

CONVERGENCE AND DIVERGENCE IN TRANSLATING VS. INTERPRETING COMPETENCE

Jamal al-Qinai
Kuwait University
jamalqinai@hotmail.com

The paper tackles competence in English-Arabic translation and interpreting while highlighting similarities and differences at the textual and performance levels. It sets out by discussing the requirements of quality and fluency for both translators and interpreters. A focal point of interest is performance constraints in simultaneous interpretation, which include, among other things, logistics, lag, SL deficiencies, lexico-grammatical asymmetry and rhetorical divergence. The study concludes with an overview of the compensation strategies employed by interpreters such as queuing, segmentation, approximation, compression, and ellipsis.

0. Introduction

For the proponents of the *theorie du sens* (Dillinger, Lederer, & Seleskovitch), there is no apparent difference between translating and interpreting, as both deverbilize an SL message and reproduce it in a TL utterance in a 'spontaneous' and 'automatic' manner (Pochhacker 1994:22 and Baker 1998:42). Yet, many interpreters and psycholinguists consider the two to be very different and even incompatible professions. The most obvious of these differences is that a translator deals with written language and has time to access reference sources, revise, edit, and polish his work, while a simultaneous interpreter (SI) deals with oral language under stressful conditions and has no time to refine or retract his output (Gile 1989: 41). He is expected to play the role of an overhearer, not a conversationalist. His task is to parrot the SL speaker in a different language code. For after all, he transmits to a public whom he does not know thoughts of which he is not the author. Any supplementary background, whether terminological or world knowledge, should be acquired prior to interpreting, as decision-making and response to the SL stimulus has to be instantaneous and 'spontaneous'. 'Non-automatic' text processing operations that require a special effort can give rise to errors, omissions, and gaps (Baker 1998:44). Therefore, an SI should be witty, quick-tongued, and possess a high level of SL/TL proficiency.

A number of experimental studies conducted by psycholinguists (Treisman 1995; Goldman-Eisler 1968; Gerver 1972; and Henderson 1982) focused on performance variables such as SL/TL pace of delivery, short-term memory, ear-voice span, noise interference, pauses, false starts, etc. Many recurrent interpreting errors have been attributed to either saturation in or improper management of the

interpreter's processing capacity.

In the following sections, the paper will discuss points of convergence and divergence between translation and interpreting. It should be noted at the outset that this study is concerned with simultaneous conference interpreters (SI) who sit in a booth without having direct contact with the SL speaker. This will exclude liaison (i.e., ad-hoc or casual) interpreters who play the role of an intermediary with the right to solicit repetitions, rephrase, give explanations, summarize, and rearrange.

1. Quality and audience reception

While assessing the quality of a written translation, reviewers may look for grammatical, terminological or orthographical accuracy, and stylistic fidelity. In interpretation, audience rather than reviewers are mainly concerned with intelligibility, speedy delivery and avoidance of corrections, false starts, and artificial pauses in the middle of a sentence. TL audience requires a continuous flow regardless of the lag the interpreter faces between the onset of an SL burst and its TL rendition. This element of continuous flow will lead to rushed structures, lack of cohesive devices, and paraphrases of jargon terms as the interpreter is denied any break to evaluate his options.

While the audience may sympathize with the interpreter in cases of false starts, stuttering, or self-corrections, they may be unforgiving when an erroneous rendition leads to poor bilateral communication. It is, therefore, better for an interpreter to pass unnoticed as an invisible mediator since feedback from the audience is often a criticism rather than praise. An interpreter is expected to produce a full post-edited version with no room for revisions as he does not have the option of covering his mistakes with ivy, as architects do, or with mayonnaise, as chefs do (Sykes 1987:97). Such recipient constraints are not observable in the same way in written translation. A translator can work on his draft(s) in the absence of the recipients who will only have access to the finished work rather than the work in progress.

2. Fluency and output ratio

Venuti (1998:1-2) criticizes linguistic-oriented attempts to objectively quantify and measure interpretation output relative to SL input. In his view such an approach ignores the fact that translation and interpretation entail a creative reproduction and manipulation of the SL original. Bassnett (2001:751), in turn, believes that it is absurd to believe 'that complete equivalence can ever exist' let alone be measured quantitatively.

A conventional way of assessing the fluency of an interpreter is to compare the volume of the SL input and the TL output. In written translation this can be measured in terms of word count, paragraph and sentence divisions as well as punctuation marks and cohesive devices. In SI one can measure the ratio of pauses, chunking, acceleration, deceleration, and tempo of delivery. The highest pause intervals are the equivalents of paragraph divisions, while shorter ones mark

sentence boundaries (Yagi 2000: 534).

If the interpreter's pause time is disproportionate to the speaker's, this may indicate that the interpreter is missing out on SL discourse, either because of his/her nonfluency or owing to SL redundancy. Even if the latter is the case, the audience may readily ascribe pauses to interpreter incompetence and complain of poor quality. Therefore, interpreter fluency implies that TL pauses must not be longer than the speaker's. In other words, the speaker's performance is used as a benchmark (Yagi 2000:527). The interpreter is expected to imitate the tempo and intensity of the speaker's voice. Low speech rate is often conceived of as typical of less-qualified interpreters.

The matching of SL and TL volume by means of chunking and pause intervals is by no means conclusive evidence of an interpreter's fluency. To begin with, a cumulative speech ratio is less sensitive to occasional variations (e.g., initial pauses when rendering verbal sentences from and into Arabic). Intrasentential pauses may occur as a result of the interpreter's attempt to render a nuance or a jargon term by paraphrase.

In other instances, interpreters use a slow pace and lengthen their utterances on purpose to cover up for TL lexical gaps or omissions. Fluctuations may also occur when interpreters reformulate SL chunks into different packages in order to cope with complex structures or run-on sentences.

3. Performance constraints in SI

Like any other communication event, output in simultaneous interpreting is governed by input quality. The performance of an SI may be influenced by one or more of the following factors:

3.1 The need for specialization

It has been argued that interpreters should only work into their mother tongue as a TL (cf. FIT charter) while other linguists suggest that the mother tongue should be the SL as it is the only one s/he understands well enough to react to rapidly (Baker 1998: 45). In practice, interpreters are required to code-switch constantly between L1 and L2 as either SL or TL. Yet, it should be pointed out that the choice of SL or TL for a given interpreter depends on the comparative ease or difficulty in the comprehension and production processes. Other factors being equal, when an interpreter faces more difficulty in the comprehension stage, then he should work from his mother tongue as SL. If the difficulty is in the production stage, then he should work into his mother tongue as a TL.

While the ideal situation requires interpreters to specialize in a given field, conference organizers often perceive the interpreter to be a 'jack of all trades'. Thus, the same interpreter who undertakes legal interpretation is given economic, political, technical, or medical assignments.

3.2. Personal and logistical factors

The interpreter's awareness that major decisions hinge upon the precision of the interpretation puts him in a highly stressful situation. The quality of the

interpretation is negatively affected by the interpreter's inexperience, fatigue, lack of motivation (e.g., financial incentives), or poor audio-visual conditions in the booth (e.g., inefficient acoustic equipment, distorted signals, noisy surroundings). Some speakers use gesture to amplify or clarify what s/he is saying. This may form an integral part of the communication process in certain cultures. Unfortunately, conference booths are often placed at the farthest point from the podium (usually at the back of the conference hall). This will deprive the interpreter from maintaining visual contact with the speaker's gestures or multimedia presentation, a task not required of the translator of written texts.

3.3 Lack of a holistic approach

To quote an old cliché, Dijk (1983:101) compares a simultaneous interpreter to a juggler, a tightrope walker, rather than a scientist working under ideal conditions. As he ventures into the unknown, an SI never knows what awaits him around the bend or where to go next. More often than not, the subject of the SL may shift drastically, especially in QA sessions. He may be caught off guard when the speaker uses a neologism or an idiolectal idiom.

In contrast, the translator has sufficient time between text reception and delivery (up to an agreed deadline, which might be negotiable) to look at the text 'holistically' at first before attempting to 'localize' his attention to a given paragraph, sentence, clause, or a word. The input processed by the translator is an autonomous 'polished' text with most of its cohesive devices inserted in place. He does not have to anticipate the next segment, as the whole text is a tangible 'visible' entity laid before him. He has more time to ponder the entire text at his disposal. As a result, memory load is less and stress is milder.

An interpreter does not have this holistic top-down approach. It is the task of the SI to wrestle with the immediate textual clues on the basis of the separate installments of input. Each chunk of output is expected to be 'locally' coherent in its own right and fall in line with the overall context (Mason & Hatim 1997:51). This means that the SI must possess the original speaker's talent and have a hermeneutic power of his own. In practice, however, an SI relies on textual signals available in the immediate pretext rather than the overall context. He operates at the level of the lexical item until a break occurs in the speaker's output (e.g., a pause or falling intonation), at which the interpreter is able to predict how the clause will be completed. This impromptu performance denies the interpreter the opportunity to apply the 'think-aloud protocols' where translators introspect and verbalize what they do as they do it. Therefore, false starts, slips, editing, and self-repair have to be dealt with on the spot. Many of the so-called jerky starts and inconsistent TL renditions may be traceable to lack of an adequate overview of context and structure rather than interpreter's incompetence.

3.4 Time lag

This relates to the ear-voice span (i.e., decoding and encoding), which varies according to the syntactic and lexical complexity of SL input and pace. Thus, for example, if the SL syntactic structure is too complex, the time given for the lexical search diminishes. The further an interpreter lags behind the speaker the clearer

the understanding of the SL message, hence the easier its reformulation, but the heavier the burden on memory (Giles 1995:207). Although full synchronization remains an ideal, an excessive delay can disrupt the interpreter's execution tempo and may lead to a freeze in the encoding of some TL chunks.

A professional translator typically produces 6-7 words per minute or approximately 360 per hour. An SI, in contrast, has to respond instantly to the incoming SL utterance at a rate of approximately 150 words per minute or 9000 words per hour. The pace of delivery depends among other things on whether the SL discourse is an improvised or a written speech and the time limit allocated for each speaker. For example, long conference presentations of some 20 or 30 pages are often squeezed into twenty minutes or less.

While the translator is free to weigh a range of alternatives before deciding on the 'best' version, the interpreter has only one chance (Baker 1998:186). With an increase in speed (e.g., 180-200 w.p.m.) and a more complex text, there is bound to be a decline in output accuracy and more cases of vague, poorly cohesive structures, mistranslations, and omissions. The time available for evaluative listening is curtailed by the pressure to process current input, render preceding input, and anticipate the next utterance. This is aggravated by the feedback of the interpreter's voice from the microphone to the headset.

Unlike a consecutive interpreter who can take notes and render the gist of the SL utterance without his attention being divided between speech reception and production, a simultaneous interpreter is engulfed in a crisis situation. S/he is always on tiptoes as s/he tries to apply tactics and strategies (see below) to cope with the SL input in 'real time', and time in SI is relatively uniform and extraordinarily stringent. Therefore, The load in SI is rather on the short-term memory, while in consecutive interpreting the long term memory comes to the forefront.

In a given interpretational situation there are triggers that increase processing-capacity requirements. These include fast speeches with dense information, unusual logic, syntactic and stylistic idiosyncrasies, as well as lack of redundancy (e.g., numbers, names, and acronyms). The result is a saturation of the processing capacity that leads to a pile up of earlier, more difficult segments. In such situations novice interpreters follow a consecutive-interpretation strategy whereby they listen long enough to make sense of a given SL segment and translate it without following up what the SL speaker is saying during the transformation into TL (Gile 2000:543). Naturally, there would be a high rate of omission, a low speech ratio, and eventually a lag.

3.5 SL deficiencies

The smoothness and fluidity of TL delivery may be negatively affected by the poor quality of an SL input. The latter may be fraught with obscurities, solecisms, non-standard accents, misarticulated word segments, idiolectal peculiarities, a vocabulary replete with foreign borrowings, and sloppy syntax (e.g., incomplete and run-on sentences). For example, Arabic speakers tend to override sentence boundaries and ignore comma pauses. In fact, commas in Arabic are a formal

convenience, as they do not necessarily coincide with pauses in actual speech, as in (1).

- (1) مضى ما يقرب من قرن ونصف على بداية التنقيب الأثري، و نشر العديد من الكتب حول علم الآثار، إلا انه لم يزل هناك غموض في كثير من معاني هذا العلم، فهو من العلوم الحديثة التي دخلت البلاد العربية، واتسعت مجالاته اتساعا كبيرا، بالإضافة إلى أنه جلب معه مصطلحات مبهمة وغير معروفة، وكثيرا ما يلتبس معناها على الدارسين.

/mɪɫɖa: ma: yaqrub min qarn wa-niʃf ʃala: bida:yat al-tanqi:b al-ʔaθari:, wa-nuʃira al-ʔadi:d min al-kutub hawla ʃilm al-ʔa:θa:r, ʃala: anna-hu lam yazal huna:ka ʔumu:ɖ fi: kaθi:r min maʃa:ni: ha:ða: al-ʃilm, fahuwa min al-ʃulu:m al-hadi:θa allati: daɣalat al-bila:d al-ʃarabiyyah, wa ʔittasaʔat maja:la:tuhu ʔittisa:ʃan kabi:ran, bil-ʔiɖa:fah ʔila: annahu jalaba maʔahu muʃtalaħa:t mubhama wa-ʔayr maʃru:fah, wa-kaθi:ran ma: yaltabisu maʃna:ha: ʃala: al-da:risi:n/

[Almost a century and a half has passed since the beginning of archaeological excavation, and many books were published on archaeology, although there is still ambiguity in many of the concepts of this science, for it is one of the new sciences that entered the Arab countries, and its fields expanded tremendously, and it further introduced ambiguous and incomprehensible terms, and their meanings are often confusing to students.]

Texts like the one above increase the load on the interpreter's short-term memory and may disrupt his comprehension of the SL input. Interpreters from Arabic as SL sometimes wonder about the value of rendering convoluted speeches or repetitive presentations that do not advance any new hypothesis or argument. A calque rendition would make English, as a TL, sound awkwardly superfluous. The result is an interlinear translation that aspires to the communication of an informative message rather than stylistic elegance. For this reason, interpreters improvise their own way of segmenting the SL input into minimal units of meaning in order to avoid any unanticipated turns while rendering an unstable SL discourse.

3.6 Structural asymmetry

Despite the interpreter's competence, pauses and delays may become inevitable owing to the structural asymmetry of SL/TL patterns. If the pace of the SL is slow or moderate, the interpreter may opt for a delay tactic until the SL syntactic format becomes clear. Goldman-Eisler (1968:31) considers pausing to be an attribute of spontaneity in the creation of new 'verbal' constructions. For instance, English has a fixed linear word order while Arabic is a free word-order language. When a verb occurs initially in Arabic the interpreter has to wait for the subject before he can start the English rendition. To double the trouble, when the verb and its agent/subject are intersected by a parenthetical or subordinate phrase, this initial inactivity becomes greater, as in (2).

(2)

وكانت قد وقعت في الأيام القليلة الماضية وفي نفس المنطقة أعمال شغب مشابهة.

S

V

/wa ka:nat qad waqaʔat fi: al-ʔayya:m al-qali:lah al-ma:ḍiyah wa-fi: nafs

V

al-minṭaqah ʔaʕma:l šayab muša:biha/

S

[Over the past few days similar riots occurred in the same region.]

In other words, the interpreter has to wait for the theme before rendering the rheme or propos. This structural realignment may, however, lead to a change of focus, as the beginning of a clause represents an emphatic position.

Other constituents and discourse links are affected in the same way. Arabic prefers explicit links (e.g., cohesive devices and markers of case, number, and gender agreement) while English is more implicit (i.e., uses more-neutral referents). The word pioneer, for example, has a zero syntactic feature in English as an adjective with regard to case, gender, and number. In Arabic, it can be rendered into one of six forms رائد/raaʕid/ (masc. sing), رائدة/raaʕida/ (fem. sing), رائدان/raaʕidaan/ (masc. dual), رائدتان/raaʕidataan/ (fem. dual), رواد/ruwwaad/ (masc. pl.), رائدات/raaʕidaat/ (fem. pl.) according to gender and number, and a further fifteen forms depending on the nominative, accusative or genitive case of the qualified noun.

Similarly, an Arabic verb in a post-nominal position has to agree with its subject in number and gender. For example, the verb *presented* in the sentence *the speaker presented his paper* can be interpreted as either قدم/qaddama/ (masc. sing.) or قدمت/qaddamat/ (fem. sing.), while the same verb after a plural subject in English can be rendered as قدما/qaddamaa/ (masc. dual), قدمتا/qaddamataa/ (fem. Dual), قدموا/qaddamu:/ (masc. pl.) and قدمن/qaddamnna/ (fem. pl.).

Furthermore, Arabic uses the definite article for cases that would otherwise be expressed by a zero article in English. Even adjectives qualifying defined nouns require marking for definition (Shunnaq 1993:95), as in (3).

- (3) International conventions call for **the** dissemination of a just peace among Muslims, Christians, and Jews.

تدعو المواثيق الدولية لنشر السلام العادل بين المسلمين والمسيحيين واليهود.

/tadʕu: al-mawa:ʕi:q al-dawliyyah li-našr al-sala:m al-ʕa:dil bayna

al-muslimi:n w-al-masi:hiyyi:n w-al-yahu:d/

[The international the conventions call for the dissemination of the just the peace among the Muslims, the Christians, the Jews.]

In the literal back-translation of the Arabic interpretation, there are eight definite articles while only one is used in the English original.

The above examples show that neutral anaphoric and cataphoric pronominal/ adjectival referents in English have to be marked for gender, number, and definiteness in the Arabic version. This would increase the TL word count. It also demands more time and effort on the part of the interpreter to determine the nature of the linkage, as in (4).

(4) To praise Thee, to glorify Thee, to bless Thee, to give thanks to Thee, to worship Thee in all places of Thy dominion, for Thou art God ineffable (Kelly 1979:187).

Here, anaphoric references to God have to be rendered in the masculine gender in Arabic. The interpreter who has no visual access to the speaker's text may render the wrong gender but it would be too late then to retrieve the spoken utterance. In contrast, a translator can decide the case, number, gender, and definiteness of constituents before embarking on the actual process of translation.

3.7 Lexical incompatibility

Henderson (1982:49) maintains that the interpreter is continually involved in evaluating and filtering the information of the SL message rather than its words. Although this may be true of the general output of interpretation, our analysis of recorded conference interpretations has shown that pauses often result from the interpreter's wrestling with a difficult jargon term for which he has no ready-made paraphrase. Sometimes, a lengthy paraphrase would delay the interpreter's response to a following segment. For instance, the neologism Macdonaldization requires a long time and a thorough analysis of the politico-economic concept involved before it can be borrowed into Arabic as *مكدلة* /makdala/ or paraphrased as *ماكدونالد* /al-ittijaah naḥwa taṭbiq aṣlu:b ṣarikat makdo:nald/ in an economic context, and as *الهيمنة الأمريكية* /al-haymana al-ʔamri:keyya/ 'American domination' in a political one. The same can be said for the word *deglobalization* *النكوص عن العولمة* /an-nukuṣ ʔan al-ʔawlama/ and the 1980's *Reaganomics* *الاقتصاديات الريغانية* /al-iqtisā:diyyaat ar-ri:ʔaagiyya/.

One of the main areas of lexical incompatibility concerns compounding, which is a productive morphological process in English. Yet, it becomes a source of problems in Arabic, which lacks this process. As compounds in general are poorly paraphrasable, they are likely to cause delays for the interpreter who has to economize in the delivery time. This is particularly true of new nonlexicalized compounds and jargon wherein the semantic relation between their adjuncts is not transparent enough to be interpreted correctly, such as *metal matrix composite* (in the aluminum industry), *unmap volume* (in computer software), which have no target equivalents in Arabic.

To tackle the problem of lexical incompatibility, the interpreter may resort to one of four alternatives:

- a. Transliterate (i.e., borrow the loanword in approximation to the SL pronunciation), e.g., spectrophotometer *سبكتروفوتوميتر*

- b. Paraphrase by using a composite genitive, adjectival, or prepositional expression, e.g., Spectrophotometer مقياس الطيف الضوئي /miqya:s al-ṭayf al-ḍawʔi:/
- c. Derive a new word by blending a root and a noun or attaching affixes to lexical stems, e.g., spectrophotometer مطياف /miṭyaaf/.
- d. Expand the semantic meaning of an existing word.

Needless to say, under the constraints of time, alternatives c and d are the least likely to be attempted, as the interpreter is not expected to assume the task of a lexicographer.

Another lexical divergence that causes both delay and an increase in the TL volume is the rendition of abbreviations and acronyms that in Arabic are spelled out in full. In example (5), the s-apostrophe (s') and the abbreviation U.S. are given full equivalents in Arabic. [Smiths' must be plural and needs referent]

- (5) The Smiths' relatives have been U.S. residents for the past twelve years.

إن عائلة سميث مقيمة في الولايات المتحدة منذ إثني عشرة سنة.

/ʔinna ʔaqa:rib ʔa:ʔilat smiθ muqi:mu:n fi: al-wila:ya:t al-muttahida
munðu ʔiθnay ʔašara sanah/

3.8 Cultural and rhetorical divergence

Sometimes a translator may intervene on behalf of the readers to achieve coherence by explaining a reference to a cultural norm or a literary work, as in (6).

- (6) Henry the Eighth is a landmark in the history of English literature.

تعتبر مسرحية هنري الثامن علامة مميزة في تاريخ الأدب الإنجليزي.

/tuʕtabar masrahiyyat Hinri: al-θa:min ʔala:mah mumayyazah fi: ta:ri:ḫ
al-ʔadab al-ʔinji:lzi:/

Here, the translator inserted the word مسرحية /masrahiyya/ 'play' as he felt that the TL audience might not share the same background as that of the TL audience. Under the constraints of time and immediacy of delivery, an interpreter cannot decipher all the inferences, presuppositions, and allusions of the SL speaker. In the following example, the translator, who was concerned that the TL audience might not have the 'casserole' schema, inserted a paraphrase explanation; an interpreter would simply borrow the SL pronunciation as in (7).

- (7) The chef has already cooked your casserole, sir!

لقد انتهى الطباخ من طهي الكاسرول (وجبة من الخضراوات واللحم).

/laqad ʔintaha: al-tabba:ḫ min ṭahy al-ka:saru:l (wajbah min al- ḫuḍrawa:t
wal-lahm)/

Arabic rhetorical thrust depends on reiteration by means of lexical and pronominal recurrence, redundant conjunctions, and synonyms (hendiadys). The latter may be used for alliteration rather than for sense addition. Thus there is an

increased level of explicitness in Arabic, which may be more evident in written translation. In interpretation, there is less room for modifying the SL cohesive features as the addition of extra lexical items or pronominal references would consume time and create an unnecessary delay. In the Arabic translations in (8-9), the boldfaced words represent the additions in the rendition of the English original.

- (8) Halfway to the office, he realized that he had forgotten the keys at home.

كان في منتصف الطريق إلى المكتب حينما لاحظ أنه قد نسي المفاتيح في المنزل.

[He was halfway to the office when he realized that he had forgotten the keys at home.]

James ran into the kitchen for a sandwich.

جرى جيمس إلى داخل المطبخ ليحضّر شطيرة.

/jara: jims ?ila: **da:χil** al-maṭbaχ liyuhḍira šaṭi:rah/

[James ran **inside** the kitchen to **bring** a sandwich]

Arabic uses dummy initial and-connectors to signal sentence and paragraph boundaries and make up for its somewhat lax system of punctuation. In the following Arabic extract from a conference on money-laundering (Kuwait 2000), the interpreter was faced with two, *and*-connectors, one genuinely additive, the other adversative. Yet, both were rendered as and due to the interpreter's failure to anticipate the adversative link between the two sentences.

- (9) وتزايد التبادل التجاري بين الدول نتيجة لتقدم الأنظمة المصرفية الآلية. و أدى ذلك إلى تزايد عمليات غسل الأموال.

/wa taza:yada al-taba:dul al-tija:ri: hayna al-duwal nati:jatan litaqaddum al
?anzima al-maṣrafiyyah al-ʔa:liyyah. wa ʔadda: ḥa:lika ?ila: taza:yud
ʔamaliyya:t ʔasi:l al-ʔamwa:l/

[Recorded interpretation]

And trade exchange among countries has increased owing to the advanced automated banking systems. **And** this led to a rise in money-laundering operations.

[Proceedings translation]

Moreover, trade exchange among countries has increased thanks to the advanced automated banking systems. **Yet**, this led to a rise in money laundering.

Despite being grammatically a coordinating conjunction, 'and' may introduce logically subordinate structures, digressions, or contradictory statements. In such instances, it is often coupled with another 'meaningful' conjunction, as in (10).

- (10) 'and then' وعندئذٍ / 'and even' وحتى / 'and but' ولكن / 'and as' وأما / 'and if' وإن
/waʔin / waʔamma: / wala:kin / wahatta: / waʔindaʔiḍin/

An interpreter has to think over the functions of such conjunctions and whether they help in the cohesive linkage or the progression of ideas. The erroneous reproduction of an SL conjunction may jeopardize the logic and consistency of the argument, as in (11).

- (11) تسعى اتحادات شركات الألمنيوم للإبقاء على أسعار المواد الخام مستقرة. وعندئذ فإن أية تذبذبات في الأسواق يجب ألا تفسر بأنها نتيجة فشل هذه الاتحادات في الالتزام بمبادئها.

/tasʕa: ʔittiha:da:t ʕarika:t al-ʔalamunium lil-ʔibqa:ʔ ʕala: ʔasʕa:r al-mawa:d al-ʕa:m mustaqirrah. wa-ʕindaʔiðin faʔinna ʔay taðabðuba:t fi: al-ʔaswa:q yajib ʔalla: tufassar biʔannah: nati:ʒat faʕal ha:ðihi al-ʔittiha:da:t fi: alʔiltiza:m bimaba:diʔiha:/

[Aluminum corporate syndicates aim at maintaining stable prices for raw materials. Then, any market fluctuations should not be construed as a failure of such consortiums to adhere to their principles] (Arabal Conference Kuwait, 1999).

The retention of عندئذ /ʕindaʔiðin/ 'then' in the interpretation has given a sequential additive link between the two sentences. The sense of consequential/resultative relationship in the SL would require the use of 'therefore', 'consequently', 'as a result', etc.

In such cases, the interpreter should view SL formal devices with skepticism as *faux amis*. Indeed, the above examples refute the misconception leveled at interpreters as being nothing but shadowers who mimic the SL speaker without exhibiting a measure of autonomy. Likewise, trainee interpreters should be made aware of the occasions when SL cohesive devices may be reproduced or jettisoned in the TL depending on their role in the service of textual coherence and thematic progress.

3.9 Phatic communion

Modes of address in Arabic and English differ widely. In Arabic, it is customary to greet the audience with honorary titles and use elaborate phatic phrases in the opening and closing segments of speeches. Likewise, Arabic speakers frequently invoke the name of God or quote religious verses to express greetings and wishes even in the most technical of speeches, as in (12).

- (12) بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

/bismi alla:h al-rahma:n al-rahi:m/

[In the name of Allah Most Gracious most Merciful.]

أيها الأخوة والأخوات

/ʔayyuha al-ʔuʕwa wal-ʔaʕawa:t/

[O, Brothers and Sisters]

السلام عليكم و الصلاة على نبينا محمد

/al-sala:m ʔalaykum wa-al-ʕala:t ʔala: nabiyyina: muhammad nuhayyi:kum/

[May peace be upon you and our Prophet Mohammed]

نحييكم تحية مباركة من عند الله

/tahiyyah muba:rakah min ʔind alla:h/

We greet you with the Grace of Allah

‘وقل اعملوا فسيرى الله عملكم ورسوله والمؤمنون’

/wa-qul ʔiʔmalu: fasayara alla:h ʔama:lakum wa-rasu:luh wal-muʔminu:n/

[‘And say: work! For Allah, His messenger and the believers will witness your deeds’.]

To an English speaker who uses a simple ‘good morning/evening’ and ‘thank you’, such expressions are void of any informative value. Otherwise, if rendered verbatim, the greeting السلام عليكم /as-salaamu ʔalaykomu/ would sound similar to the Biblical ‘peace to thee and thine house’ (Hassanain 1994:73). Such courteous expressions are more frequent in orally delivered speeches than in written texts. They call for tactical omissions on the interpreter’s part as they are generally intended for their phatic function rather than propositional content or referential value (Sykes: 101).

4. Compensation strategies

Experienced interpreters use all kinds of anticipation strategies regarding both context and structure. But even when prior expectations are sufficiently focused, the processing is still tentative and the hypotheses must be confirmed or disproved by the forthcoming textual evidence (Hatim & Mason 1997:45). To tackle the limitations of textual clues, interpreters resort to other means such as register membership, type of topical issues involved (i.e., domain), pragmatics, semiotics, participants, stylistic background, etc. But these are not conclusively reliable clues to overcome the unpredictability of the way a given text will develop and conclude (Mason & Hatim 1997:51). Therefore, interpreters resort to a number of strategies that may help ease the burden and improve the pace of delivery.

4.1 Intonational clues

Unlike written translation, in interpretation suprasegmental features occupy a paramount status. Delays, hesitations, false starts, stuttering, tempo, and accent are part and parcel of the overall effect. One of the paraverbal clues an SI may resort to is the intonation pattern of the SL discourse. Thus, if there is a rising intonation on the theme, a rheme is to follow. In case of a rising intonation coupled with an inversion of subject and verb, an interrogative structure is to follow. When a level or rising intonation continues for a long time, this signals either a list of parallel structures or a sequence of phrases (or sentences) with a falling intonation on the finite verbal clause that serves as a common rheme, as in (13).

- (13) Basically the trend of the government to privatize ~ the consolidation of businesses ~ the setting up of a free trade zone ~ and the soaring stock prices ~ are all indications of an imminent economic boom #. [~ indicates level or rising intonation. # indicates sentence-end intonation].

Yet, caution should be exercised as the implications of intonational contours may differ from one language or variety to another. For instance, the intonation of excitement in Italian resembles that of anger in English. An American teenage female would use a rising consultative intonation in almost all sentences whether affirmative or interrogative. Further, a Burmese uses an almost stilted rise-and-fall (circumflex ^) pattern regardless of the meaning content of the utterance. A misinterpretation of these phonological aspects may lead to a change of sense and focus. In contrast, a translator has no such worries aside from the occasional emphasis represented by italics or underlining and the rare insertion of a transcription.

The question is, should an interpreter imitate (i.e. reproduce) SL intonational patterns in order to maintain neutrality by acting as an invisible agent, or should s/he adapt the phonological patterns to those of the TL and be accused of taking sides? In practice, interpreters often tend to accommodate their audience by adopting equivalent TL patterns. In case of a great disparity between the SL and TL, a neutral level (i.e., flat) contour is rendered.

4.2 Cohesive signals

Aside from intonational contours, an interpreter may rely on SL cohesive devices to anticipate the next segment of a given discourse. For example, the use of course, nevertheless, yet, while, etc., signals a counter-argument structure. The use of enumerative words (e.g., firstly, secondly, the following, finally) introduces a list of parallel structures in the form of a theme followed by a rheme, an NP plus comment or simply an NP without a finite clause. An 'if' would signal a conditional structure and so on.

4.3 Queuing

Here, the interpreter delays either a less important TL rendition or a complex sentence structure during a heavy load period and then catches up in any lulls that occur later (el-Shiyab 2000:556). Although this tactic helps the interpreter in reducing lag, it has its drawbacks, as the postponed segment may not fall in line with the cohesive pattern of later segments. It may also jeopardize the SL thematic progression.

4.4 Segmentation and parceling

One of the basic processes an interpreter has to perform is the segmentation or chunking of the SL discourse into what Vinay (Vinay & Darbelnet 1958) terms manageable *unité de pensée* or units of meaning that can be translated en bloc. This strategy helps in processing long-drawn or run-on sentences that require declustering (i.e., slicing) into shorter units in order to cope with short-term memory span. Segmentation is particularly useful for languages that have Russian doll-like structures with one subordinate clause fitting into another one, which in

turn fits into another (Jones 1998:102), as in (14).

- (14) 'A passion for routine in administration, the sacrifice of flexibility to rule, delay in the making of decisions, and refusal to embark upon experiment', evils inherent in bureaucracy, according to Harold Laski, are undoubtedly to be found in bureaucratic bodies — public and private — but the efficiency and realizability desired in the operations of any large organization are also the product of what sociologists call bureaucracy (ITI Qualifying Exam 1994).

After segmentation and some structural rearrangement, the above example was rendered into the following version in Arabic:

(15)

ويرى هارولد لاسكي أن العيوب المتأصلة في البيروقراطية وهي الولوج بالروتين الإداري، والتضحية بالمرونة في سبيل التقيد بالأنظمة والتأخير في اتخاذ القرارات موجودة بلا أدنى شك في الهيئات البيروقراطية 'ورفض الخوض في التجارب العامة والخاصة على حد سواء. إلا أن تحقيق الكفاءة والإنجاز في عمليات أي مؤسسة كبرى ما هو إلا نتاج لما يطلق عليه علماء الاجتماع لفظ البيروقراطية.

/wa yara: haruld la:ski: ʔnna al-ʕuyu:b al-mutaʔaʕṣilah fi: al-bi:ru:qra:ʕiyyah wa-hiya al-walaʕ bi-al-ru:ti:n al-ʔida:ri:, wa-al-taḍhiya bil-muru:nah fi: sabi:l al-taqayyud bil-ʔanzimah wa-al-taʔxi:r fi: ʔittiḡa:ḍ al-qara:ra:t wa-raḑd al-ḡawḑ fi: al-taja:rub mawju:dah bila: ʔadna: šak fi: al-haya:t al-bi:ru:qra:ʕiyyah al-ʕa:mmah wal- ḡa:ššah ʕala: had sawa:ʔ. ʔilla: ʔanna taḡqi:q al-kafa:ʔah wal-ʔinja:z fi: ʕamaliyya:t ʔay muʔasasah kubra: ma:huwa ʔilla: nita:j lima: yuṭliq ʕalayhi ʕulama:ʔ al-ʔijtima:ʕ lafz al-bi:ru:qra:ʕiyyah/

[According to Harold Laski, evils inherent in bureaucracy, i.e., 'a passion for routine in administration, the sacrifice of flexibility to rule, delay in the making of decisions, and refusal to embark upon experiment', are undoubtedly to be found in bureaucratic bodies — public and private. Yet, the efficiency and realizability desired in the operations of any large organization are also the product of what sociologists call bureaucracy.]

Segmentation in written translation depends on visible punctuation marks and paragraph divisions while in interpretation it is an ad hoc process that depends on gaps and pauses in the SL speech or the interpreter's short-term memory. If the SL sentences are small and numerous, interpreters may parcel (i.e., combine) them into larger units and vice versa. In other words, the interpreter would reformulate SL discourse units into shorter or longer fragments according to SL or TL style and tempo. The difference in number between the SL and TL fragments indicates whether the interpreter has sliced long sentences of SL or otherwise joined short structures into longer more complex ones.

To counter the risk of lagging behind the SL speaker, interpreters often start formulating their TL utterances before having a full picture of the idea to be expressed. This involves selecting neutral sentence beginnings that allow the interpreter to steer the sentence more easily towards the speaker's conclusion (Baker 1998:43). In a context of English-Arabic interpretation, for example, a neutral structure would be a nominal sentence (SVO) rather than the normally preferred Arabic verbal order (VSO). This would reduce the time required for the initiation of an Arabic verbal structure, which requires the onset of the verb in the predicate of the English original. The interpreter, therefore, does not have to wait until the speaker utters the verb at the end of the SL sentence before he can interpret the intervening material, particularly in the presence of a subordinate clause, leading to the main verb (Crystal: 349), as in (16).

- إن مؤسسة الموانئ ممثلة بالمدير العام عملت على رعاية هذه الندوة.

ʔinna muʔasasat al-mawaʔni? mumaʃʃalah bil-mudiri al-ʔa:m ʕamilat ʕala:
riʕa:yat S V
ha:ʃihi al-nadwah/

1. Difficulty of determining gender and number when feedback from the SL discourse is nonexistent. For example, the word clients in the sentence *all clients are required to sign a power of attorney* can be rendered as either a masculine عملاء /ʕumalɑ:ʔ/ or feminine عميلات /ʕami:lɑ:t/. In interpretation, it is customary to use the 'dominant' masculine (singular or plural) to refer to both genders in the absence of any textual clues.

2. The insertion of agreement affixes to anaphoric constituents (verbs, adjectives, and pronouns) requires more time and effort on the part of the interpreter. In the following dialogue (House & Blum-Kulka 1986: 22), the specification of gender is deliberately delayed down to the fourth line in the English original, while it is specified in the first line in Arabic.

- کیت: سمراء (صمت).

دیلی: سمینہ أم نحیفة؟

Kate: /ʔasman minni: ʔala: ma:ʔaʔtaqid/

كيت: أسمن مني على ما أعتقد.

Kate: Fuller than me, I think (pause).

Deeley: /ka:nat kaða:lika fi: al-sa:biq/

ديلي: كانت كذلك في السابق

Deeley: She was then?

Kate: /ʔaʔtaqid ða:lik/

كيت: أعتقد ذلك

Kate: I think so.

Deeley: /qad la: taku:n kaða:lika ʔalʔa:n/

ديلي: قد لا تكون كذلك الآن.

Deeley: She may not be now.

Arabic requires the adjective to be marked for gender immediately after the lexical item being modified. This may be overcome in translation by looking further down for textual clues. But the case might be different for the interpreter who finds himself obliged to correct the gender after uttering the first three lines. The Arabic version would be more cohesively explicit with a dense texture rather than the loose SL original. Such grammatical modifications along with the insertion of *كذلك* /kaða:lika/ 'so' would increase TL overall volume and cause delivery delay. This process would be reversed when Arabic is an SL as there would be a high level of syntactic redundancy.

3. Difficulty in determining T/V second person pronoun. In a vocative discourse, the English second person pronoun 'you' may be rendered in the singular *أنت* /ʔanta/ or the deferential plural *أنتم* /ʔantum/ in translation, one can look for textual clues, while in interpretation the urgency to render the immediate context of utterance blocks the contextual clues further down the line. The most frequent strategy to overcome such indecisiveness is to use the second person inclusive plural form or an agentless passive structure.

4.6. Calque and paraphrase

Instances of calque renditions abound in interpretation owing to the constraints of time and the intermittent nature of speech delivery. In order to avoid any unanticipated lexical turns, interpreters may adhere to the SL lexical patterns creating a verbatim version of the SL. In the following examples quoted from a Conference on Globalization (Kuwait, 1999), the boldfaced collocations in Arabic were firstly rendered verbatim in interpretation, whereas in a more careful translation of conference proceedings they were given equivalent English collocations.

(18)

ويحمل هذا التغيير في طبيعته مشاكل عديدة.

/wa-yahmil ha:ða: al-taʔyi:r **fi: ʔayya:tihi** maʃa:kil ʔadi:dah/

Interpretation: This change carries with it many problems.

Translation: This change is fraught with many problems.

- (19) وتتميز هذه الحادثة عما سبقها من حوادث في حدثها.

/wa-tatamayyazu ĥa:ðihi al-ĥa:diθa ʕamma: sabaqaha: min hawa:diθ fi: šiddatiha:/

Interpretation: This incident is distinguished from previous ones in its intensity.

Translation: This incident has unprecedented intensity.

On the other hand, paraphrase, which is a strategy of explication (Al-Qinai 1999: 237-239), is used in cases of SL cultural references or jargon terms and compounds for which the TL lacks direct one-word equivalents (see under lexical incompatibility above), as in (20).

- (20) carcinoma → ورم البشرات السائرة الخبيث /waram al-bašra:t al-sa:tirah al-χabi:θ/ [malignant tumor of the epithelial tissue]

/al-saʔy/السعي → running between Safa and Marwa during pilgrimage.

4.7 Approximation and substitution

In the absence of a direct TL equivalent or when the interpreter finds it difficult to remember the TL item, an alternative that shares most of the semantic features of the TL word is used, as in (21).

- (21) opium poppy → مخدرات /muχaddira:t/ [drugs] instead of الخشخاش /al-χišχa:š/

Unlike approximation, an interpreter may substitute the SL term by a remotely related equivalent, which becomes handy under the stress of a rapidly delivered speech, e.g.,

Legion of Merit → الفيلق المتميز /al-faylaq al-mutamayyiz/ [the distinguished legion] instead of وسام الإستحقاق /wisa:m al-istihqa:q/

- (23) سرير البحر /sari:r al- bahr/ [sea bed] instead of قاع البحر /qa:ʕ al-bahr/

4.8 Reduction

This strategy involves the use of a superordinate term to superimpose two collocational synonyms. Alternatively, the interpreter may delete modifying words and retain key semantic elements. Needless to say, this results in a change of the intended force of the SL, as in (23) (el-Shiyab: 236).

- | SL | Interpretation | Translation |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| Terrible consequences
wayi:mah/ | أخطار /ʔaχta:r/ [dangers] | عواقب وخيمة /ʕawa:qib |

- | | | |
|---|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Direct severe criticism
naqdan la:ðiʕan/ | ينتقد /yantaqid/ [criticize] | يوجه نقدا لاذعا /yuwajjih |
|---|------------------------------|---------------------------|

Premeditated aggressive plans نوايا عدوانية /nawaaya ʕudwa:niyyah/ [aggressive plans] نوايا عدوانية مبيتة /nawa:ya: ʕudwa:niyyah mubayyatah/

4.9 Compression

This strategy is employed when interpreters try to economize by sifting the SL input into shorter and briefer TL output, especially when interpretation is conducted from Arabic into English. Here, paraphrased loan abbreviations,

acronyms, and jargon terms are reinstated in their original English form, as in (24).

- (24) وحدة العناية المركزة /wihdat al-ʿina: yah al-murakkazah/ [intensive care unit] → ICU
 معهد الكويت للأبحاث العلمية /maʿhad al-kuwayt lil-ʿabha:θ al-ʿilmiyyah/ [Kuwait Institute for Scientific Research] → KISR
 التهاب منبت الظفر /ʔiltiha:b manbat al-zifr/ [inflammation of nail stem] → onychia

4.10 Borrowing

In view of the rapid pace of delivery in conference presentations, an interpreter may find recourse in adopting a TL loan-form by way of transliteration, as in (25).

- (25) WAP (i.e. Wireless Application Protocol) → واب /wa:b/

Massicot → أول أكسيد الرصاص /masiku:t/ instead of أول أكسيد الرصاص /ʔawwal ʔuksi:d al-raṣa:s/ [lead monoxide]

4.11 Ellipsis

Certain kinds of SL utterances may be omitted when they are deemed cumbersome or superfluous. Such a strategy of reduction is resorted to in the following cases:

1. Repetition: In the following excerpt from a PTSD conference (Kuwait 1994), the boldfaced items in the Arabic original have been edited out.

- (26) لقد تعرض المدنيون لشتى أنواع التعذيب البدني والتعذيب النفسي. فمن صنوف التعذيب البدني الحرمان من الطعام والاعتداء الجنسي. أما التعذيب النفسي فقد تمثل في إرغام المدنيين علي مشاهدة حالات الإعدام.

/laqad taʿarraḍa al-madaniyyu:n lišatta: ʔanwa:f al-taʿḍi:b al-badani: wa al-taʿḍi:b al-nafsi:. fa-min ṣunu:f al-taʿḍi:b al-badani: al-hirma:n min al-taʿa:m wal-ʔiʿṭida:ʔ al-jinsi:. amma: al-taʿḍi:b al-nafsi: faqad tamaθθala fi: ʔirṣa:m al-madaniyyi:n ʕala: muša:hadat ha:la:t al-ʔiʿṭida:m/

Verbatim: [Civilians were subjected to all kinds of physical **torture** and psychological torture. **Among the kinds of physical torture** is food deprivation and sexual assault. **As for psychological torture it was manifested** in compelling civilians to witness cases of execution.]

Interpretation: Civilians were subjected to all kinds of physical and psychological torture, such as food deprivation, sexual assault, and compelling civilians to witness executions.

The lexical repetition of the words physical, psychological, and torture in Arabic is intended to reiterate the concept of trauma and deprivation. It seems that the interpreter felt that the recurrence of such lexical items was inappropriate in English rhetoric and should therefore be neutralized by skipping.

2. An interpreter may gloss over an SL term when he fails to find its exact equivalent in the TL or when a paraphrase is too long. The latter is most likely when the interpreter is lagging behind the speaker and attempts to catch up. It

should be noted, however, that this is a drastic measure that is rarely resorted to lest the interpreter should be accused of incompetence or malpractice, as in (27).

(27) **The rationale** for holding this seminar is to evaluate the papers presented in the conference.

هذه الندوة تقيم الأبحاث المقدمة للمؤتمر.

/ha:ðihi al-nadwah tuqayyim al-ʔabha:θ al-muqaddamah lil-muʔamar/

[This seminar evaluates the papers presented in the conference.]

5. Conclusion

While both translators and interpreters perform almost similar tasks of rendering a TL version of an SL original, the performance constraints and the skills required for each vary in many aspects. A translator deals with visible text and has time to access reference sources, revise, edit, and polish his work, whereas a simultaneous interpreter deals with oral language under stressful conditions and has no time to refine or retract his output. Some of the points raised in this study, such as syntactic asymmetry, lexical incompatibility, and cultural-rhetorical divergence pertain to both translator and interpreter. Yet, issues such as lack of a holistic approach, time lag, and intonational patterns remain the exclusive domains of the interpreter.

Whether deviation between SL input and TL input in terms of quality, volume, and textual strategies is attributable to performance constraints or interpreters incompetence remains a moot point. The resort to compensatory strategies, such as ellipses, paraphrase, and approximation, should be approached with caution, as they can be abused by novice interpreters who may attribute their errors to poor SL quality and unfavorable logistics.

Further studies in this area may investigate cognitive and pragmatic aspects of interpretation in contrast to translation. Other studies might consider points of convergence and divergence across different languages.

REFERENCES

- AL-QINAI, J. 1999. Explication Vs implication in English-Arabic translation. *Theoretical Linguistics*, 25:2/3.236-55. New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- BAKER, Mona. 1998. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge.
- BASSNETT, Suzan. 2001. Variations on translation. *SIGLO* 2001:749-59. Universidad de ALCALA, Salamanca.
- CRYSTAL, David. 1988. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- EL-SHIYAB, R. and R. HUSSEIN. 2000. On the use of compensatory strategies in simultaneous interpretation, *META: Journal des Traducteurs/Translators' Journal* 14:3.548-57. Montreal: Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal.

- GERVER, D. 1972. Simultaneous and consecutive interpretation and human information processing. *Research Report HR 566/I*, London: Social Science Research Council.
- GILE, D. 1989. *La Communication linguistique et réunion multilingue - Les Difficultés de la transmission informationnelle en interprétation simultanée*. Unpublished Ph.D thesis, Université de la Sorbonne, Paris.
- . 1995. *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- GOLDMAN, E. 1968. *Psycholinguistics: Experiments in Spontaneous Speech*. London: Academic Press.
- HASSANAIN, Khalid. 1994. Saudi mode of greeting rituals. *IRAL International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching/Internationale Zeitschrift für angewandte Linguistik in der Spracherziehung* 32:1. Heidelberg. Julius Groos Verlag.
- HATIM, Basil, & I. MASON. 1997. *The Translator as Communicator*. London: Routledge.
- HENDERSON, J. 1982. Some psychological aspects of simultaneous interpretation. *The Incorporated Linguist* 21.149-50.
- HOUSE, Juliane, & BLUM-KULKA, J. (eds). 1986. *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- JONES, R. 1997. *Conference Interpreting Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- SYKES, John. 1987. Professional translation standards. *Institute of Translation and Interpreting Conference: The Business of Translation and Interpreting*. 1-2 May, 96-8 London: ASLIB.
- KELLY, L. G. 1979. *The True Interpreter*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- LEDERER, M. 1981. *La Traduction Simultanée - Expérience et Théorie*. Paris: Lettres Modernes.
- PÖCHHACKER, F. 1994. *Simultandolmetschen als Komplexes Handeln*, Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- SHAKIR, A., and M. FARGHAL. 1992. Collocations as an index of L2 competence in Arabic English simultaneous interpreting and translation. *Translatio* 11:3. 227-45.
- SHUNNAQ, A. 1993. Patterns of repetition in Arabic forced by morphology with reference to Arabic- English-translation. *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics* 28.89-98. Poznan: Adam Mickiewicz University.
- TREISMAN, A. M. 1995. The effects of redundancy and familiarity on translating and repeating back a foreign and a native language. *British Journal of Psychology*, 56:3.369-79.
- VAN DIJK, Marcel. 1983. *Better Translation for Better Communication*. London: Pergamon Press.
- VENUTI, L. 1998. *The Scandals of Translation*. London: Routledge.
- VINAY, J., & J. DARBELNET. 1958. *Stylistique Comparée du Français et de l'Anglais*, Paris: Didier.
- YAGI, Sane. 2000. Studying style in simultaneous interpretation. *META* 45:3.520-47. Montreal: Les Presses de l'Université de Montreal.