AL-FARABI KAZAKH NATIONAL UNIVERSITY
International Relations Department
Chair of Diplomatic Translation
Translation business in the field of international and legal relations
"Simultaneous Translation of Monologue and Dialogical Speech"
2022-2023 academic year fall semester

Lecture 2

Module 1: Tenets of Translation Studies

Lecture 2: Synchrony of listening and speaking

Plan of the lecture

1. Introduction
2. Tactics in simultaneous interpreting
3. Conclusion
4. References

Aspects of the lecture

1. Quantitative Aspects of SI Style
2. Fluency
3. Chunking
4. Linear Discourse Development

Goals of the lecture

1. Introduce Quantitative Aspects of SI
2. Explain basic training technique for listening and speaking simultaneously
3. Familiarize with Discourse Development

Basic concepts

Synchrony, listening, speaking, shadowing

A conference speaker and audience who do not speak the language of one another can only evaluate the simultaneously interpreted discourse by its form. They assess the performance of an interpreter by the fluency and nativelikedness in their TL discourse. Kopczynski (1994) conducted a survey among conference speakers and attendees to identify what they viewed as elements that contribute to quality in a simultaneously interpreted discourse. He found that both groups ranked fluency and style third on their list of priorities after content and terminological precision.

Skilled interpreters (e.g., Jones 1998: 130) warn novices that "they should not make artificial pauses in the middle of a sentence because they are thinking of what to say next or are waiting for extra input from the speaker." They observe that audiences sometimes expect the interpreter to "keep up a continuous flow of sound in the booth" worrying about missing out on part of the SL discourse (Jones 1998: 128). They stress that "the constant objective of the interpreter is to provide a correct translation of the original in a form that sounds as natural and as authentic as possible in the target language: the audience should not feel they are listening to a translation" (Jones 1998: 90). Not only does an interpreted discourse need to be fluent to earn the SI practitioner approval from their partners in the communication process, the speaker and audience, but also they need to imitate the tempo and intensity of the speaker's voice according to Kopczynski (1994). He found out that the majority of his questionnaire respondents had considered important that the interpreter assume a ghost role, ie, imitating the speaker. Although the validity of this conclusion is doubtful, as Kopczynski himself indicated, it points to the importance that interpretation users place on the method of TL discourse delivery. Because of the clear relevance of fluency to perceived interpreter competence, it is sound to consider it an aspect of SI style. Fluency is immediately relevant to the method of SI delivery; it represents the fluidness and smoothness of SI delivery. Therefore, it should not be controversial to consider fluency an aspect of interpretation style. We can study fluency quantitatively if we succeed in identifying the elements that contribute to a seemingly effortless, fluid, and smooth interpretation. There is no doubt that false-start and hesitation ridden interpretation is non-fluent. And so is an interpretation with incomplete sentences, long-drawn-out delays, and a large volume of inactivity. Since these can be readily identified, fluency ought to be quantifiable. For instance, an interpreted discourse which consists of 40% pausing and has 10 false-starts, 15 hesitations, 13 incomplete sentences, and 7 instances of extended delays, is certainly less fluent than one that has 30% pausing, 5 false-starts, 5 hesitations, 3 incomplete sentences, and only 4 instances of extended delays. All of these properties of fluency are quantifiable; therefore, it should not be contentious to claim that fluency itself is one aspect of SI style that is also quantifiable.

Follow-up questions

1. Describe Daniel Gile's approach to Effort Models

2. Describe translation problems caused due to lack thereof between the source language and the target language in lexical, syntactic, and general informational terms.

3. Speak about time lag and chinking in SI

References

1. AIIC (1982): Practical Guide for Professional Interpreters, Geneva, Association Internationale des Interprètes de Conférence.

2. Barik, H. C. (1969): A Study of Simultaneous Interpretation, thesis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.—— (1973): "Simultaneous Interpretation: Temporal and Quantitative Data," Language and Speech, 16-3, pp. 237-270.

3. Caretllieri, C. (1983): "The Inescapable Dilemma: Quality and/or Quantity in Interpreting," Babel, 29, pp. 209-213.