpreting as communicative interaction) which is a term referring to the way in which communicating parties use their bodies and behaviour as a resource for framing and organizing their talk. The interpreter being treated as an active participant to the conversation, (s)he has to keep up with participants’ ability in communication to repeatedly invoke alternative contextual frames within the talk of the moment. According to some linguists, the analysis of a participation framework within activities makes it possible to view participants of the communication as not simply embedded within a context but actively involved in the process of creating it.

Inference is divided in Chernov’s work (Chernov) into four kinds; linguistic inference, cognitive inference, situational inference and pragmatic inference.

#### 6.1. Linguistic inference or syntactic anticipation

Linguistic inference is drawn by the hearer from the semantics of the discourse. This is a subconscious process based on intuitive linguistic knowledge of the hearer. It is based on the interpreter’s knowledge of either collocations and formulas or “predictor” words (words which provide clues to the role of proposition in the sentence such as function words, connectives,...).

The hearer is intuitively guided by the law of semantic agreement and (s)he is subconsciously looking for the iterative semantic components which make up a

coherent discourse. That means that (s)he makes inferences from the previous context. From the interpreter's point of view, iteration is a factor which allows for linguistic inference and thus makes it easier for him/her to render the message correctly. So it may be perfectly possible to understand speaker's meaning without actually understanding every single word and expression they use. If a word by itself is not important for understanding the text as a whole, it can be easily omitted by the interpreter without changing the sense of the message. However, linguistic inference is primarily based on the hearer's knowledge of the language used in the communication.

## **6.2. Cognitive inference or extralinguistic anticipation**

Cognitive inference has for its source hearer's cognitive thesaurus (background knowledge). It is based on cognitive knowledge or "cognitive complements" and it varies according to situational and personal factors.

Both linguistic and cognitive inference are very closely linked. To comprehend that is to infer the sense of the utterance in a sentence for example "A dog lies on the carpet in living room.", is possible only against the background of the traditional notions people have about life on the Earth, its laws and rules including gravitation without which it would not be possible for the dog to lie on the carpet. If the dog and the carpet were placed into a spaceship for example one would not be able to determine whether the dog is on the carpet or the carpet is on the dog. Background knowledge is thus very essential for human comprehension. The interpreter has to be familiar with the topic/situation in order to be able to translate correctly the message. If there is any ambiguity or the word translated has more than one meaning, background knowledge is needed to facilitate the rendition of the message while conserving the correct sense of it.

Chernov (67-68) shows another example of the importance of background knowledge choosing the performance of interpreter during symposium on breast feeding arranged by UNICEF when lecturer's utterance "the tiny stomach of an infant capable of holding only forty spoons of milk" was translated by the Russian interpreter as "four TEAspoons" and caused outburst of protests from the audience. By this example, Chernov demonstrates that the source of interpreter's error was lack of knowledge of an infant's anatomy, the fact that she rendered the phrase on the basis of a purely linguistic inference and the lack of preparation for the interpretation.



Preparation is closely connected to the inference as during the preparation, one infers what will be talked about, what vocabulary will be needed and what one probably should study for in order to more easily understand the discussed topic.

All the questioned interpreters in the experiment stated that they prepare themselves before the act of interpreting and that it is unlikely for them not to check up on information needed. They have to know for who they will be interpreting as well as the topic (whether they will be interpreting a wedding, at court or at a business meeting) and they adapt their preparation to it. The interpretation gets much easier when the interpreter already knows the speaker and is acquainted with his/her opinions and attitude towards the issue, the interpreter thus combines knowledge of both factor M and P.

It should be stated that linguistic and cognitive inference are not separated. On the contrary, they are connected to one another and they work together helping the interpreter during the process of rendering the message. When the interpreter lacks one of them there is a possibility that (s)he will make a mistake.

**Data Sample 34: Anticipation (6a)**

**S: And then they did these polls where I went through the roof and I wasn't even running, right?**

I2: ... {long silence and hesitation} skrz půdu?, na- na střechnu?, myslela jsem si, že to nezvládnou?

*(through the attic? On the roof? I thought I was not going to make it.)*

Having to face a translation of this sentence, interpreters had many problems dealing with it. They all had access to linguistic inference since all of them interpret from English so they are familiar with its rules and restrictions. What they were lacking was background knowledge which would make the cognitive inference possible. So they had to rely only on the linguistic inference, translating the sentence word by word.

In this case, after a long hesitation, the interpreter first started employing the linguistic inference to render the sense of each word separately but after realizing that it did not make any sense (s)he tried to employ the cognitive inference building on that little what (s)he heard before.

### **Data Sample 35: Anticipation (9b)**

I3: ... {greater hesitation } Šel jsem ... na- na střechu a ani jsem neběžel.

*(I went on the roof and I was not even running.)*

This is an interpreter choosing the linguistic inference and translating the text word by word. As (s)he did not know the topic, (s)he chose the easiest way to translate the utterance, the literal translation.

The last interpreter refused to translate the sentence saying that (s)he can think of three different translations but not knowing the context (s)he cannot choose among them.

Here one can see that while interpreting both cognitive and linguistic inference have to be employed. Lacking knowledge of one of them makes it for the interpreter very hard if not impossible to render the message correctly.

#### **6.2.1. Contextualisation**

Knowledge of the situation though important is not the only fundamental aspect allowing cognitive inference. It is the knowledge of the outside world where several specific events develop in sequence such as seasonal rhythms, temperature changes, or ocean streams. People learn to anticipate them as they grow up and this knowledge shapes them and their thinking. They do not even think about it, it is self-evident for them that a horse has four legs, the sun comes up in the morning and in the evening back down but all this knowledge being subconsciously anticipated by the interpreter influences the interpretation. However, some of those aspects change from culture to culture so it is important for the interpreter to know not only the grammar rules of the language but to be familiar with the culture in which the language is being spoken as well. This probability anticipation of the development of the message is the basic mechanism making SI possible.

This ongoing process of getting to know the context is called contextualisation. Setton (cited in Monacelli 61) describes it as a process where – for each successive utterance-context is specified by the previous utterance. He defines contextualisation as being both unconscious when a mental model is maintained and relevance is sought and conscious when a set of assumptions is constructed on the basis of previous discourse.

When the speaker and the hearer (here the interpreter) share the same context they create reasonable expectations that they are both referring to objects in the same way or that they are seeing them in the same light. However, the context of an utterance is a psychological concept, a subset of hearer's or speaker's assumptions about the world and those assumptions do not have to be necessarily shared by all participants of the communication. It is referred to as "cognitive environment" which takes into account the various external factors but the main emphasis is placed on the stimuli which they provide and its mental availability for the process of interpretation.

The context is generally distinguished into two different types. One which can be referred to as external or distal which includes information about the external world such as information about class, ethnicity, or gender of the speaker. The second type can be considered "internal". It is possible to understand through this type of context the type of occasion or interaction that is created by the participants through their actions.

It is Relevance theory which approaches communication from a view of competence rather than behaviour. It refers to part of people's assumptions about the world or cognitive environment. However, the interpreter is not always able to bring about the mutual cognitive environment between both parties so as to ensure successful communication.

### **6.3. Situational inference**

This is a kind of inference which refers to words and phrases such as "me" or "there" that cannot be understood without additional context. According to Chernov (70), the point zero of the deictic co-ordinates is represented by the "I" of the speaker, and "HERE" and "NOW" in relation to the speaker. These three instances change with every speaker and are very subjective. The interpreter cannot render the message correctly without any additional contextual information. There can be reminded the factor S which is closely linked with the situational inference being one of its building units. It can again be pointed to the example of the interpreter translating "I" in the text as a woman's voice when really it was a man's speech. That point both to a lack of knowledge of S factor and the situational inference as well.

The interpreter starts the inferencing already at the point of preparation when (s)he learns all the information needed for the interpretation. Amid those information, (s)he learns about the time and place of the interpretation and all the interpreter declared that

Just knowing where the interpretation will take place gives them essential clues how it will look like and how they should be preparing.

Understanding the situation which you are in is essential for a correct translation. The same form of words can have different, sometimes opposite meanings, depending on the specific situation as hearer makes inferences strictly depending on the situation. A simple example of “Lights please” meaning either “turn off the lights” or “turn on the lights please” depending on the situation in which the speaker finds himself.

The situational inference is allowed by the factor F as well as by the factor T or their combination.

Factor F is concerned with the type of conference or generally with the place where SI is provided. It can tell the interpreter what type of clothes (s)he should wear therefore gives her/him a hint about the formality of the event and the atmosphere. The initial data about the location provide sufficient basis for anticipation of many other factors of the SI communicative situation. This information is complemented by factor T which is closely linked with the E factor.

#### **6.4. Pragmatic inference**

This type of inference the hearer makes about the speaker and his social role as well as his specific role in a given situation.

It is useful to have knowledge about the speaker. This knowledge can include his nationality which can give the interpreter a clue to his possible view on the discussed matter. Knowing that the speaker for whom you will be translating during the discussions about refugee crisis in Europe is German, you can anticipate his probable view on the matter in advance. These interpreter’s assumptions about speaker (and his motive – factor M) are derived from knowledge of the current situation in the given country, in the world as well as from the social group and/or from any opposing forces acting against the interests of that particular social group.

When the interpreter has more in-depth knowledge about the speaker, including his individual characteristics and what is more important his discourse idiosyncrasies, it clears the way for pragmatic inference and with this knowledge can the interpreter anticipate a speaker’s choice and his political and moral opinions.

In the example from data, it is definitely useful for the interpreter to know who is president Trump and what his political opinions are. In the second text, the interpreter should be familiar with the BREXIT issue and whether the speaker is for or against it. Knowing this makes a difference and gives the interpreter a useful advantage while interpreting. Then (s)he knows what to expect as for example in this section where interpreter translated a passage from Speech Two which discussed possible “BREXIT” situation.

**Data Sample 36: Anticipation (c1)**

**S: When I was here last two years ago, I talked about Britain and why I believe it is better for the UK and certainly the EU that Britain is an engaged and active member of the club.**

I2: A když jsem tady byl před dvěma lety, tak jsem mluvil o tom, jak považuji za důležité, aby Británie byla součástí Evropy, a to je důležité tedy 'jak pro Evropu, 'tak pro Británii.) {faster speech rate}

*And when I was here two years ago, I talked about how I think it is important that Britain is part of Europe and that is important for both Europe and Britain)*

Owing to the background knowledge of the subject and that the speaker is against Britain leaving the EU, the interpreter translated the SL passage “engaged and active member of the club” as “I think it is important that Britain is part of Europe (...)”. Knowledge of the speaker and his/her opinions provides a source for a cognitive inference and thus facilitates inferencing as it was done in this example.

However, it is important to state that all factors can combine and do combine on a regular basis and are interdependent helping interpreters to render the message in a correct and efficient way.

**6.5. Interdependence of semantics and background knowledge in inferencing**

Inference is allowed not only by the factors in the communicative situation but by the components of discourse structure as well. When SI interpreter perceives and tries to comprehend the discourse, he makes inferences both from his knowledge of various communicative situation and from the components of the semantic structure. So it can be said that more experienced the interpreter is, faster is his competence of inferencing. Components of the semantic structure allow the interpreter to make inferences about the sense of the incoming discourse and they become interdependent with interpreter’s background knowledge and his acquaintance with the communicative situation, helping

the interpreter to attain the necessary level of comprehension in the extreme conditions of SI.

If the interpreter has some knowledge of the theme and origins of the event, he can from this knowledge draw certain conclusions about referential, deictic and evaluative components.

In the experiment, all the interpreters confirmed that their past experience help them in a current situation similar to the past ones to apply grounds for hypotheses about forthcoming developments in speech, a certain probability being ascribed to each of the latter.

### **6.6. Probability anticipation as a step-by-step process**

Retrieval of the sense or semantic structure of the discourse is a progressive process allowing the interpreter perception of a message little by little. One has to bear in mind that a discourse has semantic coherence, the sense of the whole. Only after hearing the whole discourse, we can completely understand it and analyse it.

This statement was confirmed by interpreters themselves in the semi-structured questionnaire. When asked whether they correct themselves during interpretation, they claimed that when they realize that they made a mistake in comprehension they waited for more speech to unfold and only then when they understood the sense of the message, they tried to correct themselves.

However, SI interpreter does not have the luxury to listen to the whole discourse and (s)he has to deal with the small chunks, trying to anticipate meaning of the whole discourse while interpreting them. It is a continuous development where the idea in each utterance is “complete” only relatively. Rather each utterance expresses an idea which is closely and inseparably linked with the preceding and subsequent ideas. But how is it possible that the interpreter is able to derive the meaning of the whole from utterances building it up?

When the semantic structure is coherent, the interpreter is able to achieve the comprehension via dynamic and cumulative process of inferencing. In order to be semantically coherent, the discourse has to unify its co-referential substructure. That refers to an extent to which each utterance in the discourse deals with the same matter or the same object of thought within the same framework.

It needs to be dependent on the context in which it is used as well as it needs to have the uniformity of value judgements about the objects of thought. In order to be semantically coherent, the discourse should have a single pragmatic framework and factive and modal unity. Then the SI interpreter who does not receive the discourse as a whole and receives it gradually, utterance by utterance can draw the meaning from these utterances.

As the SI interpreter cannot hear the entire sentence and has to immediately interpret, (s)he uses segmentation. In order to be able to encode and vocalise a segment for output, the interpreter generally requires to know the predicate. The interpreter has to break his/her translation into separate segments while being under high pressure. By this segmentation (s)he can gradually construct the whole discourse creating its whole by the number of segments.

Nevertheless, the interpreter has more strategies at hand while building up the discourse. Knowledge of another language (other than the SL and TL) is a controversial issue. Either it can be a great advantage to the interpreter or a disadvantage to him/her. Belonging to the same language family, two languages can have many similar factors helping the interpreter to understand the given text. (S)he can make use of that when not being sure of the meaning of one word in SL/TL (s)he can search in her other language's thesaurus for help. In the experiment, two of the interpreter claimed that knowledge of other language actually helps them during the interpretation. Translating from English but having the knowledge of Italian, the interpreter is able to translate words (s)he does not know in English but being similar with the Italian ones (s)he is able to render the message correctly. According to the interpreter, (s)he uses this strategy quite often, particularly when translating words not so common in English thus words (s)he does not use frequently and are not automatized, (s)he makes use of Italian words with the same meaning which are on the other hand used frequently so (s)he has them stored in the long-term memory. On the on the other hand, one interpreter claimed that knowledge of the other language actually makes the interpretation worse for him/her and these two languages get mixed in her head causing inaccuracy in translation and longer EVS. Nevertheless, comprehension should not be slowed by knowledge of other languages. Phonetics and phonology filter out words in other languages from their initial phonemes, but lexical activation and suppression are likely to be significant in production (Setton 75-76).

The first meaning evoked by a word will only be its most publicly shared meaning, the one which definition one can find in a dictionary. If not found in the interpreter's thesaurus of the given language, this meaning can be then searched for in another language's thesaurus the interpreter knows.

Every language is very specific but the similarities between them can make interpreter's work easier. As a typical strategy response to the word-order conflicts, which may often rise during the translation, is anticipation and "saucissonnage".

### **6.7. Theme, rheme and their role in comprehension during SI**

In order to understand what the speaker wants to communicate by his/her sentence, it should be clearly distinguished between what is (s)he talking about and what is (s)he saying about it. Chernov (42-43) in his work distinguished two things. The first being what one talks about which he called "basis of the utterance" and the second what one says about it which he named "focus" of this utterance. In other words, the basis of the utterance corresponds to theme and the focus of the basis of the utterance corresponds to rheme. Basically, it is when the speaker announces a topic and then says something about it. First there is the original thought, present in the speaker's mind which is then transformed into a discourse consisting of discrete units which is developing through time. This represents a way of rendering the speaker's communicative intent. The main concern of the simultaneous interpreter is with foregrounding of subject matter in a coherent discourse, not in an isolated utterance.

#### **6.7.1. Theme**

In interpreted discourse, one and the same subject matter will be dealt with in a number of sentences until it a new subject matter is introduced. The topic of the text is constituted by the object of thought with the greatest density of linkage to other concepts in the discourse. As the discourse unfolds, the continuous process of anticipation will generate new referents which are closely linked with the main topical ones and will thus increase redundancy in the sense of the message. It is the discourse cohesion which ensures the required redundancy in the thematic component of the discourse semantic structure. Every sentence points to the main theme and is linked to other sentences in the discourse and makes it easier for the interpreter to infer what will come next.



Chernov talks about a phenomenon which he called “staging” referring to a situation when at any particular point in the discourse there are certain things which are “on stage” and whatever is “on stage” is “foregrounded”. And only objects and entities that have already been brought on stage can be referred to later in the discourse by means of pronouns or definite expressions (Chernov 45). This “bringing on stage” or “staging” also allows for items to retreat from the lime light, or even from the stage altogether, as the discourse develops. This is how can the co—reference be explained. It functions on the basis when important elements and other components of thematic structure are being repeatedly mentioned in the discourse. A component which continues to play a role in the discourse is repeatedly brought “on stage” thus preventing from fading or being supplanted in memory by other, newer components appearing in the discourse. For example the “I” of the speaker always stays foregrounded.

The process of SI is typically performed on oral discourses with a semantic structure in which a foregrounding element plays a certain role at the point of its first appearance in an utterance. After this role, the foregrounding element becomes part of the theme of the discourse as a whole, which is constructed step by step in the interpreter’s mind.

### **6.7.2. Rheme**

Rheme, in contrast to the theme, exists only as foregrounder. Once the topic, theme of the discourse has been clearly stated or transparently implied, and the referential network is established, the interpreter seeks to comprehend the sense of the discourse and looks for information about actions and evaluations. (S)he seeks to comprehend speaker’s certainty or uncertainty as well as his/her intentions. Proper perception and comprehension of these parameters allow the interpreter to comprehend the message and they serve as reference points in the mental actions performed by him during simultaneous interpretation.

To know the rheme, one would have to combine knowledge of factor P, factor M and factor S. Who is the speaker, why is (s)he talking and what is his/her motivation? For example, in the case of political statement, a speech at an international gathering, one might expect the typical or dominant rheme to be the rheme of value judgement. In other words, most politicians or delegates do not seek to inform the audience about something for the sake of that information, but they want to convince the audience of the need to take a certain action. The speaker then represents the facts of his own choice

in support of certain arguments and he presents them with his own judgement of their values.

The interpreter renders not the sense of each utterance alone but the sense of the utterance as a whole. (S)he takes every sentence individually and builds up a discourse with a theme which is delivered with a certain purpose and intention of the speaker, rheme. The interpreter's objective at any given moment of his/her performance is to establish the communicative intention of the speaker in each particular segment of the discourse. When an interpreter misses the rheme of a discourse, it can lead to the loss of a substantial part of the message.

Chernov (124) distinguishes two types of rhemes; weak rheme and strong rheme. Weak rheme or the existential foregrounder as Chernov calls it performs only one function of the predicate, it refers the utterance to the outside world. It serves to introduce the deictic world of the discourse and its spatio-temporal co-ordinates into the semantic structure of the discourse. Predicate cannot remain neutral. It bears information not only of existence but also of factivity, modality and the communicative attitude of the speaker. So a weak rheme, being a predicate, of necessity performs a speech act.

### **6.8. Ear-voice span (EVS)**

SI interpreter must constantly monitor, store, retrieve, and decode the input of the source language while at the same time recording and encoding the translation of the previous input. As the interpreter does not have a chance to listen to the whole discourse and starts translating when the discourse develops, (s)he has to work under extreme conditions and time limits.

Ear-voice span or "lag" refers to the time elapsing between the subject's or interpreter's monitoring of the input, and his/her repeating or encoding it, respectively. This lag increases in length and periodically accumulates until the amount of input to be stored by the interpreter seems to surpass his storing capacity. And when this happens, the interpreter must catch up with the input in order to bring the distance between target and source language down to a manageable portion. EVS illustrates how long it takes for each interpreter to encode the source language, comprehend it and to decode it into the target language. It is closely linked with the anticipation and comprehension process. The faster and more successful anticipation is, the shorter is the EVS.

Delay or a lag varies over time, becoming shorter or longer depending both on the original speech and its successive translation. A special consideration should be given to linguistic factors, particularly word order. When word order is different in the respective languages it inevitably results in hesitations of varying degrees of obviousness.

All interpreters depend on information of a structural nature before they can start translation. The crucial piece of information for an interpreter is the predicate which enables him to start translation. Either the interpreter may wait for the information contained in the predicate or (s)he will agree to violate some of the conventions of the language which rendering is being made. Whether an interpreter chooses to begin to translate without awaiting the end of any input chunk, or whether he waits and stores more than one chunk before starting the translation, seems largely a matter of the nature of the particular chosen language. It was proved (Pöchhacker, Shlesinger 74-75) that when translating for example from German, interpreters delay translation longer than when translating from French or English. It is supposed that this is most probably because the predicate in German comes at the end of the proposition and objects or other modifiers precede it and it is only when the interpreter has decoded the predicate that he can start the translation.

Talking about interpreter's performance, the time variable is not uniform. It becomes problematic once a delay reaches a certain length thus interfering with the normal progress of the translation activity. In actual practice, it often happens that the interpreter receives the text of the paper to be translated or at least its summary and he is thus provided with additional informational and in particular anticipatory elements which make for him the translation easier so that the EVS should be shorter as well. On the other hand, when the mechanism of probability anticipation is blocked, one experiences a lengthening of the interpreter's lag (EVS).

### **6.9. Anticipation as psychological aspect of SI**

Talking about anticipation, it should also be discussed the psychology and the role of interpreter's brain in the whole process. The level of brain's ability to construct anticipations of events allows the successive act of interpretation. Human brain accumulates all the past experience and uses them during the interpretation as a help during anticipation. When the overall sense of the whole discourse is already clear then

it is preceded by conceptualization of a given chunk of the discourse. All of these processes are driven by a strong motivation to comprehend the particular utterance which is just being interpreted and the discourse as a whole. The ultimate goal of that motivation is to provide an adequate interpretation after comprehending the sense of the SL discourse which is then recreated in the TL.

When interpreting, the interpreter employs working memory in the process. William James separated it into primary and secondary memory. In the primary memory, only temporary forms are being stored so as to be readily accessible to conscious awareness. The secondary memory is assumed to reflect a much more durable system for the long-term storage of information. The both types work simultaneously during SI since the spoken language, by its very nature demands memory for its adequate comprehension.

Words share some but not all of the semantic features of their translation equivalents and thus will not denote all of the same referents.

A distinction is being made between two concepts; (Paradis 22) the implicit linguistic competence (such as phonology, morphology, syntax, and the lexicon) and the pragmatic aspect of language use (such as a reliance on inferences from situational context, general knowledge, emotional prosody,...).

The implicit linguistic competence in other words grammar is being learned consciously, usually in school. It is available for conscious recall and is applied to the production and comprehension.

The pragmatic aspect or metalinguistic knowledge is acquired incidentally, usually through interactions with speakers of the language in situational contexts. It is a kind of know-how of the speaker, stored without conscious knowledge of its contents, and it is used automatically. During interpretation considerable demands are being imposed on the cognitive aspect which allows the interpreter to comprehend the situation and the context in which is the discourse unfolding.

In order to interpret a certain utterance, there are certain processes taking place that enable it. In the normal course of events, as a verbal message reaches the ear of the interpreter, it undergoes two parallel sets of processes such as mnemonic encoding and linguistic decoding (Paradis 21). In other words it means that the interpreter breaks

down the incoming message into smaller chunks which correspond to syntactic phrases and/or semantic units.

The whole process is fairly complex. All starts, as it was already noted, with the echoic memory being employed to grasp the incoming source language chunk, then the chunk is linguistically decoded by the interpreter in order to arrive at the meaning of the chunk. This is followed by encoding the chunk in the target language succeeded by the output of the translation in the TL which is then picked up by the ear of the interpreter and is being monitored for correctness, being decoded to arrive at the final comprehension. If the final meaning in the TL is identical with the SL meaning in the beginning of the process, then the translation is deemed successful.

While this complex process is taking place, the speaker of the source text continues to produce the SL verbal material. So the interpreter has to decode the second incoming message while encoding the first one in the TL, and so on until the whole sentence and then the whole discourse has been translated.

When one speaks, his/her brain creates strong associations between the elements of each language and forms separate networks of connections that can nevertheless be independently activated or inhibited (Chernov 157-159). The created traces can be freely activated. The more frequently a given trace is used, the lower its activation threshold so it is easier for the speaker to activate it again and the lesser amount of stimulation is needed to activate it again. The activation threshold is a function of frequency of activation and the time elapsed since its last activation (Chernov 157-159).

Interpreters must activate the TL system by themselves in order to encode what they have just decoded from the SL while at the same time they must keep a different SL utterance in their short-term memory. For example a bilingual speaker usually elects to speak one language rather than another thus the activation threshold of the language which was not selected is raised. One can see that SI thus imposes considerable demands on the cognitive system and in particular on the activation of threshold levels of each language system.

#### **6.10. Memory in SI**

Talking about SI processes it should be also mentioned how the interpreter's memory works during these processes decoding information from the SL speech and encoding it

again into the TL. Recent research has demonstrated that brain organization as well as cognitive functioning can be both influenced by experience. Regular involvement or training in particular activities may improve the functioning of specific brain structures and the mental processes they mediate. Thus the more experienced interpreter is, (s)he should be better at storing and working with the provided information. Comparing consecutive interpreting and SI, consecutive interpreting data are stored fundamentally in a long-term memory (LTM) whereas in SI data are being stored in short-term memory.

In the process of SI, text passages and/or individual elements remain cognitively present even after the simultaneous processing without an intention to learn as well as a simultaneous interpreter adapts to the speaker during the ongoing interpretation. (S)he adapts to his/her speaking style, rhythm of speech, use of individual linguistic patterns and other specificities of speaker's speech which (s)he gradually learns during SI. This adaptation to the speaker occurs unconsciously and interpreting strategies are acquired during the process. In SI in order to memorize the whole content of the text in long-term memory an interpreter would have to have to learn it intentionally. The information will not be stored in interpreter's long-term memory when doing a routine work or if interpretation can be done without background knowledge. If a task is complex in a way that it does not leave any processing capacity available, the interpreter will not be able to store information in long-term memory at all. If an utterance is syntactically complex, it imposes an additional load on working memory. This is determined by a number of propositions presented in the utterance, by the presence of complex or multiple clausal subordination as well as by non-linear sequence of predicates in the utterance. When an interpreter breaks the utterance into two facilities (s)he can get a relief from the overload on working memory.

All the various processes taking place during the interpretation seem to challenge verbal working memory abilities for the temporary storage of the information received until it is subsequently recoded into the TL. The role of working memory abilities is very substantial for SI and at the same time it is significantly burdened by SI.

The interpreter uses not only long-term and short-term memory but (s)he also makes use of two other different kinds of memories (Setton 244) helping him/her to successful discourse comprehension.

## 1. Immediate (phonological) memory

It is described as a very short term memory storing words with only linguistic signification. It is required for sensory identification and integration to existing knowledge. Immediate memory is likened to a scroll on which incoming words and sounds are displayed briefly (around three seconds) before disappearing. However, the information carried by these words contributes to the registration of ideas, or sense-units in the long-term cognitive memory.

## 2. Cognitive memory

This second type of memory used by the interpreter is a longer-span memory which registers ideas by associating them with pre-existing concepts.

Switching in between those kinds of memories the interpreter builds up a meaning of the whole discourse in his/her head and achieves comprehension. This process becomes very tiring as the interpreter has to maintain coherence by attending to all the “cognitive indicators” in the previous discourse.

### **6.11. Speech rate**

Interpreter’s memory is also very closely linked with speech rate which should be also mentioned here as it is an important aspect in SI. Success in interpretation is influenced by many factors and speech rate is one of them.

Delivery speed imposes limitations on interpreter’s performance particularly when a speech is being read out loud by the speaker thus the speech rate considerably increases and the interpreter has to face a great load of information which (s)he has to store in the memory and subsequently encode to the TL. The EVS can thus become longer than it is during an unprepared speech. Recent studies have investigated that speech rate may be the possible source of difficulty in interpretation. Although speed delivery plays a very important role in SI, it should be stated that some speakers are likely to speak very rapidly but provide little information. However, what is more important than the speed of delivery (since high speaking speed is typical of SI) is the information density, complexity of the speech, prior preparation and familiarity with the topic of discourse. Rendition of a message which is presented with increased speech rate is usually

reflected in terms of diverse non-fluencies and tendencies to omit phrases or different parts of the spoken discourse. Even though some studies provided contradictory results showing that a higher presentation rate of a text can have a positive effect on performance due to reduced strain on interpreter's working memory.

However, the interpreter can make use of redundancy of the text which (s)he can omit, rendering the given information just once. Translation concerns meaning, not the words and rendering meaningful text is more important than speed delivery. Interpreter's short "horizon" in terms of segment available for processing and the pressure of time make it difficult for the interpreter to store the message and render it correctly.

The interpreter must work at a high processing speed, must be resistant to stress as well as s(he) needs to have the ability to cope with multiple loads, as during SI there is a need for multiple-task performance. The whole process of SI can be accomplished only on the basis of the interpreter's full mastery, continuous improvement and automatization of the necessary interpretation strategies.

#### **6.12. Attention in the process of SI**

Attention is another important aspect of constituting the whole process of interpreting. An interpreter divides his/her attention in between various elements turning his/her attention once to SL then to TL. How is attention divided influences the final result of SI. Claudia Monacelli (61) talks about Goffman's concept of "attentional tracks" specifying how an interpreter perceives relevant and non-relevant action by communicating parties.

Posner (cited in Smith 39) defines attention breaking it down into three basic components.

##### **1. Alertness**

Alertness refers to readiness to deal with incoming stimuli and leads either to a good or a bad final result. It is a state when the interpreter is geared up to make a rapid choice which is being determined by the current situation. A good result is considered when interpreter having a greater speed in selecting information is more efficient and fast during interpreting, thus the process and result are successful. A bad result is considered when sometimes an interpreter selects words too rapidly and that then leads to inaccuracy.



## 2. Orientation

It is a second key component of attention. It defines which direction the interpreter's attention turns to choosing a specific target. It is only a detection of a given target, a prerequisite to deeper levels of processing.

## 3. Detection

The third and a last component of attention is a process that selects and engages a particular and specific bit of information from an utterance.

These three components of attention all work together tuning interpreter's attention to specific elements in the speaker's speech. Interpreter detecting information interferes with the processing of other information. In order to detect given information, an interpreter has to exhaust more attentional resources than during even orientation making this information available for later cognitive processing.

### 6.13. Self-monitoring and feedback

SI as a multiple task performance requires many things to be done at the same time imposing great demands on the interpreter. (S)he has to provide the listener with the translation which is correct and complete. When translating, the interpreter uses attention to monitor his/her output for potential errors in his/her rendition. The correction can be made on the phonological, syntactic and lexical levels. The monitoring is ongoing and goes as far as the discourse evolves. The monitoring has to take place in order to see whether the rendered message is functionally equivalent or whether it has to be somehow modified and corrected.

Such a correction can be demonstrated on the following example from the experiment.

#### Data Sample 37: Anticipation (2b)

S: = but you know, my first major speak was at CPAC=

I3: ... a můj- moje první hlavní řeč byla u {hesitation} CPAC =

*(And my first major speak was at CPAC)*

The interpreter made here a self-correction after having heard end of the sentence where (s)he found out that the possessive pronoun refers to the feminine noun. Thus (s)he

changed the original “můj” referring to a masculine noun to “moje” which refers to a feminine noun which in this sentence is “řeč” (speak).

Naturally, the interpreter will not either become aware of every error (s)he makes nor (s)he will be able to correct every mistake which was registered. Error tolerance varies from one interpreter to another and there is always the time pressure which may lead the interpreter to forgo correction so as not to jeopardize the simultaneity of the process of interpretation.

It was confirmed by the asked interpreters that even though they can in many cases hear the mistake made by them, there is almost never any time left for the correction. They agreed that if the mistake is not fundamental and does not change the meaning of an utterance, they continue in the translation so as not to interrupt the ongoing process.

## **7. Omissions and additions in interpretation**

During the process of interpretation, the interpreter’s version may depart from the speaker’s original version. Every language is different, following different grammatical rules which the interpreter is bound to obey in order to construct the utterances correctly. These departures often lead the interpreter to either omit some material from the source text or to add or substitute some material in the target text. While substitutions also present an important resource to the interpreters, they are not the focus of enquiry of this thesis.

### **7.1. Omissions**

Omissions are referring to items which are present in the original version but were left out in the translation provided by the interpreter (Barik 78). Omissions can be often seen during interpretations and they are employed by the interpreter to satisfy the need to omit redundant information. However, the interpreter has to somehow choose which words can be omitted and which ones have to be preserved. One can make omissions when talking about contextually irrelevant repetitions, false starts, or fillers such as “well”, or “you know”. Words one cannot and must not omit are those bearing the information, the contextually relevant words which are indispensable for the comprehension of the text. It can be said that some degree of quality in SI can be indicated by non-omission and good interpreters, not being familiar with the context to make such decisions, should not leave out elements from the text. Nevertheless,

omissions are made on a regular basis and they are one of the strategies an interpreter frequently uses to be successful in his/her task. “High quality” is not the same thing as rendering everything in the source text (Pym 6).

Following Barik, four types of omissions can be distinguished (Barik 80-85).

### 1. Skipping omission

This is an omission of a single lexical item or a short phrase which was left out by the interpreter and which is of a minor consequence.

#### **Data Sample 38: Omissions (2b)**

S: = **but you know, my first major speak was at CPAC** =

I3: ... a můj- moje první hlavní řeč byla u {hesitation} CPAC =

*(And my first major speak was at CPAC)*

Here the interpreter skipped translation of a short phrase “but you know” and went directly to the translation of the main information without causing any disturbance or loss of information in interpretation or

### 2. Comprehension omission

This is an omission of a larger unit than just a lexical item. Larger unit of the text is omitted due to the interpreter’s inability to comprehend or translate it. This can result in a final loss in meaning and sometimes disjointed speech.

Using an example from the experiment, the comprehension omission can be observed in the following example.

#### **Data Sample 39: Omissions (2)**

S: = **but you know my first major speak was at CPAC** =

I1: = ale jak víte =

*(but as you know)*

The interpreter completely left out two fundamental elements; that it was the first major speech of that speaker and that it was at CPAC. Without this information, the text becomes unclear and incomplete. The reason of this omission would probably

be incomprehension of the abbreviation “CPAC” and thus leaving it out along with elements surrounding it. But this action makes the interpretation erroneous as the content of the message was not fully rendered.

### 3. Delay omission

The third type of omission made refers to an omission of a larger unit of text and it is similar to the comprehension omission. The difference is that delay omission is primarily caused by the delay of the interpreter in relation to the speaker at a particular point in interpretation. This delay causes that the interpreter fails to register, or to leave out some part of text in order to catch up with the ongoing speech of the speaker which can be illustrated on the following example from the experiment.

#### **Data Sample 40: Omissions (e) 1**

S: = **and certainly the EU that Britain is an engaged and active member of the club.**

I1: = a ... CAPS také o tom, že Británie je novým členem {asking for repetition of the end of the sentence} klubu.

*(and also about the fact that Britain is a new member of the club)*

Due to a long hesitation prior to interpretation, the interpreter failed to register both adjectives “engaged” and “active”. (S)he then omitted them in the TL translation.

### 4. Compounding omission

Compounding omission refers to the interpreter regrouping or compounding elements from different clause units. This results in a sentence with a slightly different meaning from the original though the gist is retained later in the discourse.

However, this type of omission was not identified in the experiment and the example will not be provided.

## **7.2. Additions**

Addition refers to an item not to be found in the original text which is newly added to the text by the interpreter.

Barik differentiates four types of additions (80-85).

## 1. Qualifier addition

It refers to the interpreter adding a qualifier or short qualifying phrase not present in the original version. This addition preserves the meaning although it slightly changes it. It makes a difference when one says that someone is fast or intelligent changes it to “very fast”, “very intelligent”.

### Data Sample 41: Additions (g)

S: = as we're at the beginning of an election campaign in this country =

Il: = protože jsme na počátku hlavní kampaně v této zemi,=

*(as we are at the beginning of the main campaign in this country)*

In this example, the interpreter added to the TL a new quantifier “main” which was not present in the SL discourse. (S)he thus changed the meaning of the sentence.

## 2. Elaboration addition

Though similar to the qualifier addition, it is more elaborate and more extraneous to the text. It is only a little change and it does not imply any change to the meaning of the original text.

Barik (90) demonstrates elaboration addition on the example of the translation from French to English from his on data.

S version: Je dois rester conscient de ce qui est juste. (I have to stay/be conscious of what is just.)

I version : I must be aware and conscious of what is just and fair.

The example illustrates that the interpreter added two new elements “aware” and “fair” to the TL which are not present in the original sentence. However, those two words are being employed to clarify in the target language the meaning of what is being said. The French word “conscient” translated by its English equivalent “conscious” is reinforced by a verb “to be aware” which has very similar meaning as “conscious” and thus does not change or affect the meaning of the sentence. Secondly, the addition of “fair” is a further example of the interpreter reinforcing what is being said in the original sentence.

### 3. Relationship addition

This addition refers to the act when the interpreter adds a connective or some other material used to introduce the relationship among units of a sentence not specified in the original.

#### **Data Sample 42: Additions (5a)**

**S: I loved the people. I loved the commotion.**

I2: ... {longer hesitation} Lidi mě podpořili a ... užila jsem si i tu atmosféru.

*(People supported me and I enjoyed the atmosphere)*

Here the interpreter added a connective “a” making from two independent sentences one unit containing two parts connected by coordinate connector.

### 4. Closure addition

This addition serves the interpreter to give closure to a sentence unit and it thus accompanies rephrasing, omission or misinterpretation made by the interpreter. Closure addition does not add anything substantial to the sentence.

Nevertheless, this type of addition was not identified in the data.

In the experiment, additions and omissions represent a powerful tool in SI and they were both employed by interpreters in the experiment. Omissions served the interpreter to save the time during the strict time limits imposed on him/her in SI. However, the interpreter has to choose wisely what (s)he can omit and what has to remain in the text in order not to produce an erroneous translation. This requires experience and a skill.

Additions were in the experiment employed by the interpreter in order to retain the structure of the SL. Every language structure is different and the interpreter has to make sure that the speech flow remains uninterrupted. Both omissions and additions facilitate interpreting and were used by interpreters on a regular basis.

## 8. Conclusion

The aim of the thesis was to provide an introduction to the work of the Russian linguist Ghelly V. Chernov (1929-2000) who in his work *Inference and Anticipation in Simultaneous Interpreting* (2004) focused on the importance of anticipation and redundancy in the process of SI. The thesis introduced Chernov's theory and underpinned this with an analysis of data collected as part of the experiment. The experiment set out to test Chernov's theory and to demonstrate which processes take place during SI interpretation and how they are employed by the interpreter, with particular focus on anticipation and redundancy. The thesis illustrated anticipation and redundancy as two interlinked concepts participating in the process of SI. They both play an important role in interpreter's comprehension during SI and his/her success in rendering the message. It demonstrated the importance of anticipation in SI suggested by Chernov and that it is being actively employed by interpreters during their work as one of the most important strategies facilitating the process of interpreting.

The approach taken was to introduce anticipation and redundancy as two essential building blocks in the process of simultaneous interpretation which work together and when used by the interpreter correctly, they facilitate a better comprehension in SI. First, the thesis presents different strategies which can be employed by the interpreter during SI and one can see what numerous processes take place during interpretation, often simultaneously. This provides an insight into the demanding work of the SI interpreter and shows the complexity of different processes and strategies employed by him/her. After a description of these processes, the focus was shifted to redundancy and anticipation in particular. Every chapter and subchapter in the thesis contributes to its main research question and deepens the comprehension of it.

In addition to Chernov's theory which represents the core of the thesis, an experiment was also conducted, representing the second building block of the thesis. Examples from its analysis were used to complement the theory. It was conducted to test the theory in practice. The experiment provided an opportunity to observe whether and how is Chernov's theory employed by interpreters in their work.

The experiment was designed with help of three interpreters. The main aim of the experiment was to examine the importance and employment of anticipation and redundancy in the work of three Czech interpreters. The experiment included translation

of two speeches and was followed by an interview with proposed questions which aimed to seek interpreters' own experience and their own point of view on the subject in their work.

Owing to the experiment and the analysed data, the thesis was able to answer the question whether an interpreter really makes use of Chernov's strategies described and to what extent (s)he uses them. All interpreters' translations demonstrated the use of anticipation as well as their work with semantic redundancy. Anticipation may indeed be claimed to constitute the key element in SI; all three interpreters relied heavily on the strategy of redundancy during their interpretation. This may be particularly seen when comparing the renditions of Speech One for which interpreters were not provided with any further information. For Speech Two the interpreters were provided with the basic information about the speaker, place and the subject of the speech. Here prior awareness proved to be a crucial element and an essential strategy used in SI. This claim was supported by interpreters cross-stating that preparation in advance for the interpretation event is essential in rendering a professional interpretation. Owing to prior preparation, anticipation aids the interpreter and is more likely to be successful in his/her rendition. Preparation has been demonstrated to be key to the anticipation process for interpreters. Even the knowledge of the person for whom they will be interpreting becomes a source of anticipation since from this time (as confirmed by interpreters), the interpreter already thinks about the possible situations which might occur or the vocabulary (s)he might use during interpretation.

The experiment demonstrated how interpreters dealt with redundancy of the text. Who left the TL message redundant and who used compression or omission to make the speech less redundant. By lowering redundancy of the text, the interpreter gains time to produce a better translation of the incoming message. By usage of the transcript markers it was referred to the relevant features in the speech, it was illustrated when the interpreter had problems with rendering the message, whether (s)he hesitated before the output and whether it took a long time to process the SL message. This is an important signal demonstrating that something occurs in the cognitive process of the interpreter and requires them to engage strategies in order to catch up to the speaker. The subchapter focusing on the ear voice span (EVS) contributed to understanding to what extent is the EVS important in examining SI and that it directly influences interpreter's performance. The EVS indicates how long does it take to the interpreter to process the



given chunk and to deliver the translation to the hearer resulting in a rule; the better anticipation, the shorter the EVS. The transcript markers illustrated the approximate EVS and whether it took the interpreter longer to produce the TL speech by marking longer pauses and hesitations before the output. Using this technique, the transcript illustrated that the longer pause prior to rendering the heard chunk to the TL, the harder it is for the interpreter to render it correctly, not forgetting any relevant information from the text. Transcripts of Speech One with no context provided contain more hesitations and longer pauses than transcripts of Speech Two where interpreters were familiar with the context. This observation supports the idea that the EVS is linked with ability to anticipate and the poorer anticipation, the longer the EVS.

The design of the experiment, where interpretations of two texts were compared, demonstrated how important anticipation is in the SI process and how much interpreters rely on it in rendering the meaning of the utterance. The experiment illustrated that when anticipation fails, it is harder to employ other strategies as compression or addition, the meaning of the utterance becomes difficult to detect and the translation becomes erroneous.

In the majority of cases, employing the strategies proved to be beneficial for interpreter's rendition from the SL into the TL. When employing these strategies, one should also consider interpreter's experience and skill in SI which can decide whether the employment of the strategy is successful.

The experiment demonstrates that strategies described in Chernov's theory are employed in practice and they assist the interpreter during SI. Their employment represents an improvement in the interpreter's renditions. It can be observed from both the interpreters' translations and their responses in the semi-structured questionnaire that anticipation plays an important role in their work as SI interpreters. All of them consider prior preparation to be an indispensable element in their SI experience. Only when they are provided with the information needed for the translation, can they employ anticipation to the greatest extent.

The interline translations demonstrated how the interpreter copes with redundancy, when (s)he chooses not to render it and makes compressions or omissions or when (s)he leaves it as it is. Whether (s)he chooses to take the iterative element out or leave it in the text, redundancy is rather a positive factor in SI.

In order to collect data and to make the analysis, a thorough study of Chernov's theory and other relevant literature were needed. Only then the experiment could be designed and texts for interpretation chosen followed by a search for SI interpreters which was not an easy task to undertake. With that gained knowledge, the semi-structured questionnaire was created and interpreters interviewed. In order to be able to create transcripts of the speech, other literature had to be studied and when transcripts were written, their analysis could be then made which provided the examples in the thesis. A thorough learning process was under way during the work and while the analysis of data was being done a possible improvement of collecting the data was spotted. The speeches were read to interpreters during the interview so they did not all have exactly same conditions as they would have if the speeches were played to the interpreters in their original form. This could be possibly changed in the future methodology of data collecting.

The thesis examined Chernov's theory in practice and demonstrated how it is being employed by interpreters. It successfully illustrated SI strategies, analysed them and explained them in the context of Chernov's theory. The comparison of Speech One and Speech two translations highlighted the importance of anticipation in SI and how much interpreters rely on it. It is interesting how much interpretation can change when the interpreter is provided with information and how much the process of anticipation directly influences SI. It was also demonstrated that it is difficult to interpret or even prepare for the use of language which makes special reference to a cultural or specific genre (politics) or humour, in this case combining the song of an 80s UK punk band to the very serious business of the UK should leave the EU.

Speech One: "And then they did these polls where I went through the roof and I wasn't even running, right?"

Speech Two: "I'm not going to engage in the debate about what fans of The Clash would know as "should I stay or should I go?".

Both speeches challenged and confused the interpreters.

The experiment tested the theoretical knowledge in practice. It assisted in comprehending the processes employed during the SI and an opportunity to examine them while they are being simultaneously employed. The thesis enriched and deepened

the point of view on interpreting, it provided an insight into the complexity of the SI process. It demonstrated the ways in which the interpreter can work with the language and how (s)he does it. Interviews with interpreters provided an opportunity to see SI in action. This and the subsequent analysis of the data were inspiring and motivated me in the future pursuit of the subject.

## List of References

- Barik, Henri C. *Simultaneous Interpretation: Qualitative and Linguistic Data*. L.L. Thurstone Psychometric Laboratory, University of North Carolina, 1973.
- Chernov, Ghelly V. *Inference and Anticipation in Simultaneous Interpreting*. Vol. 57, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2004.
- Dimitrova, Brigitta Englund, and Kenneth Hyltenstam, editors. *Language Processing And Simultaneous Interpreting Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Vol. 40, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2000.
- Edwards, Jane Anne., and Martin D. Lampert. *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1993.
- Fasold, Ralph W., and Jeff Connor Linton. *An Introduction to Language and Linguistics*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Lambert, Sylvie, and Barbara Moser Mercer, editors. *Bridging The Gap, Empirical Research In Simultaneous Interpretation*. Vol. 3, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1994.
- Macnamara, Brooke N., and Andrew R.A. Conway. "Working Memory Capacity as a Predictor of Simultaneous Language Interpreting Performance." *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, Dec. 2016, [www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2211368115000923](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2211368115000923).
- Monacelli, Claudia. *Self-Preservation in Simultaneous Interpreting, Surviving the Role*. Vol. 84, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2009.
- Pöchhacker Franz, and Miriam Schlesinger, editors. *The Interpreting Studies Reader*. Routledge, 2002.
- Setton, Robin. *Simultaneous Interpretation: a Cognitive-Pragmatic Analysis*. John Benjamins Pub. Co., 1999.
- Witt, Ernst-Jan C., and Marie Gillette. "What Is Linguistic Redundancy?" [Http://Www.math.rug.nl](http://Www.math.rug.nl), 15 Mar. 1999, [www.math.rug.nl/~ernst/linguistics/redundancy3.pdf](http://www.math.rug.nl/~ernst/linguistics/redundancy3.pdf).

## Appendices

### Appendix 1

#### Translated speeches and their “ideal” translation – experiment

1. Speech One - current American President Trump’s speech with no context provided to interpreters

So I just want to thank – but you know my first major speak was at CPAC and – probably five or six years ago. First major political speech. And you were there. And it was – I loved it. I loved the people. I love the commotion

And then they did these polls where I went through the roof and I wasn’t even running, right?

But it gave me an idea. And I got a little bit concerned when I saw what was happening in the country. And I said, “Let’s go to it.”

##### 1.1. “Ideal translation”

Jen bych Vám chtěl poděkovat, ale jak víte, tak moje první významná řeč byla na CPACu (Conservative Political Action Conference), zhruba před pěti či šesti lety. Byla to moje první větší politická řeč. A vy jste byli u toho. A bylo to úžasné. Lidé byli skvělí, stejně tak jako atmosféra.

A pak udělali ten průzkum, ve kterém jsem měl neskutečný úspěch a to jsem ani nekandidoval.

To mi ale vnuklo nápad. A začal jsem mít trochu obavy, když jsem viděl, co se v zemi děje. A řekl jsem: “Pojďme do toho!”

2. Speech Two - First Vice-President Timmermans’s speech with context provided

Thank you

Good afternoon to all of you

It's a great pleasure to be back after two years. When I was last here two years ago, I talked about Britain and why I believe it is better for the UK and certainly the EU that Britain is an engaged and active member of the club. Let's get one thing clear at the start, as we're at the beginning of an election campaign in this country I'm not going to engage in the debate about what fans of The Clash would know as "should I stay or should I go?"

## 2.1. "Ideal" translation

Děkuji

Všem Vám přeji dobré odpoledne

Je mi velkým potěšením tu po dvou letech zase být. Před dvěma lety jsem zde mluvil o tom, proč věřím, že je pro Velkou Británii a rozhodně i pro Evropskou Unii lepší, když je Británie jejím aktivním členem a zapojuje se do evropských záležitostí. Hned na začátku si ujasněme jednu věc. Jelikož jsme na počátku volební kampaně v této zemi, nebudu se zapojovat do debaty na téma, zdali bychom měli v EU zůstat či odejít.

## Appendix 2

### 1. Speech One transcript - president Trump's speech with no context provided

S ... speaker

I1 ... interpreter 1

I2 ...interpreter 2

I3 ... interpreter 3

Line one ... the original speech (SL)

Line two ... interpreter's translation to Czech (TL)

Line three ... interline translation, which was the subject to analysis against the original speech (in the transcript highlighted in grey)

Interpreter one (I1)	
Transcript Line	
(1) S:	<b>So I just want to thank =</b>
I1:	Chci Vám poděkovat = <i>(I want to thank you)</i>
(2) S:	<b>= but you know my first major speak was at CPAC =</b>
I1:	= ale jak víte = <i>(but as you know)</i>
(3) S:	<b>= probably five or six years ago.</b>
I1:	= ... před pěti či šesti lety <i>(five or six years ago)</i>
(4) S:	<b>First major political speech.</b>
I1:	Byla nová první hlavní politická řeč. <i>(It was a new first major political speech)</i>
(5) S:	<b>And you were there.</b>
I1:	A vy jste při tom byli. <i>(And you were there)</i>
(6) S:	<b>And it was – I loved it.</b>
I1:	A já, mně se to opravdu líbilo. <i>(And I, I loved it)</i>
(7) S:	<b>I loved the people.</b>
I1:	Moc se - moc se mi líbili ti lidé. <i>(I really – I really liked the people)</i>
(8) S:	<b>I loved the commotion.</b>
I1:	{no translation provided, the interpreter did not know}
(9) S:	<b>And then they did these polls where I went through the roof and I wasn't even running, right?</b>
I1:	... {great hesitation, asking for repetition, the sentence repeated three times, the interpreter did not provide the translation}
(10) S:	<b>But it gave me an idea.</b>
I1:	A díky tomu jsem dostal nápad. <i>(And because of that I got an idea)</i>
(11) S:	<b>And I got a little bit concerned when I saw what was happening in the country.</b>
I1:	Začal jsem se zajímat, když jsem viděl, co se děje v zemi. <i>(When I saw what was happening in the country, I started to be interested)</i>
(12) S:	<b>And I said, CAPS let's go to it.</b>
I1:	A řekl jsem, CAPS no uděláme to. <i>(And I said well we will do it.)</i>

Interpreter two (I2)	
Transcript Line	
(1a) S:	<b>So I just want to thank – but [you know my first major political speak was at CPAC and – probably five or six years ago.]</b>
I2:	[Chtěla bych jenom poděkovat, ... chtěla bych Vám říct, že můj první velký veřejný projev byl v ... CPAK] {rising intonation, more of like a question} ... {hesitation} asi před pěti lety. <i>(I just would like to thank, I would like to tell you that my first major speak was at CPAC probably five years ago.)</i>
(2a) S:	<b>First major political speech.</b>
I2:	Můj 'první 'velký 'veřejný 'politický 'projev. {segmentation of the phrase, every single word stressed} <i>(My first major public political speech.)</i>
(3a) S:	<b>And you were there.</b>
I2:	... A vy jste tu – vy jste tam byli. <i>(And you, you were there.)</i>
(4a) S:	<b>And it was – CAPS I loved it.</b>
I2:	A bylo to s ... CAPS kvěly. <i>(And it was great.)</i>
(5a) S:	<b>I loved the people. I loved the commotion.</b>
I2:	... {longer hesitation} Lidi mě podpořili a ... užila jsem si i tu atmosféru. <i>(People supported me and I enjoyed the atmosphere)</i>
(6a) S:	<b>And then they did these polls where I went through the roof and I wasn't even running, right?</b>
I2:	... {long silence and hesitation} skrz půdu?, na- na střechu?, myslela jsem si, že to nezvládnou? <i>(through the attic? On the roof? I thought I was not going to make it.)</i>
(7a) S:	<b>But it gave me an idea.</b>
I2:	Ale udělala jsem si představu. <i>(But I got an idea)</i>
(8a) S:	<b>And I got a little bit concerned when I saw what was happening in the country.</b>
I2:	A začala jsem se trochu obávat, když jsem zjistila, co se děje v zemi. <i>(And I started to be a little bit concerned when I found out what was happening in the country.)</i>
(9a) S:	<b>And I said, CAPS let's go to it.</b>
I2:	A řekla jsem, pojďme do toho. <i>(And I said let's go to it)</i>



Interpreter three (I3)	
Transcript Line	
(1b) S:	<b>So I just want to thank=</b>
I3:	... Chci jenom poděkovat = <i>(I just want to thank)</i>
(2b) S:	<b>= but you know, my first major speak was at CPAC=</b>
I3:	... a můj- moje první hlavní řeč byla u {hesitation} CPAC = <i>(And my first major speak was in CPAC)</i>
(3b) S:	<b>= and probably five or six years ago.</b>
I3:	= to bylo asi tak {slight hesitation} před pěti nebo šesti lety. <i>(That was probably five or six years ago)</i>
(4b) S:	<b>First major political speech.</b>
I3:	'První 'zásadní 'politický 'projev. <i>(First major political speech)</i>
(5b) S:	<b>And you were there.</b>
I3:	A vy jste tam byli. <i>(And you were there.)</i>
(6b) S:	<b>And it was – I loved it.</b>
I3:	A bylo to, ... moc se mi to líbilo. <i>(And It was, I loved it.)</i>
(7b) S:	<b>I loved the people.</b>
I3:	Miluji ty lidi. <i>(I love the people.)</i>
(8b) S:	<b>I loved the commotion.</b>
I3:	Miluji ... {the interpreter did not know the Czech equivalent} <i>(I love...)</i>
(9b) S:	<b>And then they did these polls where I went through the roof and I wasn't even running, right?</b>
I3:	... {greater hesitation } Šel jsem ... na- na střechu a ani jsem neběžel. <i>(I went on the roof and I was not even running.)</i>
(10b) S:	<b>But it gave me an idea.</b>
I3:	Ale ... 'to mi vnušlo nápad. <i>(But it gave me an idea.)</i>
(11b) S:	<b>And I got a little bit concerned when I saw what was happening in the country.</b>
I3:	... Začal jsem se o to zajímat, když jsem viděl, co se děje {hesitation } na – na venkově. <i>(When I saw, what was happening in the countryside, I started to be interested in it)</i>
(12b) S:	<b>And I said, CAPS let's go to it.</b>
I3:	A řekl jsem 'půjdem do toho. <i>(And I said we'll go to it.)</i>

## Appendix 3

### 2. Speech Two transcript - First Vice-President Timmermans's speech with context provided

Interpreter 1 (II)	
Transcription Line	
(a) S:	<b>Thank you, good afternoon to all of you.</b>
II:	Všem Vám přeji dobré odpoledne. <i>(Good afternoon to all of you)</i>
(b) S:	<b>It's a great pleasure to be back after two years.</b>
II:	Je mi velkým potěšením být zpátky po dvou letech. <i>(It's a great pleasure to be back after two years.)</i>
(c) S:	<b>When I was here last two years ago, =</b>
II:	Když jsem zde byl před dvěma lety, = <i>(When I was here two years ago)</i>
(d) S:	<b>= I talked about Britain and why I believe it is better for the UK =</b>
II:	= {slight hesitation} mluvil jsem o Británii a taky proto, proč je to lepší pro Spojené království = <i>(I talked about Britain and also because, why it is better for the UK)</i>
(e) S:	<b>= and certainly the EU that Britain is an engaged and active member of the club.</b>
II:	= a ... CAPS také o tom, že Británie je novým členem {asking for repetition of the end of the sentence} klubu. <i>(and also about the fact that Britain is a new member of the club)</i>
(f) S:	<b>Let's get one thing clear at the start, =</b>
II:	Rovnou si pojďme ujasnit jednu věc, = <i>(Let's get one thing clear at the start)</i>
(g) S:	<b>= as we're at the beginning of an election campaign in this country =</b>
II:	= protože jsme na počátku hlavní kampaně v této zemi,= <i>(as we are at the beginning of the main campaign in this country)</i>
(h) S:	<b>= I'm not going to engage in the debate about what fans of The Clash would know as "should I stay or should I go".</b>
II:	= ... nebudu - nebudu se zabývat tím ... {asking for repetition of the end of the sentence} ... co by ... {hesitation} - ovlivnilo voliče. <i>(I am not going to, I am not going to engage in anything that would influence voters)</i>

Interpreter two (I2)	
Transcript Line	
(a1) S:	<b>Thank you, good afternoon to all of you.</b>
I2:	Děkuji vám, přeji vám všem {slight hesitation } dobré odpoledne. <i>(Thank you, good afternoon to all of you)</i>
( b1) S:	<b>It's a great pleasure to be back after two years.</b>
I2:	Je mi velkým potěšením být tady znovu zpátky po dvou letech. <i>(It's a great pleasure to be back here after two years.)</i>
(c1) S:	<b>When I was here last two years ago, I talked about Britain and why I believe it is better for the UK and certainly the EU that Britain is an engaged and active member of the club.</b>
I2:	A když jsem tady byl před dvěma lety, tak jsem mluvil o tom, jak považuji za důležité, aby Británie byla součástí Evropy, a to je důležité tedy 'jak pro Evropu, 'tak pro Británii.) {faster speech rate} <i>And when I was here two years ago, I talked about how I think it is important that Britain is part of Europe and that is important for both Europe and Britain)</i>
(d1) S:	<b>Let's get one thing clear at the start, as we're at the beginning of an election campaign in this country I'm not going to engage in the debate about what fans of The Clash would know as "should I stay or should I go?"</b>
I2:	/?/ Díky tomu, že jsme na začátku politické kampaně, tak chci rovnou říct, že se v tom nebudu angažovat a ... nechtěl bych se dostat – dostat do debat na téma, jestli má - máme zůstat nebo máme jít. <i>(Owing to the fact that we are at the beginning of an election campaign I want to say straight away that I am not going to engage in it and I wouldn't want to get myself into debates about whether we should stay or we should go.)</i>

Interpreter three (I3)	
Transcript Line	
(a2) S:	<b>Thank you, good afternoon to all of you.</b>
I3:	Děkuju, pěkné odpoledne vám všem. <i>(Thank you, good afternoon to all of you.)</i>
(b2) S:	<b>It's a great pleasure to be back after two years.</b>
I3:	Jsem velice rád, že mohu být zase po dvou letech zpátky. <i>(I am really glad that I can be here again after two years.)</i>
(c2) S:	<b>When I was here last two years ago, =</b>
I3:	Když jsem tady byl naposledy před dvěma lety, = <i>(When I was here last two years ago)</i>
(d2) S:	<b>= I talked about Britain and why I believe it is better for the UK =</b>
I3:	= mluvil jsem o Británii, a proč si myslím, že je pro Spojené království lepší = <i>(I talked about Britain and why I think that it is better for the UK)</i>
(e2) S:	<b>= and certainly the EU that Britain is an engaged and active member of the club.</b>
I3:	= a také pro EU, že Británie je její součástí a je aktivní. <i>(and also for the EU that Britain is its member and is active.)</i>
(f2) S:	<b>Let's get one thing clear at the start, =</b>
I3:	Ujasněme si hned na začátku jednu věc, = <i>(Let's get one thing clear at the start)</i>
(g2) S:	<b>= as we're at the beginning of an election campaign in this country =</b>
I3:	= když zahajujeme volební kampaň v této zemi = <i>(As we are launching an election campaign in this country)</i>
(h2) S:	<b>= I'm not going to engage in the debate about what fans of The Clash would know as "should I stay or should I go?".</b>
I3:	= nechci se pouštět do debat o tom, jestli je otázka o tom, jestli zůstat nebo odejít. <i>(I am not going to engage in debates about whether there is a question about whether we should stay or we should go.)</i>

## Appendix 4

### 3. Transcriptions demonstrating the flow of the speech and lexical comparison

<b>Speech One transcript - president Trump's speech with no context provided</b>			
<b>Original Text</b>	<b>Interpreter one (I1)</b>	<b>Interpreter two (I2)</b>	<b>Interpreter three (I3)</b>
So I just want to thank	Chci vám poděkovat (I want to thank you)	Chtěla bych jenom poděkovat (I just would like to thank)	Chci jenom poděkovat (I just want to thank)
but you know my first major speak was at CPAC	ale jak víte (but as you know)	chtěla bych Vám říct, že můj první velký veřejný projev byl v ... CPAK (I would like to tell you that my first major speak was at CPAC)	... a můj- moje první hlavní řeč byla u {hesitation} CPAC (And my first major speak was at CPAC)
probably five or six years ago.	před pěti či šesti lety (five or six years ago)	asi před pěti lety. (Probably five years ago)	to bylo asi tak před pěti nebo šesti lety. (That was probably five or six years ago)
First major political speech.	Byla nová první hlavní politická řeč. (It was a new major political speech)	Můj 'první 'velký 'veřejný 'politický 'projev. (My first major public political speech)	'První 'zásadní 'politický 'projev. (First major political speech)
And you were there.	A vy jste při tom byli. (And you were there)	A vy jste tu – vy jste tam byli. (And you, you were there)	A vy jste tam byli. (And you were there)
And it was – I loved it.	A já, mně se to opravdu líbilo. (And I, I loved it)	A bylo to s ... CAPS kvěly. (And it was great)	A bylo to, ... moc se mi to líbilo. (And It was, I loved it)
I loved the people.	Moc se - moc se mi líbili ti lidé. (I really liked the people)	Lidi mě podpořili (people supported me)	Miluji ty lidi. (I love the people)
I loved the	{no translation}	a ... užila jsem si i	Miluji ... {the

commotion.	provided, the interpreter did not know}	tu atmosféru. (I enjoyed the atmosphere)	interpreter did not know the Czech equivalent} (I love...)
And then they did these polls where I went through the roof and I wasn't even running, right?	... {long hesitation, asking for repetition, the sentence repeated three times, the interpreter did not provide the translation}	... {long silence and hesitation} skrz půdu?, na- na střechu?, myslela jsem si, že to nezvládnou? (through the loft? On the roof? I thought I was not going to make it.)	... {greater hesitation } Šel jsem ... na- na střechu a ani jsem neběžel. (I went on the roof and I was not even running)
But it gave me an idea.	A díky tomu jsem dostal nápad. (And because of that I got an idea)	Ale udělala jsem si představu. (But I got an idea)	Ale ... 'to mi vniklo nápad (But it gave me an idea)
And I got a little bit concerned when I saw what was happening in the country.	Začal jsem se zajímat, když jsem viděl, co se děje v zemi. (When I saw what was happening in the country, I started to be interested)	A začala jsem se trochu obávat, když jsem zjistila, co se děje v zemi. (And I started to be a little bit concerned when I found out what was happening in the country)	... Začal jsem se o to zajímat, když jsem viděl, co se děje {hesitation } na – na venkově. (When I saw, what was happening in the countryside, I started to be interested in it)
And I said, CAPS let's go to it.	A řekl jsem, CAPS no uděláme to. (And I said well we will do it.)	A řekla jsem, pojďme do toho. (And I said let's go to it)	A řekl jsem 'půjdem do toho. (And I said we'll go to it.)

<b>Speech Two - First Vice-President Timmermans's speech with context provided</b>			
<b>Original text</b>	<b>Interpreter one (I1)</b>	<b>Interpreter two (I2)</b>	<b>Interpreter three (I3)</b>
Thank you, good afternoon to all of you.	Všem Vám přeji dobré odpoledne.	Děkuji vám, přeji vám všem {slight hesitation } dobré odpoledne.	Děkuju, pěkné odpoledne vám všem.
It's a great pleasure to be back after two years.	Je mi velkým potěšením být zpátky po dvou letech.	Je mi velkým potěšením být tady znovu zpátky po dvou letech.	Jsem velice rád, že mohu být zase po dvou letech zpátky.
When I was here last two years ago, =	Když jsem zde byl před dvěma lety, =	A když jsem tady byl před dvěma lety, =	Když jsem tady byl naposledy před dvěma lety =
I talked about Britain and why I believe it is better for the UK =	{slight hesitation} mluvil jsem o Británii a taky proto, proč je to lepší pro Spojené království =	tak jsem mluvil o tom, jak považují za důležité, aby Británie	mluvil jsem o Británii, a proč si myslím, že je pro Spojené království lepší =
and certainly the EU that Britain is an engaged and active member of the club.	= a ... CAPS také o tom, že Británie je novým členem {asking for repetition of the end of the sentence} klubu.	byla součástí Evropy, a to je důležité tedy 'jak pro Evropu, 'tak pro Británii.) {faster speech rate}	a také pro EU, že Británie je její součástí a je aktivní.
Let's get one thing clear at the start, as we're at the beginning of an election campaign in this country =	Rovnou si pojdme ujasnit jednu věc, protože jsme na počátku hlavní kampaně v této zemi, =	/?/ Díky tomu, že jsme na začátku politické kampaně, tak chci rovnou říct, =	Ujasněme si hned na začátku jednu věc, když zahajujeme volební kampaň v této zemi =
I'm not going to engage in the debate about what fans of The Clash would know as "should I stay or	= ... nebudu - nebudu se zabývat tím ... {asking for repetition of the end of the sentence} ... co by ... {hesitation} -	že se v tom nebudu angažovat a ... nechtěl bych se dostat - dostat do debat na téma, jestli	= nechci se pouštět do debat o tom, jestli je otázka o tom, jestli zůstat nebo odejít.

should I go“.	ovlivnilo voliče.	má - máme zůstat nebo máme jít.	
---------------	-------------------	------------------------------------	--

**Transcription symbols used:**

. sentence-final falling intonation

? final rise

... pause of ½ second or more

' primary stress

**CAPS** emphatic stress

- glottal stop: sound abruptly cut off

() “parenthetical” intonation: Lower amplitude and pitch plus flattened intonation contour

= at the end of the line indicates segment to be continued after another’s turn; at the beginning of line indicates continuation of prior segment after another’s turn

/?/ inaudible utterance

{ transcriber’s comment

( ) interline translation



## Appendix 5

### Semi-structured questionnaire – questions asked

	<b>Interview question</b>	<b>Interpreter One (I1)</b>	<b>Interpreter Two (I2)</b>	<b>Interpreter Three (I3)</b>
Gained experience	How long have you been interpreting?	I started when I was 12 years old. (The interpreter is about 40 years old)	I have been interpreting for 9 years.	I have been interpreting for 5 years.
	What are the topics you interpret most often?	Mostly for real estate agencies, when foreign people want to buy a house.	I often interpret for Škoda company so mostly processes of production. And I interpret for real estate agencies as well.	I interpret for the court and weddings.
	Who do you usually interpret for? (companies/organisations/individuals)	In majority of cases, I interpret for companies.	I mostly interpret either for companies or for individuals.	Usually organisations and individuals.
	Do you interpret on a regular basis?	It depends, but usually twice a week.	Not really. Usually three times a month.	Not really. It is usually two times a month.

Preparation before interpretation	Do you prepare prior to undertaking interpretation work? If so, what kind of preparation?	Yes, I do prepare. If a company has a website, I look at it to get informed what they do. When I know what will be discussed I study it in order to understand it.	I search on the internet for relevant information. If I do not understand some processes, I study them.	Yes, I prepare. When it is for court I have the possibility to look into documents. When I interpret a wedding, I prepare relevant vocabulary so it has some quality. If I have already done it, I do not really need prior preparation because I already know what awaits me.
	Do you look up in advance vocabulary which could be possibly relevant to the subject of interpretation?	Yes, I do. I think of the words I might need and I look them up	Yes. I look up the words I think relevant for interpretation and then I study them.	Yes, when I interpret something new or an official event which requires specified vocabulary.
	Do you always know for who and on what kind of	Yes, I always insist on them telling me. I	Yes, that is the essential information I	Yes, it is really important for me to know so I

	occasion you will interpret?	employ interpreters as well and according to the subject of the interpretation I choose the most appropriate one to go, one who is the best at interpreting that particular subject.	always want to know. I always need to know what awaits me and for what I have to prepare.	know what awaits me.
Knowledge of other languages.	Do you interpret from any other language than English?	I speak Russian, Italian, Spanish, and German. But I scarcely interpret from these languages. But when I do, it is usually from German.	Yes, I interpret from Italian.	I know several languages but I interpret only from English. But I learnt Russian, Japanese, Italian and German.
	Do you think that knowledge of other language influences your interpretation from English in some way?	It does. I personally have problems with switching in between the languages and I confound the vocabulary. I see it rather as a disadvantage.	Yes, it can provide a help when trying to remember a word or on the other hand it can confuse the interpreter and (s)he can mix the two languages	Yes, it assists me in rendering the message.

			together.	
	Does the knowledge of another language assist you in the interpretation from English? If so, in what ways?	When I interpret from English to Czech, knowledge of other foreign language helps me (it helps you with vocabulary which is similar across languages) but when I interpret from Czech to English it poses many difficulties (the vocabulary is muddled up).	It helps me in interpreting from English because Italian and English have many similar words and when I cannot remember a word in one language, the other helps me in its rendition.	It helps me to remember vocabulary which is similar for both languages.
	What aspect of interpreting do you find most challenging?	The time limits. When you have to be as fast as possible with the rendition and it has to be rendered correctly.	For me it is the stress during interpretation and when I have to interpret for someone who does not suit me.	When the speech is too long – I simply do not remember it any longer. I do not like when the speech is short either. Then one does not understand the context and has no time to get

				acquainted with it.
	What do you struggle with the most?	Finding the appropriate synonym in other language.	Sometimes I have difficulties in finding the appropriate synonym in the other language in such limited time.	It is hard to pay attention all the time and some elements just slip from my mind.
	What is your strategy in translating words in the text you are not familiar with?	I infer their meaning from the other elements present in the sentence.	I would omit them and tried to render the message without it.	I wait for the ongoing message in order to infer their meaning from it and if there is no time, I omit it.
	What do you do when you want to render the sense of the message even though you do not understand all elements present in it?	If I do not understand more than one word in a sentence, I try to give a neutral, non-committal rendition and wait for the ongoing message to explain it to me.	I would infer the sense from the rest of elements and from the ongoing message.	I try to infer the sense of the message from its surroundings.
	What are "ideal" interpreting conditions for you?	For me, it is interpreting without stress, in the pleasant	When I know where I go interpret and what will be the	It is when I interpret a subject I am interested in

		<p>atmosphere. I like it when you really feel that people appreciate your work and they really need you in order to understand each other.</p>	<p>subject of interpretation. Ideal would be if they worked with me as with a partner. It is nice when they offer you a glass of water for example.</p>	<p>and when I know what awaits me.</p>
	<p>When you make a mistake in interpretation, do you correct yourself? How?</p>	<p>When it is a significant mistake, I correct myself, later in the translation. By adding a sentence where I make the correction.</p>	<p>I try to correct myself but there is usually no time for it.</p>	<p>If there were be time to do it, I would. But I usually do not correct myself even though I am usually aware when I make a mistake.</p>

