MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

A CRITICAL RE-EVALUATION OF THE TARGET-ORIENTED APPROACH TO INTERPRETING AND TRANSLATION

R. Tunç Özben



MARMARA UNIVERSITY
CENTER FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND RESEARCH

8659
MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

A CRITICAL RE-EVALUATION OF THE TARGET-ORIENTED APPROACH TO INTERPRETING AND TRANSLATION

P
306.5
.Ö93
1999

R. Tunç Özben

R. Tunç ÖZBEN
TARAFINDAN
MERKEZ KÜTÜPHANE'YE
BAĞIŞLANMIŞTIR.
10.05.1999
İSTANBUL.

Marmara Üniversitesi
Kütüphane ve Dokümantasyon Daire Başkanlığı
0008659

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ
KÜTÜPHANE ve DOKÜMANTASYON
DAİRE BAŞKANLIĞI

MARMARA UNIVERSITY
CENTER FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND RESEARCH
ISTANBUL 1999

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

Marmara University ..... **Publication No: 641**

Center for Foreign Language Teaching and Research ..... **Publication No: 2**

All rights reserved, **NO** part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including, recording and storing in any information storage and retrieval system without written permission from **Rıza Tunç Özben**.

Cover Design: Sanatevi Reklamcılık ve Halkla İlişkiler Ltd. Şti.

Cover Caricature: Semih Balcıoğlu

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ
KÜT. DÖK. D. BŞK.
E.N.
8659

ISBN : 900 – 400 – 196 - 0

Printed on the press facilities
in the Faculty of Technical Education,
Marmara University
Istanbul - 1999

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

In memory of my father, ***Orhan Sermet Özben****, who with his sacrifices provided me with not only the wherewithal to study but also the awareness of the importance of study in one's life.*

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

The author thanks the **Italian Institute of Culture in Istanbul**, which has made the publication of this book possible.

(L'autore ringrazia l'**Istituto Italiano di Cultura di Istanbul** che ha reso possibile la pubblicazione del volume.)

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

FOREWORD

It is a pleasure to present what I very much hope will be the first half of a two-fold operation. Tunç Özben offers a state-of-the-art summary of what has taken place in the world of Interpreting Studies in Western Europe drawing upon primary sources in English and Italian and through them summarising a great deal of the debates which have raged in French and German as well. Given his language combination it is perhaps inevitable that Trieste plays, in his text, a perhaps disproportionately significant role. It, therefore, befits the present writer who holds the chair of Simultaneous Interpretation into English at that University to invite readers to take into full and due consideration the work done and currently underway in Paris, Vienna, Geneva, Saarbrücken and Germersheim, just to mention the centres with which the author of the forward is most familiar. Not all of the stimulating work carried out in these centres is available in either Italian or English.

Tunç Özben's work offers a review of the different approaches to simultaneous and consecutive interpreting. Inevitably much of the theory of interpreting, not just in the author's text, derives from translation theory and the author bases his work on Gideon Toury's work and argues well his case for doing so. Özben's work is a veritable "vademecum" for those who, with an anglophone and italophone inclination wish to set about finding their bearings in the world of Interpreting Studies. The bibliography provides a variety of helpful indications as to the research studies to be consulted elsewhere. The gathering, sifting and selection of a vast quantity of material and the presentation of same in a succinct readable form is a noteworthy achievement.

Özben has introduced the reader, many of whom will presumably and hopefully be Turkish, to the scholarly studies of the past two decades which concentrate largely on translation and interpretation from and into the major vehicular languages, though, of course, Toury uses Hebrew as one of his working languages. The consummation devoutly to be wished, possibly from the pen of Mr. Özben himself, is surely an introduction for non-turcophone readers to the vast array of interesting questions raised by the practice of simultaneous interpretation from Turkish into western languages and vice versa. What are the strategies the Turkish interpreter uses to convey the implications of the inferential mood in Turkish when (s)he is working into other languages? We shall certainly be dependent for some while on Turkish interpreters working out of their mother tongue and a series of strategies proposed to convey ideas expressed in a language with such markedly

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

different features from Romance, Germanic or Slav languages would make fascinating reading.

The providing of information cannot be a one-way process. While it is certain that Turkish readers will welcome an introduction to Interpreting Studies, it is equally certain that the non-turcophone world needs information about what has been done, is being done and is planned for the future in Turkey itself. A period of difficult communication may lead to the laying of new foundations for a new form of comprehension on a more equal footing, which, in our particular sector, can only be inaugurated when we, outside Turkey, know about the questions raised by the process of translating and interpreting from and out of Turkish almost as much as our Turkish friends already do about this process carried out between the major vehicular languages. The best tribute to pay to Tunç Özben's work is to express the wish that he begin work immediately on volume two.

David Snelling

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

PREFACE

Translating and interpreting are two separate but related forms of "Translation." Various scholars of interpreting studies believe that translation theories are significant in understanding the phenomena of interpreting. On the other hand, it is widely held that recent translation research and theory operate in accordance with the major assumptions of the Target-Oriented Approach, an influential modern theory of translation developed by the Israeli scholar G. Toury in order to explain all phenomena related to written translation. The approach, however, had not previously been systematically examined as a possible theoretical framework for interpreting studies as well.

To investigate the relevance of the Target-Oriented Approach to interpreting studies, a "secondary analysis" of a selection of interpreting studies literature, consisting of 81 sources obtained through bibliographic research at the *Scuola Superiore di Lingue Moderne per Interpreti e Traduttori* in Italy, has been carried out to compare and contrast the major assumptions of the Target-Oriented Approach with relevant assumptions developed in the domain of interpreting studies.

The findings of this study, submitted in 1998 as a master thesis to the Department of Translation and Interpreting at *Boğaziçi University*, Istanbul, indicate that the Target-Oriented Approach is a useful theoretical framework for the domain of interpreting studies, even though it is not a theory general enough to explain all phenomena related to written translation, but a more specific theory, particularly, related to cultural issues in translational phenomena.

R. Tunç Özben
Istanbul, 1999

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This volume has been written thanks to the support of many people. I wish to express my sincere gratitude to all those who have contributed to my study, but there are a few names that I feel especially obliged to mention.

I am most grateful to Prof. Nedret Kuran, without whose invaluable contribution I could have never completed this work. During the course of my study, she provided me with balanced advice and criticism on the one hand and freedom to exploit my creativity on the other. I would especially like to thank Prof. David Snelling for taking part as an external examiner in the examining committee of this study. My thanks also go to Prof. Suat Karantay, who always kept me alert to the fact that the findings related to the interpreting studies should be linked to the "Target-Oriented Approach" as comprehensively as possible. I am very grateful to Prof. Laura Gran, who has been generous not only with encouragement and advice, but also with providing various sources to be used in this study. Finally, I would like to express my appreciation to Ms. Jean Efe, who offered generous assistance in editing the final draft.

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ 1883

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

MARMARA
ÜNİVERSİTESİ

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

1 Introduction 1

1.1 The Problem 3

1.2 Purpose 3

1.3 Importance 4

1.4 Assumptions 4

1.5 Scope 6

CHAPTER II

2 Theoretical Framework Of The Study 7

2.1 A Historical Account of Translation Theory 7

2.2 Target-Oriented Approach 10

CHAPTER III

3 Procedure 19

3.1 Methodological Design of the Study 19

3.2 Population and Sample 20

3.3 Method of Data Collection 22

3.4 Method of Data Analysis 25

CHAPTER IV

4 Findings And Discussion 29

4.1 Findings 29

4.1.1 A Historical Account of Interpreting as a Profession 29

4.1.2 Terms, Concepts, and the Evolution of Methods and Training in Interpreting 34

4.1.3 Interpreting Studies 45

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

4.1.4 Interpreting Research 50
4.1.4.1 A Historical Perspective 50
4.1.4.2 Functions 53
4.1.4.3 Empirical Research and Process 58
4.1.4.4 Beyond Empirical Research: Non-Product/Product-Oriented Studies 64
4.1.5 Prescriptiveness in Interpreting 68
4.1.6 Descriptiveness in Interpreting 71
4.1.7 Source Orientedness in Interpreting 74
4.1.8 Target Orientedness in Interpreting 80
4.1.9 Interpreting Theory 85
4.1.9.1 Models Developed Within the Psychological Paradigm ... 90
4.1.9.2 Hypotheses Developed Within the Neurolinguistic Paradigm 93
4.1.9.3 Models Developed Within the Functional Paradigm 94
4.1.9.4 Models Developed Within the Linguistic Paradigm 97
4.1.9.4.1 Théorie Du Sens 97
4.1.9.4.2 Skopostheorie 99
4.1.10 Interpreting and Culture 100
4.1.11 Norms in Interpreting 105

4.2 Discussion 115
4.2.1 Is the Target-Oriented Approach a Useful Theoretical Framework for Interpreting Studies? 115
4.2.2 Critical Reflections on the Target-Oriented Approach as a General Theory of Translation 133

CHAPTER V

5 Summary, Conclusion and Suggestions 139

5.1 Summary 139
5.2 Conclusion 140
5.3 Suggestions 141

BIBLIOGRAPHY 143

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

If you are able to state a problem, it can be solved.
EDWIN H. LAND, AMERICAN INVENTOR (1909-1991)

Before the world was created,
the Word already existed.
"THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO JOHN"

God created the world by word,
instantaneously, without toil and pains.
"THE TALMUD"

CHAPTER I

1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter includes the problem, the purpose, the importance, the assumptions, and the scope of the study. Furthermore, in order to facilitate and provide a more comprehensive insight into the presentation of the problem, the following paragraphs reveal information about the general theme of the problem - theory in interlingual phenomena: interpreting and translation - and then presents the problem, taking it out of its general context by narrowing it down to a specific subject - the Target-Oriented Approach - so that it can be defined in a detailed way in the problem section.

Scholars who investigate language maintain that there are two kinds of interlingual phenomena: interpreting and translation. According to Wills, for instance, "SI [Simultaneous interpreting] is an important object of a theory of interlingual transfer [...]" [Wills, 1977:346]. Stenzl supports Wills in this regard, pointing out that an overall model of simultaneous interpretation is a model of an interlingual communicative task [Stenzl, 1983]. As to translation, Roman Jacobson distinguishes three types of phenomena: intralingual translation, interlingual translation and intersemiotic translation. He further states that translation falls into the second category, namely, interlingual translation. In summary, although interpreting and translation represent different modes of process, both of them belong to the same ontological category, that is interlingual phenomena [Bassnett, 1985].

Gran and Viezzi claim that theory is important to explain the interpreting process:

> *It is hoped that the present issue will contribute [...] to the search for valid theoretical models to explain the interpretation process [Gran & Viezzi, 1995: 115-116].*

Gran also affirms that theories of translation can be useful in the formulation of a theory of interpreting:

> *Translation and linguistic theories are often relevant to the interpretation process. Of course they do not and cannot take into account some peculiarities of interpretation as an immediate, oral rendition of a spoken text. Thus, when working toward a theory of interpretation, additional elements have to be considered [...]. It is however true that a number of indicators and instruments can be drawn from linguistic and translation theories [Gran, 1990: 4-5].*

Finally, Gran's position as to the relationship between translation and interpreting theories is agreed to by Stenzl, who criticizes the lack of interest in translation theory on the part of interpreting scholars:

> *[...] authors writing about simultaneous interpretation do not usually refer to or draw on translation theory [Stenzl, 1983: 1].*

She also points out the importance of co-ordinating research work in translation and interpreting, saying that:

> *the results of the translation research should neither be ignored nor uncritically applied to interpretation, but [...] should be critically evaluated in order to clarify to what extent they are valid for interpretation as well [Stenzl, 1983: 2].*

Stenzl believes that such an assessment can contribute to a general theory of interlingual communication:

> *Such an evaluation would [...] contribute toward the development of a general theory of mediated interlingual communication, i.e. a theory encompassing written translation and interpretation in all its forms [Stenzl, 1983: 2].*

Recent translation theory exploits a general theory, the Target-Oriented Approach (TOA) formulated by Gideon Toury:

> *Recent Translation Studies has found itself effectively using Toury's model [...]*
>
> *Several aspects of Toury's theory have contributed to development within the field: [...] [Gentzler, 1993: 133].*

Toury argues that his theoretical framework is valid for all translational phenomena:

> *It [the present book] consists of a series of papers representing a suggestion of steps in their author's search for such a theory, a search underlined by one main object: to enable himself, and if possible, other students of translational phenomena - be they entire texts or their constituents, corpora bigger than one text, or, finally, phenomena which have no direct textual realization - to account for them in a systematic way, within one unified framework.*
>
> *[...] Most of the author's actual work in translation studies, on both theoretical and methodological levels, as well all of his field studies, have been carried out with special regard to literary translation. Nevertheless, he regards most of the mechanisms dealt with as pertaining not to this specific type of translation alone, but to translation in general, as a type of semiotic activity and product [Toury, 1980: 7].*

1.1 THE PROBLEM

This study focuses on the problem that, although Gideon Toury's TOA is an influential and comprehensive modern theory of translation, the validity of its assumptions and hypotheses has not been investigated by scholars of interpreting studies (IS), who believe that theories of translation are related to interpreting and that research between the two disciplines should be co-ordinated.

1.2 PURPOSE

In line with the above-mentioned problem, the aim of this study is to examine Gideon Toury's TOA in order to find out whether its major arguments are valid for the interpreting process as well as written translation. Within this framework, it aims at answering the following research questions, hopefully leading towards a solution to the problem of the study:

1. What kind of discipline is IS?
2. What are the branches of IS?
3. What is theory in IS?
4. What is the function of theory in IS?
5. What are the basic assumptions of the major theories in IS?
6. What is the function of research in IS?
7. Is there process-oriented research in IS?

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

8. Is there product-oriented research in IS?
9. Is there diachronic research in IS?
10. Is there synchronic research in IS?
11. Is there descriptive research in IS?
12. What is the function of process in research in IS?
13. Is there a systemic approach in IS?
14. Is culture a determining factor of the interpreting process?
15. What is the function of source utterance in the interpreting process?
16. What is the function of target utterance in the interpreting process?
17. Are there constraints that determine the interpreting process?
18. Are there norms related to the interpreting process?
19. Do the answers given to above written questions support the premises formulated by Gideon Toury's TOA? If yes, to what extent?

1.3 IMPORTANCE

Although many studies have been done within the framework of the TOA, such studies are limited to translational phenomena and do not include the interpreting process.

Scholars of IS believe that theories of translation are relevant to the interpreting process and can therefore be used in the formulation of a theory of interpreting. For this reason, testing the validity of the TOA from the point of view of IS should be an important contribution to the theoretical domain of interlingual phenomena.

Given these circumstances, the importance of this study consists in re-evaluating the TOA in relation to a new criterion, namely IS.

1.4 ASSUMPTIONS

In this study it is assumed that, although translation and interpreting have different modes of process, the assumptions, hypotheses and theories developed for the former are to a significant degree valid for the latter since both of them belong to the same ontological category, namely the category of interlingual phenomena.

This assumption is supported by different scholars who have contributed to the literature of IS. Gile, for example, believes that what is shared by these two

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

disciplines is more significant than their divergences:

> *[...] over the years I have become convinced that [...] the similarities far outweigh the differences [Viezzi, 1996: 6].*

The same position is maintained by Viaggio too:

> *[...] both translators and interpreters specialize at mediating in interlingual communication. This basic feature, distinguishing the twain from the rest of the mortals, is a bond stronger than the differences between oral and written communication rending them apart [Viezzi, 1996: 6].*

The similarities between interpreting and translation are stressed by the scholars of translation studies (TS) as well. Nord elaborates this point as follows:

> *interpreting is a special form of translation, because the situation requires the presence of the ST recipient as well as the translator and the TT recipient. [...] both the sender and the recipient are present [...] together with the translator in the role of the TT producer. All the participants communicate in the same place at the same time using the same medium, and the function is the same for all of them except the translator [Viezzi, 1996: 7].*

Another scholar of TS, Newmark, points out that the heart of the similarities between translation and interpreting lies in one thing, words:

> *[...] both translation and interpretation have to be based on words, sentences, linguistic meaning, language - because apart from the interpreter's paralanguage and body language (not always clear in a booth) they have no other material foundation. Meaning does not exist without words [Newmark, 1981: 98].*

To support the assumption of this study, one can also refer to Viezzi, who reports that "media interpreting" is more similar to translation than interpreting in the traditional sense (where speaker, interpreter and audience share the same communicative situation).

Translation is characterized by a "displaced situation": a phenomenon in which the source text (ST) is produced and received in a situation different from that in which the target text (TT) is produced and received. In this phenomenon, the translator produces a TT for an "indefinite" group of readers. All this is similar to media interpreting, where, as in the case of an interpreting service rendered for television, the interpreter has an "indefinite" audience. He/She does not know the number or characteristics of his/her listeners and does not receive any kind of "feedback" from them. Under such circumstances there is a clear distinction, not only in a physical sense but in a situational sense as well, between the speaker and his/her audience, and consequently between interpreter and his/her audience. This

new media-dependent situation distances the role of the interpreter from the communicative aspects rendering interpreting more similar to translation:

> *In questi casi viene a determinarsi una netta separazione non solo fisica ma anche situazionale tra oratore e destinatari dell'interpretazione, i quali assumono un ruolo affatto nuovo. Non diversamente quanto accade generalmente in traduzione, dove i destinatari della traduzione non sono i destinatari del testo originale, i destinatari dell'interpretazione non sono i destinatari designati del testo dell'oratore né condividono con questo la situazione comunicativa [...]*
>
> *Questa nuova situazione [...] può modificare radicalmente le coordinate comunicative dell'interpretazione e il ruolo dell'interprete [...][Viezzi, 1996: 7-8].*

Finally, Shlesinger supports the assumption of the present study as follows:

> *Notwithstanding the substantial differences between interpreting and translating, then, the applicability of translation theoretical paradigms to simultaneous interpreting research - and the potential of interpreting research for the formulation and refinement of translation theoretical constructs - cannot be overlooked [Shlesinger, 1995: 10].*

1.5 SCOPE

The data for this study consists of IS literature written between 1971-1997 in English and Italian on theory, research, culture and norms.

This study is not an empirical study, but a secondary analysis of IS literature; therefore the validity of its results depends on the validity of the analysis.

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

The aim of science is to establish theories and then to prove (or disprove) them.
T. L. BAKER, SCHOLAR

POLONIUS: What do you read, my Lord?
HAMLET: Words, words, words.
WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE, "HAMLET"

CHAPTER II

2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

In this chapter, general background on the theory to be examined is provided. For this reason, a description of translation theories before the TOA is first given and then the TOA is presented in detail.

2.1 A HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF TRANSLATION THEORY

Translational phenomena, variously defined by scholars as an "art," a "craft," or a "science" [Bassnett, 1985], date back to the third millennium BC:

> *The Babylon of Hammurabi's day (2100 B.C.) was a polyglot city, and much of the official business of the empire was made possible by corps of scribes who translated edicts into various languages [Nida, 1964: 11].*

Those who have dealt with this art, craft or science since the third millennium B.C. have had various challenging problems to tackle in the translation process. As a matter of fact, Randolph Quirk believes that translation is "[...] one of the most difficult tasks that a writer can take upon himself." [Bassnett, 1985:5].

Some major issues concerning the translation process are "decoding" and "recoding" mechanisms, problems of "equivalence," "loss" and "gain," and "untranslatability" between source and target languages; and, indeed, whether translation is a "science" or a "secondary activity" [Bassnett, 1985].

Translation theory aims at determining, categorizing, and ultimately utilizing general principles of the translation process in relation to its major issues [Bassnett,

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

1985]. Within a schematic and simplified framework, translation theories can be classified diachronically under three major categories:

1. Translation theories based on source-oriented approaches,
2. Linguistic translation theories,
3. Recent translation theories.

All theoretical frameworks developed under the source-oriented approaches from the 2nd century B.C. up to the 20th century A.D. are source-oriented, normative, synchronic and focused on process. In other words, theoretical assumptions put forward under this category aimed at explaining the translation process on the basis of professional experiences by saying what a translator must or must not do in order to render a good translation. Under these assumptions the focus was on the fidelty to the source text in terms of form and meaning. More specifically, the translator was expected to duplicate the source text in all its aspects as a target text. In these assumptions there was no room for historical analyses of the translation process since translation was considered a static phenomenon .

For instance, the French humanist Étienne Dolet (1509-46) formulated one of the first theories of translation by establishing for the translator five principles which fall into the category of source-oriented theories:

(1) The translator must fully understand the sense and meaning of the original author, although he is at liberty to clarify obscurities.

(2) The translator should have a perfect knowledge of both SL and TL.

(3) The translator should avoid word-for-word renderings.

(4) The translator should use forms of speech in common use.

(5) The translator should choose and order words appropriately to produce the correct tone [Bassnett, 1985:54].

St. Jerome's suggestions about how to render translation can be considered another example of source-oriented theories:

St. Jerome already stated that Bible translations must respect the exact form of the source text because God's word must not be tampered with whereas in secular texts the translator should strive to render the meaning of the source text [Stenzl, 1983: 6].

On the other hand, linguistic translation theories started after the 1st decade of the 20th century and have lasted approximately 50 years. During this period translation became a branch of linguistics; it was therefore considered a means for linguistics rather than an independent science. Consequently, theories in this period

developed as linguistic studies, not directly as TS. Although these theories contributed to TS, they did not claim to be an autonomous science.

In this period, translation theory was seen as part of linguistic communication based on the "information theory," which defines language as a code. In communication, senders (i.e. speakers or writers) would then encode what they intend to convey (the message) and the receiver (the listener or reader), who shares the same code, would decode it. From this perspective, translation is a special case of this type of communication: since sender and receiver do not share the same code, the translator recodes the message from the sender into the receiver code. The message is the invariant, and the central problem of translation is to sustain this message even though there is generally no one-to-one correspondence between the signs of the two different code systems. Therefore, one task of translation theory is to describe the relations that might exist between such non-corresponding signs, e.g. "one-to-one equivalence," "one-to-two (or one-to-many) equivalence," "two-to-one equivalence," and "one-to-zero equivalence" at word, sentence, and textual levels [Stenzl, 1983].

These theories were also basically source-oriented, normative, synchronic and focused on process as in the previous period.

Finally, the last three decades of the 20th century represent the period in which TS have taken the initiative to become an autonomous science. James Holmes, an American poet/translator who taught TS at the University of Amsterdam until his death, coined the term TS for the new scientific approach. His work distinguishes three areas in TS: the "descriptive branch," the "theoretical branch," and the "applied branch." The "descriptive branch" is subdivided into three areas of research: "product-oriented," "function-oriented," and "process-oriented." Holmes defines the ultimate purpose of TS as the development of a full and comprehensive translation theory [Gentzler, 1993].

In this period, theories such as the "*Skopos* theory," the "Relevance theory," and the TOA have been influential in TS. The *Skopos* theory put forward by Hans Vermer [1989] views the translation process and the teaching of it as a substantial revision of the linguistic attitude, considering translation merely as a communicative process in which purpose has been given the major emphasis. On the other hand, the "Relevance theory" put forth by Sperber and Wilson [Gutt, 1993] claims that there is no need for a distinct general theory of translation since translation can be naturally accounted for under the general aspect of human communication: "Relevance theory" [Gutt, 1993].

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

The "*Skopos*" and "Relevance" theories, which stem from linguistic paradigms, do not deal with literary translation. Determining the functions and describing equivalences of literary texts is not easy because the meaning of these texts stem not only from their denotative meaning, but especially from their connotative meaning. Because literary text is a linguistic entity on its own, it is not easy to explore the meaning of literary texts with the precise scientific criteria of linguistic paradigms [Göktürk, 1986]. Ultimately, because linguistic translation theories do not cover literary translation as an object of investigation, the TOA marks the transformation of TS into a scientific field in the real sense of the term.

2.2 TARGET-ORIENTED APPROACH

In 1970 the Israeli scholar Itamar Even-Zohar formed a synthesis of "structuralism," "Russian formalism," the "Communication theory," and semiotics to put forth the "Polysystem theory" (PT), of literature and culture. The PT, which deals with all cultural, linguistic, literary, and social phenomena, does not account for translations as single texts, but regards them as a system functioning within a polysystem[1] governed by the literary system in which translations are done:

> *As a consequence, one hardly gets any idea whatsoever of the function of translated literature for a literature as a whole or of its position within that literature. Moreover, there is no awareness of the possible existence of translated literature as a particular literary system. The prevailing concept is rather that of "translation" or "translated works" treated on individual grounds.*
>
> *[...]I use the term "translated literature" not just as [...] "the group of translated literary works," but as a denotation for a body of texts which is structured and functions as a system.*
>
> *[...]I conceive of translated literature not only as a system in its own right, but as a system fully participating in the history of polysystem, as an integral part of it, related with all the other co-systems [Even-Zohar, 1978: 117-118].*

Gideon Toury, another Israeli scholar and theoretician, was inspired by the PT and formulated the TOA, an exclusive and comprehensive theory of translation which is a reaction to normative, (exclusively) synchronic, and source-system-oriented theoretical frameworks focused on the process of source-text typology and linguistic theories.

[1] "Literary polysystem includes all sorts of literary and semi-literary texts as an aggregate of systems" [Even-Zohar, 1978: 119].

Toury, in his book entitled *In Search of a Theory of Translation*, says that he wants to formulate a general theory applicable to all translational phenomena:

> *It [the present book] consists of a series of papers representing a suggestion of steps in their author's search for such a theory, a search underlined by one main object: to enable himself, and if possible, other students of translational phenomena - be they entire texts or their constituents, corpora bigger than one text, or, finally, phenomena which have no direct textual realization - to account for them in a systematic way, within one unified framework.*
>
> *[...] Most of the author's actual work in translation studies, on both theoretical and methodological levels, as well all of his field studies, have been carried out with special regard to literary translation. Nevertheless, he regards most of the mechanisms dealt with as pertaining not to this specific type of translation alone, but to translation in general, as a type of semiotic activity and product [Toury, 1980: 7].*

The TOA criticizes all major premises of Source-Oriented Theories (SOT), substituting new ones for them. First of all, traditional SOT distinguish two levels in TS: theory and process. The TOA criticizes this and claims that theories developed by SOT do not satisfy translation realities because they are abstract, prescriptive norms that do not stem from actual translation processes:

> *But when one looks closer at the existing theories of translation, [...] their notions are only restricted versions of a general concept of translatability because they always have some specified adequacy conditions which are postulated as the only proper ones, if not disguised as the only possible ones. The descriptive level of norm is thus transformed in them, not simply into a predictive, but into a prescriptive construct, inevitably rendering the theory of translation as a whole normative [Toury, 1980: 26].*
>
> *Thus, it appears not only as naive, but also as misleading and infertile for translation studies to start from the assumption that translation is nothing but an attempt to reconstruct the original, or certain parts or aspect thereof, or the preservation of certain predetermined features of the original, which are (or are to be) unconditionally considered the invariant under transformation, in another sign-system, as it is usually defined from the source's point of view [Toury, 1980:17].*
>
> *[...] Most of the theories of translation hitherto formulated tend to be prescriptive, and thus are in no position to serve as a point of departure for research. Therefore I here posit the need for a revision of the theory in keeping with the needs of the translation scholar, namely a revision which will lend it a greater descriptive and explanatory force [Toury, 1980: 62].*
>
> *[...] This paper wishes: [...] (b) to argue that source-oriented theories-while able to serve as a basis for translators' training and other applied activities-*

are totally unable to supply a sound starting point and framework for a descriptive study of actual translations, especially literary [Toury, 1980: 35].

[...] Such a theory [Source-oriented]will inevitably be directive, normative in nature, because it will recognize only "correct" instances (and types) of performance as belonging to the domain it covers; in other words, it will identify "translation" with (or reduce it to) "correct" translation, according to its a priori, ST-based conditions [Toury, 1980: 39-40].

[...]in contradistinction to the required relationships postulated by the ST/SL-oriented theories of translation, which are merely speculative [Toury, 1980: 46].

[...]Thus, an ST-oriented theory is inadequate, or at least insufficient, as a basis for a descriptive study of translations relationships as empirical phenomena [Toury, 1980: 40].

Therefore, the TOA contends that TS is an "empirical discipline" since its object of study is about real life:

Since the object - level of translation studies consists of actual facts of 'real life' - whether they be actual texts, intertextual relationships, or models and norms of behavior - rather than the merely speculative outcome of preconceived theoretical hypotheses and models, it is undoubtedly, in essence, an empirical science [Toury, 1985: 16].

and adds a third level to the theory and process in the framework of TS, namely, "Descriptive Studies" (DS), a branch necessary for every empirical discipline, including TS:

No empirical science can make a claim for completeness and (relative) autonomy unless it has developed a descriptive branch [Toury, 1985: 16].

[...] What we need, however, is not isolated attempts reflecting excellent intuitions and supplying fine insights (which many of the existing studies certainly provide) but a systematic scientific branch, seen as an inherent component of an overall discipline of translation studies, based on clear assumptions and armed with a methodology and research techniques made as explicit as possible. Only a branch of this sort can assure that the findings of individual case studies carried out within its framework will be both relevant and intersubjectively testable, and the studies themselves repeatable.

In what follows I intend to sketch a tentative rationale for such a branch of Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS) [...][Toury, 1985: 17-18].

He distinguishes, in compliance with Holmes, three branches that interact with each other: "theoretical," "descriptive," and "applied" TS:

It appears, then, that theoretical, descriptive and applied translation studies-

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

the three branches of a prospective fully-fledged and relatively autonomous discipline (see Holmes) - may and should be distinguished in terms of three levels of translational relationships [...] [Toury, 1985: 35].

These three branches deal with possible, existing, and required relationships respectively:

[...] the three levels of translational relationships, along with criteria (or types of conditions) for their establishment and the consequent branches of translation studies (to which cf. especially Holmes) where they are fit to be used: [Toury, 1985: 35].

Type of Relationship	*Criterion (or Type of Condition)*	*Appropriate Verbs, e.g.*	*Branch of Translation Studies*
Possible	*Theoretical*	*Can (under certain circumstances)*	*Translation Theory*
Existing	*Empirical*	*Is*	*Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS)*
Required	*A priori*	*Should be*	*Applied Translation Studies*

Fig. 2.1. Translational relationships in relation to their respective branches as proposed by Toury

Within this framework, translation theories consist of a series of interrelated hypotheses:

[...] translation theory will ultimately become a series of truly interconnected hypotheses, which is the only kind of theory which would offer a possibility of supplementing exhaustive descriptions and viable explanations with justifiable predictions [Toury, 1995: 280].

They are developed in the light of findings of DS whose task is to describe and explain actual translational facts:

[...] one of the aims of (TS) should definitely be to bring the results of descriptive-explanatory studies executed within DTS to bear on the theoretical branch [Toury, 1995: 15].

[...] They [descriptive-explanatory investigations] also form a vital link in the elaboration of translation theory itself [Toury, 1995: 281].

[...]descriptive studies are actually the best means of testing, refuting, and

especially modifying and amending the underlying theory, on the basis of which they are executed [Toury, 1985: 16].

[...]One of their [of descriptive studies] aims is always to put to test the hypotheses and models supplied by the theory, in whose framework the studies are carried out. There is simply no other way of verifying, refuting, and especially amending these hypotheses, and without a constant testing of this sort the theory is bound to lose contact with the empirical phenomena, or to lead to stagnation [...] [Toury, 1980: 80].

On the other hand, applied TS in accordance with the results of DS and therefore with the theoretical branch is a prescriptive branch:

Obviously, descriptive-explanatory investigations can be rewarding in the attempt to draw the applied extensions of Translation Studies close to real-life behavior, thus mitigating whatever pretentiousness they are liable to display[...][Toury, 1995: 281].

They [Applied Translation Studies] are not intended to account either for possibilities and likelihoods or for facts of actual behavior, but rather set norms in a more or less conscious way. In brief, to tell others what they should have done/ or should be doing, if they accept these norms and submit to them [Toury, 1995: 19].

The DS start with and are focused on translations themselves rather than on the translation process:

[...]any research into translation should start with observational facts, i.e. the translated utterances themselves (and their constitutive elements, on various levels), proceeding from there towards the reconstruction of non-observational facts, and not the other way around [Toury, 1985: 18].

The reason for this, according to Toury, is the simple fact that it is extremely difficult to examine the human mind, whereas one can easily examine its products, namely, the translations:

[...] translating process, i.e. those series of operations whereby actual translations are derived from actual source texts, though no doubt also empirical facts and as such a legitimate part of the object level of translation studies, are only indirectly available for study, as they are a kind of 'black box' whose internal structure can only be guessed, or tentatively reconstructed.

[...] Translated texts and their constitutive elements are observational facts, directly accessible to the eye [Toury, 1985: 18].

When the translations are examined within the framework of DS, the source text is just one criterion to be taken into consideration with the real emphasis given to the translations themselves, which according to the target system are not projections of the source text, but indeed the only reality:

> *[...]any research into translation, [...] should start from the hypothesis that translations are facts of one system only: the target system. It is clear that, from the standpoint of the source text and source system, translations have hardly any significance at all, even if everybody in the source culture 'knows' of their factual existence (which is rarely the case anyway) [Toury, 1985: 19].*

Finally, apart from the "synchronic," a "diachronic analysis" of the translations is desirable since this can give a wider perspective to the study, which can then in itself be more comprehensive in its findings and conclusions:

> *One of the tasks of this branch [DTS] of translation studies will be to account for the relationships actually obtaining between a body of translated items serving as its corpus (be it a single text, the total variety of solutions to a certain, well, defined translational problem, the entire production of a certain translator, school of translators, period [...])[Toury, 1980: 90].*
>
> *What is implied in this explanation is a tendency to relating the traditional notion of equivalence on the one hand, while making one essential change in it on the other: from an a-historical, largely normative concept to a historical one intended as a descriptive device [Toury, 1980: 56].*
>
> *It will be argued that this approach, [...], is more adequate from the point of view of the requirements of descriptive, historically-oriented translation studies, and likely to correct many of the flaws inherent in the existing, mostly prescriptive and a-historical approaches to the problem [Toury, 1980: 63].*
>
> *It follows that historical changes in translational norms may best be described in terms of the type and degree [...][Toury, 1980:142].*

According to the TAO, synchronic or diachronic DS reveal "translation norms," which establish the type of equivalence between source and target texts, to understand translation process:

> *[...] norms are the key-concept and focal point in any scientific approach to the study and description of social phenomena, especially behavioral activities [...][Toury, 1980: 52].*
>
> *Norms are operative at every stage in translating process and at every level in its products, the translation itself [Toury, 1980: 53].*
>
> *[...] the translation norms, which should therefore be the focal concept in any study of literary translation and the main object of the study [Toury, 1980: 50].*

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

Like any other behavioral activity, translation is necessarily subject to constraints of various types and degrees. A special status among these constraints is enjoyed by norms [Toury, 1980:141].

Translation norms are not static facts valid for ever, but rather they are dynamic:

But they [norms] are by no means fixed and given. On the contrary, the establishment of the exact relationships is an essential part [...] of the overall study of translational norms [Toury, 1980: 54].

They act in terms of "cultural constraints":

Target constraints, while never totally ignored, [are] often counted as subsidiary; especially those which would not fall within Linguistic of any kind [Toury, 1995:24].

[...] translations have been regarded as facts of the culture which hosts them [Toury, 1995:24].

[...] translations are facts of target cultures; on occasion facts of especial status, some times even constituting identifiable (sub) systems of their own, but of the target culture in any event [Toury, 1995:29].

Thus for Luboshitsky it was simply necessary to find Hebrew names for the title characters [...] But Luboshitsky's considerations are much more Hebraic than that: they are cultural rather than merely linguistic in nature. He was looking for names which will be Hebrew not in form only, but will also be suggestive for the Hebrew reader, that is evoke in him certain associations on the basis of his cultural background [Toury, 1980: 150].

The TOA distinguishes three types of norms: "preliminary," "operational," and "initial norms." Preliminary norms involve the choice of the work and the translation strategy within the target cultural system. For instance, which authors, periods, genres, schools are preferred by the target culture? Is intermediate or second-hand translation permitted? What are the permitted mediating languages?:

I find it convenient and rewarding, as well as theoretically justified, to distinguish first of all two larger groups of translational norms in terms of these two dimensions: preliminary and operational [...]

Preliminary norms have to do with [...]a definite translation "policy" [and]the "directness" of translation [...]

As "considerations regarding translation policy" I have in mind the factors affecting or determining the choice of works (or at least of authors, genres, schools, source literature, and the like) to be translated [...]

Considerations concerning directness of translation involve the threshold of

tolerance for translating from languages other than SL: is an intermediate (second-hand) translation permitted at all? In translating from what (primary) source literatures/literary systems/periods and the like is it permitted/prohibited/tolerated/preferred? What are the permitted/prohibited/tolerated/preferred intermediating languages? [Toury, 1980: 53-54].

On the other hand, "operational norms" are actual decisions made during the translation process:

***Operational norms**, in turn, [are] direct actual decisions made during the translating process itself. They affect the metrix of the text, that is, the modes of distributing linguistic material (especially of larger units) in the text, and the actual verbal formulation of the text [Toury, 1980: 54].*

Finally, the "initial norms" categorize the individual translator's choice to conform either to the original text with its textual relations and norms, or to the target culture's linguistic and literary norms, or some combination thereof:

[...]I would like to introduce [...] the "initial norm." This most important notion is a useful means to denote the translator's basic choice between two polar alternatives deriving from the two major constituents of the "value" in literary translation mentioned earlier: he subjects himself either to the original text, with its textual relations and the norms expressed by it and contained in it, or to the linguistic and literary norms active in TL and in the target literary polysystem, or a certain section of it [Toury, 1980: 54].

Therefore, it is not reasonable to consider translation equivalence as fidelity to the source text. Rather than fidelity or lack of fidelity to the source text, translation equivalence can be seen as "adequacy" or "acceptability." In the former the translator will move closer to the source text system, but in the latter to the target system:

If [...], the translation tends to adhere to the norms of the original work, and through them - as well- to the norms of SL and/or the source literary polysystem as a whole. This tendency, which we shall call the pursuit of an adequate translation, may mean - or cause - incompatibility of the translated text with the target linguistic and/or literary norms [...]

If, on the other hand, [...], the operational linguistic and literary norms of the target system are triggered and set into full operation. Whereas adherence to the norms of the original determines the adequacy of the translation as compared to it adherence to the norms of the target determines its acceptability in the target linguistic and/or literary polysystems as well as its exact position within them [Toury, 1980: 55].

Translation norms can be dictated either by source or target system

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

depending on the type of the norm: preliminary norms are influenced by the source system, whereas operational norms are affected by the target system:

> *[...] translational norms of all kinds are, to a large extend, dependent on the position held by translated literature as a whole, or by its relevant section(s) (generic, systemic, and the like) in the target literary polysystem [...]*
>
> *Moreover, as the translator's actual attitude towards a literary work to be translated also depends on the position of the work within the source polysystem[...][Toury, 1980: 56-57].*

To sum up, the TOA suggests a descriptive, diachronic (including synchronic aspects) target (including source) system-oriented theoretical framework focused on the product rather than a normative, (exclusively) synchronic source system oriented theoretical framework focused on the process of the SOT [Bengi, 1993].

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

A concept of science [is] defined essentially by its methodology.
C. STENZL, SCHOLAR

Words are the only things that last for ever.
WILLIAM HAZLITT, BRITISH WRITER (1778-1830)

CHAPTER III

3 PROCEDURE

This chapter tells the reader "how" this study has been carried out. It consists of the following four parts: (1) methodological design of the study, (2) population and sample, (3) method of data collection and (4) method of data analysis. In the first part, the research method used in this study is given; in the second part, methods of data selection are presented; in the third part, the research tools and the steps used to obtain the data are explained; and finally in the fourth part, methods of studying data that are already available are illustrated.

3.1 METHODOLOGICAL DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The research method employed in this study is "secondary analysis." This method links the research problem to a set of available data collected for other purposes by other researchers. In the literature of research methodology, secondary analysis is defined as: "[...] any further analysis of an existing dataset which presents interpretations, conclusions, or knowledge additional to, or different from those presented in the first report" [T. L. Baker, 1994: 260]. The reason why such a method was adopted is that the study, which is of a highly theoretical nature, requires a larger data set than could be easily obtained by researcher on his own through another research method such as field[1], survey[2], or experimental[3] research.

[1] Field research attempts to understand how an entire segment or unit of the phenomena under investigation operates in its own terms.

[2] Survey research can either describe or explain phenomena by selecting in a representative way a sample of individuals and soliciting their responses to a set of questions.

[3] Experimental research attempts to explain how a specific part of the studied phenomena operates when it is stimulated by an experimental device.

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

Research methodology literature suggests that under these conditions secondary analysis is the ideal method to use:

> *[...] you should consider secondary analysis if you want to use a dataset larger than what you could collect yourself [...]*
>
> *'One advantage of secondary analysis is that it forces the researcher to think more closely about theoretical aims and substantive issues of the study rather than the practical and methodological problems of collecting new data' (Hakim, 1982, p. 16) [...]*
>
> *This may be one of the reasons that it has become such a widely reputed method [T. L. Baker, 1994: 260-261].*

Methodologically speaking, the study is based on a secondary analysis because it enables the researcher to reassess the important findings of other scholars for a solution to his problem. In fact, a research design which postulates such an analytical reassessment is the most appropriate solution for a theoretical problem such as this is.

3.2 POPULATION AND SAMPLE

The "population"[4] for the study is any information written in any scientific publications (articles, essays, papers, M. A. and Ph. D. theses) on the theories, research, culture, and norms in IS. This is a very general population, abstract and almost impossible to access. Therefore, to determine a concrete and accessible empirical representation of the population, that is to say, the "sampling frame"[5] of the study, bibliographic research was carried out in the library of the *Scuola Superiore di Lingue Moderne per Interpreti e Traduttori* - School for Translators and Interpreters - (SSLM) in the University of Trieste, Italy. All English and Italian language written sources in the library have been considered as empirically observable units of the population, or as the sampling frame of the research. This bibliographic research, revealed that the "sample"[6] of the study would consist of 81 sources. The reason why the sources of the library of SSLM was taken as the sampling frame for the population of the study is that SSLM is the university department with the best international reputation for research work in IS [Gile,

---

[4] A population is the set of units or elements (corpus of analysis) to which the results of the study are expected to be generalized.

[5] A sampling frame is the enumeration or the "list" of the population.

[6] A sample is the selected set of elements of the population (dataset).

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

1991: 169; Pöchhacker, 1995 b: 60].[7]

The type of sample used in this study is "purposive sampling."[8] The reason for choosing the 81 sources that constitute the sample of the study, selected from sources on theory, research, culture and norms in IS can be explained as follows. Sources about IS theory were selected because the aim of the study is to test a theory, the TOA; sources about IS research were taken into consideration because the TOA postulates a close link between theory and research, so that the one supplies material for the other; and finally, sources about culture and norms in IS are included in the sample because the TOA posits important theoretical assumptions about them.[9]

The sample of the study was limited to the sources in English and Italian, because the researcher knows these two foreign languages well.

In order to decide whether a source was about theory, research, culture or norms, key words in the titles were taken into consideration as criteria: the key words for theory are "approach," "model" and "theory"; for research "acquisition," "brain," "cerebral," "cognition," "cognitive," "deverbalization," "esperimenti," "experimental," "experiments," "hemispheric," "lateralization," "neuro," "neurolinguistic," "neurobiological," "neuroscience," "process," "processing," psycholinguistic," "psychosemantics," "research," "research work" and "sperimentale"; for culture "culture," "international," "multicultural," "multiracial," "politica," "politics"; and for norms "norms" and "standards."

The 81 sources of the sample identified by the key words above can be classified according to subject as follows:

---

[7] The researcher believes that SSLM satisfies the validity criterion in for secondary analysis as to "the quality of the data-gathering organization" [cf. T. L. Baker, 1994].

[8] A purposive sample is a form of nonprobability sample in which the units selected seem to meet the study's needs.

[9] The researcher believes that these categories satisfy the validity criteria for a secondary analysis as to "the purpose of the original researchers" and "the extent to which the dataset contains indicators that will enable the researcher to test his/her research problem" [cf. T. L. Baker, 1994].

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

SUBJECT	NUMBER
SOURCES ABOUT RESEARCH	46
SOURCES ABOUT THEORY	24
SOURCES ABOUT CULTURE	9
SOURCES ABOUT NORMS	2

Fig. 3.1. The distribution of the sources in relation to their subjects

The study has been carried out on a set of data units (interpreting literature) selected on the basis of purposive sampling so that the most common characteristics of the data (information related to the research) could be considered. Such a purposive sampling should allow more reliable generalizations.[10]

3.3 METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION

The tools used to collect data from the sample were a list of criteria prepared in relation to the research questions and computer charts.

The items included in the criteria list are the following: 1. "constraints," 2. "culture," 3. "descriptive," 4. "diachronic," 5. "education," 6. "equivalence," 7. "ideology," 8. "initial norms," 9. "interpreting studies," 10. "norms," 11. "operational norms," 12. "practice," 13. "preliminary norms," 14. "prescriptive," 15. "process-oriented," 16. "product-oriented," 17. "research," 18. "source-oriented," 19. "synchronic," 20. "system," 21. "target-oriented," and 22. "theory."

The computer program Microsoft Excel 4.0 was used to prepare computer charts. During the readings notes were taken on the sides of the reading material in compliance with the items on the criteria list. During the note-taking procedure three

[10] "Many qualitative researchers [...] do **purposive sampling** for reasons other than representativeness. [...] That is, they deliberately choose individuals who will put their ideas to the test. Such sampling strengthens the logic of the method and, when done properly, is a stringent test of the findings." [Krathwohl, 1993: 138].

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

different symbols were used to clarify the content of the information elicited from the reading material and written in the notes at the sides. These notes are "OK," "NO," and "0." The first symbol indicates that the content of the note taken supports the related item on the criteria list, the second one opposes it, and finally the third one neither supports nor opposes it. For instance, a note such as 1 [OK] means that this source supports the TAO in relation to constraints, whereas another note like 2 [NO] means that the content of this source does not support the TAO as to culture, and finally a third note which is 3 [0] means that this source neither supports nor opposes the TAO concerning descriptiveness.[11]

The steps taken during the data collection can be explained as follows: first, the problem of the study was decided. Secondly, the bibliographic research was carried out in Italy. By the end of this research the sampling frame of the study had been determined and it was decided to select data units on the basis of the purposive sampling. Then a criteria list was prepared with a number from 1 to 22 for each item and finally, the interpreting literature was read.

Finally, all the data, in terms of the notes taken at the sides of the material, were stored in the computer using Excel 4.0 so that computer-made charts could be obtained in order to have a clear and comprehensive picture of the data collected. For this, four different files were used for each subject: a file for sources related to IS theory, a file for sources on research in IS, a file for sources on culture in IS, and a file for sources concerning norms in IS. In each file the names of the authors were written in the first column from top down chronologically, whereas the 22 items on the criteria list were written across in the first row with the headings of author, title, data and page numbers of the source. The matrix of the computer chart shown below:

[11] See the second paragraph above to understand the meaning of each number.

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

Author	*Title*	*Date*	*Pages*	*Constraints*	*Culture*	*Descriptive*	*Diachronic*	*Education*
Arjona								
Namy								
Moser								
Wills								
Stenzl								
Lambert								

Fig. 3.2. Computer chart matrix used to store data obtained from reading material

The notes taken from each source were written in the appropriate criterion column (whether they support, oppose the criterion or are simply neutral). In order to indicate the typology of a note in the chart three different types were used: "**bold**," "underline" and "regular." When the page number of a note supportive to the chart criterion in relation to the TAO was written in the appropriate column, it was written in bold to show that the information on that specific page supports the TAO; on the other hand if a note was contradictory of a chart criterion, then its page number was underlined and finally, if a note neither supported nor opposed a chart criterion, then its page number was written in regular type.

Author	*Title*	*Date*	*Pages*	*Constraints*	*Culture*	*Descriptive*	*Diachronic*	*Education*
Arjona	*X*			**15**			**67**	
Namy								
Moser	*Y*				*12*			*22*
Wills								
Stenzl								
Lambert	*Z*					**151**		*158*

Fig. 3.3. An example showing the note-taking typology used to store data in the computer chart

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

The above-noted page numbers 15, 67, 12, 22, 151, and 158 on the chart mean that there are six different types of information in three sources (x), (y), and (z), written respectively by Arjona, Moser and Lambert. The information in the source (x) on pages 15 and 67 support the TOA in relation to constraints and diachronic research, whereas the first item, on page 12, in the source (y) is neutral in relation to the function of culture in the TOA; on the other hand the second bit of information, on page 22, opposes the TOA in relation to education, and finally the first entry, on page 151, in the source (z) supports the TOA in relation to descriptiveness whereas the second bit, on page 158 of the same source, is neutral in relation to education within the framework of the TOA.

3.4 METHOD OF DATA ANALYSIS

In this study, data collected with the methods and tools listed above have been analyzed as follows:

Data collected from the sample of IS literature were grouped under four categories depending on the type (research, theory, culture, or norms) and sorted in respective charts. Next, the page numbers, written chronologically (from the past to the present) under each of the 22 items of criteria in the charts, were counted to quantify the data related to that specific item. Then the information related to every page number was extracted from the sources to grasp the main idea contained in every single source in relation to that specific item. The results of this content analysis were recorded in terms of a word or phrase near the page number so that a profile of the qualitative aspects of the data could be attained. Finally, once all data were quantitatively and qualitatively described, the data were sorted into groups and arranged both chronologically and in order of importance to be presented in the chapter of findings.

What follows is an example illustrating the data analysis procedure employed to analyze the item "research" in relation to historical aspects from the criteria list consisting of 22 items.

Once the four sets of charts on research, theory, culture, and norms were analyzed, it was discovered that only the first two sets, research and theory, contained data on research. It was also clear that out of 46 sources expected to deal with research and 24 with theory, only 17 and 13 sources respectively contained data on research. Second, it became clear that the 17 sources which, on the basis of their titles, were supposed to deal with research had 50 pages to be analyzed for information on research, whereas the second set of 13 sources on theory had 28

pages for such analysis. When these pages had been analyzed, the data in them were grouped under five categories, some with sub-categories: data about 1) the history, 2) the nature, 3) the object of study with the sub-category co-operation, 4) the types with the sub-categories experimental, process, product-oriented, and 5) the function of interpreting research. Finally, it was determined that there were nine sources expected to be dealing either with theory or research from which data could be used to come up with some findings about the history of interpreting research. These nine sources had 12 pages to be dealt with for content analysis. At the end of the content analysis, the following concepts on the history of interpreting research had been identified as significant:

1. the beginning of interpreting research,
2. the Venice Conference,
3. the Trieste Symposium,
4. IS as a new academic discipline,
5. IS as an academic discipline in the 1990s,
6. the languages of interpreting research publications,
7. the Turku conference,
8. the internationalization of interpreting activity, and
9. the rise of interpreting research in 1980s.

These main ideas were written down next to the page numbers of their sources and arranged chronologically in order of importance and in accordance with the principle of coherence. As a result of this rearrangement of the main topics, the analysis ended with the following set of items to be used in writing about the historical aspects of interpreting research:

1. Among the scholars of IS there is a general consensus that IS is a new academic discipline.
2. However, interpreting research started much earlier with different paradigms.
3. The conference held in Venice in 1977 included significant discussion of these different paradigms.
4. Aside from the Venice conference, another international scholarly meeting, the 1986 Symposium organized by SSLM in Trieste represented a turning point in interpreting research coined the "Trieste era" in IS literature.
5. The 1994 Turku conference took another step forward in shaping interpreting as a scientific discipline.

6. What precedes implies that research work in IS increased in the 1980s.
7. Consequently, we can argue that IS became a scientific discipline of its own in the early 1990s.
8. The transformation of IS into an academic discipline has also turned it into an international scientific activity.

To conclude, it is hoped that this chapter has explained to the reader the procedures employed in the study.

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ 1883

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ 1883
MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

What we see depends mainly on what we look for.
JOHN LUBBOCK, ENGLISH ASTRONOMER (1803-1865)

No matter how eloquently a dog may bark, he cannot tell you that his parents were poor but honest.
BERTRAND RUSSELL

CHAPTER IV

4 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, (1) research and (2) theories on interpreting, as well as issues related to (3) culture and (4) norms in IS are presented separately, explaining the major points of each. An introductory part preceding the treatment of these four notions provides insights into history, terminology and the concepts of interpreting as well as the historical evolution of its methods and training.

The purpose of this chapter is, first, to present the findings of the secondary analysis of the previously selected interpreting literature, that is, of the dataset collected from the sample and then, secondly, to discuss these findings in relation to the study. Consequently, it is hoped that the presentation of this secondary analysis or re-evaluation of the above-mentioned literature and discussion will lead towards an answer to the question addressed in this study: "Is the TOA valid for IS?"

4.1 FINDINGS

4.1.1 A HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF INTERPRETING AS A PROFESSION

IS literature provides various diachronic studies considering the historical aspects of interpreting from different viewpoints. For instance, M. Bowen, who discusses diachronic aspect in IS from a didactic point of view, argues that "[...] we should not neglect the study of the history of the profession" [Bowen M., 1993: 173] since "[...] any profession needs a sense of perspective," [Bowen M., 1993: 172] and explains the reasons for such studies in IS as follows: "The present-day translators and interpreters and their students need the sense of perspective that a knowledge of history can give. We should not have to re-invent the wheel every time we have to

explain basic concepts of our profession." [Bowen M., 1993: 173]. Volpi and Gentile also point out the importance of diachronic aspect in IS. However, they consider this issue from another perspective: the interpreting process. Volpi claims that during SI the rendition of certain speech categories are historically, culturally and socially determined; therefore the interpreter has to be knowledgeable about these constraints and react accordingly: "Le formule di cortesia [...] sono frutto delle tradizioni storiche, culturali, sociali e caratteriali di una comunità linguistica. [...] L'interprete, di conseguenza dovrà conoscere queste particolari caratteristiche in ognuna delle lingue con cui lavora." [Volpi, 1991: 36]. Similarly, Gentile indicates the importance of diachronic aspect in the interpreting/translation process in relation to social context:

> *[In communicative translation] [...]the translator or interpreter pays much more attention to the "dynamic equivalence" of the text which entails a recognition of the importance of the social context and the function of the text within that given context. Pergnier (1980), in treating this aspect, also introduces the idea of the interpreter/translator as the "fortuitous" receiver of messages and thus introduces an important element which one could call the "social setting of the translator" which no doubt impinges on the practice of translation and opens up the whole question of the synchronic or diachronic relationship of the translator to the text. This is obviously more significant for translators of non-contemporary texts but could be a problem even in technical translation [Gentile, 1991: 348].*

Snelling, too, is in total agreement with Volpi and Gentile as to the importance of the diachronic aspect in IS:

> *I heard Professor Agostino Lombardo talking a couple of days ago and he was asked the question as to whether or not it was advisable for great works of art to be retranslated periodically. He replied that it is not only advisable but absolutely essential. The writer will write for posterity, for immortality. The translator is writing at a historically determined time in a specific place for a historically determined reader. Well, if that is true for the translator, it is doubly true for the interpreter. The interpreter is translating for a specific audience, at a specific time and is conditioned by the specific requirements of the moment and the audience for whom he is working [Snelling: 1989: 141].*

IS literature provides evidence for research which has been designed diachronically. To give an example, the interview between William Skinner and Thomas F. Carson explores working conditions at the Nuremberg Trials. At the end of this study, which aims at discovering phenomena of the interpreting process in a specific period of history, the interviewer implicitly points out the importance of diachronic analysis. While doing this, he underlines the consequences of its findings

in relation to the present, which depicts the evolution of the interpreting process through time for court interpreters, as follows:

> *The differences and similarities between interpretation as practiced and as a profession today are striking. [...] That is as unthinkable today as the notion of having German attorneys ask the interpreter what a certain word meant. Recent United States legislation concerning court interpreters has forbidden exactly this kind of commentary on the part of court interpreters [...]*
>
> *In conclusion, Mr. Carson's experience and his willingness to speak about it have provided a new perspective [...][Skinner, 1990: 14].*

Another study includes both a diachronic and synchronic design at the same time:

> *The analysis comprises a "diachronic" part, in which the output of writings and research on interpreting until 1988 will be compared to the literature since 1989 with respect to both works and authors, as well as a "synchronic" part, in which the recent literature (1989-1994) will be analyzed more closely with regard to topics and categories of work [Pöchhacker, 1995 a: 17].*

Last but not least, a work of Schjoldager [1995] provides further evidence for the simultaneous employment of diachronic and synchronic analysis in interpreting research. In this work, Schjoldager analyzes interpreting research under two headings: "Interpreting Research in a Historical Perspective" and "Interpreting Research in a Contemporary Perspective." Finally, some scholars contend that a diachronic approach in IS is a natural consequence now that IS has become a scientific discipline of its own:

> *[...] the formalization of interpreter training has led to the emergence of a field of studies in its own right: the formulation of a set of theoretical principles on the basis of which the discipline can be taught, observed and described. Interpreters, like translators of the written word, have begun to reflect on the pioneers of their own profession [Delisle & Woodsworth, 1995: 253].*

What follows exposes the evolution of interpreting as a profession in line with the diachronic data obtained from the IS literature.

Today, different categories of interpreters with specific qualifications are distinguished: conference interpreters, court interpreters, escort interpreters, and community interpreters. However, in the past these categories did not exist. Scholars such as M. & D. Bowen, and Kaufman and Kurz [1995] in their diachronic analysis of the historical evolution of interpreting and interpreters suggest that interpreters can be best categorized according to the roles they have played over the ages:

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

interpreters in the service of the state and religion, interpreters in expeditions of discovery and conquest, and interpreters in the military and the diplomatic services.

According to another diachronic analysis carried out by Kurz [1985] to explore the origins of interpreting, the earliest evidence of interpreting dates back as far as the third millennium B.C. in Pharaonic Egypt, the Egyptians depended on the services of interpreters in their trade relations with other peoples. The earliest recorded references to the use of interpreting are tomb inscriptions describing the princes of Elephantine as "overseers of dragomans" in charge of diplomatic and trade expeditions to Nubia, a rich borderland of Pharaonic Egypt. These princes can be considered as military interpreters, too, because they were involved in fighting during the expeditions. However, Vermer is skeptical of this argument as he doubts whether the inscription really refers to interpreting [Bowen M. & D., Kaufman and Kurz, 1995].

Nevertheless, according to M. & D. Bowen, and Kaufman and Kurz [1995] there is no doubt that interpreters for military purposes existed in ancient times because armies always needed interpreters for making and keeping allies, determining the enemy's plans and positions, overseeing conquered lands, and negotiating with the enemy.

M. & D. Bowen, and Kaufman and Kurz [1995], point out that the earliest sound references to military interpreting date from Alexander the Great's campaigns in Asia. During these campaigns, he used interpreters to communicate with the various peoples he conquered or won over as allies. Later, during the war in Asia Minor between the Greek city states and the Persians, the Greeks and the Persians each brought their own interpreters to the peace negotiations. The Romans also made use of interpreters, both in their campaigns and in the administration of their conquered territories. In the Middle Ages, French chroniclers mention that interpreters were used during the Crusades. In fact, Herbert verifies this in another diachronic study: "[...] in the beginning of the XIIth century, a French lawyer advises his King to set up a school of interpreters for use in the Middle East and more particularly in the Holy Land during the crusades [...]" [Herbert: 1977: 5]. M. & D. Bowen, and Kaufman and Kurz [1995] mention that according to the accounts of the French expedition to the Middle East in 1798, French and Arabic speaking translators and interpreters worked in Egypt and Palestine during Napoleon's campaign. Finally, during World War I, military co-operation between the Allies depended on interpreters. Colonel Byred, for instance, interpreter to General John J. Pershing, commander of the American Expeditionary Forces, and Paul Mantoux, who served as an interpreter to officers during World War I and later to the supreme

War Council in Versailles, are examples of interpreters who contributed to military co-operation during World War I.

M. & D. Bowen, and Kaufman and Kurz [1995] point out that since all the major world religions have spread beyond the territories in which they originated, interpreting, like translation, has also been fundamental in the religious lives of many peoples.

Judaism, for instance, relied on interpreters for centuries because Hebrew was not the only language spoken by the Jewish; a large number of Jews spoke Aramaic as well. Consequently, interpreting/translation from Hebrew into Aramaic and vice versa was required. From the fifth century B.C. to the tenth century A.D. there were interpreters working in the courts, Talmudic schools and academies of Palestine and Babylonia.

Furthermore, Niang in her diachronic survey [1990] of the historical development of interpreting in Africa, argues that interpreters played an important role in the Islamization of Africa by translating preachers' speeches orally into the local languages.

Christian missionaries also used interpreters to win converts. Cortés, for instance, during his conquest of Mexico in 1519 made use of the interpreters not only for military reasons, but for converting the Indians as well. Similarly, the first European missionaries in Africa in the mid-nineteenth century translated sacred texts for the indigenous peoples [Bowen M. & D., Kaufman and Kurz, 1995].

M. & D. Bowen, and Kaufman and Kurz [1995] reveal that apart from military and religious reasons, interpreters were used in missions of commerce, power and territorial expansion. Interpreters, crucial for these purposes, were not readily available. In the sixteenth century one of the most frequently used methods was kidnapping natives of the new region to teach them the language of their abductors. For example, during their voyages Christopher Columbus, Francisco Hernàndez de Còrdoba and Jacques Cartier captured Indians, taught them their European languages and later used them as interpreter-guides. This point is also noted by Herbert: "Two centuries later, Cristopher Columbus sent young Indians to Spain to be trained as interpreters [...]" [Herbert: 1977: 5].

According to M. & D. Bowen, and Kaufman and Kurz [1995] another category of interpreters existing in the past was interpreting diplomats/diplomatic interpreters. Latin was the lingua franca of the church, science, literature and diplomacy in Europe until the seventeenth century. With the decline in the use of

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

Latin, international negotiations through interpreters became common practice. In this period, the prestige of the French court of Louis XIV contributed to the adoption of French as the main language in European diplomacy. However, there was an exception to the use of Latin and French for diplomacy: the Ottoman sultans used neither Latin nor French with European monarchs such as the Hapsburgs and Louis XIV. Therefore, both courts started to train their own interpreters or "dragomans." Herbert elaborates this point as follows: "[...] all Embassies in foreign countries have always had dragomen or other interpreters to make contacts possible with local people." [Herbert: 1977: 5]. In 1669, France started training official interpreters in Turkish, Arabic and Persian. These interpreters were assigned to ambassadors and consuls. In 1754, Empress Maria Theresa also established the Oriental Academy, which trained orientalists and interpreters for the imperial court. In 1781, the U.S. Department of Foreign Affairs organized for the first time an office for interpreting and translation, employing a French interpreter and a French translator [Obst H. & Cline R. H., 1990]. In 1833, the Constantinople dragoman school established in compliance with the French program in 1669, was closed and the program later replaced by the renowned School of Oriental Languages of Paris in 1880. In 1984, the U.S. Department of Foreign Affairs acquired a historical component: "A 'Historical File' was established to preserve photographs, documents and newspaper clippings on the work of Language Services or on individual staff members for future generations and as basic stock for exhibits on the work done by staff. Translator Ruth Cline volunteered to be the first Language Services historian and keeper of the file." [Obst H. & Cline R. H., 1990: 12].

This brief survey on the basis of different diachronic studies on interpreting throughout history illustrates that interpreters of the past have not only witnessed history, but have shaped it as well [Bowen M. & D., Kaufman and Kurz, 1995].

4.1.2 TERMS, CONCEPTS, AND THE EVOLUTION OF METHODS AND TRAINING IN INTERPRETING

Some scholars argue that interpreting is the oral form of translation:

[...] interpretation is the oral translation of a message across a cultural/linguistic barrier [Arjona, 1977: 35-36].

Interpretation-which might be described as an oral form of translation [...] [Stenzl, 1983: 1].

As a matter of fact, others believe that the objectives of translation and interpreting are the same:

I am astonished by the identity of views between what Professor Newmark said about translation and what I feel about interpreting, that our objectives are identical: we require clarity, brevity, good structure and ready accessibility to a busy audience. I am simply quoting Professor Newmark to indicate the identity of views we have on this point [Snelling, 1988: 43].

However, other scholars define interpreting in a more autonomous way: "Interpreting is, of course, a process in which an oral text is received, decodified and reconstructed, both in simultaneous and consecutive interpreting." [Crevatin, 1989: 21]. In the literature of IS, the term interpreter is defined as "the shortened version of the conference interpreter," [Arjona, 1977: 35] or "[...] any individual who is able to receive a message in one language and reformulate and re-transmit it orally in a second language [...]" [Anderson, 1977: 218], or "[...] a sort of schizophrenic subject who is able to perform a nearly impossible task." [Darò, 1989: 55]. An interpreter, who has mastered various difficult skills such as listening to the source language, understanding/analyzing, summarizing, and then speaking in the target language to fulfill his/her task, still has an ambiguous professional status since sometimes he/she is socially ignored:

It was at that time that I had my first experience of conference interpreting. The French finance minister M. Thierry and the Governor of the Banque de France M. Luquet had to go to London in June 1917 to negotiate a loan. Professor Mantoux was not available and as a young Army officer I was then on a four-day home-leave from the front. So they decided to take me along as an interpreter, but since the word "interpreter" could not possibly apply to the holder of a diplomatic passport (which I was given) I was described as the Minister's Private Secretary [Herbert, 1977 : 7].

[...] the interpreter [...] sits in his glass case, without any contact with the other participants, and translates mechanically what is said on subjects in which he is not interested by people whom he does not know. [...] he often feels greatly humiliated. How often have we not heard people say: 'After all interpreters are just like parrots, they merely repeat what other people say, they are never allowed to express their own opinion: talking machines could do the job' [Herbert, 1977 : 9].

In those days [in the nineteenth century in Africa] the interpreter was no longer the learned and privileged person who belonged to the upper classes of society or even to the royal family [Niang, 1990: 35].

In some ways an interpreter can be regarded as a necessary evil, an outsider who is on secrets [Kahtan, 1987: 99].

On other occasions he/she is respected for these skills:

At that time the interpreter was seated on the rostrum next to the chairman

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

and the General Secretary and was both their confidant and their technical adviser in the matter of International Conference Procedure. Most chairman had little or no experience of presiding over international multilingual meetings, a matter in which the interpreter had become an expert [...]

The Secretary General was so impressed that he provided us with a very special rest-room equipped not only with comfortable armchairs, but also with four beds on which to relax [Herbert, 1977 : 7].

Most often, these interpreters did not have their role confined to that of a simple conveyor of a message. Esteemed as highly intelligent people by both parties, they were also often consulted for guidance and advice [...]

The interpreter in those days often acted as an ambassador and adviser [Niang, 1990: 35].

Such qualities are defined as God-like characteristics for the ideal interpreter by some scholars:

The ideal interpreter has God-like characteristics: he(or she) is omniscient, omnipotent and invisible. [...] [Kahtan, 1987: 99].

Others analyze them in terms of human qualities as assessed by the Edwards Personality Preference Schedule:

[...] the successful interpreter 'desires to be the centre of attention and to be independent, is not very anxious, does not seek sympathy for self, and is not rigid' (Schein, 1974 p.42) [...]

[Whereas,] Anderson (1976) discusses the interpreter and his role in terms of 1) the interpreter as bilingual, 2) ambiguities and conflicts, and 3) power [Ingram, 1977: 114-115].

Interpreting as carried out by an interpreter takes different modes or forms: "consecutive," (CI) "whispered," (WI) or "simultaneous" (SI).

When conference interpreting started for the first time at the end of the First World War, CI was the only form of interpreting practiced in the meetings and negotiations, and it was predominantly used until the introduction of equipment designed specifically for SI. CI is the oral translation of a 10 to 15-minute speech after it has been delivered by the speaker; it has three essential steps: listening to the source language speech, note-taking, and delivery of the target language speech. CI is the usually preferred type of interpreting at small meetings, such as committees and round-tables, where two languages suffice and booths for SI are often not available. There are two forms of CI: (i) continous, where the interpreter waits until the source speaker has finished his entire speech before delivering his version and (ii) discontinuous, in which the interpreter delivers his version, during breaks in the

source speaker's output. For this purpose, interpreters generally aid their memory by means of a particular note-taking technique which helps them to reconstruct the whole speech in the target language, without altering its general structure.

During the CI while the speaker keeps talking, the interpreter is carrying out two different tasks at the same time: analyzing and note-taking of the speaker's words on the one hand, and listening to the following speech on the other hand. Some scholars argue that of these two parallel tasks, the note-taking, for which the guiding principles have been explored by such interpreters as Rozan (1957), is more important:

> *The basic skill developed by the consecutive interpreter is that of taking rapid notes in various 'shorthand' forms, and reconstructing the original message on the basis of his notes [Gerver, 1971: 69].*

Others believe that the latter is more vital:

> *The instructor can offer the following feedback: 'Try to listen more and write less. [...] [Nicholson, 1993: 64].*

This second position is supported by Özben with the above written arguments as follows:

> *On the basis of this premise, the use of abbreviations, symbols, and the specific arrangements of the elements on the page during note-taking is not meaningful in itself, if the result makes clear only the sense of individual words or parts of the discourse [...]*
>
> *Such an approach would probably produce interpreters who do not listen to the discourse in order to understand it, but merely hear it and take notes accordingly [...]*
>
> *In short, firstly, notes have a purely connective function between the ideas stored in the short-term memory and their specific order that the interpreter elaborates when he extracts the ideas from his memory to transmit them in the target language, and secondly, the notes have a particularly substitutive function with respect to short-term memory, in registering the contents of the specific nature of the message, a process that memory by itself has difficulty in realizing effectively because it must concentrate on other tasks which are relatively more important, defined in this paper as "to grasp the idea, namely the content of the message" [...]*
>
> *During note-taking the interpreter may avail himself of various techniques including the use of symbols. In any case the interpreter need not think of taking notes using the various symbols while sacrificing his comprehension of the message. Undoubtedly a considerable number of symbols are useful in his work, but if one identifies the use of symbols as a fundamental part of the*

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

work of the consecutive interpreter, one must not forget that he must first create the symbols, then practice them when the occasion occurs. After all the time and energy spent in learning them, there is the risk that he might not be able to use them with respect to a different discourse, given that another subject requires a completely different lexicon [...]

According to the writer of this paper, in consecutive interpretation [...] the specific task of the interpreter is to understand the message [...][Özben, 1993: 47-48].

As to the final step of CI, that is, the rendering of the target discourse the importance of public speaking skills are underlined in IS literature:

Public speaking skills for consecutive interpretation are critical. [...] Typical problem areas include: (a) minimal eye contact with the audience; (b) not speaking loudly enough; (c) distracting habits (such as tapping a pencil on the podium or shifting one's weight from foot to foot, thereby producing a rocking motion); and (d) long pauses during which trainees are often trying to decipher their notes [Nicholson, 1993: 60-61].

Another controversial argument is whether CI increases the amount of time that a meeting necessitates. Some scholars are convinced that CI is too time-consuming:

[...] its [CI's] use will inevitably considerably lengthen conference proceedings [Gerver, 1971: 69].

On the other hand, other scholars such as Danica Seleskovitch oppose the view that CI increases the time required by a conference:

Noted interpreter and theorist Danica Seleskovitch, for one, maintains that the thinking time which consecutive interpretation imposes on the participants or a meeting helps concentrate the discussions. Because of this, she argues, 'consecutive interpretation actually saves time' [Delisle & Woodsworth, 1995: 249].

Indeed, IS literature reveals the position of delegates who confirm Seleskovitch's view:

This view was shared by many delegates in the past. British Prime Minister Lloyd George and other delegates at the San Remo Conference, for example, agreed that it was easier to conduct negotiations through the medium of an interpreter than by means of direct speech, since the breaks would give more time for thought [Delisle & Woodsworth, 1995: 249].

In spite of its advantages, CI came to be considered an unsuitable interpreting technique, especially when more than two languages were involved for an

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

interpreting service. Therefore, new solutions were sought to allow the interpreter to speak at the same time as the speaker, using a system of earphones and microphones. Such a system was developed by International Business Machines and used for the first time in 1927 at an international Labor conference in Geneva (in combination with CI). It was also used in 1935 at the 15th International Congress of Physiology in Leningrad, where the opening speech delivered by Professor Pavlov was simultaneously interpreted from Russian into French, English and German. During the Second World War SI was not used at all, but it was again put into practice at the War Crimes Trial of the International Military Tribunal in Nuremberg in 1945 and 1946. Once the United Nations had witnessed the effectiveness of SI, it signed a contract with Colonel Léon Dostert, the Chief of Interpreting and Translation Services in Nuremberg to supply SI services to the United Nations. The first working languages at the United Nations were English, French, Russian and Spanish; Chinese was later added. At first, both CI and SI were used in the General Assembly of the United Nations. Then in 1947 in resolution 152 (11) SI was recognized as a permanent service, either as an alternative to, or in combination with CI. As a matter of fact, this resolution marked the end of CI in the Assembly of United Nations. At the beginning the full use of SI in United Nations faced opposition from experienced interpreters, but SI was fully accepted by 1950, once the equipment had been improved. Under these conditions, CI became the main form of interpreting used in court and community interpreting [Delisle & Woodsworth, 1995].

IS literature supplies abundant definitions of SI, originally introduced as an alternative to CI to compensate for its inadequacies. Some of these definitions emphasize the co-occurrence of the listening and speaking:

> *[In] simultaneous interpretation [...] the interpreter translates out loud as he listens to the source language message [Gerver, 1971: 1].*
>
> *[...]it[SI] is the art of re-expressing in one language a message delivered in another language at the same time as it is being delivered; the re-expression should be clear, unambiguous and immediately comprehensible, that is to say perfectly idiomatic, so that the listener does not have to mentally re-interpret what reaches him through the earphones [Namy, 1977: 26].*
>
> *Simultaneous interpreting is a multiple task, comprising both comprehension (the construction of meaning from sound through the segmentation and mapping of speech input onto mental representations) and speaking (conceptualization, lexical selection, grammatical encoding, phonological encoding, articulation, self-monitoring) [Shlesinger: 1995: 15].*
>
> *Simultaneous interpreting consists of listening to a speech uttered in a source*

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

language (SL) and translating it into a target language (TL) at the same time [Fabbro, Gran B. & Gran L., 1991: 2-3].

Indeed, Gerver on the basis of an empirical study illustrates that "[...] they [the interpreters] were simultaneously listening and speaking for over 75% of the total input-output time." [Gerver, 1975:124]. In spite of the statistical differences, Barik indicates the same point in accordance with another study: "Barik (1974) calculated that in the process of simultaneous interpreting the speaker's and interpreter's speeches overlap 42% of the time, while the interpreter speaks alone 28% of the time, the speaker speaks alone 18% of the time and both are silent 12% of the time" [Fabbro, Gran B. & Gran L., 1991: 3].

Finally, Nicholson, in addition to parallel listening and speaking, offers a more elaborate definition of SI which seems to highlight the complex nature of the SI process in relation to its synchronous tasks:

Simultaneous interpretation may be defined as 'the act of concurrently perceiving, understanding, analyzing, translating, and speaking with the goal of communicating a message from one language to another [Nicholson, 1992: 90].

Others underline the key role that time pressure plays in SI:

[...] simultaneous interpretation delivered under time pressure [...] [Gerver, 1971: 69].

[...] the simultaneous interpreter is constantly engaged in a catching-up race with the aim of holding constant or, still better, reducing the time-lag between SL textual decoding and TL textual encoding thus of guaranteeing a time continuum in SI [Wills, 1977: 345-346].

[...] simultaneous interpreting is an interlingual multiple task performed under extreme temporal constraints [Shlesinger: 1995: 15].

[...]SI: A special time-constrained and technology-dependent modality of orally mediated inter-lingual (and therefore inter-cultural) communication whereby listening/understanding, analyzing/translating, and producing/delivering take place (quasi-) simultaneously [Viaggio, 1996: 74].

Ultimately, considerations about the nature of SI characterized by the information gap are also significant to understand what SI actually is:

[...] Alexieva (1990) points out difficulties which are peculiar to this interpreting mode: 'The former [written translation and CI] can be compared to a game of chess, as the par excellence example of a game with complete information, where all the pieces -and in our case, all the text units - are on the chessboard. [...]. In SI, however, the interpreter sees only part of the

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

chessboard, which is very small at the beginning of the speech he is interpreting. Therefore, in the case of polysemous units he can only make predictions about whether unit A (word, phrase, or utterance) will be followed by unit B, C or D, and will be respectively analyzable as meaning A1, A2 or A3. (Alexieva, 1990: 2-3)' [Gran,1997:150].

Such a complex task as listening and speaking at the same time, under time pressure and with an information gap during the rendition of SI, requires skills that can be acquired only through long practice:

[...] simultaneous translators seem to acquire the ability to do this (i.e. speak and listen simultaneously) after long practice [Gerver, 1971: 50].

As students of interpreting gain the necessary skills - i.e. handling linguistic material, doing two things at the same time (listening and speaking), effectively using memory retention, and decreasing reaction time - to become a simultaneous interpreter, they become familiar with two alternative strategies: "meaning-based interpreting" (which involves a lexical and syntactic reformulation of the original speech structure when it is rendered in the target language) and "word-for-word interpreting." The students learn to employ one of these two strategies on the basis of different factors, such as speed and type of speech (technical, political, etc.), stress conditions, and so on [Fabbro, Gran B. & Gran L., 1991].

In relation to interpreting training, some educators suggest that different pedagogical strategies should be employed for CI and SI, and that the acquisition of the skills related to CI should be a prerequisite for those skills necessary to master SI:

[...] I am pleading for a differentiated approach in the teaching of consecutive and simultaneous [...]

Although I agree that consecutive interpreting should be the gateway and should be taught first [...] [Kalina, 1992: 255].

There is also no doubt that full mastery of at least two languages is a prerequisite to interpreting, and thus language acquisition cannot be part of an interpreting training syllabus:

An interpreter must know his languages thoroughly before he begins to practice the profession, because he cannot learn or improve his knowledge of a language while expressing the meaning of a message at 150 words a minute [...]

Many schools claim to teach both language and interpretation at the same time. But language-learning exercises can only impede the learning of interpretation [...] [Seleskovitch, 1978: 77].

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

The tasks of interpreting and translating require a preexisting level of language competence [...] and language teaching should disappear from interpreting/translating courses [Gentile, 1991: 350].

Although interpreting requires the acquisition of complex and difficult skills through long practice on the part of the interpreter, the argument that "interpreters are born, not made" prevailed for a long period. Therefore, the teaching of the various skills that would enable the interpreter to cope with the complex and demanding tasks of his/her profession started only in the 20th century. Until the 20th century, interpreters learned by trial and error how to interpret on the job. In the 1940s specific university programs aimed at training professional interpreters started. The first universities with formal interpreting training were the Universities of Geneva (1941), Vienna (1943), Mainz/Germersheim (1946) Saarland (1948), Georgetown (1949) and Heidelberg (1950).

After the formalization of interpreting training, in the 1980s more universities started conducting scientific studies of interpreting phenomena:

[...] a University faculty favours and, indeed, insists on research activity leading to an enrichment of scientific knowledge in the field in question [Snelling, 1983: 1-2].

Therefore the formulation of a series of theoretical postulates on discipline arose:

The University teacher must convey to his pupil a knowledge of the concepts and laws governing his field of study [...][Snelling, 1983: 2].

Today there are various universities in the world that conduct scientific research in IS. Pöchhacker [1995 b] points to five of them as particularly well-established centers in IS research and designates them as "schools." These "schools" alphabetically are: Georgetown (Division of I&T), Paris (ESIT), Trieste (SSLM), and Vienna (Department of T&I).

The most important exponents of the "Georgetown School" are David and Margareta Bowen, who - apart from research on language competence, aptitude for interpreting, and interpreter training - have carried out a significant amount of research on the history of interpreting. Margareta Bowen is also the author responsible for *The Jerome Quarterly*, a 16-page IS journal where contributions on historical topics are published [Pöchhacker, 1995 b].

The "Paris (ESIT) School" has produced relatively little research recently.

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

The most notable figure of the "School" is Danica Seleskovitch, formulator of the *théorie du sens* advocated by other ESIT members who have published articles in various media. Among them, Karla D. Jean Le Féal, less interested in the *théorie du sens*, has written papers on research-specific topics published in *The Interpreters' Newsletter* of the "Trieste School." Among the works published recently by representatives of ESIT , the most important is *Pédagogie raisonnée de l'interpretation*, co-authored by Seleskovitch and Lederer (1989), which defends Seleskovitch's theoretical position against the criticism from certain representatives from the other "Schools" named here [Pöchhacker, 1995b].

The "Paris (ISIT) School" is designated as the "New Paris School" and described by Pöchhacker [1995 b: 53] as a "[...] 'one-man show' made up of Daniel Gile." ISIT does not support any particular theoretical position, although the "Effort Model" coined by Gile receives special attention. Gile criticizes prescriptive theories in IS and advocates a scientific approach characterized by systematic observation and empirical research. However, the scientific approach proposed by Gile does not avail itself of theoretical postulates from TS since it depends on a cognitive psychology-based paradigm. Recently, Gile has also published works on specific research methodology to be employed in IS [Pöchhacker, 1995 b].

Pöchhacker [1995 b] describes the "Trieste School" as the center of interpreting research(ers) and the leading school in IS with Laura Gran, an AIIC conference interpreter and a full professor as its "leading representative." Gran has realized an interdisciplinary co-operation with the members of the department of Neurophysiology at the University of Trieste within an IS research paradigm. With this approach, Gran and her co-workers have carried out research exploring the interpreting process in line with neuropsychological experimentation. Because, methodologically, the "Trieste School" is based on a scientific-experimental approach, there is an increasing link between the "Trieste School" and the "New Paris School" led by Gile. However, neuropsychological experimentation is not the only research paradigm used in the "Trieste School." Text linguistics and discourse analysis are the heart of another paradigm employed by other researchers such as Christopher Taylor. Maurizio Viezzi, also from the "Trieste School," has carried out research work on "sight translation," comparative aspects of output in various modes of interpreting, and interpreting-quality assessment. Finally, Snelling is the representative of a didactic paradigm. Gran [1990] acknowledges Snelling's contribution to the teaching of interpreting at the "Trieste School" as invaluable. According to Gran, Snelling has contributed effective and original solutions to render typically elaborate and complex Italian sentences in a semantically equivalent

and stylistically correct English. As to the teaching of interpreting, Snelling [1990] himself mainly argues that a grammatically correct manipulation of target-language structures is an absolute prerequisite for the successful conveying of a message. Pöchhacker [1995 b] lists many reasons why the "Trieste School" has been conferred a widespread international prestige. The academic staff of the "Trieste School," which includes professors with a background in languages and linguistics as well as an enthusiastic interest in research on interpreting, is the foremost among those reasons. The diversity of disciplinary approaches employed is the second one. He gives as the third reason the satisfactory quantitative and qualitative aspects of its academic staff, and adds the variety and the quantity of its Master's theses on interpreting (although post-doctoral or similar professorial qualifications are not a prerequisite for supervising them) as the fourth reason. Finally, he names *The Interpreters' Newsletter*, the interpreting journal launched in 1988 by the "Trieste School," now the leading medium for papers on IS. as the last reason.

Pöchhacker [1995 b] contends that it is not possible to talk about a real "Vienna School" since there is no common theoretical or disciplinary approach used by its representatives and it has a limited academic infrastructure:

> *If the diversity of approaches, also noted for the 'Trieste School', is insufficient to question the existence of a 'Vienna School', its limited academic infrastructure - one professorship for T(&I), no journal, hardly any Master's theses on interpreting - does cast some doubt on its capacity to function as a center of research on interpreting [Pöchhacker b, 1995: 57-58].*

The University of Vienna's Department of Translator and Interpreter Training owes its international prestige in the IS circles to Ingrid Kurz, a professional AIIC interpreter who also works as a media interpreter for Austrian television and has a wide range of publications on subjects from the history of interpreting to modern-day technical and professional issues, and from quality expectations among different user groups of interpreting services to neurophysiological measurements of cerebral activity during mental interpreting. Kurz has been co-operating with M. Bowen, who is of Austrian origin, since both of them have a common interest in the historical aspect of IS. Such co-operation between the two scholars has encouraged a co-operation between the T&I schools both at the University of Vienna and at Georgetown as well. Another representative from Vienna is Franz Pöchhacker, a relatively new scholar in the field of IS with a combined research approach utilizing the paradigms of translation theory as well as descriptive empirical research. This diversity of approach can be observed in other scholars as well. For instance, Hilddegund Bühler, who is not engaged in IS any

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

more, used to deal with "situational-semiotic," quality and discourse-related aspects of interpreting. Meanwhile Birgit Strolz has employed in her doctoral thesis (1992) an approach combining the *théorie du sens* with findings from cognitive psychology and an empirical analysis of broadcast interpreters [Pöchhacker b, 1995].

To conclude, formal training in interpreting first began in the 1940s. In the 1980s, IS emerged as an academic discipline in its own right. No doubt today, among the various universities that deal with the scientific study of the interpreting phenomena, the "Trieste School," which advocates an interdisciplinary scientific approach to explore the interpreting process and other issues related to it, is the most influential [Pöchhacker, 1995 b].

4.1.3 INTERPRETING STUDIES

Today among the scholars of IS there is a general consensus that IS is a new academic discipline of its own:

> *[...]interpretation, a relatively new field of study where there is still a great deal to investigate and discover [...] [Gran & Viezzi, 1995: 111].*

> *[...]Katharina Reiss, one of the pioneers of translation studies as an academic discipline, stated that, in her view, it was only since the past five years or so that one could really speak of interpreting studies as a branch of academic research in its own right [Pöchhacker, 1995 a: 17].*

Gran reports that the "Paris School" is the architect of IS as the study of the knowledge and practice of the principles that govern interpreting phenomena:

> *[...]there is quite a lot going on in the brain while this complex task [the rendition of SI] is being performed. The first, most obvious aspect is linguistic transcoding, which, in turn, implies listening to (decoding) a text, conceptualizing it (possibly a non-verbal operation) and encoding it in a different language. This was the basic approach of the eminent scholars from the Paris school, those who laid the foundations of Interpretation Studies [Gran, unpublished article].*

However, IS literature reveals that there has been an ontological doubt about the nature of this discipline among the scholars who deal with it. Although some scholars have been rather skeptical whether IS is a Science at all: "Jennifer Mackintosh mentioned this morning that she was not quite sure whether or not interpretation was a science," [Snelling, 1989: 141] for others there is no doubt that it is a science in every sense of the word:

> *Well, I think the very fact that there are two groups of people here - practicing interpreters with University teachers and research workers - proves, beyond*

any doubt at all, that interpreting is a science in the both senses of "Science": science as the exercise of an acquired craft or skill and science as the study of a specific department of learning [Snelling, 1989: 141].

Still others are convinced that IS is a science although they believe that it is not a basic science, but an applied science of a unique human skill:

"Is Interpretation a science in its own right?" my answer is "yes": not a basic science, but an applied discipline, involving a combination of linguistic and non-linguistic features which make it a unique human skill [Gran, 1997: 26].

Another controversial issue that emerges from IS literature in this regard is whether IS is a sub-discipline of another science or an autonomous discipline. Some IS scholars believe that the study of the interpreting process is mainly a subject of psychology in one of its sub-disciplines: cognitive psychology. To give an example, Lederer says:

Interpreting is a human performance in which cognitive activity is first and foremost; it therefore leads us into the field of psychology with no need to resort to special experiments [...]

Thus interpreters can rejoice in having the opportunity of comparing their results with those obtained by psychologists [...] [Lederer, 1977:323].

Similarly, d'Arcais claims that "[...] there is a considerable amount of knowledge within contemporary cognitive psychology which could be integrated and used to give reasonable answers to theoretical and practical questions in the study of interpretation," [d'Arcais, 1977:401] since he believes that "There are several domains of study within the psychology of language, memory, speech perception, attention, human performance, which will give an important contribution to the cognitive study of interpretation." [d'Arcais, 1977: 397]. Some other scholars, on the other hand, affirm that the phenomena related to interpreting is primarily the object of study of linguistics and its sub-branches. As an example of this position, Wills contends that, "As a subject of linguistic and psycholinguistic research, SI can be looked at [...] [Wills, 1977: 346]. Whereas, Dodds offers a wider account as to the role of linguistics in IS: "Social linguists, psycho-linguists, comparative and descriptive linguists, text linguists, semiologists, semanticians and even linguistic philosophers are taking a closer look at the interpretation process." [Dodds, 1989: 17]. Finally, Stenzl argues for a more comprehensive function of linguistics in terms of a "theory of communication" for IS:

What I am suggesting is that we need a reorientation or perhaps more accurately a widening of our research framework so that rather than the

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

> *predominantly psychological perspective we adopt a more functional approach that considers interpretation in the context of the entire communication process from speaker through the interpreter to the receiver [Stenzl, 1989: 24].*

The last discipline to which some scholars relegate interpreting is "neuroscience," particularly neurology and its sub-branches. Darò declares that, "In our opinion these studies based on a scientific approach that derives from neurolinguistics, neuropsychology and physiology may serve to increase our knowledge of the mental process of an interpreter [...] [Darò, 1989: 55]. Gran favors Darò's argument as follows: " I feel that if these phenomena [Gran's personal, subjective experience] are studied in co-operation with neuropsychologists and neurophysiologists [...]" [Gran, 1989: 96] and insists on the issue, stating that "I have outlined a few problems relating to simultaneous interpretation. I hope linguists, neuropsychologists and neurophysiologists will assist us in trying to find satisfactory answers to these questions raised, particularly by means of joint research." [Gran, 1989: 98]. However, IS literature points out that some scholars appreciate IS as a more independent scientific field: "[...] interpreting as a science, will have to establish its own aims and its own limits, it will have to decide what it can do and what it cannot [...]" [Snelling, 1989: 141]. Similarly, Gran, who argues for the employment of neuroscience to investigate interpreting phenomena, in the final analysis, is in search of an autonomous discipline for IS:

> *We interpreters have got in closer contact with psychologists, linguists, experts in communication etc. Much as we owe to these scholars, however, we shall have to become more and more aware of the specificity of our discipline, identify our problems, set our own goals and be able to use the tools we need to inquire into the various facets of the interpretation process.*
>
> *In other words, we have to develop our own research guidelines and our own criteria [...]*
>
> *We should be aware of the fact that, while scholars in other fields may be interested in conference interpretation some of the time, we are - or should be - interested all of the time! That is the reason why we should take research into our own hands and decide what we want to find and how to go about it [Gran, 1997: 26].*

As a matter of fact, IS literature indicates that this plurality, of disciplines regarding interpreting phenomena as their own object of study and, in turn, the vagueness of the realm of IS itself due to the havoc played by this plurality are considered by some scholars as the major obstacles to its survival as a scientific discipline: "The profession will not have genuinely come of age until it is based on a

scientific definition and study of its object [...]" [Viaggio, 1996: 82].

The solution to this dilemma, represented on the one hand by different disciplines trying to explain interpreting phenomena, and on the other, by the desire to have an autonomous discipline for IS, leads to a compromise: IS as an interdisciplinary discipline. Kurz argues for the interdisciplinarity of IS as follows: "Translation Studies (which has become a discipline in its own right covering both translation and interpretation) [...] is increasingly being viewed as an inter-discipline drawing 'on a number of disciplines ... without being a subdivision of any of them' (Snell-Hornby 1988: 2)." [Kurz, 1995 a: 166]. Gran, too, favors interdisciplinarity, "Inter-disciplinarity is a pre-requisite if a better understanding of the cerebral process involved in interpreting is sought." [Gran, 1990: 11]. She also notes the advantages of interdisciplinarity in IS as manifested in the co-operation of various disciplines:

> *The advantage of interdisciplinary studies is that some of the methods used in other scientific areas can be applied to study certain phenomena of the interpreting process [Gran, unpublished article].*
>
> *In order to obtain significant and reliable findings, another question is how these various methods and tools should be used and how the results should be interpreted. Here again, interdisciplinary co-operation is fruitful [Gran, unpublished article].*
>
> *The fact of working with researchers belonging to other scientific areas has many advantages: first of all you are obliged to have an open and flexible attitude, you have to describe and define the issues under investigation with precision and accuracy [...]*
>
> *On the other hand, you have to learn a lot about other disciplines and grasp a way of thinking and of defining problems which at first may be unfamiliar [...]*
>
> *While you carefully consider suggestions and hypotheses about the interpreting process as perceived by a neurologist, your own ideas and proposals are constantly challenged and this kind of discussion is extremely fruitful [Gran, unpublished article].*

As a matter of fact, IS literature indicates that interdisciplinary co-operation is an indispensable component in dealing with intralingual phenomena:

> *Prof. Salevsky referred to the much debated question of translation and interpretation theory, the approach to experimental research and training problems in a fast-changing world where new requirements call for solutions and stated: "Bearing in mind that nothing is absolute in science, training and practice [...] we need: 1. closer interdisciplinary co-operation in translation theory [underline in original][...] [Gran, 1990: 6].*

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

Some scholars such as Gran ask which disciplines are of major importance in the interdisciplinary study of IS:

> *Conference interpretation is a relatively new branch and probably its basic disciplines have not been properly defined yet. In my opinion these are: applied linguistics, psycholinguistics and neurolinguistics [Fabbro & Gran, 1997: 18].*

Another interpretation of IS emphasized by certain eminent scholars such as Gile or Gran is that IS is an empirical science. Pöchhacker reports that " [...]Gile calls for a more 'scientific approach', putting empirical research by means of systematic observation and experimentation [...]" [Pöchhacker b, 1995: 54]. He also points out the "Trieste School" where Gran is the leading researcher: "The use of 'scientific-experimental methods' in research on interpreting appears to be the heart of the 'Trieste School' [...][Pöchhacker b, 1995: 55]. Gran advocates the empirical character of IS because she believes that inquiry into interpreting phenomena, which belong to the world of experience, is ultimately an epistemological issue, and the empirical method developed by Western society is the approach par excellence for phenomena in the world of experience:

> *This civilization [Western] however, has developed a unique and unprecedented approach to the problem of knowledge: the experimental scientific method [...]*
>
> *The experimental scientific method initiated by Galileo Galilei is based on successive stages: a) a systematic analysis of previous contributions on the subject; b) the definition of what is known and what is unknown; c) the elaboration of a hypothesis for an as yet unknown phenomena or for an unresolved problem; d) the setting up of an experiment whose results will either corroborate or disprove the experimental hypothesis and e) the formalization of the new data into a model to be incorporated in basic sciences such as biology and physics [Gran & Fabbro, 1988: 23].*
>
> *What we previously defined as the Western approach requires that we <u>also</u> [underline in original]consider the question of interpretation from a scientific-experimental point of view [Gran & Fabbro, 1988: 24].*

A final point in IS literature concerns its branches. Wills distinguishes three branches of IS: theoretical, descriptive and applied. Stenzl agrees with Wills in this regard, as does Viaggio, who specifies that this categorization stems from the theoretical position put forward by the "Manipulation School" and particularly by Holmes and Toury. Viaggio also affirms that these three branches are indispensable for the development of the discipline:

> *SI can be looked at from theoretical, descriptive and applied aspects [...]*

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

[Wills, 1977: 346].

Wills (1978) describes three aspects of translation research: [...] a general theoretical perspective [...] a descriptive perspective [...and] the application of [...]both the theoretical and the descriptive approach to the teaching and practice of translation [Stenzl, 1983: 3].

*Following manipulators (Holmes and his followers, notably Toury),we can distinguish three lines of pursuit: **theoretical, descriptive** and **applied** [bold in original] [Viaggio, 1996: 75].*

The profession will not have genuinely come of age until it is [...] fully established and articulated the three indispensable basic components: research of the phenomenon, theoretical grounding (and didactics) of the discipline and practice of the activity [Viaggio, 1996: 82].

To conclude, various influential scholars of the discipline regard IS as a new, autonomous, interdisciplinary, empirical and applied science where co-operation among various disciplines such as linguistics, psycholinguistics and neurolinguistics is seen as a prerequisite. Furthermore, there is also a tendency - in compliance with TS - to distinguish three levels of IS: theoretical, descriptive and applied.

4.1.4 INTERPRETING RESEARCH

4.1.4.1 A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Gile (1994), distinguishes four historical stages in the evolution of interpreting research: (1) the "Prehistoric" period, (2) the Experimental-Psychology Period, (3) the Practitioners' Period and (4) the "Renaissance" [Schjoldager, 1995].

Gile (1989) indicates that the "Prehistoric" period started in the 1950s when a number of interpreters such as Herbert (1952) and Paneth (1957) considered the interpreting process in an introspective way. Although these intuitive efforts did not claim any scientific validity, they determined the general agenda for later research and were followed in the Experimental-Psychology Period of the sixties and early seventies by a series of experimental studies with different paradigms formulated by linguists, psycholinguists and psychologists like Oléron and Nanpon[12] (1964), Treisman (1965), Lawson.(1967), Barik (1971), Goldman-Eisler (1972) and Gerver (1974), all of whom viewed interpreting as a complex behavioral activity to be studied experimentally. The work of these scholars was criticized for lacking

[12] Gerver [1975] reports that the first research on simultaneous interpreting was carried out by Oléron and Nanpon in 1964 on ear-voice spans.

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

validity because their experiments were based on amateur interpreting in laboratory situations not representative of real conference interpreting. Nevertheless, these experimental works and their multiple paradigms dominated this period. Gran and Viezzi [1995] point out that the conference held in Venice in 1977 played a significant role by discussing these different paradigms and should be considered one of the major contributions to interdisciplinarity in interpreting research. Recently, Shlesinger [1995], too, has been arguing for the diversity and plurality of paradigms in interpreting research, which - according to her - should include "translation-theoretical," "sociocognitive," "textlinguistic," "didactic," "processing," "physiological," "time-sharing" and "strategies" paradigms since any given variable of the multi-variable, complex interpreting process under investigation can be explored only through that/those paradigm(s) which meet/s the requirements needed for the exploration of that specific variable.

The third stage, or the Practitioners' Period, started in the mid-seventies and lasted until the beginning of the eighties. Danica Seleskovitch dominated interpreting research and theory with an introspective-intuitive approach called *théorie du sens* or the "theory of sense." In this period other introspective theoretical models were proposed by Gerver (1976), Moser (1978) and Gile (1985). However, another international conference, the 1986 Symposium organized by SSLM in Trieste, was a turning point in interpreting research, initiating the "Trieste Era" of IS literature, the so called "Renaissance" of Gile. The findings and scientific orientation of this SSLM symposium published in *The Theoretical and Practical Aspects of Teaching Conference Interpretation* (edited by Gran and Dodds in 1989) on the one hand introduced a new approach to IS in which the key concepts were interdisciplinarity, co-operation and descriptive methodology [Schjoldager, 1995] and, on the other hand, encouraged the scientific research, among young researchers. Another contribution of SSLM has been the publication of *The Interpreters' Newsletter*, which has contributed to the development of scientific research all around the world [Gran & Viezzi, 1995].

One may say that after the 1986 Trieste Symposium and the contributions of SSLM, interpreting research has been based on a scientific approach regardless of specific paradigm which is operating. In fact, IS literature from the late 1980s onward provides various arguments about interpreting research as a scientific field:

> *[...]I feel that a more scientific approach to these problems can enhance the performance of conference interpreters or at least help us improve our teaching methods [Gran, 1989: 98].*
>
> *[...]scientific research, and therefore also research in the field of*

interpretation, is not an idle "game," but rather a systematic discussion among people who share an interest in the same topic and want to enlarge and usefully apply their knowledge [Fabbro & Gran, 1997: 17].

The use of "scientific experimental methods" in research on interpreting appears to be at the heart of the "Trieste School" approach [Pöchhacker, 1995 b: 55].

[...]Gile calls for a more "scientific" approach, putting empirical research by means of systematic observation and experimentation before intuitive reasoning and theoretical models [Pöchhacker, 1995 b: 54].

Finally, the 1994 Turku conference held in co-operation with SSLM represents the latest step in shaping IS as a scientific discipline. Developments since the mid-1980s, on the one hand, have encouraged scientific research in IS worldwide and have challenged Seleskovitch's introspective-intuitive approach on the other, paving the way for IS to become a scientific academic discipline of its own in the early 1990s.

Pöchhacker [1995a] also argued that the transformation of IS into an academic study has also turned it into an international scientific field with publications in a great number of languages including Czech/Slovak, Danish, Dutch, Finnish, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Russian, Spanish, and Swedish. Furthermore, English has become the major vehicular language for international publications in the IS journals (55.7%). Apart from the variety of the languages used in various national publications and the utilization of English in international publications, the globalism of IS is also manifested by the contributions of newly emerging international research centers. In addition to the well known American, Austrian, Canadian, French and Italian scholars, Pöchhacker reports [1995 b] that scholars from Japan (Interpreting Research Association of Japan), Finland (University of Turku, Center for Translation and Interpreting), and Denmark (Business Schools at Arthus and Copenhagen) have recently been carrying out significant interpreting research.

As for the latest perspective on interpreting research, one may refer to Schjoldager [1995] reiterating Moser-Mercer (1991) that today there are two rival schools of philosophy in interpreting research: (1) the "liberal arts group" and (2) the "natural sciences group." Both are in search of a theory on interpreting, but they differ radically in the methodology employed to construct their theory. The former, based on the principles of Seleskowitch, Lederer, Garcia-Landa and their co-workers operates on the assumption that the *théorie du sens* is unquestionable, and they regard it as the model for their research. The "natural sciences group," on the other

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

hand, formed after the Trieste Symposium in 1986, believe that they are still in an initial stage of constructing interpreting theory. To formulate a theory of interpreting, scholars in this group continue to propose hypotheses and test them empirically.

To conclude, research on interpreting has developed over four stages: a (1) "Prehistoric" Period, an (2) Experimental-Psychology Period, a (3) Practitioners' Period, and a (4) "Renaissance." Today it is carried out by two rival scholarly groups operating mainly with ideas representative of the Practitioners' and the "Renaissance" Periods.

4.1.4.2 FUNCTIONS

From the IS literature emerge different functions of interpreting research. Some scholars contend that it serves to explore the interpreting process and aid the practice and teaching of the profession:

> *In our opinion, therefore, being a professional interpreter is not sufficient to explain what interpretation is and how it should be practiced and taught. Apart from reports on personal experience and discussions with experimental researchers on the already known aspects of interpretation, inquiries which ought to be carried out to broaden existing knowledge should be started for the benefit of all those who really intend to approach interpretation with a non-arbitrary approach [Fabbro & Gran, 1994: 307].*

IS literature indicates different studies revealing the interaction between interpreting research, practice and teaching. For instance, Le Ny in the "Concluding Remarks" of his study, which analyzes psychosemantic aspects of SI, writes, "it is certain that a more systematic psychological study of simultaneous interpretation would contribute knowledge useful for the practice, and particularly for the training, of this profession." [Le Ny, 1977: 297]. An argument presented by Darò in the "Discussion and Conclusions" section of her paper focuses on speaking speed during simultaneous interpretation, another example illustrating the interaction between interpreting research and the teaching of interpreting. In this section she first discusses the conclusions of her research and finally writes, "bearing in mind this principle of a functional hemispheric specialization for different tasks, we may develop a gradual neurological approach for the teaching of interpretation." [Darò, 1990: 89]. Similarly, Lambert says that "these findings, when followed by further research, may have important implications for the future training of conference interpreters." [Lambert, 1988: 386]. Like Lambert, d'Arcais reports that "the knowledge obtained by these studies can have interesting practical applications for

teaching interpreters appropriate ways of dealing with problems dependent on the structures of the languages involved in the translation process." [d'Arcais, 1977: 394]. Gentile points out that "neurolinguistics is contributing to the area of interpreting and simultaneous interpreting in particular, with the work carried out at the University of Trieste [...] A number of experiments [...] are yielding interesting results [...] for the teaching of interpreting [...]" [Gentile, 1991:348-349]. A final example of interaction between research and teaching can be given from a paper by Gran discussing the neurolinguistic research in SI. Towards the end of the section entitled "Cerebral Lateralization in Simultaneous Interpretation," she refers to the interpreting research related to cerebral lateralization and concludes that:

> *These indications imply that the training of students should not be limited to linguistic aspects but should also take into consideration non-verbal factors affecting performance, in particular stress, emotional features (such as lack of self confidence), insufficient control over all the successive and concomitant stages of simultaneous interpreting, etc. Some of these aspects could be taken care of by paying greater attention to the gradual acquisition of each verbal and non-verbal skill needed to become an interpreter [Fabbro & Gran, 1997: 22].*

Finally, in the section "Recognition of Semantic and Syntactic Errors among Interpreting Students and Professional Interpreters" of the same paper, Gran argues as follows:

> *The typical lateralization for language functions to the left hemisphere, which is normally found in monolinguals, tends to diminish concurrently with greater proficiency in a foreign language and as a result of training in the particularly complex task of simultaneous interpreting. [...]Recent studies (Paradis 1990), however, suggest that these are in fact modifications of attentive strategies which may involve one cerebral hemisphere more than the other [Fabbro & Gran, 1997: 23].*

In the next paragraph Gran discusses the implications of the above-mentioned studies to the teaching of interpreting:

> *The awareness of phenomena such as the modification of cerebral attentive strategies in the course of time may suggest that teachers should pay greater attention to the way in which students wear their headphones. Far from imposing any given position, the teacher should encourage students to try and adjust their headphones in different ways until they find the most satisfactory solution. Teaching experience has shown that such apparently trivial questions as the positioning of headphones, the tuning of the volume of the incoming speech, the monitoring of the volume and quality of one's own voice may improve performance more than might be expected [...]*

The last two findings, i.e. students being more aware of syntax and professionals paying greater attention to semantics, are also of considerable practical interest. [...] students are afraid of missing parts of the original message and stick to the superficial structure of discourse, while professionals are more familiar with language switching and are flexible, relaxed and detached enough to forget words and concentrate on meaning [Fabbro & Gran, 1997: 23-24].

IS literature sampled for the solution of the problem of this study indicates another function of interpreting research: to test hypotheses based on the findings of the previous studies by verifying or refuting them:

[...]intuitions are not to be taken for granted and, in order to be reliable, any idea or statement should be based on strict experimental methodology [Gran, 1990: 11].

If we do not want our theorizing to become empty and self-serving, a prominent role must be played by experimental studies, based on sound scientific principles, to test acquired conclusions and open new lines of investigation [Gran & Viezzi, 1995: 116].

Research in IS literature provides evidence for this function. Fabbro, for example, discusses the neurobiological aspects of bilingualism and polyglossia and referring to experimental research carried out in SSLM reports the following:

Our data indicate that during the acquisition and improvement of a second language after age 11 hemispheric specialization for language functions undergoes modifications whereby the right hemisphere becomes more competent for L2 than for L1. Representation of L1 remains unvaried. These data confirm and extend previous investigation [...]; they seem to contradict other studies (for instance Obler's hypothesis that the right hemisphere is more involved in the initial stage of acquisition of L2; Obler, 1982) and provide material for the hypothesis formulated by Galloway (1980) and Soares (1981; 1984). The increased competence of the right hemisphere for L2 could also explain why some polyglot aphasic patients (with leisons of the left hemisphere) recover their second language better than their first (Minkowsky, 1963; Fabbro, unpublished data) [Fabbro, 1989: 80].

Gran, on the other hand, comments that:

Anna Fini wrote 'Studio delle lateralizzazioni cerebrali durante l'interpretazione simultanea,' based on a time-sharing paradigm, which was intended to verify the hypothesis of the left cerebral hemisphere being more involved in analytical tasks as against right-hemisphere prevalence in the processing of deep semantic meaning. This hypothesis was not confirmed [...][Gran, 1990: 12].

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

Similarly, the experimental study carried out by Alessandrini can be considered evidence for the point under discussion:

> *An experiment was conducted with 12 professional interpreters working in consecutive from English into Italian. The purpose of the experiment was: a) to verify the assumption that numbers are indeed a problem even for experienced interpreters [Alessandrini, 1990: 77].*

The statement of purpose of another research project also provides evidence for the function of interpreting research as a testing agent:

> *The present study was designed to verify the hypothesis suggested by Chernigovskaya, Balonov, and Deglin (1983) that L1 and L2 are lateralized differently for semantic and syntactic structures [Fabbro, Gran B., Gran L., 1991: 5].*

Finally, the findings on cerebral lateralization in SI discussed by Gran can be taken into consideration as a last illustration of the point under investigation:

> *It was also expected that the right hemisphere would perform more poorly, especially when involved in the concurrent manual task. Surprisingly, the experiment did not reveal any significant cerebral asymmetry or lateralization in linguistic functions. This finding confirmed the results of the previous study showing bilateral cerebral involvement in a complex verbal task such as simultaneous interpreting. This is probably due to the activation of considerable non-verbal, as well as verbal, cognitive tasks in SI [Fabbro & Gran, 1997: 21].*

IS literature demonstrates still another function of interpreting research: modification of theoretical assumptions from previous studies by elaboration into more refined hypotheses.

What follows is a collection of cases taken from IS literature to demonstrate this function of interpreting research:

> *By examining the results obtained on the recall measures and grouping them into two categories, an interesting hypothesis emerges [Lambert, 1988: 386].*

> *On the basis of these data Green proposed an interesting theoretical model to explain the organization and control of verbal output in bilinguals [Fabbro, 1989: 74].*

> *Bearing in mind this principle of a functional hemispheric specialization for different tasks, we may develop a gradual neurological approach for the teaching of interpretation [Darò, 1990: 89].*

> *The cases of alternate antagonism and paradoxical translation phenomena already mentioned [...]which were reported by Paradis and co-workers*

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

[...]can provide further data for a theory on the cerebral mechanisms subserving translation process [Fabbro & Gran, 1994: 298].

The peculiar case of a bilingual aphasic patient has been reported: she was no longer able to understand simple questions or commands expressed in her mother tongue (e.g. "What time is it?" or "Show me your tongue!") but nevertheless she translated them correctly into her second language. This type of dissociation suggests that at least some aspects of the whole translation process can be accomplished without the involvement of the systems accounting for conscious comprehension [Fabbro & Gran, 1997: 16-17].

A final case to be considered is another study by Darò, in which she examines the roles of memory and attention in SI. She reports that the findings of her work are compatible with the argument based on previous studies that the cerebral organization of linguistic functions in interpreters is less asymmetrical than in monolinguals, a phenomenon which gradually develops with proficiency in foreign languages. Darò, on the basis of her study, elaborates the argument further:

In our opinion, therefore, the stronger symmetry of linguistic functions in simultaneous interpreters may also depend on a modification of their attentive strategies. The simultaneous interpreter, who listens to an incoming message and at the same time has to translate it into another language and to control his own output, must learn to give up his preferential right-ear lateralization for verbal material, and try to focus his verbal attention on both ears [Darò, 1989: 54].

In conclusion, the arguments above relating to various functions of interpreting research demonstrate that there is significant interaction among interpreting research and theory, and its practice and teaching. More specifically, they indicate that, on the one hand, interpreting research serves to aid interpreting practice and teaching, and on the other hand, within the theoretical domain it first tests hypotheses by either confirming or rejecting them and then, in a second stage, elaborates to present new hypotheses.

4.1.4.3 EMPIRICAL RESEARCH AND PROCESS

In traditional interpreting research the most influential paradigm is the empirical paradigm. One finds arguments supporting the empirical paradigm in IS literature. Anderson, for example, claims that "the quality of interpretation should also be assessed under experimentally controlled conditions [...]" [Anderson, 1977: 228-229]. Likewise, d'Arcais completely disagrees with those who believe that empirical research is inappropriate for interpreting research:

A claim [...] from the professional interpreters, was that studies based on

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

laboratory experiments cannot tell us very much about language interpretation, because they are too far from the real situation in which interpretation takes place, and from, "real life." [...] This point of view is clearly wrong. It is not because a situation is "closer" to "real life" that a study becomes good; it obviously depends on the questions asked on the methods used to get an answer, and so forth. The point, however, has to be kept in mind when making generalizations from laboratory experiments to the "real" situation of the interpreter's work [d'Arcais, 1977: 394].

Stenzl [1983] indicates that empirical research in IS focuses on the process of interpreting and on the psychological mechanisms involved in it, analyzing four different aspects: (1) input, (2) process, (3) input/output and (4) output; and a series of variables (including quality of sound transmission, ear-voice span, and pauses) which are characteristic of this process:

ASPECTS	VARIABLES
INPUT	Quality of sound transmission; Source text rate; Source text type; Number and position of pauses.
PROCESS	Quantitative and qualitative ear-voice span.
INPUT/OUTPUT	Source language and its relation to the target language.
OUTPUT	Propositional content of the interpretation compared with source text content; Pauses in the interpretation; Phonological characteristics of the interpretation; Comprehension and recall in the audience.

Fig. 4.1. Aspects and variables of interpreting process studied by empirical research [Stenzl, 1983: 32]

Below are some quotations illustrating the fact that empirical research is mainly process-oriented in IS:

The study to be discussed in this report represents attempts to study the process involved in simultaneous interpretation, particularly when carried out under poor listening conditions, and to assess the relative effectiveness of these two forms of interpretation in conveying information to the listener [Gerver, 1971: 1-2].

Finally, before discussing a model of the process, we come to the question of the strategy employed by interpreters in order to cope with the demands [...] [Gerver, 1975: 123].

As a preface however, I should like to stress how important it is to consider

what interpretation is supposed to achieve before embarking on a detailed study of the process involved [Lederer, 1977: 323].

And this is our aim here too. We simply want to understand and be able to explain how the interpretation process works so that this can then be taught to students [Dodds, 1989: 18].

In our opinion, these studies based on a scientific approach that derives from neurolinguistics, neuropsychology and physiology may serve to increase our knowledge of the mental process of an interpreter [Darò, 1989: 55].

The proceedings of the Conference on Language Interpretation and Communication held in Venice in 1977 and of the successive Seminar on Interpreting in a Multilingual Parliament in Luxemburg in 1979 as well as those of the Meeting on Language Comprehension at la Sorbonne in 1980 all seem to indicate that the need is now felt for greater knowledge of the brain processes involved in interpreting [...] [Gran, 1989: 93].

A diachronic survey of the empirical research in IS indicates that simultaneous listening and speaking, one of the most sensational aspects of the SI process, was one of the earliest objects of study for empirical research in IS. Stenzl [1983] reports that Pintner (1969) and Gerver (1974) found that although inexperienced people tend to have some difficulties, experienced interpreters appear to be relatively untroubled by simultaneous listening and speaking during SI. Therefore, one may say that simultaneous listening and speaking during SI does not seem to be a major problem for interpreters.

On the basis of the findings presented by Gerver (1969), Stenzl [1983] points out that empirical research in IS concentrated mostly on the input aspect of the interpreting process. Within this framework empirical research has been carried out to analyze source speech delivery rates. Gerver (1969) confirmed interpreters' suggestions (Seleskovitch, 1968) that a rate between 100 and 120 words per minute is optimal, although it may differ for different speech types.

Stenzl [1983] points out further empirical research done by Déjean Le Féal, who compared spontaneous speech to reading aloud and found that it is not the delivery rate that causes difficulties in interpreting speeches read aloud, but such factors as intonation and the number and quality of pauses. This research also revealed that spontaneous speech has more pauses than speeches read. Therefore, on the basis of Goldman-Eisler's (1968) suggestion, which posits that speakers hesitate more when their output is characterized by high intellectual quality, one may argue that pauses sometimes indicate to the listener that a cognitively complex speech segment being produced.

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

According to Stenzl [1983], another variable related to input analyzed by empirical research is "ear-voice span," that is, the time lag between the interpreter's hearing a segment of a source speech and his/her utterance of the corresponding segment in the target language. Stenzl recalls that a classic mistake committed by beginner interpreting students is to follow the source speech too closely, although empirical research carried out on this issue by Oléron and Nanpon (1965) and Lederer (1981) indicate that during SI there are ear-voice spans of between 2 and 10, or 1 and 11 seconds respectively.

Stenzl [1983] provides information on experimentation with technical equipment used during SI. Gerver (1974) shows that the quality of this equipment is extremely important. Noise produced by the sound systems, for instance, can hinder an appropriate rendering of SI.

Stenzl [1983] reports that empirical research in IS has also been carried out on the output of the interpreting process. To provide some cases, Barik, first, described various types of omissions, additions and substitutions, although according to Stenzl, these descriptions need to be more clearly defined. Second, Déjean Le Féal compared interpreters' speech (German) rates with source speech (French/English) rates. Such a comparison showed that the interpreters' speech tends to become shorter as the source speech rate increases, at least in SI from French and English into German. Next, Paneth (1957) and Gerver (1974) found out that during the rendition of SI interpreters correct themselves, which indicates that they monitor their own output, whereas Kirchhoff (1976) argued that experienced interpreters seem to aim at a fairly regular output rate. Finally, Gerver [1971] compared the comprehension and recall of the audience in consecutive and SI and found no significant difference.

Stenzl [1983] believes that empirical research in IS concentrates on what happens in the interpreter's mind, almost never considering other aspects of interpreting phenomena such as the interaction between speaker, interpreter, and audience; and source and target speeches. This is because while in psychology, which represents one of the traditional paradigms in IS, experimental techniques have been developing for some time, in linguistics methodological tools to analyze the spoken language in use related to interpreting phenomena are relatively new. Stenzl also argues that another reason for the lack of interest in other aspects of interpreting is due to a defensive mechanism among interpreters:

> *We are quite pleased when psychologists confirm that ours is a complex job which requires a number of highly developed skills, but we are perhaps less inclined to document the limits of our skills and to face the occasions when we*

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

did not properly understand a speaker or were unable to adequately render a message even if we had understood it [Stenzl, 1983: 42].

Furthermore, empirical research carried out on bilingual language processing has interesting implications on the interpreting process. Lambert reports that, "apparently there were different forms of processing going on somewhere in our bilinguals' brains, and the differences were traceable to their language acquisition backgrounds." [Lambert, 1977: 138]. Referring to Weinreich (1953), Erwin and, Osgood (1954), Lambert [1977] points out that there are two types of bilinguals attributable to acquisition histories: "compound"/ "early" bilinguals and "co-ordinate"/ "late" bilinguals. The former acquires his/her two languages simultaneously (e.g. from infancy on) and with interlocutors who used the two languages equally often and interchangeably. He or she develops a common system for both languages. The latter, on the other hand, learns both languages separately in terms both of time of acquisition (the second language learned after infancy) and of socio-cultural context (one language at home, the other from outside). This kind of bilingual has two functionally independent language systems. On the basis of empirical evidence Lambert argues that the compound/early bilinguals tend to have a more analytic form of language processing, whereas co-ordinate/late bilinguals operate on a more holistic form of processing. These findings, depending particularly on the age of acquisition, relate language learning experience to cerebral processing styles with interesting implications for interpreting. Lambert, on the basis of several empirical studies, contends that interpreters who are compound/early bilinguals seem to involve both the left and right hemispheres in their language processing, whereas those interpreters who are co-ordinate/ late bilinguals apparently process language only with their right hemisphere.

In recent years, several other empirical studies have explored further cerebral processing styles with a new interdisciplinary approach called the neuroscience paradigm - neurophysiology, neuropsychology and neurolinguistics - [Pöchhacker, 1995 b].

The incentive for this paradigm arose in the second half of the 19th century, when the physician and anthropologist P. Broca showed that the human brain is "asymmetrical," that is, the two cerebral hemispheres of the human brain have different functions:

The right brain does much better than the left in 'pattern-matching' tasks, or in recognizing faces, or in other kinds of spatial-perceptual tasks. The left hemisphere is superior for language, for rhythmic perception, for temporal-order judgments, for mathematical thinking [Fromkin & Rodman, 1978: 32].

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

In monolingual right-handers, the left hemisphere is the language hemisphere; it is dominant in the organization of linguistic functions. On the other hand, Albert and Obler (1978) found that the bilinguals and polyglots tend to have more bilateral representation of language since although right-hemisphere damage caused language disorders only in 1-2% of right-handed monolinguals, 10% of bilinguals or polyglots suffered language disorders after right hemisphere damage. On the basis of these findings among bilingual and polyglot aphasic patients, two neurophysiologists concluded that bilinguals and polyglots have a greater language representation in the right hemisphere than monolinguals [Gran & Fabbro, 1988].

A substantial number of experiments in neuroscience, stemming from the evidence for brain-function lateralization provided by Broca, and Albert and Obler (who have demonstrated that bilinguals and polyglots have language-functions lateralization different from that of monolinguals), have been carried out at SSLM, conducted by Laura Gran and her colleagues. The most commonly used methods adopted by neuroscience to study cerebral asymmetry are the "dichotic listening method"[13] and the "tapping method."[14]

One of these experiments (Fabbro et al. 1990) has revealed that conference interpreters in general, and female interpreters in particular, have a cerebral organization of linguistic functions different from that of monolinguals and polyglots. In other words, the interpreters tend to have a more symmetrical brain representation than the others. Further research (Spiller-Bosatra et al. 1989, 1990; Darò 1989) has shown that this modification in the cerebral organization of linguistic functions among student conference interpreters is due to long training in SI. Such long practice has enabled the student interpreters not only to acquire professional skills but language competence in their left ear (right hemisphere) as well. As a matter of fact, Sylvie Lambert (1990; 1993) examined ear advantage during SI from L1 into L2 as well as from L2 into L1 and showed that during SI in both directions, the right-handed interpreters generally tend to listen to the source

---

[13] In the dichotic listening method developed by Kimura in 1961, two different acoustic signals (numbers, words, or syllables) are sent simultaneously to each ear through two earphones, each of which is connected to one channel of a double-track tape-recorder, so that one ear hears channel 1 and the other hears channel 2 [Gran, 1988].

[14] During an experiment carried out by the tapping method, used to study cerebral lateralization for superior cognitive functions such as speech recognition and production, subjects are asked to press a button connected to a digital counter as fast as possible in silence for a given number of trials of 20 seconds each, first with their right index finger (which is controlled by left-hemisphere) and then with their left index finger (which is controlled by right hemisphere). During the tapping session, a concurrent verbal task is performed (such as reciting a series of words, reading, etc.) [Gran, 1988].

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

speech with their left ear so that they can control their own input in the target language with their right ear. On the other hand, the fact that female interpreters have a particular tendency for more symmetrical brain representation can be explained as follows:

> *Further significant features in the study of cerebral asymmetries are the ontogenesis and sexual differences in hemispheric lateralization. Various studies on this subject have indicated that females attain maturation of the left hemisphere at an earlier age than males and tend to have a more bilateral representation of language. Males, on the other hand, appear to develop the specialized process of the right hemisphere more precociously and are more left-lateralized for language [Gran & Fabbro, 1988: 25].*

To support the argument of Gran above, one may resort to statistics: in SSLM about 92% of the simultaneous interpreting students are female, and this percentage is even higher among professional interpreters working for International Organizations (the European Parliament, the Commission of the European Communities, and the Council of Europe; Gran & Dodds 1989). These data are interpreted as follows:

> *[...]apparently females have a better aptitude for learning languages at high proficiency levels as well as for performing complex cognitive and motor skills, such as those involved in simultaneous interpreting (Ponton 1987; Hampson & Kimura 1988; Fabbro 1989 a, 1992) [Fabbro & Gran, 1994: 296-297].*

Another experiment (Gran & Fabbro 1989; et. al. 1991) has indicated that student interpreters and professional interpreters have different approaches to SI. The latter apparently adopts semantic strategies or meaning-based interpreting, whereas the former seems to focus on the syntactic aspects of the message, namely word-for-word interpreting. Finally, a last experiment involving both meaning-based and word-for-word interpreting has indicated that cognitive tasks seem to be more difficult for the former than for the latter [Fabbro & Gran, 1994].

Recently, Kurz [1995 b] has studied brain lateralization in line with neuroscience using the "EEC - electroencephalogram - method" which detects mental processes in terms of electrical activity produced by brain as a result of the specific mental process. Kurz has said that "information on verbal thinking can be obtained from on-going EEG" [Kurz, 1995 b: 13], and her results, though she has used a different research method within the neuroscience paradigm, are compatible with other findings obtained through the neuroscience paradigm in SSLM:

> *These first results tend to confirm the results and hypotheses of other*

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

researchers, notably from the Scuola Superiore di Lingue Moderne per Interpreti e Traduttori of the University of Trieste (SSLM), regarding right-hemispheric involvement in bilinguals [Kurz, 1995 b: 3].

[...]albeit obtained by completely different methods [...][Kurz, 1995 b: 13].

On the basis of the findings of empirical research in compliance with the neuroscience paradigm one may conclude that:

Simultaneous interpretation is a particularly complex cognitive task, and requires massive and concurrent activation of both cerebral hemispheres, thus apparently engaging more cerebral structures than mere listening and speaking [Fabbro & Gran, 1994: 306].

To summarize, in IS process-oriented empirical research (carried out with different scientific experimental paradigms) to explore what happens in the interpreter's mind has been successful in yielding valuable information on interpreting phenomena:

[...]the study of simultaneous and consecutive interpretation with scientific experimental methods, as tedious or speculative as it may sometimes appear, is bound to contribute greatly to general knowledge in this field and ultimately have real practical repercussions [Fabbro & Gran, 1994: 307].

4.1.4.4 BEYOND EMPIRICAL RESEARCH: NON-PRODUCT/PRODUCT-ORIENTED STUDIES

IS literature indicates that apart from empirical studies designed to explore the interpreter's mental activity, other research, based neither on classic psychological nor on neuroscience paradigms, has been carried out through questionnaires and interviews. In fact, Gile suggests that such data collection instruments should be used to investigate the quality of interpreting:

For example, a very important question which has never been studied in depth is the nature of interpretation quality: how is quality defined by interpreters, by delegates, what are its parameters and what is the relative importance of each? In order to find out, interviews and questionnaires can be used [Gile, 1990: 233].

Data collected in an interview administered by Skinner [1990] to investigate working conditions at the Nuremberg trials constitute an example of an interview being used to analyze interpreting phenomena diachronically.

Another argument indicating the need for questionnaires and interviews is the fact that this method also obtains data from interpreters on their own impressions

of interpreting phenomena. For example, a study carried out by Anderson provides the following information:

> *By specialization with respect to style is meant the fact that interpreters differ in their willingness to undertake either simultaneous or consecutive interpretation assignments. One of the more experienced non-AIIC interpreters described in detail his procedures for controlling the situation so that he never was expected to render simultaneous interpretations, which he described as very difficult. He reported that he often interrupted speakers and insisted that they pause while he interpreted what they had just said, thus maintaining manageable units for consecutive interpretation. Among the AIIC interpreters, one made a point of saying that she really preferred consecutive interpretation, and would like to specialize in that form if sufficient opportunities arose for her to earn her livelihood from such activities. She was particularly frustrated by the anonymity of the simultaneous arrangements in which she was forced by economic exigencies to work most of the time. Another reported that she preferred the anonymous surroundings of the sound-proof booth. She was more comfortable being able to take off her shoes and relax in the relative privacy of the booth than in situations in which she was "on display" [Anderson, 1977: 226].*

Alessandrini also points out the use of questionnaires for interpreting phenomena:

> *In a survey of 1982 on interpreters' occupational stress, 65% of the 826 interpreters who completed a questionnaire on job stress considered the interpretation of figures as a source of stress at work [Alessandrini, 1990: 77].*

Anderson himself used questionnaires for his doctoral dissertation entitled *Personality Profiles of Professional Translators and Conference Interpreters*:

> *To investigate the personality characteristics of professional linguists, two questionnaires were used. The first was designed by the present writer, intended to elicit biographical and career information opinions and was completed by a sample of 65 professional translators (Ts) and 35 conference interpreters (Is). The second was Cattell's "Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire" ("the 16PF") and was completed by Ts, Is and a sample of 46 students on the Postgraduate Diploma course in Interpreting and Translating at the University of Bradford (Pgs)[Anderson, 1984: 32].*

Finally, Viezzi points out that questionnaires have been used by various researchers to investigate the quality of interpreting:

> *Nel 1986 H. Bühler pubblicò uno studio nel quale [...], l'autrice aveva predisposto un questionario [underline added] con il quale chiedeva ai participanti [Viezzi, 1996: 24].*

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

I risultati di un'altra ricerca effettuata [...] da Meak nel 1990. Anche per questo studio era stato utilizzato un questionario [underline added] (contenente 9 domande e uno spazio riservato ad eventuali commenti, suggerimenti e osservazioni)[...] [Viezzi, 1996: 29].

[...] lo studio pubblicato da Kopczynski nel 1994 riassume i risultati di una ricerca [...]

Il questionario [underline added]era diviso in tre parti: [...][Viezzi, 1996:31].

Un altro studio [...] pubblicato da Marrone nel 1993[...]

I dati più interessanti emersi dagli 87 questionari [underline added] compilati possono essere così riassunti: [...][Viezzi, 1996:33].

In addition to research carried out with questionnaires and interviews, products of interpreting, too, have been used to collect data on interpreting phenomena. These product-oriented researches are based on conference recordings and transcriptions of the interpreters' work. For example, Gile recommends the use of transcriptions in projects investigating terms used in conferences: "Conferences can be recorded and the transcripts used for a study of the terms used." [Gile, 1990: 231]. He also suggests that a prospective international network intended to promote interpreting research should "share resources to facilitate multi-centre studies (in particular, share tapes and transcripts of original speeches as well as IRT documents)." [Gile, 1990: 235].

The IS literature analyzed for this study includes evidence of the actual use of transcriptions and conference recordings. The study of Gerver both considers the effects of noise on the performance of simultaneous conference interpreters and compares the effectiveness of simultaneous and CI in conveying information to the listener under normal and adverse listening conditions. This is the oldest sample unit in this study using products of interpreting to collect data on interpreting phenomena: "The present analyses were carried out on subjects' tapes [...]" [Gerver, 1971: 31]. Below are some other examples from IS literature describing the uses of transcriptions and conference recordings in interpreting research:

A computerized analysis (employing a pause criterion of 250 msec.) of 14 conference recordings from 5 to 20 minutes in length and of six interpreters working from French to English showed that[...][Gerver, 1975: 124].

For a number of years, our research team at Paris University (Sorbonne Nouvelle) has been recording speeches and discussions at multilingual international conferences and comparing not only speeches and their interpretations but also speeches in different languages [Lederer, 1977: 323].

This passage in English and its interpretation into French was chosen from a

number of transcripts of recordings I made at that conference [Lederer, 1977: 324-325].

My investigations of recordings of interpretations led me to put forth the general concept of units of meaning [Lederer, 1977: 330].

The results of some studies on the performance of interpreters in "normal" situations have been reported at the symposium. Studies of this type can be based on collections of transcriptions of samples of the verbal behavior of interpreters (e.g., through recording of first language input on one track and of second language output - the interpreter's production - on the other track of a tape-recorder) as in Lederer's paper [d'Arcais, 1977: 385].

Five minutes of the patient's spontaneous speech in each language he knows are recorded and transcribed and then analyzed according to the following parameters: [...][Fabbro & Gran, 1997: 13].

The texts to be interpreted were tape recordings of actual presentations at international conferences dealing with political and economic topics [Kurz b, 1995:7].

Viezzi also provides evidence for product-oriented studies carried out on interpreting quality by such scholars as Barik, Galli and Giardini:

[...] tutti gli studi presentati in questa sezione sono studi per così dire applicativi, prevalentemente basati su un confronto tra testo originale e testo prodotto [underline added] dell'interprete, anche se, soprattutto negli studi più recenti, vengono presi in considerazione anche altri aspetti [Viezzi, 1996:12].

Il materiale dello studio [of Barik] era costituito da 48 interpretazioni simultanee effettuate da 6 soggetti [...]. Ciascun soggetto aveva interpretato 8 testi: [...] Questi testi [underline added]erano stati poi analizzati dall'autore[...][Viezzi, 1996:13].

Nel 1990 Galli pubblicò i risutati di uno studio [...]. Allo studio avevano partecipato tre interpreti professionisti le cui interpretazioni simultanee erano state registrate [underline added]nel corso di un convegno medico [Viezzi, 1996:16].

Un altro studio [...] é stato effettuato da Giardini nel 1995 [...] nell'analisi, l'attenzione dell'autrice si concentra non soltanto sul prodotto [underline added] [...][Viezzi, 1996:17-18].

IS scholars indicate that product-oriented studies stem from TS and suggest their validity should be tested to find out whether they are compatible with the needs of IS or not:

[...]Gerver (1974 a) used an evaluation method for translation to assess

interpretation in one of his experiments, and he and other researchers (Barik, 1969, Lambert, 1982) assess interpretation on the basis of transcripts, i.e. more or less as if they were translations. But are they right in assuming that a task involving spoken language can validly be evaluated in transcribed form, which would imply little difference between translation and interpretation? Or are there important differences? And if there are, what are they? I would contend that the results of translation research should neither be ignored nor uncritically applied to interpretation, but that they should be critically evaluated in order to clarify to what extent they are valid for interpretation as well [...][Stenzl, 1983: 2].

However, Viaggio is not skeptical as Stenzl about the validity of product-oriented studies. Actually, he believes that interpreting research cannot develop properly without such:

Most significantly, the evolution of IS as an academic discipline continues to suffer from at least five key problems [...] "material" (lack of access to authentic output for product-oriented studies) [...] [Pöchhacker, 1995 b: 60].

In summary, IS literature reveals that interpreting research, apart from process-oriented empirical studies, also includes non-product and product-oriented studies, the latter of which have a vital function in the development of the discipline.

4.1.5 PRESCRIPTIVENESS IN INTERPRETING

Prescriptiveness is an issue that has determined the flow of various important scholarly writings in IS. Gile, for example, argues that prescriptive theorizing useful in the initial stage of IS, is no longer beneficial: "In interpretation research and theory (IRT), PT [personal theorizing] has made important contributions. However, it has now become an obstacle to progress [...]" [Gile, 1990 b: 28]. Gile also points out that although "personal" or prescriptive theories are not useful any more, they are still utilized in IS: "[...] most of the theories developed to date are only based on direct, personal experience [...]" [Gile, 1990 a: 230]. Similarly, Stenzl reports that theoretical and didactic models in IS are still prescriptive: "[...] it means that our theories and models as well as our teaching methods are based on our ideas and impressions of what interpreters do rather than on systematic observation of the reality of our work." [Stenzl, 1989: 24]. In fact, IS literature, in compliance with Gile and Stenzl, reveals various prescriptive assumptions on interpreting phenomena. For instance, Welford (1968), availing of "single channel theories of human information processing," without testing their validity in SI, prescriptively posited that simultaneous interpreters are able to speak and listen at the same time because long practice has taught them to ignore the sound of their own voices

[Gerver, 1975]. Current interpreting research, however, reveals that interpreters monitor both the source language input and the target language output during the rendition of SI [Fabbro & Gran, 1994].[15]

Neisser (1967), referring to the "motor theory of speech perception," argues that SI is a form of shadowing [Gerver, 1975]. In this case, too, interpreting research provides counter evidence in relation to this prescriptive assumption, demonstrating that SI is a more complex task than shadowing: Gerver [1971], studied the effect of noise on the performance of simultaneous interpreters in an experiment where interpreters shadowed and simultaneously interpreted. The findings of the experiment show that (1) interpreters made more mistakes than shadowers; (2) noise has a retarding effect on simultaneous interpreting as compared with shadowing in terms of decreased output rates and increased pause times. Furthermore, the claim that SI should be rendered from one's B and C languages into his/her A language is called a myth by Chernov [1992], who criticizes this postulate referring to Denissenko and stresses the importance of complete understanding even at the expense of certain stylistic imperfections. Chernov is also critical of those who (Schveitser, 1967) believe that interpreting through relay[16] is inadmissible. The latter claim that the relay form of SI is an inferior mode due to the fact that on the one hand it tends to reduce the amount of information during the first stage, causing loss of some essential information at the second stage, and on the other hand, any error made in the first stage will be necessarily reproduced in the second stage as well. Chernov recognizes these flaws inherent in relay interpreting, but contends that it is unavoidable when the number of the working languages is more than four and some are rare or exotic. Another example of a the speculative assumption is that "[...] consecutive interpretation is often thought to be superior to simultaneous interpretation in terms of accuracy and style [...]" [Gerver, 1971: 69]. However, Gerver [1971] has demonstrated that there is no difference between the two modes in the listeners' ability to obtain information. Finally, Gile criticizes Seleskovitch's *théorie du sens* as a dogmatic theory since it is introspective, intuitive and not confirmed by scientific research [Gile, 1990 a: 226].

Furthermore, Pöchhacker maintains that in early IS it was not only theoretical assumptions which were speculative, but also the research as well: "[...] in earlier

---

[15] "Indeed, experienced interpreters confirm that one can simultaneously listen in one language, speak in another, write down a page number and search through documents [...] and look at one's watch to see when one's booth mate is due back! All this takes place while the interpreter continues to listen and speak about new information." [Karmiloff-Smith, 1977: 375].

[16] Two-stage interpretation.

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

decades, books on interpreting tended to present a more practical/professional outlook (experience-based descriptions, suggestions for training and practice, etc.)[...]" [Pöchhacker, 1995 a: 21].

However, despite its abundant presence in IS, some scholars believe that prescriptive theory and research is of no use in understanding the interpreting process properly: "It is fascinating to speculate about the mental processes involved in interpretation, but speculation can do no more than raise questions," [Stenzl, 1983: 47] and IS cannot become a scientific discipline, employing a prescriptive framework for its pursuits:

> *Gile calls for a more "scientific" approach, putting empirical research by means of systematic observation and experimentation before intuitive reasoning and theoretical models [Pöchhacker, 1995 b: 54].*

> *Apart from reports on personal experience and discussions with experimental researchers on the already known aspects of interpretation, inquiries which ought to be carried out to broaden existing knowledge should be started for the benefit of all those who really intend to approach interpretation with a non-arbitrary approach [Fabbro & Gran, 1994: 307].*

Some scholars criticize prescriptive theories so severely that they describe them as a "despotic" attitude:

> *For some people, in fact, only the teachings of a few so-called "Masters of Truth" (Detienne 1967) were necessary and sufficient, i.e. the teachings of people who, given their hierarchical position in the academic world or their seniority in the profession, are always right and hold the key to truth on what interpretation is and how it should be taught. Without intending to underplay the importance of good advice based on long experience, it must nevertheless be admitted that this kind of despotic attitude has always been strongly counterproductive and detrimental in the past [Fabbro & Gran, 1997: 17].*

However, other scholars indicate that it is not so easy to shift from prescriptive theories to a scientific approach: "The jump from non-systematic, uncontrolled observation or personal experience-based theories to empirical research seems both intimidating and baffling [...]" [Shlesinger, 1995: 8].

Gile [1990 a] gives four different reasons to explain why speculative theorizing exists in IS:

Most interpreters who carry out interpreting research are not scientists by training,

most of the non-interpreter researchers do not have contacts with the

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

interpreting research community, and

practicing interpreters have little time to spare on scientific research that requires time and effort.

Furthermore, there is a certain "defensiveness" among interpreters fearing to lose prestige either as the practitioner of an impossible task or as a theoretician of a renowned theory.

However, although "personal theorizing" has been influential in IS for a long time, Pöchhacker [1993] argues that since the start of the "Renaissance" period in the mid-1980s with the initiative of the "Trieste School," empirical research has prevailed over "personal theorizing."

To sum up, the literature reveals that prescriptive theory and research have long dominated IS. Currently, however, there is a strong emphasis on empirical research within the framework of a scientific approach.

4.1.6 DESCRIPTIVENESS IN INTERPRETING

IS literature points out that descriptiveness is indispensable in the various disciplines investigating interpreting phenomena, theory in general, and interpreting theory and research in particular.

Scholars of the various disciplines argue that descriptiveness is necessary for their fields. Gerver, for example, mentions that "when faced with complex behavior, the psychologist's first task must be to describe before he can explain." [Gerver, 1975: 119]. Similarly, d'Arcais reports that bilingualism is a popular area of research in psycholinguistics and social psychology, pointing out that "most of the studies are of a descriptive character," [d'Arcais, 1977: 390] whereas Ingram draws attention to the difficulty in obtaining descriptive data for research in sign language interpreting: "A major problem we face in sign language interpretation is the lack of data to describe the linguistic codes [...]" [Ingram, 1977: 112]. Finally, Parsons comments on the importance of descriptiveness for a "human-factors" or "ergonomic"[17] approach to SI in an international organization: "Whichever the aim, in a human factors investigation the first step is to describe and analyze the tasks and procedures [...]" [Parsons, 1977: 315].

---

[17] "A human factors intervention in a human information processing system seeks to solve some real-life problem, such as increasing the effectiveness of individual or system performance, or, [...] resolving the problems of stress and tension that the system and its processes impose on participants." [Parsons, 1977: 315]

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

For some scholars descriptiveness is an intrinsic characteristic of a scientific pursuit. For example, Gile argues that a scientific discipline operating empirically needs to be descriptive: "Gile calls for a more 'scientific approach' [... with] empirical research by means of systematic observation [...]" [Pöchhacker, 1995 b: 54]. Dodds suggests that the first function of a scientific theory is to describe the phenomena under investigation: "[...] the principle purpose of theory is to describe phenomena through observation and analysis." [Dodds, 1989: 18].

Scholars also report the significance of descriptiveness for IS in particular. As mentioned earlier in this study[18] Wills [1977], Stenzl [1983] and Viaggio [1996] suggest that IS can be divided into three lines of pursuit, one of which is the descriptive branch. However, apart from some exceptions such as Kirchhoff's "description of both the common elements and the difference between translation and interpretation," [Stenzl, 1983: 41] and Barick's "descriptions of various types of omissions, additions, substitutions and other errors" [Stenzl, 1983: 28] IS has not traditionally resorted to DS. Stenzl, for example, complains of the lack of descriptions in IS: "The literature on simultaneous interpretation offers [...] no systematic observations and descriptions of interpretation in practice," [Stenzl, 1983: 47] and consequently the prescriptive character of interpreting theories and teaching methods: "[...] means that our theories and models as well as our teaching methods are based on our ideas and impressions of what interpreters do [...]" [Stenzl, 1989: 24]. She calls for reliance on a descriptive approach in IS: "[...] rather than on systematic observation of the reality of our work." [Stenzl, 1989: 24]. She is convinced that a descriptive approach to interpreting phenomena will contribute to IS in different ways: "[...] an objective description [...] could contribute not only to better training of future interpreters but also more realistic expectations and better advice for conference delegates and international organizations who depend on interpreters." [Stenzl, 1983: 42]. Both Gile and Gran agree with Stenzl as to the lack of DS in IS, and Gile draws attention to its consequences in terms of prescriptive interpreting theories:

> *In particular, as pointed out by Stenzl (1983: 47), there is virtually no descriptive data on what actually happens in the field, and most of the theories developed to date are only based on direct, personal experience [...] [Gile, 1990 a: 230].*
>
> *As Catherine Stenzl (1983) pointed out, however, the literature on simultaneous interpretation offered, and still offers today, a limited range of*

[18] See section "Interpreting Studies" of this chapter.

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

experimental data and theoretical approaches, and practically no systematic observations and descriptions of interpretation in practice [Gran, 1990: 5].

Gran emphasizes the reason for the lack of DS in IS, quoting again Stenzl: " Catherine Stenzl (1989) stated that, to her mind, 'the interaction between theory and practice is taken too much for granted and that in our field the relationship between theory and practice has often been one of coexistence rather than interaction.'[...]" [Gran, 1990: 6].

Although, traditionally, describing interpreting phenomena fail, some scholars believe that various problems in IS might be solved by means of descriptions of those questions under investigation. Stenzl, for example, argues that problems related to the interpreting process as well as the quality and the linguistic aspects of interpreting phenomena require descriptive data:

Before we can develop solid models of the whole process of interpretation we will need empirically validated models of text comprehension, text production, memory for text, and communication through language in general, so that we can determine whether and in what way the task of interpretation alters the communication and text processing procedures that are used in ordinary monolingual communication, and how the presence and work of interpreters alters the interaction between the primary partners in the communication process [...]

In the mean time we need to develop a broad base of observational data that enable us to describe regular and typical patterns of interpretation [Stenzl, 1983: 48].

Such a quantitative assessment method - possibly a simplified method of propositional analysis - would not solve the difficult problem of quality evaluation, but it might at least give us some objective measurement for the description of conditions which are likely to lead to significant information loss [Stenzl, 1983: 31].

These are only a few questions from just one aspect - the linguistic aspect of interpretation - that can't be answered without a broad, systematically collected basis of observational data. The collection of such a data base therefore seems an urgent and important task [Stenzl, 1983: 52].

Fabbro and Gran, on the other hand, state that research in the so-called neuroscience paradigm does employ descriptive analysis rather than a prescriptive approach:

In neuropsychological and neurolinguistic analysis all the components and sub-components underlying a cognitive process, such as language, are not thought of or theoretically hypothesized by scholars 'a priori', but rather they

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

are the result of direct observations on the spot [Fabbro & Gran, 1997: 14].

Nowadays a substantial number of scholars affirm that interpreting research can be carried out in terms of DS: "There can be no doubt that research on interpreting could be carried out as a descriptive study." [Schjoldager, 1995: 40]. In fact, Gile [1990 a] suggests a series of observational projects such as the preparation of glossaries, conferences and terms used at conferences, lexicometric studies and linguistic error analyses. A further argument is that theory should be based on descriptive data:

Now let us consider an issue that has been debated for quite along time: how can a theoretical model of the interpreting process be built. [...] Three stages can be conceived in the building up of a theoretical model: i) First, collecting an inventory of non-contradictory available experimental data [...] [Gran, unpublished article].

To summarize, although there was no room for DS in the initial stages of IS, the importance of such has become clear. DS have become indispensable to numerous researchers, and the data obtained through these descriptions are considered by some scholars as the initial step in the development of interpreting theory.

4.1.7 SOURCE ORIENTEDNESS IN INTERPRETING

IS literature reveals that source speech dominates interpreting phenomena in practice, teaching, research and theory. Thus, theoretically speaking, many people (scholarly or not) involved in interpreting phenomena view faithfulness to the source as the ultimate objective of an interpreter.

Some scholars have questioned the effect of source speech on the interpreting process: "What aspects of the source language message affect his [interpreter's] performance [...]" [Gerver, 1975: 121]. Some other scholars such as Posner (1967) believe that source speech is related to the perception stage of the interpreting process: "[...] [the interpreter] carries out the operations involved between perception of the source language message and [...]," [Gerver, 1975: 125] whereas others like Gerver emphasize the synthesis of the source message during the interpreting process: "After synthesis of the source language message, then, the interpreter might generate his translation in an analogous way [...]" [Gerver, 1975: 125]. However, it seems that the effect of source speech (the most discussed aspect of the interpreting process) is related to the production of target speech. This effect can be analyzed in two categories: 1) linguistic and 2) extra-linguistic characteristics of the source speech determining the production of the target speech. Linguistic

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

characteristics of source speech can determine target speech on two levels: the surface (syntactic) structure and/or the deep (semantic) structure. In the former, when the interpreting process involves two languages syntactically similar, the interpreter resorts to the wording of the source speech to produce his/her target speech, which then becomes a copy of the original speech in terms of syntactic characteristics:

> *To express the same content in two such languages [which are characterized by a considerable amount of similarity in the syntactic structure] it is possible to use very similar sentence forms[...]*
>
> *In other words, the interpreter has the possibility of using the surface frame of L1 and the similarity of the words in the two languages to avoid a search among several alternative structures in L2. The formulation stage of the sentence in L2 is in these cases directly monitored by the syntactic form of L1 [d'Arcais, 1977: 399].*

Nevertheless, d'Arcais believes that the reproduction of the surface structure of the source speech is not the best strategy for an interpreter to adopt:

> *Strategies of this kind are probably not the most frequent ways of making the interpretation. However, it is reasonable to suggest that interpreters might behave not too rarely according to strategies such as the one just tentatively suggested [d'Arcais, 1977: 399].*

In the discussion of Fabbro and Gran on the approaches employed for the performance of SI, what d'Arcais has described above is called word-for-word translation strategy:

> *[...]the interpreter translates minimal meaningful units of SL which have an equivalent in the TL. [...] the overall message is not decoded at a cognitive level. In fact, by using this strategy, the interpreter may not even understand the meaning of the incoming message and nevertheless be able to translate every single word, provided he can store the single elements in his short-term memory for the time needed to find an equivalent translation of the single terms and formulate a syntactically correct sentence in the TL [Fabbro & Gran, 1994: 297].*

From the preceding it is evident that for Fabbro and Gran syntactic correlation between source and target languages is not a prerequisite for the word-for-word translation strategy. What is more, they believe that it can be utilized regularly by expert interpreters for certain types of conferences requiring this kind of interpreting:

> *This interpretation strategy may be chosen even by expert professional interpreters during conferences on highly specialized or technical topics (e.g.*

mathematics, theoretical physics, etc.) [...][Fabbro & Gran, 1994: 297].

Finally, they also argue that regardless of the type of the conference, other factors such as the rendering of lists of names, numbers, products, or countries require the specific use of the word-for-word translation strategy [Fabbro & Gran, 1994]. As a matter of fact, Seleskovitch and Lederer are in agreement with Fabbro and Gran in this regard: "[...] figures, names and technical terms require a different approach from that appropriate for the comprehension of ideas." [Stenzl, 1983: 30]. Therefore, Fabbro and Gran suggest that when the word-for-word translation strategy is employed for the right purpose, the job of the interpreter will be useful to the listeners even though the interpreter may not understand the semantic content of the source speech:

> *It may therefore happen that the conference delegates express their complete satisfaction with the interpreters' performance even though the latter have in fact understood only "sequences of words" without thoroughly understanding the meaning underlying those words [Fabbro & Gran, 1994: 297].*

However, some scholars argue that if the word-for-word translation strategy is not employed for the right purpose, it increases the number of errors committed by the interpreter even in the case of syntactically similar languages due to source-language interference: "Theoretically, form-based interpreting should lead to an increase of interpreter errors, even in cases of close linguistic proximity, since it raises the likelihood of source-language interference." [Isham, 1995: 139-140]. Another problem related to the improper use of word-for-word translation strategy to render a speech simultaneously regards the didactic aspect of IS. Nicholson [1993] comments that student interpreters tend to employ the word-for-word translation strategy automatically, regardless of the specific subject matter. As a matter of fact, this argument of Nicholson has been verified by empirical research carried out by Fabbro and Gran [1994]. Nicholson argues that this instinctive approach hinders student interpreters in acquisition of SI skills:

> *Moreover, the trainee may suffer from interference of structural nature. In other words, she or he may impose a Spanish syntactic pattern on her or his target-language rendition in English. This is most often a problem in simultaneous interpretation because of the constant overlap between the source and target languages [Nicholson, 1993: 65].*

Gile believes that SI rendition should be communication-oriented:

> *[...]students should understand that they have to formulate the message not so that the linguistic structure and words used are closest to those of the Source Language Text, but so that the impact of the Target Language Text on the*

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

receiver (reader or listener) is closest to the impact the Author of the Text is trying to achieve [Gile, 1992: 187].

Another linguistic characteristic of source speech essential to the production of target speech is the semantic component. For example, the second stage of Seleskowitch's *théorie du sens* demonstrates that the semantic component of source speech can determine the target speech in SI.

> *In the second phase, the source-language wording is deliberately forgotten and only the deverbalized message remains. Finally, in the third phase, the interpreter produces a target-language wording to reformulate the message [Schjoldager, 1995: 36].*

Fabbro and Gran's considerations as to the approaches for the rendering of SI imply use of the semantic aspect through a meaning-based translation strategy:

> *With the meaning-based translation strategy, the interpreter retains sentences or at least brief information chunks by stripping them of their superficial linguistic form, whereas the meaning is recorded in the TL as accurately as possible. There is no need for the interpreter to retain the surface structure of the SL-text in his/her verbal short-term memory, though he/she has to understand the deep structure of it, in order to render its meaning in the TL. Adopting this translating procedure, the interpreter is generally less exposed to syntactic or lexical interferences between his working languages and can therefore choose more appropriate linguistic expression in the TL. This technique is adopted in most circumstances and is highly recommended during training courses as it produces a real "interpretation" of the original message into the TL [Fabbro & Gran, 1994: 297].*

In addition to its syntactic and semantic characteristics, which are of linguistic nature, source speech presents extra-linguistic features, such as speed: "[...] if processing capacities are overloaded through excessive speed, complexity or noise the interpreter may not perceive the entire message or may not be able to store all its segments correctly," [Stenzl, 1983: 46] the number of hesitation pauses: "Goldman-Eisler (1968) reports significant correlations between the number of hesitation pauses and degrees of previous verbal planning or rehearsal," [Stenzl, 1983: 50] and the intention "[...] his [the interpreter's] words are determined by his understanding of the speaker's intended meaning [...]" [Lederer, 1977: 327]; "[...] nella sua decodificazione del messaggio, l'interprete deve sempre tenere presente quelle che sono le intenzioni [undeline added] dell'oratore." [Volpi, 1991: 30]; "[...] he [interpreter] should consider as his own the intentions or aims of the ... speaker and act accordingly [...]" [Viezzi, 1996: 45]. Such implementations of the speaker are influential in the production of target speech, too.

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

Source speech is important not only in practice and teaching, but in research as well: "Studies concerned with specific variables involved in the process of SI concentrate mostly on variables on the input side." [Stenzl, 1983: 24].

Last but not least, various theoretical assumptions on how quality interpreting should be carried out reveal source components as the ultimate purpose of the interpreting process. Landon, a freelance interpreter, for example, believes that there is a cause-and-effect relationship between interpreting quality and fidelity to the original discourse: "My own feeling is that I have done my job really well when I [...] [was] in the spirit of the original [...]" [Landon, 1988: 20]. In fact, Landon's position as to the function of the source input in the SI process is shared by most of her colleagues. To provide a case, Bühler (1986) carried out a survey to collect the opinions of professional AIIC interpreters on criteria determining interpreting quality. The results reveal that 96% of the respondents described fidelity to the sense of the original message (among 16 criteria presented by Bühler) as "highly important," the highest evaluation parameter on the questionnaire which also included "important," "less important" and "irrelevant" [Viezzi, 1996]. The conclusion of Bühler again underlines the importance of source speech for interpreting phenomena:

> *the quality of interpretation can only be judged by comparison with the original ... delegates do not normally know the original and its quality and are therefore likely to judge the quality of interpretation by ... superficial criteria [...] [Viezzi, 1996: 26].*

Another survey, carried out by Kurz (1988), shows that not only interpreters but also different listener categories (such as doctors and engineers) view fidelity to the original message as the most important parameter in SI [Viezzi, 1996]. Dressler, on the other hand, implicitly argues the importance of source input by pointing out that target output has two speakers, namely the interpreter and the source speaker:

> *[the interpreter] plays the role of a co-speaker closely dependent on the speaker of the source text. ... In this sense, the target text has two co-speakers, the interpreter as overt speaker and the source text speaker as covert speaker [...] [Viezzi, 1996: 48].*

To Gile, the task of interpreter, who is a co-speaker in the target speech, is revealing the source input:

> *the general consensus is that Translation is to be a "faithful" image of the original discourse and that Translators should strive to represent fully the sender and his interests (Gile 1991: 198) [Viezzi, 1996: 45].*

Finally, Snelling's considerations on the clarity of the source message (to

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

make the task of the interpreter possible) underlines the importance of the source in the rendition of SI:

> *[...] a speaker may only be interpreted if he actively wishes to explain himself clearly and be understood by those listeners who do not understand his mother-tongue. The original source must be expressed in such a form as can be conveyed to, stored and subsequently emitted by the transmitter [Snelling, 1983: 8].*

Snelling insists on clarity in the source and resorts to metaphorical expository strategies to underline its importance:

> *I am going to talk about interpretation theory and I am going to use, as my starting point, two great artists whose role as precursors of interpretation theory has not been generally recognized: the one is Leon Battista Alberti and the other William Shakespeare. Leon Battista Alberti stated " di cosa chiara immagine chiara"; now, in our particular context, I take that to mean that if the source text is produced in a readily identifiable form, then the target text can be produced in a corresponding and equally readily identifiable form [Snelling,1989: 141].*

In conclusion, IS literature reveals that source discourse determines the interpreting phenomena of process, training, research and theory through both linguistic and extra-linguistic aspects.

4.1.8 TARGET ORIENTEDNESS IN INTERPRETING

Analysis of the sample in this study indicates that the audience, or listener, is also an important component both in the interpreting process and in the quality assessments of different scholars.

Various scholars view interpreting as an act of communication rather than as a linguistically oriented activity: "[...] [the interpreter] 'may never be called upon to engage in the exact translation of the words, rather he will communicate [...]" [Katan, 1996:12]. Here his ultimate purpose is to produce a meaningful discourse in L2 for the target audience: "[...] [the interpreter] will communicate the ideas in terms that are meaningful to the members of the target audience' [...]" [Katan, 1996:12]. This view has advocates from a didadactic point of view as well:

> *After many years of school-type translation, students tend to think of translation as a language-centered activity rather than as a people-oriented professional service: they strive to find linguistic 'equivalences' or near equivalences without trying to assess the communicative effect of their target-language text or speech [...] professional interpreting and translation strategies and tactics are communication-oriented and [...] students should*

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

understand that they have to formulate the message not so that the linguistic structure and words used are closest to those of the Source Language Text, but so that the impact of the Target Language Text on the Receiver (reader or listener) is closest to the impact the Author of the Text is trying to achieve [Gile, 1992: 187].

IS literature points out different factors influential on the accessibility of the source message to the target audience. Apart from previously discussed factors (see "Source Orientedness in Interpreting") related to the source component such as the speaker's intention and whether or not the source message itself is clearly expressed, there are factors such as sound quality:

To be sure the most elegant interpretation is useless if those for whom it is intended are unable to hear it due to faulty equipment [...]

The AIIC interviewers were quite concerned about the quality of the sound transmitted to their listeners. Several commented to the effect that if the sound system is poor the ordinary conference delegate is likely to blame interpreters [Anderson, 1977: 224].

and the interpreter's use of appropriate strategies for the production of the target input : "A further process plays a role in target text production: anticipation or prediction," [Stenzl, 1983: 37] and the receiver's possession of the necessary situational knowledge to grasp the meaning of the message:

The speaker from socio-cultural context A defines the communicative intention I1, assesses the receiver's situational and textual knowledge (step 1), constructs (step 2) and utters (step 3) the source message which consists of linguistic elements (the source texts), para-and extra-linguistic elements [...]and the presupposed knowledge of the receiver [Stenzl, 1983: 46].

[...] the information to be transmitted by means of a text is constructed in the minds of the listeners as a function of their general, specialized, personal and contextual knowledge and competence as well as their expectations and communicative intentions, [...][Viezzi, 1996: 23].

Some scholars discuss the importance of the listener particularly in relation to the accessibility of the source message to the target audience. Namy, for example, considers listener from a didactic point of view:

So far, we have been discussing the speaker only. Equally important, if not more, is the listener. [...]students tend to forget that interpreters work for an audience. [...]if it were not for these people, they would be out of a job. It is essential for the interpreter always to have his "client" in mind. While working, he must constantly ask himself: "Am I being clear? Do I make sense? Is my delivery all right?" I try to impress my students with the idea

that the interpreter is there to help delegates and that consequently he should spare no effort to be clear and accurate [...]

Students must know from very early on what delegates expect of their interpreter[...]

a number of questions future interpreters should keep in mind with respect to their audience:

-Who is the listener?[...]

-What is his nationality?

-What is he hoping to get out of the conference?

-What is his cultural background?

-What is his native tongue? [...]

-How much does he know about the subject at hand?[...]

-What is his social position? [...][Namy, 1977: 32-33].

Volpi, on the other hand, referring to Snelling (1989), suggests that not only the student interpreter, but the professional interpreter as well, should take the audience into consideration during his/her rendition of the target speech: "Un fattore che deve sempre essere tenuto in attenta considerazione è il tipo di pubblico [underline added] a cui l'interprete si rivolge." [Volpi, 1991: 10]. Similarly, Kurz points out the importance of the listener as follows: "the target language receiver or listener must be seen as an essential element in the [communication] [square parentheses original] process (1993: 20)." [Viezzi, 1996: 28]. Snelling discusses the importance of target listener in a more theoretical way:

I am going to talk about interpretation theory and I am going to use, as my starting point [...]

Now, the second point and the turning point in what I wish to say comes from an idea inspired by a paper given by Professor Sven-Olaf Poulsen from the University of Aarhus at a meeting in Copenhagen, early in October, about machine translation [...]

Professor Poulsen, speaking in the context, not of interpretation but of a machine translation, wished to introduce a new variable into the traditional equation. He said it is no longer sufficient just to think in terms of the source text passing through the interpreter to become the target text. After all, a target text must be targeted upon a specific audience and it is, therefore, necessary to involve, as a variable in the interpretation equation, the audience and the specific qualities of that audience [...] So, the formula is no longer simply "source text, interpreter, target text", it becomes "source text,

interpreter, target text targeted upon a specific beneficiary", knowledge and awareness of whose specific requirements will, in turn, influence the interpreter in his choice of technique and, above all, in his choice of language [Snelling,1989: 141-142].

In fact, other scholars, theoretically speaking, think likewise:

[...] there is no reason to doubt that, as in [the] case of written translation, so too in case of simultaneous interpreting "target-oriented constraints of a cultural-semiotic nature indeed shape the cognitive processes involved in individual acts of translation" (Toury and Lambert 1989: 3) [Shlesinger, 1995: 9].

Once the importance of the target listener has been recognized in the interpreting process seen as a communication act, it becomes clear that there are different listener groups with different needs: "Sulla base di questi risultati Kurz formulò l'ipotesi che gruppi diversi di utenti potessero avere aspettative e priorità diverse [underline added] [...]" [Viezzi, 1996: 27]. This position is also supported by Marrone, who believes that the interpreter should have: "acute perception of the requirements and expectations of different audiences [...]"[Viezzi, 1996: 35]. Stenzl comments on the importance of target audience as follows:

If we look at the English interpretation of an elaborate literary speech of welcome by the French host of a conference and find that the English version is couched in very simple basic English we may assess the interpretation as very poor. If however we know that the audience of the English booth consists of up to 90% of non-native speakers of English with a very limited command of that language we may arrive at the opposite conclusion, namely that the interpreter performed her task very well [Stenzl, 1989: 24].

Snelling, on the other hand, provides examples of different listener groups, indicating that the interpreter should analyze his/her audience in terms of their cultural, vocational and linguistic characteristics, and perform accordingly:

I would propose a group of people in which technical expertise is shared by the speaker and the audience, though not necessarily by the interpreter. A medical conference, for example. The Italian doctor will have an equally profound understanding of the subject matter, the interpreter will possibly be less expert in that subject matter. If the interpreter comes up with "carbon monoxide", the listening audience will, then, from their own cultural background and specific technical preparation, be able to make up for the interpreter's shortcomings.

The second group I would like to propose is a group with a shared cultural patrimony and here, it is the interpreter and the beneficiary who share the cultural patrimony, unfamiliar to the speaker. I remember I was myself once

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

translating an Italian speaker and there was one lone Britisher in the audience. I was translating only for him and knew he was a high-ranking civil servant. The Italian speaker began to speak about promotion in the Italian Civil Service and he began to refer to automatic promotion, independently of any criteria of merit. Now, knowing that the beneficiary of my services shared exactly the same cultural and linguistic patrimony as myself, I was able to use the expression: "It's Buggins' turn", which is a highly idiomatic British form of language, admissible only in the context of shared cultural experience between interpreter and beneficiary, never to be risked upon American, Japanese or even mixed audiences.

The third group I wish to propose is the most hybrid group of all[...]and that is where there is no shared cultural patrimony whatever, neither between the speaker and the interpreter, nor between the interpreter and the beneficiaries, nor yet among the beneficiaries themselves (the audience can be made up of Britons, Americans, Japanese speaking English and such like). Under these circumstances, it is the interpreter who has to be aware of the lowest denominator of linguistic comprehension and who will, therefore, quite deliberately, select simpler language register than he would in case 'B' (of the shared cultural patrimony) [Snelling, 1989: 142].

IS literature shows that to interpret considering the needs of the target audience requires various additional tasks for the interpreter, such as preparing him/herself for the conference subject matter in the target language: "[...] interpreters will tend to read documents in the target language to obtain basic knowledge, rather than merely seek translations of specific, technical terms in the source language; [...]" [Karmiloff-Smith, 1977: 375]; obtaining information on the listeners: "[...] è importante che L'interprete si documenti anche sui suoi ascoltatori [underline added] [...]" [Volpi, 1991: 22]; producing a target speech whose surface structure deviates from L1 to render the source message more intelligible rather than conveying an ambiguous message to the target audience: "The interpreter should never hesitate to depart - even considerably - from the original if in doing so he makes the message more clear" [Namy, 1977: 27] by omitting, explaining or substituting parts of speech of the source message: "[...] l'interprete avrà la possibilità, secondo il suo discernimento, di ometterle, tradurle, spigarle, o sostituirle [underline added] con battute simili che meglio si adattino alla realtà socio-culturale dei suoi ascoltatori" [Volpi, 1991: 9], so that the surface structure of the target speech is compatible with the surface structure requirements of the target language: "[...] l'interprete è in grado [...] di ricodificarlo [il messaggio], ricostruendovi attorno una struttura linguistica superficiale che, libera dall'influenza della lingua di partenza, appartiene solo alla lingua d'arrivo [underline added]" [Volpi, 1991: 16], described as the interpreter being at the same "wave length" with

his/her listeners: "Al momento della ricodificazione del messaggio, invece, l'interprete deve spostarsi sulla "lunghezza d'onda" [underline added] dei suoi ascoltatori, (appartenenti ad una comunità linguistica diversa da quella dell'oratore)." [Volpi, 1991: 30].

All strategies employed to satisfy the needs of the target audience can be condensed under a specific interpreting approach: meaning-based interpreting, which suggests that the interpreter "is generally less exposed to syntactic or lexical interferences between his working languages and can therefore choose more appropriate linguistic expressions in the TL" [Fabbro & Gran, 1994: 297]. This approach is based on the *théorie du sens* developed by Seleskovitch:

> *Do interpreters use their syntactic knowledge of the source language as a source of information for planning the TL sentence, or is syntactic knowledge used only for the original parsing of the input, such that once comprehension has been achieved, the structure of the SL input has no further role during simultaneous interpretation? Seleskovitch [...], an influential interpreter educator in Paris, has formalized the latter view [...][Isham, 1994: 192].*

> *According to Sele.kovitch, in order to accomplish communication with the help of SI the simultaneous interpreter must be able to transfer the result of his SL textual analysis into a semantically and stylistically acceptable TL form [Wills, 1977: 345].*

Last but not least, IS literature provides evidence for the importance of the target audience in relation to interpreting quality assessment, too. Viezzi, for example, referring to Giardini, reports that interpreting quality assessment cannot be based only on the comparison between the source input and target output, but furthermore on analysis of the target output as an autonomous entity:

> *Con questo studio di Giardini la metodologia analitica fa quindi un passo avanti e diventa più accurata e significativa: non consiste più nella meccanica rilevazione delle deviazioni formali tra testo di partenza e testo di arrivo, ma considera anche, scrupolosamente, le caratteristiche del testo di arrivo in quanto tale, come se fosse in qualche modo un testo autonomo* [underline added]. *[Viezzi,1996: 18].*

Advocating the conclusions of Viezzi, Stenzl discusses the importance of the target audience vis-a-vis quality assessment as follows: "I quoted this example at some length because it illustrates how problematic it is to evaluate an interpretation without considering the receivers and their presupposed knowledge [...] [Stenzl, 1983: 30].

To conclude, IS literature clearly shows that the target listener is an important

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

component of the interpreting process seen as a communication act and defined as the interaction among the source message, the interpreter, the target message, and the beneficiary (the target listener).

4.1.9 INTERPRETING THEORY

Those who deal with interpreting have contradictory opinions about the significance of theory. Some scholars believe that theory is useless because interpreting is mainly a practical activity:

> *Jean Herbert, the doyen of European interpreters, always began his course of lessons with the announcement that it would be divided in two parts: theory and practice. He would then propose to treat interpretation theory first. 'The speaker delivers a speech in his language' he would say 'and the interpreter proceeds to deliver the same speech in his. We will now pass to practice' [Snelling, 1983: 1].*

Their motto is "Don't-think-about-it! Just-do-it!" since they have practiced interpreting for many years without resorting to any theory.

Others do not see any dichotomy between interpreting theory and practice: "I am also tired of hearing [...] that theory and practice of interpretation are mutually antagonistic." [Snelling, 1988: 42]. Indeed, various scholars such as Dodds [1989], Gentile [1991], Pöchhacker [1992], Salevsky [1993], Gran [1997], and Viaggio [1996] believe that theory is necessary. Dodds, for example, states that "[...] we all must now begin to talk very seriously in terms of a general theory of interpretation [...]" [Dodds, 1989: 17]. Pöchhacker [1992] argues that although the " 'Don't-think-about-it!! Just-do-it!' approach may work in practice, it does not work for the teaching of interpreting since the "teachers need to understand what they are doing" [Pöchhacker, 1992: 211]. For Gentile a theory of interpreting should be based on a theory of language: "All discussion on interpreting and translating presupposes a theory of language. It is only this framework (whether implicit or explicit) that one can identify and evaluate the problems inherent to the activities of interpreting and translating." [Gentile, 1991: 348]. Viaggio, too, supports a theory of interpreting based on a general theory of language: "If SI is a linguistic activity, we ought to proceed from a General Theory of Language, i.e. the ability of man to acquire, develop and use a second signal system." [Viaggio, 1996: 76]. However, since interpreting is involved in not only linguistic but semiotic aspects as well, Ingram [1977] is convinced that a complete theory of interpreting should also include a semiotic framework, taking into account, for example, sign language interpretation as well, as it is a semiotic activity. In fact, Viaggio also underlines the importance of

semiotics in a theory of interpreting, claiming that in the final analysis, a more unified theoretical approach embedded in a General Theory of Semiosis is necessary: " [When interpreting is studied as an inter-lingual mediation,] there is no escaping a General Theory of Translation, embedded in a General Theory of Communication, itself framed within a General Theory of Semiosis." [Viaggio, 1996: 78].

Although the need for theory in interpreting is felt by various scholars in the field, it is also argued that IS is an academic domain with little theoretical development. For example, Pöchhacker [1993] contends that the focus of scholarly activity in IS is on empirical research dealing with isolated problems of mental micro-process with little indication, if any, as to their relative theoretical foundation. To Pöchhacker it seems that theory has been relegated to the "tail-end" of empirical research so that the general attitude of IS scholars seems to be "take care of research and the theory will take care of itself !" [Pöchhacker, 1993: 53]. He also argues that the phrase coined by Daniel Gile, "Interpretation Research and Theory," or IRT to denote investigative and conceptual inquiry in IS reflects the priority of research over theory. Pöchhacker believes that interpreting theory and research should forge a disciplinary identity so that IS can avoid becoming a peripheral domain of linguistics and psychology, becoming rather a (n) (inter-)discipline of its own.

Despite of the complaints above that theory in IS is being sacrificed to empirical research, some scholars discuss issues related to ontology and the nature, purpose, and functions of the interpreting theory.

Ontologically speaking, Gran [unpublished article] argues that a theory of interpreting reinforced by experimental research can be built up in three stages: first (1) collecting an inventory of the non-contradictory experimental data available; (2) building up a theory by connecting all this available experimental data by means of non-contradictory relationships; and (3) building up predictive models. In the first stage, different problems related to the interpreting process (e.g. comprehension, cognitive processing, verbal output, auditory mechanisms, interaction between the various stages of the process and attention) are identified for experimental study based on a hypothesis that will either be confirmed or refuted. She also argues that in the case of non-experimental research considering linguistic, semantic or syntactic aspects, for example, they should be studied on the basis of a rational and logical scheme. Then, in the second stage, relationships among various experimentally corroborated hypotheses are established to provide broader comprehension of the entire interpreting process. Gran believes that the models proposed by Gerver (1976) and Moser (1978) are based on such relationships. In the

final stage, the theories developed in the second stage will, ideally, predict the results of future research. However, Gran points out that all the existing interpreting theory is still far from such results.

Within the ontological domain, in addition to reflections on how to build up a theory, IS scholars also have suggestions on types of theories. Salevsky [1993] distinguishes three types of interpreting theory: (1) a general theory, (2) special theories and (3) particular theories. While a general theory of interpreting accounts for the universal characteristics of interpreting, special theories are related to various interpreting situations. Salevsky suggests that special theories might incorporate the following areas:

1. *Varieties of interpreting (consecutive versus simultaneous interpreting),*
2. *The medium (human, machine, computer-aided interpreting),*
3. *Language combinations (linguistic problems when interpreting from or into a particular language),*
4. *Culture combinations (culture-specific problems when interpreting from or into a particular language/culture),*
5. *Area/institution (interpreting for the media, courts, negotiations etc.),*
6. *Text relations (text type, degree of specialization etc.), and*
7. *Partner relations (between general and specific characteristics of the source-text producer and the target-text addressee).*

Finally, particular theories are formed by combinations of different special theories.

On the other hand, Dodds [1989] has interesting ideas as to the nature of interpreting theory. He argues that while interpreting theory is not purely scientific like theories of the natural and physical sciences, it is a rational theory:

> *I honestly think we can exclude a priori the possibility of interpreting being compounded into a purely scientific theory - it certainly cannot be compared to the physical sciences where there is such a degree of logical and empirical determination that there can be elaborated precise and very rigid correspondence rules of the type: C1.....C10 = X that is to say, given certain conditions, something else happens or must follow. There may very often be a high degree of appropriateness and skill in a given interpreter's performance, but no scientific theory will be powerful enough to predict such a performance with absolute correspondence rules. It does not follow from this, however, that we cannot have a rational theory all the same. Prof. Farrell for one is quite categorical in this respect, for he says: "The domain of the rational is wider than that of the scientific [...]" [Dodds, 1989: 18].*

However, his position does not mean that interpreting theory is divorced from reality and practice. The link between theory and reality is, first, determined by the

purpose of the theory: to understand and explain the interpreting process. This purpose is discussed by various scholars including Gerver [1971], Wills [1977], Stenzl [1983], Salevsky [1993], Gran and Viezzi [1995]. Dodds, like Moser [1977], Snelling [1983], Stenzl [1983, 1989], Kalina [1992], Pöchhacker [1992], Salevsky [1993], and Gran and Viezzi [1995], indicates that such a purpose would serve to teach the interpreting process to students. On the other hand, in addition to its contributions to didactics, interpreting theory aimed at the investigation of the process also serves the orientation of the practice itself [Wills 1977, Snelling 1983, Stenzl 1989, Gentile 1991, Salevsky 1993] as well as research [Snelling 1983, Salevsky 1993]. In other words, as argued by Salevsky, training, practice and research are theory-based: "Experience without concepts is blind." [Salevsky, 1993: 164] and it is natural that "there must be genuine interaction between theory and practice" [Stenzl, 1989: 23]. Such interaction is carried out by means of DS of the interpreting process, which is the second element discussed by Dodds to link a rational theory, which is a general statement developed on the basis of corroborated set of hypotheses, to reality:

> *[...] the principle purpose of a theory is to describe phenomena through observation and analysis. It is through observation that hypotheses are set up and tested, certain patterns discovered and then compared and correlated with other patterns in other observations and finally an abstraction made, that is to say a general statement or description is made which constitutes a theory [Dodds, 1989: 18].*

Nonetheless, since the interpreting process includes an infinite number of linguistic, psychological and neurological variables, he believes that a purely descriptive theory is not "powerful," but too restricted in its nature to explain all these variables. For him, a descriptive interpreting theory also needs to be predictive to work well. However, Dodds says that such a theory does not exist at the moment. On the other hand, he argues that since interpreting theory, to him, is a rational theory, its predictions cannot reflect reality in terms of absolute certainty, but on a scale of probability factors. Finally, he argues that a theory's being rational does not damage the scientific value of that theory. He claims that although a rational theory can be subjective and intuitive, its scientific validity can be guaranteed in terms of objectivity through methodological criteria established a priori. In other words, Dodds contends that not only a theory related to a purely empirical paradigm, but also a subjective or intuitive theory related to a rational paradigm can be scientific. What makes a theory scientific is not its empirical or rational paradigm, but its objectivity. And the objectivity of a theory, Dodds argues, is determined by the objectivity of the methodology it employs:

The key-word here, of course, is objectivity and straightway, over this point more than any other, objections are usually raised. For how can one be objective with respect to one's own subjective feeling or judgment about a given interpreting performance? For example, the interpreter's delivery and presentation is either good or bad depending on the listener's feeling or subjective reaction to that performance - what Chomsky calls the "hearer's intuition." Researchers in the physical sciences would certainly have no truck with any belief that intuition can be used as objective data on which to base a theory. But in the fields of language, perception, human psychology and ergo interpretation, there is little else apart from the informant's intuition that can be used as the empirical data for our corpora. [...] the problem is not so much what the data is but rather [...] through the rigorous and scientific testing of the 'hearer' we can (a) objectively determine what constitutes a good/bad performance in rational, relative terms, if not in absolute terms, and (b) then go on to establish a set of probability rules that the good interpreter already intuitively knows and that the teacher-interpreter can make explicit so that it can be passed on to the student as a model. Objectivity comes into it not over any discussion as to whether opinion, feeling or intuition can be considered objective data (this, as for psychology and psychiatry, we must take as a basic postulate) but rather over the testing of the data itself [Dodds, 1989: 19-20].

Finally, in IS literature the importance of methodology as the determining factor in the scientific endeavor is also discussed by Stenzl, who supports Dodds, arguing that "a concept of science [is] defined essentially by its methodology" [Stenzl, 1983:12].

The theoretical domain of IS offers various descriptions to explain the interpreting process in terms of hypotheses, models or theories; the major ones have been developed by Seleskovitch (1968), Kirchhoff (1976), Gerver (1976), Moser (1978), Chernov (1979), Stenzl (1983), Vermer (1983), Gile (1985), Pöchhacker (1992), Fabbro and Gran (1994) [Pöchhacker 1992, Schjoldager 1995, Fabbro and Gran 1997]. These descriptions seem to be developed in compliance with four different paradigms: "psychological," "neurolinguistic," "functional" and "linguistic." While the psychological and neurolinguistic paradigms focus on the mental process of the interpreter in terms of information processing, processing capacity and neurological components; the functional paradigm considers interpreting as a communication process; and, finally, the linguistic paradigm analyzes the interpreting process in terms of textual characteristics.

What follows is a very schematic and simplified description of the major models, an attempt to describe and explain the interpreting process in compliance with the four different paradigms mentioned above.

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

4.1.9.1 MODELS DEVELOPED WITHIN THE PSYCHOLOGICAL PARADIGM

Gerver [1975] develops a model to account for the interpreting process as a cognitive behavior which involves the perception, storage, retrieval, transformation, and transmission of verbal information. Gerver's model includes a short-term buffer storage or a very short-term memory, a short-term operational memory, a long-term memory for knowledge of languages, and an output buffer. According to the model, the source language input is received (perceived) in the short-term buffer storage, and then it is processed for comprehension in the operational memory by means of information stored in the long-term memory. When the source language message has been understood by the interpreter, it is stored for comparison with his/her target language output in the output buffer. The process of interpreting, then, is a continuous production, monitoring and testing of the possible outputs in relation to the source language input as understood by the interpreter. During this process, information is acquired in a buffer storage while a comparison is carried out between the former input and possible output. In order to cope with such a dual task, the interpreter under normal circumstances (e.g. good listening conditions, moderate speech rate, easily grasped source-language material) divides his/her attention between the various functions of the interpreting process outlined above. However, if the interpreter's working conditions are not favorable because of, difficult listening conditions or subject matter for example, then s/he will focus on decoding and encoding, while monitoring of input and/or output will likely suffer. Therefore, though Gerver's model explains the interpreting process as a number of sequential cognitive tasks operating simultaneously, it seems to involve some degree of attention-sharing as well.

The most detailed model of the interpreter's mental process is the information-processing model developed by Massaro (1975) to describe the activities involved in understanding and producing language and adapted to SI by Moser [1977] to illustrate the sequence of its processing steps. The model comprises the recognition of the incoming message, its understanding, and the production of the output material for the target audience.

According to this model, syntactic units or acoustic features of the source-language input (e.g. phonemes), are received in the "auditory receptor system" without undergoing any filtering or rejection process. In other words, everything that reaches the ear undergoes this stage of processing. This detected sensory information is then stored in "perceptual auditory storage" until sufficient information is available for the next stage. A primary recognition process takes

place when the phonological rules of the source language stored in the long-term memory (LTM) synthesize the acoustic features into syllables which are stored in "synthesized auditory memory" (SAM) for one or two seconds. In a secondary recognition process, the synthesized syllabic units are identified as words on the basis of the syntactic and semantic source-language information. The output from the secondary recognition process, the words, is stored in "generated abstract memory" (GAM) or the short-term memory for fifteen to twenty seconds for further processing. The next step is the segmenting and condensing of the words into bigger and more abstract units so that they can be organized for the comprehension. The comprehension process is, then, an interaction between the words stored in GAM and the relevant syntactic, semantic, contextual, situational and general knowledge the interpreter already possesses in his/her LTM. Moser's model defines LTM as a huge network made of "concepts," a "conceptual framework" and "conceptual relations." The content of a concept is everything one knows (i.e. has heard, read, thought or seen) about it. Apart from semantic information, which is assumed to be of universal character, concepts contain language-specific information as well, e.g. phonetic, lexical and syntactic information. During the understanding process the interpreter thus connects the words stored in GAM with concepts and conceptual relations that exist in LTM. The model suggests that the semantic and linguistic connection between the word units stored in SAM and the conceptual network of LTM involves two levels: intra lingual connections (i.e. connections between concepts and linguistic structures of one language) and interlingual connections (i.e. connections between concepts and linguistic structures of source and target languages). The output of the interpreter for the target audience proceeds, then, on the basis of the semantic, syntactic, lexical and phonological rules of the target language activated in the conceptual network of the LTM. Moser points out the importance of a particular process during the production of the target language production: prediction. She suggests that when prediction is possible the interpreter eliminates all processing stages up to the target language production stage, except the primary recognition - a passive process continuing as long as the source language (SL) message arrives at the ear of the interpreter. The final stage in Moser's model is the output control. During rendition interpreters do not hear only the voice of the speaker, but their own as well. Therefore, if necessary, they can correct their own output. Target language output control processing can take place at two levels: if the SL message is difficult to process, it will exhaust the capacity available in GAM, and for one or two seconds the output control will stop in SAM. However, if the SL message is not difficult, the output of the interpreter will be stored in GAM as if it were an SL message, and the output control may continue up

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

to fifteen or twenty seconds.

Gile [Schjoldager 1995] is interested in the interpreter's capacity for shared attention and has proposed a series of models called "Effort Models" to explain it. The "Effort Models" based on the interpreter's processing capacity show that if one component of the interpreter's attention is overloaded, other components suffer and the realization of the task is risked. The model suggests that SI involves a set of competitive operations called "efforts." There are three basic "efforts": (1) listening to and analyzing the input; (2) output production; and (3) short-term memory and retrieval of information. Each "effort" requires a specific processing capacity, depending on the task involved. Therefore, the process may become difficult or even break down if the interpreter does not have the required processing capacity. The task becomes impossible when one or more "efforts" become too demanding as a result of overloading.

Schjoldager [1995] argues that Gile's "Efforts Model" is highly praised by interpreting scholars for various reasons. First of all the model has an analytical power. Furthermore, it explains why errors sometimes occur for no apparent reason; they may be due to previous difficulties with processing capacity. The model also explains, on the basis of the language-dependent difficulties, why some language combinations seem more difficult than others. For example, interpreting from languages with subject-object-verb syntactic structure into languages with subject-verb-object syntactic structure seems to entail particular difficulties. Under those circumstances, the interpreter may either wait for the source speaker to finish his/her sentence or resort to anticipation of the not yet rendered input segment in order to compensate for the information in the final-position verb. However, such strategies may cause overloading of the "memory effort." Finally, the model could explain why some interpreters prefer to interpret from their A language into their B or C languages. The interpreter may be exhausted by the "listening effort," or the subject matter may be unfamiliar to him/her. Consequently, since understanding is a prerequisite for producing the output message, the interpreter may find dealing with the understanding process in his/her mother tongue easier.

4.1.9.2 HYPOTHESES DEVELOPED WITHIN THE NEUROLINGUISTIC PARADIGM

The studies which explore components and sub-components of the linguistic process, carried out in compliance with the neurolinguistic paradigm (analyzing aphasic patients and cerebral organization of language), suggest that language does not have a unitary function, but consists rather of several different interacting

functions. On the basis of this assumption it is argued [Fabbro & Gran, 1997] that language, neurologically, is organized on three main levels: (1) the main level or "General Neurofunctional Language System," which includes all other levels; (2) the intermediate level or the level of "Language Independent Subsystems" such as comprehension, production, reading and writing; and (3) the lower level or the level of "Language-Specific Subsystem" where most elementary cognitive units are linked to forms specific to a particular language.

In compliance with the hypothesis above concerning the organization of language in general, the neurolinguistic research based on "spontaneous translation," "paradoxical translation" and "translation without comprehension"[19] paves the way for the formulation of a neurolinguistic framework specific to the translation process. Paradis (1984) [Fabbro & Gran, 1997] argues that various subsystems of the brain involved in the translation process, although related to each other, also function independently. According to this hypothesis [Fabbro & Gran 1994] at least four different reciprocally independent neurofunctional subsystems are involved in the translation process:

> *(1) the neurofunctional system accounting for the first language (L1) with a component subserving comprehension (CL1) and another subserving expression (EL1);*
>
> *(2) the neurofunctional system accounting for L2 with related comprehension (CL2) and expression (EL2) components;*
>
> *(3) the neurofunctional system accounting for the translation from L1 into L2; and*
>
> *(4) the neurofunctional system accounting for the translation from L2 into L1 [Fabbro &Gran, 1994: 298].*

The hypothesis suggests that since these four subsystems operate autonomously, the others may still function if one of them fails. Furthermore, it implies that at least some aspects of the translation process can be accomplished without the involvement of conscious comprehension, and that translation from L1 into L2 and vice-versa are at least partially separate and independent from each other. Finally, it seems that the translation process is apparently different and independent from the comprehension and production process within a specific language. To conclude, although neurolinguistic paradigm is at an early stage, it offers interesting insights into the interpreting process in terms of hypotheses.

---

[19] See pp. 56-57; Fabbro and Gran, 1994: 298; Fabbro and Gran, 1997: 16-17.

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

4.1.9.3 MODELS DEVELOPED WITHIN THE FUNCTIONAL PARADIGM

Stenzl [1983] reports that Kirchhoff (1976, 1977), too, studies the mental process of the interpreter with an information-processing framework, introducing the notion of "subjective information," which is knowledge in the source input unfamiliar or unknown to the interpreter. During the interpreting process the higher the subjective information is, the more conceptual resources the interpreter needs to develop in the long-term memory, requiring more time in order to establish relations between the concepts of the incoming message and those of the long-term memory. Subjective information stresses the fact that interpreters need to read documents and background information before a conference to reduce or possibly avoid the search for information in the long-term memory as much as possible.

Chernov [1992] [cf. Stenzl 1989], instead of focusing on elements new to the listener in terms of subjective information, is interested in the redundant parts of the message or those elements that the receiver already knows, seeing prediction as an indispensable component during the comprehension stage of the interpreting process. Chernov, in other words, turns Kirchhoff's position upside-down and coins the term "subjective redundancy" to indicate already known information. His thesis is that only messages with an adequate degree of redundancy can be interpreted simultaneously. However, if the subjective redundancy is low or, in Kirchhoff's terms, if the subjective information is high, the interpreter has to focus his/her attention on perception and comprehension of the incoming message and cannot sufficiently control the output. Consequently, the interpreter cannot correct any errors in the target discourse.

Kirchhoff [Stenzl 1983] also examines the interpreter's psychological processes in handling syntactic differences between language pairs in order to describe those elements that have to be stored in the short term memory because they cannot be interpreted without further information, and other elements which can be rendered in the target language without requiring any other information. Stenzl reports that the study of such differences between languages is very useful to develop language- specific strategies in SI.

However, according to Stenzl [1983] the most important aspect of Kirchhoff's work is that (although she investigates the mental process of the interpreter) in the final analysis she approaches the interpreting process from a wider perspective: a comprehensive framework for interlingual communication mediated by a translator or an interpreter. She defines translation and interpreting as a

communicative process and describes variables affecting it. The interlingual communicative process, Kirchhoff argues, involves two languages and three partners; the sender (author or speaker) and the receiver (reader or listener) of the message (the text, written or spoken) are the primary partners in communication. They may belong to different linguistic and socio-cultural backgrounds, but are members of the same community. Translators and interpreters belong to both language communities and are familiar with the socio-cultural backgrounds of the primary partners. However, they are not members of the communication community since they do not originate the message - nor it is primarily addressed to them. They rarely know the subject matter (of conference or translated text) or fully participate in the communication process (e.g. exchange of literature, preparation of meetings, drafting of texts, social interaction between partners). Therefore, they often work with information deficit in proportion to that of the primary partners. This information deficit usually affects translation less than interpreting because translators can obtain additional information after they have seen the source text, whereas interpreters can resort only to information obtained before and during the meeting. Consequently, the latter often make assumptions about the information to be processed and run into difficulties when their assumptions are not correct. Kirchhoff contends that for successful interpreting the primary communication partners must consider the constraints of the interpreting process and should try to reduce them. For example, they might make texts and background documents available, be explicit in speech, speak into the microphones, and adjust their delivery rate. Furthermore, whereas in translation the meaning is conveyed only by graphic means, in interpreting the meaning is usually conveyed only orally, involving both phonological features (such as intonation, voice quality, changes in pitch and loudness, pauses) and semiotic elements (such as facial expressions and gestures) which affect the interpreting process as well.

Therefore, Stenzl [1983] argues that Kirchhoff's account of translation and interpreting as an interlingual communication process provides a comprehensive description of both the common and diverse elements of the translation and interpreting processes.

Stenzl [1983] herself proposes a preliminary framework describing information flow during the interpreting process analyzed from a communicative context. She admits that her model is neither precise, predictive nor easily testable. However, it does provide an overall framework to identify variables necessary to develop more precise models for SI as a communicative process.

The Stenzl model suggests that:

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

The speaker from socio-cultural context A defines the communicative intention I1, assesses the receiver's situational and textual knowledge (step 1), constructs (step 2) and utters (step 3) the source message which consists of linguistic elements (the source text), para-and extralinguistic elements (e.g. intonation, gestures, visual means etc.) and the presupposed knowledge of the receiver.

[...]The interpreters perceive acoustic and visual signals (step 4) emitted by the speaker. The source message as perceived is then stored and processed together with situational and textual information (step 6) and results in I2 (step 7), which is the interpreter's view of the speaker's intention and at the same time the interpreter's own communicative intention.

The interpreter then assesses the receiver's situational and textual knowledge (step 8), constructs and emits the target message (steps 9 and 11) which will normally consist of linguistic and paralinguistic elements. [...]some source text elements may be transferred to the target text with minimal processing (the strongly ritualized elements of conference speeches), so that simplifying we can link them directly between source and target text (step 10).

The receiver then perceives the interpreter's message, processes it together with the situational and textual knowledge (step 13) and performs the communicative function F (step 14). Since the receiver can see and sometimes hear the speaker, some information may be perceived directly (step 15) and integrated with the interpreter's message [Stenzl, 1983: 46-47].

4.1.9.4 MODELS DEVELOPED WITHIN THE LINGUISTIC PARADIGM

The previous paradigms have considered interpreting either in relation to the interpreter's mental process or to a functional communicative process where the relationships among the speaker, the interpreter and the audience have been analyzed. However, the interpreting process has another variable which is of vital importance: the messages or the text produced by the speaker and the interpreter and their relationship. Viezzi [1996] reports that there are two theories on the interpreting process from this perspective: the *théorie du sens* of the "Paris School" and the *Skopostheorie* of German linguistics.

4.1.9.4.1 *THÉORIE DU SENS*

Viezzi [1996] claims that the *théorie du sens* is the most influential interpreting theory ever developed: "[...] some feel that Seleskovitch et al. have said all there is to say about interpreting [...]" [Pöchhacker, 1992: 212]. While for Pöchhacker [1992] the origin of the *théorie du sens* dates back to the pre-theoretical

writings of Wirl (1958), according to Schjoldager [1995] Seleskovitch's theory is based on the ideas of Herbert (1952), who argued that interpreting was not a process of linguistic transcoding, but rather a process of comprehension and reformulation. Seleskovitch (1968), Schjoldager argues, develops Herbert's ideas and suggests that the interpreting process consists of three stages: (1) listening, (2) deverbalization, and (3) reformulation. In the first stage, the interpreter listens to the source language wording and extracts the sense. In the second stage, the source language input is deliberately forgotten, and only the deverbalized sense remains. Finally, in the third stage, the interpreter reformulates the sense of the input message for the target audience. Schjoldager [1995] points out that the *théorie du sens* sees interpreting as a language-independent process and, in spite of its disadvantages, has invalidated the idea that interpreting is merely a linguistic transcoding. In fact, Pöchhacker, too, vocalizes this contribution of the *théorie du sens* to interpreting as follows:

> *Indeed Mme Seleskovitch deserves whole hearted acknowledgment for having put her foot down against the narrow linguistic conceptions of language still prevailing in the early 1970s [Pöchhacker, 1992: 212].*

Furthermore, Schjoldager [1995] argues that the *théorie du sens* has become a valid didactic tool helping students of interpreting rid themselves of their word fixation. However, she believes that the *théorie du sens* is not a theory, but rather a hypothesis which still needs to be empirically verified.

Viezzi [1996] and Pöchhacker [1992] criticize the *théorie du sens*, which postulates that interpreting proper is not the substitution or reproduction of the words, but the reformulation of the sense and, therefore, that the understanding of the input message or source text is of primary importance. Pöchhacker [1992] [cf. Viezzi, 1996] argues against the *théorie du sens* on the ground that it is difficult to define and therefore to analyze or assess the notion of sense, whereas Viezzi [1996] comments that in the *théorie du sens* all problems and difficulties of interpreting are explained in terms of understanding the meaning, while the importance of words is ignored. However, one should not forget that the sense is expressed by means of words, or as stated by Newmark: "Meaning does not exist without words." [Newmark, 1981: 98]. The answer of the advocates of the theory is that words fade whereas sense remains. They also contend that target text production is almost an unconscious process: "take care of the sense, the words will take care of themselves." [Viezzi, 1996: 56]. The counter to this position is that the production of the target text during the SI is a strategy-oriented activity which entails identification of priorities, decision making and fulfillment of the choices.

A further aspect of the theory criticized by scholars is that it implies one

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

interpreting process characteristic for all language combinations. Stenzl objects to this as follows:

> *within their global skill interpreters use slightly different strategies depending on the source and target languages used in the communication process. This suggests that the specific language combination is an important variable ... (Stenzl 1986: 24) [...]*
>
> *In view of these results Willett's and Lederer's claim that specific languages have little effect on ear-voice-span and that problems caused by the frequent clause-final position of the German verb are a myth, cannot be accepted (Stenzl 1983: 27) [Viezzi, 1996: 57].*

Furthermore, Viezzi [1996] discusses a number of variables to show that the relationship between the source and target languages can not be ignored. He argues, for example, that the similarity and the difference between the syntactic structures, the number of the words necessary to convey a concept, the length of the words (therefore time necessary to pronounce them), the tendency to nominalization, and the argumentative structures of the source and target languages are all important influences.

To conclude, Viezzi [1996], like Schjoldager [1995], believes that the *théorie du sens* is a significant contribution toward explaining the interpreting process, but a limited theory because it considers the interpreting process only in terms of the sense and, therefore, the understanding of the source text, ignoring the production of the target text which "has to be reformulated not with sense alone, but in words (Snelling 1992: 5). " [Viezzi, 1996: 58].

4.1.9.4.2 *SKOPOSTHEORIE*

Viezzi [1996] indicates that while the focus of the *théorie du sens* is the incoming message or the source text, in the *Skopostheorie* (the "*skopos* theory") the emphasis is on the target text. The *Skopostheorie*, which was formulated in 1984 by Reiß and Vermer as a general theory of translation and interpreting (*allgemeine Translationstheorie*), is a functionalist theory. The reason why it is analyzed within the linguistic paradigm is that although it is a functionalist theory, it sees the communicative context as a function of the target text production. The *Skopostheorie* suggests that the translation process is determined by its so-called *skopos* i.e., its function or purpose. On the other hand, the *skopos* itself is determined either by the addressees or the initiator of the translation process (seen as a communicative act).

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

Pöchhacker [1992] re-evaluates the *Skopostheorie* particularly in relation to the interpreting process, within the framework of a "General Theory of Translation & Interpreting." He sees the target text production as the underlying variable in the interpreting process which he defines as "the act of target text production in synchrony with the production and/or presentation of a source text" [Pöchhacker, 1992: 215]. He also contends that the communicative situation in which target text production is carried out is of utmost importance to the interpreting process because it is this communicative situation which determines the decisions made by the interpreters during the interpreting process. Within this framework, Pöchhacker [1992] views the whole conference as a comprehensive sort of text or a "hypertext" where the initiator, the client, the speaker, the source-text listener, the interpreter and the target-text listener interact with each other to communicate a particular purpose. Therefore, a theory of interpreting, for Pöchhacker, is mainly a theory dealing with situation analysis of the communication process and inquiring "what the interpreter is doing, how, when and why" [Pöchhacker, 1992: 217].

To conclude, Pöchhacker [1992] recognizes the contribution of the psychological and psycholinguistic studies demonstrating how the incoming message is processed by means of cognitive operations, but he believes that a general theoretical perspective for the interpreting process needs a much wider theoretical framework regarding SI as a "social act involving the production of functional target texts in a specific situation of transcultural interaction" [Pöchhacker, 1992: 217].

Viezzi [1996] comments that the contribution of the *Skopostheorie* is significant because it was first to suggest that the target message functions in a target specific situation and that this communicative situation determines the choices made by the interpreters. On the other hand, he also criticizes the *Skopostheorie* because it focuses on the target text, ignoring the source text and the relations between the source and target texts.

To conclude, ontologically speaking, an interpreting theory suggests two different paradigms: empirical and rational. Both paradigms see theory as a set of tested hypotheses developed either by means of observation of empirical phenomena or subjective, intuitive formulation of the rational phenomena related to the interpreting process. Therefore, the scientificity or validity of a theory is not determined by the objectivity of the reality upon which the hypothesis is based, but depends on whether or not it has been developed and tested by an objective methodology. Such hypotheses try to describe, explain and predict the interpreting process in order to orient training, practice and research. At the moment, however,

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

interpreting theory does not have a predictive force. All the models developed with psychological, neurolinguistic, functional and linguistic paradigms confine themselves to the description of the interpreting process as a mental, communicative or textual process.

4.1.10 INTERPRETING AND CULTURE

IS literature includes evidence for the importance of culture in interpreting. Some of this evidence concerns culture in relation to communication in general. For example, some scholars argue that speech operates at two levels, namely linguistic and cultural: "Individuals involved in speech acts bring with them not only linguistic, formal baggage but cultural baggage as well [...]" [Nicholson, 1992: 92]. When this act, where there is a sender and a receiver of the message to be conveyed, involves translation or interpreting one can assume that the linguistic and cultural patrimony of the sender is different than the linguistic and cultural patrimony of the receiver:

> *She [Kirchhoff] describes translation and interpretation as a communicative process that involves two languages and three partners: the sender (author or speaker) and receiver (reader or listener) of the message (the text, written or spoken) are the primary partners in communication. They belong to different linguistic and socio-cultural backgrounds, but are members of the same communication community [Stenzl, 1983: 39-40].*

IS literature presents interesting examples of the consequences of this diversity of cultural patrimony:

> *At a meeting held recently in Japan, an American was discussing two alternative proposals with his colleagues, all of whom were native speakers of Japanese. The American was well schooled in the Japanese language and was, indeed, often called "fluent" by those around him. At this meeting, proposal A was contrasted to proposal B, and a consensus was reached about future action, and the meeting then dismissed. Upon leaving the room American commented, "I think the group made a wise choice in accepting proposal A." A Japanese colleague, however, noted, "But proposal B was the group's choice." The American continued: "But I heard people say that proposal A was better." The Japanese colleague concluded, "Ah, you listened to the words but not the pauses between the words." [Brislin, 1977: 205].*

> *[...] the Filipino people greatly value a sense of humor and [...] they use humor a great deal in their verbal play (Morales-Goulet, n.d.)[...]*

> *violence is strongly discouraged in the Philippines (Jocaano, 1969)[...] [Whereas the]American system of interpersonal behavior seems to include*

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

violence as a common staple [...] A related sociolinguistic observation is that, among married couples composed of Philipino-English bilinguals, arguments at home are held more often in English than in Philipino (Carino, 1975) [Brislin, 1977: 211].

In addition to the evidence that culture plays a significant role in the communication act, IS literature also demonstrates that culture is an intrinsic characteristic of the interpreting process as well. What follows are some typical quotations:

[...]interpretation is the oral translation of a message across a cultural/linguistic barrier [Arjona, 1977: 35-36].

Interpreting, therefore, is not merely transposing from one language to another. It is, rather, throwing a semantic bridge between two different cultures, two different "thought worlds."

My purpose here is to show that good simultaneous interpreting cannot rely on words alone. A great deal more is involved: knowledge of the speaker's cultural background [...] [Namy, 1977: 25].

[...]interpretation is always [underline in original] a formal, "cultural" activity [...][Snelling, 1983: 4].

[Interpreting is] a cross cultural, cross-linguistic, text-producing activity [...] [Viezzi, 1996: 40].

[...] SI:[...]orally mediated inter-lingual (and therefore inter-cultural communication [...] [Viaggio, 1996: 74].

It is also possible to find arguments analyzing the task of the interpreter, either explicitly or implicitly, as an "inter-cultural communicator," "bicultural," a "culture expert" or a "culture mediator" in IS literature:

The first stage aims at producing an awareness of the translator/interpreter's role as an intercultural communicator [...][Arjona, 1977: 36].

[...]in order to be a really good interpreter it is not enough to be functionally bilingual but it would be necessary to be bicultural! [d'Arcais, 1977: 391].

Because we are not just language experts, we also understand (or should), and are familiar with, the culture and customs of the country or countries whose language we speak [Landon, 1988:18].

As a cultural mediator, he or she [the interpreter] will need to be a specialist in negotiating understanding between cultures [Katan, 1996: 12].

The arguments above are also supported by various culturally determined aspects of interpreting phenomena. Linguistic competence, the interpreter's

MARMARA UNİVERSİTESİ
KÜTÜPHANE VE DOKÜMANTASYON
DAİRE BAŞKANLIĞI

instrument par excellence to perform his/her task, apart from knowledge of language, involves a cultural component as well:

> *It is argued that linguistic competence implies knowledge of the written and spoken language, as well as familiarity with the culture, religion, literature, legal and political structure of the countries, and other subjects related to each language [Kahtan, 1987: 99].*

Diverse interpreting phenomena indicate that the linguistic rendition of both source and target discourses involve culturally determined processes. For example, the cultural background of the speaker provides clues enabling the interpreter to unveil ambiguous parts of the source discourse:

> *The interpreter should be attentive to such clues as the speaker's cultural background and personal views. More than once, it is these clues that will help him decipher confusing statements in broken English [Nanny, 1977: 29].*

Obviously, this implies that interpreters should be familiar with the culture of the source discourse speaker:

> *Per decodificare il messaggio del parlante senza alterarlo, l'interprete [...] deve infatti cercare di estrapolare le sue intenzioni comunicative e chiarire le ambiguità del suo discorso. Per fare questo è necessario che l'interprete abbia delle cognizioni riguardo i retroscena culturali, storici e sociali [underlines added] del paese d'origine dell'oratore [Volpi, 1991: 29-30].*

When necessary, they can also adapt the cultural content of the source discourse to the culture of the target listener in their target discourse:

> *the modulation of the speaker's message to the listener's culture (e.g. what is for, say, Western European culture a joke or a proverb, may represent an insult in, say, Oriental culture; the use of first and second person pronouns implying direct reference in one language may need to be replaced by indirect, third person pronouns in another language culture, etc.);[...][Karmiloff-Smith, 1977: 375].*

An example of such adaptation is the interpreting of polite expressions:

> *Le formule di cortesia, infatti, variano spesso sensibilmente da una lingua all'altra e sfuggono ad una traduzione letterale, in quanto sono frutto delle tradizioni storiche, culturali, sociali, [underlines added] e caratteriali di una comunità linguistica [Volpi, 1991: 29-30].*

IS literature also provides dramatic cases demonstrating that knowing the source (and probably the target) discourse culture is still not always sufficient to render a cultural component of L1 in L2. A case in point: while performing her task, an interpreter says to her audience: "The speaker is here illustrating his point with

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

humorous examples, deeply rooted in the culture of his native land. I would, therefore, beg you to respond with laughter" [Snelling, 1983: 12]. Aside from the cultural component of the interpreter's linguistic competence, phenomena related to teaching provide another example of the involvement of culture in interpreting. Running training programs for candidate interpreters who are knowledgeable in two different cultures, regardless of whether these cultures are similar or not, presents problems, though their degree may be different:

> *Training interpreters to work between two languages with very different social and cultural backdrops, such as Chinese and English, poses problems at levels not encountered in European Programs. The most obvious are: (1) trainee recruitment, related to the status of the profession: it is difficult to find sufficient numbers of candidates highly qualified in both cultures and to attract them to what is still, outside Europe, a small, marginal and poorly paid profession [...][Setton, 1993: 185].*

Others argue that interpreting (and translation) training should include both formal and informal instruction in the cultural component of the target language:

> *As the business environment itself begins to realise that culture, at all levels, is a fundamental issue in the success or failure of cross-cultural ventures, so it should be possible for the humble, university trained, general interpreter or translator to take a more active high profile role in actively promoting understanding across languages and cultures. To do this, potential mediators should combine formal learning about language and culture with a sojourn abroad, and hence, informal modeling of the target culture [Katan, 1996: 15-16].*

However, some people reject the idea that culture can be taught formally: "There is the claim that some cultural knowledge is not 'teachable' and that one must absorb it through the process of one's skin [...]" [Gentile, 1991: 347]; they even reject the idea that culture is a necessary component of interpreting process: "[...] and the counter claim [is] that it is not necessary for an interpreter or translator to belong to a certain cultural group in order to be able to perform adequately." [Gentile, 1991: 347]. In spite of such arguments which reject the teaching or even the need of culture for interpreting, other scholars believe that anthropology is a discipline beneficial to IS, helpful in explaining some aspects of cultural component: "The field of anthropology, in a broad sense, has a role to play in understanding the interpreting and translating process in that it provides a basis for culturally appropriate 'interpretations' of utterances." [Gentile, 1991: 347].

Finally, in addition to linguistic competence of the interpreter and didactics, the evidence for the involvement of culture in interpreting phenomena is provided

by empirical research on human biology. For example, empirical research provides evidence for the effect of culture over bilingualism: "In any case, the findings suggest that the cultural and linguistic background of a person's bilinguality is more specific than one might have expected [...]" [Lambert, 1977: 137]. On the other hand, educational systems, belonging to completely different cultures, play a determining role in the cerebral lateralization which (according relatively recent findings) in the final analysis, needs a balance between the right and left hemispheres:

> *Generally speaking, one may suggest that in our Western educational system greater emphasis is laid on rational and logical processes, while right hemispheric abilities are neglected. On the other hand, the Oriental concept of reality is more of an intuitive and holistic nature (Bogen, 1975; Capra, 1975). The latest discoveries in physics have significantly shown analogies with the Oriental concept of the universe as a continuos exchange of energy, since matter after all is energy. It has emerged that the analytical and logical approach needs to be nourished and stimulated even further by right hemispheric intuition if progress is to be achieved in modern physics (Capra, 1975). In a recent interview, Nobel prize winner Rita Levi Montalcini emphasized the need to develop and educate the two parts of our brain as they are both essential in any creative process [Gran, 1989: 95].*

A further example for the determining role of culture on the cerebral lateralization is provided by Fabbro:

> *In tachistoscoptic tests verbal stimuli usually produce superiority (in terms of accuracy, reaction time, etc.) of the right visual hemisphere. However, with concrete nouns, which have a higher imaginative potential, the Right Visual Field Effect (RVFE) is lower and a Left Visual Field Effect (LVFE) is occasionally recorded. Tachistoscopic studies on Japanese subjects demonstrated that Kana (phonetic) symbols are processed faster by the right hemisphere (LVFE) (Hatta, 1977). These and other studies (see below) have revealed that different hemispheric asymmetry patterns may be obtained in different cultures [...]*
>
> *EEG studies (Rogers et al., 1977) on Hopi children engaged in language activity proved the specialization of the right hemisphere for this task. Scott et al. (1979) examined a group of dextral native American Navajos and a group of dextral Anglo subjects. Thirty pairs of consonant/vowel (CV) syllables (ba, pa, da, ta, ka, ga) were presented dichotically [...], each pair to be reported immediately after listening. The Anglo group evidenced a Right Ear Advantage (REA) as expected, whereas Navajo subjects surprisingly reported more syllables heard with the left ear (Left Ear Advantage, LEA) [Fabbro, 1989: 74].*

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

To conclude, despite some reservations, IS literature provides various arguments and evidence that culture is a determining factor in the interpreting process.

4.1.11 NORMS IN INTERPRETING

Although some scholars believe that a theory of interpreting is a theory of norms: "[...] in talking about a theory of interpreting, it is necessary to concentrate on 'natural situations,' that is situations that are the norm [...]" [Crevatin, 1989: 21], the search for norms is not seen as a methodological framework for research in IS, though some marginal theoretical support for its need is mentioned: "Though it has not been attempted yet, I think it may be possible to apply the concept of norms as a methodological tool to interpreting research." [Schjoldager, 1995: 42]. The theoretical position advocating the importance of norms in interpreting, vocalized as "there can be no doubt that the question of norms in interpreting would be both interesting and worth attention" [Schjoldager, 1995: 42] seems to have gained more ground recently with more scholars calling for a search of norms in interpreting: "Are there norms in SI? Are they culture/language/meeting-specific (are Clyde Snelling's phlegm and my histrionics reflective of such general norms)? Who establishes them? Are they adequate? Can they be changed? Who can change them? How?" [Viaggio, 1996: 80]. In fact, apart from theoretical support, some quantitatively marginal research has been carried out on norms in interpreting as well. Harris' account, for example, is nevertheless illuminating. First, he indicates that norms in interpreting are not static but changeable: "[...] it is hardly surprising that if you asked different people in different places to do so, you would find the norms are not the same everywhere," [Harris, 1990: 115] which implies that they are cultural-specific. To give an example, he reports that while in Western Europe the norm for interpreters is to work from their B into their A language, this is not the case in Canada (except for some particular cases such as those interpreters who work for Parliament). In fact, the European norm for direction of working languages is reversed in the former U.S.S.R., that is Russian interpreters are expected to work from their A into their B language as well. Another example of the cultural-specific nature of interpreting norms can be observed in the interpreting of speeches from Arabic into Western languages not spoken in a country where Islam is a strong cultural component. In this case, the interpreter omits the word God or changes religious expressions which are not compatible with the secular characteristic of the target audience in order to render his/her message intelligible to the listener: "Arabic speakers frequently invoke the name of God in their speech, and the interpreter has,

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

as it were, to laicise the translation of these utterances." [Kahtan, 1987: 101]. On the other hand, Harris proposes other interpreting norms which seem to be of universal character. For example, he indicates that in professional interpreting "the interpreter speaks in the first person as if s/he was the orator," [Harris, 1990: 115] or in professional SI "a speech delivered by a single person be spoken by a succession of several interpreters if it lasts more than 20 to 30 minutes" [Harris, 1990: 116]. A third universal norm presented by Harris is the so-called the "acceptability of the target language production." He argues that since the interpreting product cannot be revised before delivery due to time pressures "it is inevitable that mistakes and infelicities creep in which would not be considered tolerable in written translation" [Harris, 1990: 117]. Finally, Harris reports his last and so-called "true interpreter" norm which, according to him, is more fundamental and universal than the others. On the basis of this norm he describes an interpreter as an "honest spokesperson," who behaves as follows:

> *This norm requires that people who speak on behalf of others, interpreters among them, re-express the original speakers' ideas and the manner of expressing them as accurately as possible and without significant omissions, and not mix them up with their own ideas and expressions [Harris, 1990: 117].*

However, this last norm formulated by Harris seems to reflect a prescriptive ethical judgment rather than a description of a regular behavior operating in compliance with a particular constraint. Interpreters governed by a power structure because of their social relations are in a position of power and do not always behave as an "honest spokesperson" should, sometimes identifying themselves with one or the other of their clients: "[...] the interpreter could either act as a nonpartisan [...] (hence serving as a 'mediator' seeking justice), as a detached party who 'let the chips fall where they may,' or finally he could take a partisan role which served to enhance his own position with respect to the client or clients who employed him." [Anderson, 1977: 220]. In fact, the results of a survey reported by Anderson [1977] provide evidence that interpreters may take sides, which can influence the quality of their performance: "[...] they [the non-AIIC interpreters] were not only subject to identification with one or another client, but also [...] this taking of sides at least occasionally influences the quality of interpretation [...]" [Anderson, 1977: 221].

The lack of interest for the search of norms in interpreting might be due to an ontological reason: the existence of cognitive constraints in interpreting due to time pressure:

> *[...] due to the epistemological status of the research field, there are probably*

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

other and more salient features of interpreting - for instance cognitive constraints due to time pressure - that deserve an interpreting scholar's attention before deciding to investigate underlying norms [Schjoldager, 1995: 41].

In fact, various interpreting scholars draw attention to the existence of constraints in interpreting:

In coping with this [discourse processing], the interpreter is faced with certain task-specific constraints and proceeds strategically to overcome them [Kalina, 1992:252].

If the communication process is to succeed, the primary communication partners in a conference must therefore consider the constraints of the interpretation process [...] [Stenzl, 1983: 40].

IS literature provides vast evidence (often implicit and sometimes explicit) of various constraints governing the interpreting process such as (1) age of L2 acquisition [Gran & Fabbro 1988; Fabbro, Gran, Basso, Bava 1990; Fabbro, Gran B. & L. 1991], (2) cerebral organization [Gran & Fabbro 1988; Darò 1989; Fabbro, Gran, Basso, Bava 1990; Darò 1990; Fabbro, Gran B. & L 1991], (3) clarity of source input [Gerver 1975; Parsons 1977; Stenzl 1983; Snelling 1989], (4) clients [Volpi 1991], (5) direction of working languages [Gran & Fabbro 1988; Darò 1990; Gran 1997], (6) earphones [Anderson 1977; Gran 1989; Fabbro, Gran 1994], (7) ear-voice-span/lag time [Stenzl 1983; Nicholson 1992], (8) errors [Parsons 1977; Stenzl 1983], (9) figures [Alessandrini 1990], (10) goals [Kalina 1992], (11) individual factors [Gerver 1975; Stenzl 1983; Gran B. & L. 1991; Isham 1994;], (12) input/output language syntax [Le Ny 1977; Wills 1977], (13) knowledge of subject matter [Karmiloff-Smith 1977; Parsons 1977; Volpi 1991; Isham 1994; Gran 1997], (14) memory [Stenzl 1983; Kalina 1992], (15) microphones [Parsons 1977; Stenzl 1983], (16) modes of delivery [Parsons 1977; Stenzl 1983; Gran 1997], (17) no freedom of intention on the part of interpreter [Kalina 1992], (18) noise [Gerver 1971, 1975; d'Arcais 1977; Parsons 1977; Stenzl 1983], (19) pauses [Stenzl 1983], (20) physical environment [Anderson 1977; Parsons 1977; Stenzl 1983], (21) prediction [Moser 1977; Stenzl 1983], (22) principles of note-taking [Gentile 1991; Volpi 1991; Özben 1993], (23) rates of speech input [Gerver 1971, 1975; d'Arcais 1977; Karmiloff-Smith 1977; Le Ny 1977; Parsons 1977; Stenzl 1983; Darò 1990; Isham 1994; Gran 1997], (24) redundancy [Volpi 1991], (25) semantic density of the input [Isham 1994; Gran 1997], (26) sex [Darò 1990; Fabbro, Gran B. & L 1991; Gran 1997], (27) similarities and differences between L1 and L2 [Le Ny 1977; Parsons 1977; Stenzl 1983; Fabbro, Gran B. & L. 1991; Isham 1994], (28) social relations [Anderson 1977], (29) speaker's pronunciation/accent [Gerver 1971;

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

Karmiloff-Smith 1977; Parsons 1977; Gran 1997]. (30) stress [d'Arcais 1977; Parsons 1977; Gran 1989, 1997; Gentile 1991; Viaggio 1996]. (31) styles of delivery [Gerver 1975; Karmiloff-Smith 1977]. (32) target audiences [Gerver 1971; Andeson 1977; Parsons 1977; Snelling 1989; Volpi 1991]. (33) terminology/vocabulary [Karmiloff-Smith 1977; Parsons 1977; Gran 1997]. (34) time pressure [Schjoldager 1995]. (35) to have texts before interpreting [Gerver 1975; Parsons 1977; Stenzl 1983]. (36) training [Ilic 1990]. (37) types of interpreting [Anderson 1977; Lambert 1988; Volpi 1991]. (38) types of L2 learning [Darò 1989; Fabbro, Gran, Basso, Bava 1990; Gran 1997]. (39) types of speech [Stezl 1983; Gran & Fabbro 1988; Fabbro, Gran, Basso, Bava 1990]. (40) visual clues [Gerver 1975; Anderson 1977; Ingram 1977; Namy 1977; Stenzl 1983; Volpi 1991]. (41) vocal characteristics [Parsons 1977; Stenzl 1983; Gentile 1991; Volpi 1991]. The list as such is purely illustrative.

Some of these constraints provide interesting clues for other possible interpreting norms apart from those mentioned explicitly in the IS literature. These norms can be grouped under three categories: those which are apparently of ontological importance since they refer to the choices made by the interpreters in regard to interpreting policies; those which deal with choices prior to the actual interpreting process; and those which govern the actual process itself. As for the first category Fabbro, Gran, Basso and Bava [1990], Fabbro, Gran B. & L. [1991], and Fabbro and Gran [1994] indicate that conference typology is a constraint which compels interpreters to make a choice as to whether to employ a meaning-based or a word-for-word interpreting strategy. They resort to the latter strategy when the conference is on a highly specialized or technical topic such as mathematics or theoretical physics whereas the former strategy is preferred when the conference is, for instance, on politics.

In addition to conference typology, another typology which operates as a constraint upon interpreting is the target audience. Snelling [1989] reports three different types of target audience which force the interpreter to make a decision as to the choice of the language to be employed. He argues that the first type of target audience is characterized by people who share the content expertise with the speaker, but not with the interpreter. An interpreter working for such an audience is expected to choose "a language of cold scientific precision" so that the audience, having a profound understanding of the subject matter, will be able to make up for the interpreter's shortcomings due to his/her lack of expertise in the subject matter. The second type of target audience, on the other hand, shares a cultural patrimony with the interpreter, but not with the speaker. In this case, the interpreter can employ

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

a "literary language," since the interpreter and his/her audience share the same cultural patrimony. Finally, the third group is a hybrid (made up, for instance, of Britons, Americans, Australians, Japanese-speaking English and the like) where neither the speaker nor the interpreter share the same cultural patrimony as the audience. Under these circumstances, the interpreter is expected to be aware of the lowest common denominator of the target beneficiaries' linguistic comprehension and choose a "simple form of language" so that it is readily comprehensible to the target audience.

IS literature, apart from the constraints mentioned above (in the general policy choices of interpreting strategies and language registers to be employed), points out other social, psychological and cognitive constraints that appear to be determining factors on interpreters' decisions prior to the actual interpreting process. Anderson [1977] argues that the physical environment (e.g. a glass booth or a negotiating table) in which the interpreters work determines their social relations (e.g. relatively isolated or face to face) during the interpreting process. It seems that it is the compatibility of these social relations with the character traits and psychology of the interpreters that influences their decisions to undertake either the simultaneous or the consecutive mode of interpreting. SI, for example, may not be interesting for an outgoing person: "She was particularly frustrated by the anonymity of the simultaneous arrangements in which she was forced by economic exigencies to work most of the time." [Anderson, 1977: 226]. On the other hand, for an introspective individual, SI could be the right choice: "Another reported that she preferred the anonymous surroundings of the sound-proof booth. She was more comfortable to take off her shoes and relax in the relative privacy of the booth than in situations in which she was 'on display'." [Anderson, 1977: 226].

Another choice of the interpreters relates to their decisions on content: "He may also limit his interpretation performances to relatively every-day situations, or he may engage in interpretation of technical and/or specialized materials." [Anderson, 1977: 226]. The choice of the subject matter requires a further decision on the part of the interpreter: the acquisition of the "prior general knowledge" outside the specific discourse content. Under these circumstances, Karmiloff-Smith [1977] argues that the interpreter is expected to document him/herself with the basic knowledge.

A final constraint which seems to determine a norm in the interpreting process is the visual clues: the manipulation of the hands, face and upper body. Namy underlines the importance of visual clues as follows: "He must also observe the speaker closely. Facial expressions, nods, gestures, a glance across the room, are

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

just as much part of the message as words themselves." [Namy, 1977: 31]. As a result it seems that interpreters consciously desire to see the speaker while they are accomplishing their task. In fact, Namy reports that interpreters always insist on having a direct and unobstructed view of the room.

Up to now, two major types of pre-task choices made by the interpreters have been discussed: those choices which are related to the general policies in interpreting (such as the use of meaning-based or word-for-word interpreting strategies and language registers to be employed), and those choices which are related to more practical policies (such as the use of the specific interpreting mode, the subject matter to be interpreted and the utilization of the physical environment). Finally, other constraints discussed in the IS literature would provide evidence of a third type of choice: those choices made by the interpreters during the actual interpreting process.

Gerver [1971] indicates that during the interpreting process itself noise is a constraint, for under noisy listening conditions interpreters decrease their output rate, increase pause times and make more mistakes. However, Anderson [1977] comments that a certain reasonable increase in the noise level seems to have a positive consequence on the performance of the interpreter as it increases the quality of interpretation in terms of fidelty. This increase in interpreting quality under noisy conditions seems to be due to a conscious choice made by the interpreters during the actual interpreting process. The presence of noise signals to the interpreter the need for increasing attentiveness to listening. If the amount of noise to be handled by the interpreter is manageable, the increase of attentiveness on the part of interpreter actually increases interpreting quality.

Another constraint, discussed by Anderson [1977] and Chernov [1992], which seems to force the interpreter consciously to increase his/her attentiveness during the interpreting process is relay interpreting. Interpreting through relay, on the one hand, generates noise because of the presence of various relays and, on the other hand, involves errors made at the previous stages which hinder the interpreter at the following stage. Therefore, it is argued that [Chernov, 1992] relay interpreting is a source of additional mistakes in SI. Anderson argues that these flaws inherent in interpreting through relay require the interpreter to increase his/her attentiveness consciously during the performance of his/her task: "It appears, however, that such a situation [relay interpreting] may induce the interpreter to concentrate more upon the meanings to be transmitted than would normally be the case." [Anderson, 1977: 222]. Anderson also comments that the presence of a single relay can even be useful in encouraging interpreters to perform their task better than the absence of that relay,

as the presence of one relay: "may serve to provide near optimal tension levels under which the interpreters are better able to perform their tasks" [Anderson, 1977: 223].

Another choice made by the interpreters during the rendition of the speaker's message to the target audience involves an adequate ear-voice-span or time lag. Since the interpreter has to listen and speak at the same time under such constraints as the input rate, the type of text to be interpreted and/or the listening conditions, s/he must analyze a certain amount of material from the speaker's speech before s/he can start interpreting. Gerver [1975] reports that because of the above-mentioned constraints interpreters consciously delay the input material from 2 to 10 seconds or from 2 to 8 words in compliance with the capacity of the short-term memory.

During the time lag interpreters analyze source-language input to grasp its meaning, especially at the beginning of a statement. However, since SI demands the continuation of the interpreting process as long as the speaker continues the delivery of his/her speech, interpreters cannot pause to process the incoming material. Such pauses, particularly the ones which are relatively long, would give the audience the impression that information carried in the source input is being lost. Stenzl [1983], referring to Lederer, reports that during the time lag interpreters regularly resort to some phrases such as "*bien, alors, il semblerait*" in order to fill the pauses they employ while analyzing part of the incoming speech and waiting for more input material before the delivery of the target output.

As is also understood from the paragraph above, Nicholson [1992] argues that during the rendition of SI, interpreters are involved in a constant process of analysis of the source language input to disambiguate it continuously, resorting to their short term memory, previous cognitive experiences and recollections. In fact, Fabbro, B. & L. Gran [1991] report another regular behavior used by interpreters to over come the semantic constraint discussed by Nicholson: interpreters constantly tend to monitor the input in the source language and their own output in the target language so that they can make assumptions on the meaning of the incoming words and decide when to produce their own output in the target language.

Gran [1989], and Fabbro and Gran [1994] report that the cerebral organization is a constraint that requires interpreters to cover one ear with the headphone and leave the other free during SI. This is explained by the fact that - although in monolingual right-handers the left hemisphere (right ear) is dominant in the speech production - as a result of long practice SI interpreters improve the competence of their right hemisphere (left ear) as well, so that they normally listen to the input material with their left ear and control their own output in the target

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

language with their right ear.

Gran and Fabbro [1988], Fabbro, Gran, Basso and Bava [1990], Fabbro, B. & L. Gran [1991], Fabbro and Gran [1994] suggest that discourse typology and/or parts of speech in the source input play a determining role in the choice of shift from meaning-based to the word-for-word interpreting strategy and vice versa during the actual interpreting process. For example, though a conference might be on a political subject, interpreters can make use of word-for-word strategy when parts of the speaker's discourse include lists of names, numbers, products, countries or highly technical terms; on the other hand, in a conference on nuclear physics, for instance, interpreters may use the meaning-based strategy for a while if the speaker is conveying a message determined by rhetorical aspects, since the speaker is perhaps making a joke referring to his/her own culture.

Volpi [1991] reports that the morphosyntactic redundancy (redundancy related to the surface structure of the input discourse) is another constraint that forces interpreters to change the strategies mentioned above. She argues that in SI the interpreters prefers to adopt word-for-word strategy to convey morphosyntactic redundancy whereas they make use of meaning-based strategy in CI:

> *Nelle prime [interpretazioni consecutive] l'atteggiamento degli interpreti varia secondo la natura della ridondanza semantica, ma appare sempre evidente la rielaborazione del discorso, che comprende omissioni, aggiunte, riformulazioni, ma che, nella maggior parte dei casi, non provoca alterazioni del messaggio.*
>
> *Nelle simultanee, invece, come per la ridondanza morfosintattica, prevale la tendenza a mantenere pressoché immutata la struttura superficiale del discorso originale, trasferendola nella lingua d'arrivo. A volte vengono ommessi brevi segmenti del discorso, ma, in generale la ridondanza resta pressoché invariata [Volpi, 1991: 254].*

One of the outstanding characteristics of SI is the interpreter's ability to speak quickly. Darò [1990] indicates that there are various constraints, such as the rate of the input language, the direction of translation, the strategies used by the interpreter (word-for-word / meaning-based), the language proficiency of the interpreter, and the type of text to be translated (technical/rhetorical), which affect the speaking speed of the interpreter. Among these constraints the first one, the incoming speed, changes the interpreter's speed during the performance of his/her SI task. Darò reports that if the speaker's speed increases, it forces the interpreter to increase his/her own input so that s/he loses as little information from the input language as possible. Darò also comments that the need to speak faster than ordinary

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

people causes lasting changes in the cerebral organization of simultaneous interpreters; they acquire a more symmetric cerebral representation of linguistic functions than monolinguals.

During SI, interpreters cannot only increase their speed, but also decrease it to delay the output. The point about output delay has been mentioned above when time lag was discussed; interpreters must analyze a certain amount of material from the speaker's speech before they can start interpreting. In addition to this kind of output, delay at the initial stage of a source language utterance, it appears that output delay is also a conscious strategy employed by interpreters throughout the interpreting process due to semantic peculiarities in the input language. Wills [1977] and Stenzl [1983], referring to the syntactic structure of the German language where the word order is SOV, point out that the position of the verb in a sentence influences the way the interpreter handles the interpreting task. Wills argues that under such circumstances, interpreters are forced to delay their output production to wait long enough to grasp the verb, which carries the greatest quantity of semantic information in a sentence:

> *The implications for German-English SI are of primary importance. Since the semantically relevant element of the verbal phrase is in the final position in the sentence, the interpreter is forced to postpone the interpreting act, until the decoding operation of the whole sentence is complete [Wills, 1977: 347].*

Apart from the above-presented various choices made by interpreters during the process of SI, IS literature reveals other choices specific to the consecutive mode of the interpreting process. These seem to depend on the client, the psychology and social relations of the interpreter, and the time pressure.

Volpi [1991] argues that, during CI, if the client asks the interpreter to perform his/her task in compliance with certain criteria, the interpreter acts accordingly. For example, if the interpreter's client requires a concise rendition of the source input, the interpreter will omit whatever is redundant in the incoming message and will render its gist:

> *Sempre nel caso di un'interpretazione consecutiva [...] Il comportamento dell'interprete [...] sarà anche dettato anche del tipo di prestazione che gli viene richiesta. E' ovvio, infatti, che se l'ipotetico cliente chiede solo un resoconto riassuntivo di quanto è stato detto, l'interprete non esiterà ad omettere [underline added] tutto ciò che non sia strettamente inerente al messaggio essenziale dell'oratore [Volpi, 1991: 9-10].*

In fact, an experience the author had while working as a consecutive interpreter confirms Volpi's argument. He remembers his client's asking him not to

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

take notes while the input message was being delivered and to render only its main idea. Consequently, he acted in accordance with his client's request.

Anderson [1977], on the other hand, reports that during CI, interpreters may decide to answer the questions during an interview without interpreting, for they may develop negative feelings against one of their interlocutors:

> *She reported, quite candidly, that she became irritated at the repetitious asking of questions which she thought silly. Finally, she admitted, that she began interjecting her own replies without bothering to interpret the question or wait for a reply. For example if the question was 'What do you think of American girls?' she would tell the Russian youth 'They are asking about girls again, I'll tell them you think they are pretty' and then proceed to answer the question herself [Anderson, 1977: 222].*

Finally, Özben [1993], investigating the note-taking process during CI from Italian into Turkish, refers to Rozan (1957) and Gran (1982), and reports that during note-taking in CI, regardless of the language combination, the interpreters uses specific note-taking strategies completely different from those of the conventional note-taking systems used, for example, during a university lecture. To illustrate some strategies based on the principles of "verticalism" and "stepped note-taking," the interpreters deliberately refuse to take their notes horizontally as in the traditional system but put them down vertically. They also prefer to write the syntactic elements (such as the subject, object and verb) of the sentence diagonally, separating each sentence by a line to indicate the end rather than the period used in the conventional punctuation system. The interpreters make the above-mentioned decisions during CI in line with the principles of a particular note-taking system in order to overcome a constraint under which they work: time pressure. In other words, they not only take their notes quickly but can also read them immediately.

To conclude, IS literature either explicitly or implicitly reveals that interpreters, as a result of various constraints, make different choices. Some of them are related to general policies, others may be related either to decisions prior to the actual interpreting process or to the actual process itself. Furthermore, it also indicates that the constraints which force interpreters to make specific choices are determined by social, cultural, linguistic, psychological, cognitive, biological and temporal factors.

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

4.2 DISCUSSION

4.2.1 IS THE TARGET-ORIENTED APPROACH A USEFUL THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR INTERPRETING STUDIES?

Toury defines TS as an empirical science because its object of study is real life or, say, translated texts. The findings of this study indicate that IS is also regarded as an empirical science by various scholars (see pp. 45-50). For example, Gile, the most notable figure of the "New Paris School" and the psychological paradigm, and Gran, the leading representative of the "Trieste School" and the neurolinguistic paradigm, are arch-advocators of empiricism in IS. While Toury - who perceives empiricism as the systematic observation of reality, developing hypotheses about this reality, testing them and formulating generalizations - believes that hypothesis-testing is a sine-qua-non of an empirical science, Gile [1991] argues that systematic observation of reality itself can be considered sufficient. Gran [1988], on the other hand, takes a stance similar to Toury's, claiming that hypothesis-testing is an indispensable characteristic of an empirical science. In fact, Pöchhacker [1992, 1993], a scholar influential in functional and linguistic paradigms, maintains that situation-analysis of the communication process and observational studies are welcome in IS, and he also asks for empirical verification of the conceptual models as well. Finally, the representatives of the "Paris School" and the linguistic paradigm (such as Danica Seleskovitch and her co-workers) seem to oppose IS as an empirical science; they are more involved in the didactic issues within the *théorie du sens* and are not interested in the observation of interpreting phenomena and testing the relevant hypotheses related to them.

An important distinction between the degree of empiricism put forward by Toury and that supported by the "Natural Sciences" group is that in Toury's empiricism, observation constitutes the gist of the methodology both for generating and testing hypotheses. In contrast, most scholars of the "Natural Sciences" consider observation only as a preliminary or exploratory stage of research valid only for generating hypotheses and to be followed by experimental testing. This distinction seems to be due to a difference in perception of reality. For the scholars of the "Natural Sciences," reality is "out there" and independent of human consciousness, that is to say, objective and perceived through the senses, while Toury apparently believes that reality is not "out there," but in the minds of people, that is, reality is historically, socially and culturally created, constructed in subjective terms. In other

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

words, the leading scholars of the "Natural Sciences" group such as Gile, Gran and Pöchhacker perceive reality in terms of a "positivist paradigm," though in differing degrees, in contrast to Toury, who seems to see it from the perspective of an "interpretative paradigm." One can say that Toury's empiricism is a "rational" or "qualitative empiricism" whereas Gran's empiricism in IS is a strict or pure empiricism," and Gile's and Pöchhacker's empiricism is a more moderate or "quantitative empiricism." An important exception here is Dodds [1989], a renowned member of the "Natural Sciences" community, who, due to his "agnostic" and interpretative perception of reality in the construction of interpreting theory, discusses its nature as implicitly suggesting a rational or qualitative empiricism.

To sum up, IS literature shows that empiricism either quantitatively or qualitatively is the philosophical paradigm for IS scholars who want to deal with research in interpreting. Therefore, one can say that Toury's conception of TS as an empirical science is a theoretical position also supported by the scholars of the "Natural Sciences" group, whereas it seems that the "Liberal Arts" group's position is not compatible with such an empirical concept of science. Thus, Toury's argument for TS as an empirical science described in terms of systematic observation, hypothesis-developing, testing, and formulating generalizations on a subjective and constructed reality is fully supported within the qualitative paradigm, and partially supported within the quantitative paradigm of IS as well.

Toury distinguishes three fields in TS: the descriptive, the theoretical and the applied. Although none of the interpreting theories or hypotheses developed within the framework of the psychological, neurolinguistic, functional and linguistic paradigms of the "Liberal Arts" and "Natural Sciences" groups consider such areas distinctive components of their theories (since theirs are focused either on mental or communicative or text-production processes), the findings of this study (see pp. 45-50) clearly indicate that such a division within IS is acceptable without reservation to various well-known scholars of the discipline such as Wills [1977], Stenzl [1983], Salevsky [1993] and Viaggio [1996].

Toury suggests that of the three branches, the descriptive one is of primary importance, because according to him, for a complete and autonomous empirical science, DS is a prerequisite. The findings of the study show that this assumption is also supported by various scholars. To illustrate, Stenzl [1983, 1989], Dodds [1989], Gran [1989], Gile [1990], Pöchhacker [1993], Schjoldager [1995], and Fabbro and Gran [1997] all point out the importance of DS in IS, too (see pp. 71-74). Therefore, today there is no doubt among the members of the "Natural Science" group that interpreting research can be carried out in terms of descriptive study, while the

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

members of the "Liberal Arts" group seem to be uninterested in DS since they are apparently less interested in research. However, there is a substantial difference between the object of the DS suggested by Toury and those proposed by the IS scholars of the "Natural Science" group due to a difference in reality perception. While Toury postulates a description of translation norms, analyzing translated texts by means of product-oriented studies, the above-mentioned IS scholars argue primarily for process-oriented descriptions of either the mental activities of the interpreter in practice or of the communicative situation in which the interpreting process takes place.

The fact that Toury focuses on product-oriented studies does not indicate that he is not interested in the translation process. On the contrary, the reason he calls for the description of the translation norms is to understand the translation process. In other words, according to Toury, the ultimate purpose of translation theory is to discover the translation process through product-oriented studies. He contends that such a discovery, in terms of translation norms, will serve to orient translation training and practice. On the basis of this study, Toury's ultimate goal in translation theory - the discovery of the translation process - and its benefits for the applied branch of the discipline, such as the orientation of training and practice, are acceptable for IS as well (see pp. 87-88). Various IS scholars from the Experimental-Psychology Period through the "Renaissance," and most particularly the members of the "Natural Science" community of this latter period, contend that the purpose of a theory of interpreting is to understand and explain the interpreting process so that it can be better taught and, as a process-based descriptive theory, may help to orient professional interpreters as well by providing them with useful advice. At this point it should be noted that the benefits of the interpreting theory in the applied branch seems particularly acceptable to the "Liberal Arts" group as well, since their academic activity is almost exclusively focused on interpreting training and practice.

Toury also argues that translation theory consists of a set of interconnected hypotheses which describe, explain and predict phenomena related to the translation process which, he hopes, will lead to laws of translation. This study suggests that this aspect of translation theory as proposed by Toury is also either fully or partially compatible with IS as well, depending on the individual attitudes of the IS scholars. Two scholars of the "Natural Science" group, namely Gran [unpublished article] and Dodds [1989], who both discuss ontological and epistemological issues in theory construction, sometimes share the same ideas but at other times diverge in opinion although, in the final analysis, their positions are complementary to one another,

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

representing different doctrinal positions within the same continuum of theory construction, namely the positivist and rationalist philosophies. At the initial stage both of them fully support Toury, agreeing that interpreting theory consists of a set of interconnected and corroborated hypotheses which describe, explain and eventually predict phenomena related to the interpreting process. However, it seems that, although they never discuss it explicitly, their implicitly different approaches to the formulation of laws of interpreting are manifest in their concepts of prediction. It seems that Gran's position, in comparison to Dodds', is more congenial to that of Toury since her concept of prediction reflects the Galilean or positivist paradigm in science, which suggests that reality (or phenomena to be studied by a scientific discipline) is governed by strict and unchangeable laws. On the other hand, Dodds, in a rationalist paradigm, presupposes a concept of prediction which cannot reflect reality in terms of absolute certainty, but on a scale of probability factors since, for him, reality presents an agnostic nature to one in search of its knowledge in absolute terms by means of senses, possessing a subjective, therefore, an interpretative nature. It is evident that while in Gran's position there is room for laws of interpreting, Dodds implies that even if there were such laws, it would be impossible to formulate them.

Toury believes that various hypotheses in translation theory are first formulated and then corroborated or refuted, therefore tested, and finally refined by means of descriptive research. In this way, translation research contributes to the applied branch of TS through its theoretical branch, for translation training and practice are oriented by translation norms generated in the theoretical branch as a result of descriptive research that reflects genuine translational phenomena rather than the personal speculation of the theoretician. In the light of this study, the above-stated hypothesis-generating and testing function of translation research and its benefits for the applied branch, as proposed by Toury in the TOA are fully supported by various IS scholars of the Experimental Psychology Period [d'Arcais 1977; Le Ny 1977] as well as the members of the "Natural Science" group [Lambert 1988; Darò 1989; Gran & Fabbro 1994; Gran & Viezzi 1995] (see pp. 53-57). However, there is a significant difference in the research methods used to test hypotheses in the TOA and those used in interpreting research. In other words, the former uses exclusively DS to test hypotheses, whereas the latter primarily makes use of experimental studies.

It has already been mentioned above that, for Toury, translation research generating and testing hypotheses to supply material for the theoretical branch, uses product-oriented studies although the ultimate purpose of translation theory (and

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

therefore of translation research) is to explore the translation process. The reason why Toury does not require direct inquiry into the translation process is that to him the translation process or, let us say, the human brain, is a "black box" which cannot be studied directly. Such an inquiry, at best, can provide indirect information about the translation process on the basis of which, at most, tentative reconstruction of its internal structure can be made. However, this assumption of Toury is not supported by IS, in which numerous empirical studies have been carried out to explore the interpreting process, analyzing the human brain directly through psychological and neurolinguistic paradigms (see pp. 58-64). Fabbro and Gran [1994], the leading scholars of the neurolinguistic paradigm, are apparently convinced that the interpreter's mind is not a "black-box," since they believe that process-oriented empirical research has contributed significantly to exploring the interpreting process.

Although interpreting research is mainly process-oriented, it is not, however, the only research method employed to investigate interpreting phenomena. This study also shows that research in IS deals with both non-product (questionnaires and interviews) and product-oriented studies (conference recordings and transcriptions) (see pp. 64-68), therefore advocating Toury's assumption that research work can be carried out by means of product-oriented studies in IS as well.

In IS the non-product oriented studies seem to operate mostly within (1) the functional paradigm, inquiring, for instance, into the quality of interpreting, interpreters' working conditions and their social relations during the interpreting process, and (2) the psychological paradigm, investigating such issues as personality and stress, rather than in the neurolinguistic or linguistic paradigms that investigate respectively the human brain and textual production. The product-oriented studies, on the other hand, operate within the psychological, linguistic, neurolinguistic and functional paradigms, considering such issues as the effect of noise on the performance of conference interpreters, units of meaning, brain processes and quality of interpreting.

These findings, as mentioned before, clearly indicate that product-oriented studies are also employed in IS, supporting Toury's position in this regard (though they are not designed to explore interpreting norms either synchronically or diachronically).

From the study it emerges that, although interpreting research is not aimed at the discovery of the interpreting norms synchronically or diachronically, it may include both a synchronic and diachronic design for purposes other than the discovery of the interpreting norms (see pp. 29-34). IS literature illustrates various

İNÖNÜ ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

studies [Skinner 1990; Pöchhacker 1995 a; Schjoldager 1995] aimed at discovering interpreting phenomena either in a synchronic (contemporary) or a diachronic (a historical) perspective. Some IS scholars [Bowen M., 1993] believe that diachronic perspective in IS is needed for didactic purposes, whereas others [Volpi 1991] point out its importance in the interpreting process. Finally, Snelling [1990] and Gentile [1991] discuss the issue from a more theoretical point of view. Furthermore, the findings of the study indicate that the diachronic nature of the interpreting research is indispensable for empirical process-oriented studies within the psychological and neurolinguistic paradigms as well, since they and all theories dependent upon them are based on findings from previous research work. Therefore, today's (synchronic) process-oriented empirical research and the theories relevant to it are the product of a continuous process of modification and growth of the (diachronic) phenomena discovered in the past. Last but not least, the findings also show that a diachronic approach is a must for a scientific discipline, supporting, therefore, Toury's insistence upon, not only synchronic studies, but also diachronic studies within IS as well as TS.

Toury does not regard translation research in terms of individual texts either synchronically or diachronically, but rather sees it as a systemic investigation within a semiotic web in compliance with the PT formulated by Itamar Even-Zohar. The findings of this study do not provide any explicit evidence either to support or to refute this systemic approach of TS within the framework of IS. However, they do imply that systemic approach is an intrinsic characteristic of the various theoretical paradigms employed by the leading scholars of IS. The concepts and terminology of the PT are, therefore, applicable to the various theoretical paradigms of IS. For example, Gran apparently sees interpreting phenomena operating within a "neurolinguistic monosystem" where a set of interrelated (exclusively) neurofunctional components and sub-components interact with each other. The neurolinguistic system physically consists of two hemispheres and theoretically has a center or a "General Neurofunctional Language System" and a periphery consisting of a set of "Language Independent Sub-systems" and a "Language Specific Sub-system." It also implies a neurologically homogeneous structure, suggesting a deterministic character. However, although the system is apparently a static monosystem, it actually involves an inner "pseudo-dynamism" which seems to be limited to intrarelations among the neurofunctional sub-components of the periphery without changing the status of the center and periphery within the system, and therefore without changing the way the system functions. In other words, "spontaneous translation" (see p. 93) suggests that the inner structure of the monosystem discussed by Gran has a "sort" of dynamism of its own as there is a

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

permanent deterministic struggle among the sub-components of its periphery for the utterance of the words or sentences in one language on the part of a multilingual person, which eventually, leads the system to the selection of the desired language for those particular words or sentences. However, the findings of the study, interestingly, show that it also involves interrelations with what lies outside the system (its environment) as well, so that culture (see pp. 100-105) and particularly long practice (see p. 62) in interpreting seem to modify the way the neurolinguistic system functions. Through training, the system acquires a more symmetrical cerebral representation in interpreters than that of monolinguals. This implies that the proper rendition of the interpreting task requires a state of stability in the cerebral system with the left and the right hemispheres functioning simultaneously.

On the other hand, Gile suggests a "cognitive monosystem" consisting of various components related to the interpreter's capacity for shared attention. These interact with each other (see p. 92). The fact that the each so-called "effort" or component of the system has exclusively a cognitive nature and struggles with other efforts or components of the system implies that it is a monosystem with a dynamic inner structure in the sense of the term "dynamic" used in the PT. Such a structure, contrary to what Gran's system implies, is of a stochastic nature since one of the components or efforts can control (become the center of) the system, defeating others which remain on the periphery until one of them can become strong enough to overcome the other components or efforts in the periphery as well as the one in the center. One can say that while Gran's neurolinguistic system, in the final analysis, is of a static nature because the struggle among its neurofunctional sub-components in the periphery is a limited and deterministic one (and thus the center of the system apparently never changes), Gile's system is dynamic only because its center changes as a result of a stochastic struggle among its components in the periphery and center. On the other hand, Gran's system changes, not because there is a struggle among its components, but as the result of an interaction between the system (as if it were a "petrified" system by nature) and its environment. Finally, Gile's system suggests a stage of stability, too, which occurs when all the "efforts" occupying the periphery of the system process in agreement with the requirements dictated by the effort which constitutes its center for a particular instant during the interpreting process.

Pöchhacker, for his part, proposes a "functionalist linguistic monosystem" determined by the communicative situation, containing such elements as the initiator, the client, the speaker, the source-text listener, the interpreter and the target-text listener all of whom interact with each other in the production of a target-

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

text. This system also seems to suggest a struggle of these elements to occupy its center. Once one of the elements controls the center, then, it dictates its rules to the other elements of the system. Pöchhacker's system is apparently less deterministic than Gran's neurolinguistic system, but it is on the other hand less stochastic than Gile's cognitive system because it apparently suggests that among its elements, which determine the communicative situation, only the initiator and the target-text listener are likely to occupy the center, for the "*skopos*" of the interpreting process is determined by one of them. This system is less deterministic than Gran's neurolinguistic system, as it suggests a real struggle between at least two elements: the initiator and the target-text listener. Moreover, there is a theoretical possibility for the less likely elements of the system such as the speaker or the interpreter to move to the center, since it includes them in the situation analysis as well. This system, like those of Gran and Gile, reaches a state of stability once the target-text is produced to bring about the communication.

Another linguistic monosystem was developed by Seleskovitch, who (in contrast to Pöchhacker, who emphasizes the communicative situation at a macro conference level) focuses on a microtextual level of the communication act. The major elements of Seleskovitch's monosystem are the comprehension of the source-text, and the deverbalization and production of the target-text. This monosystem is static because its center is always occupied by a deverbalization, with the other elements in the periphery. Therefore, it is a monosystem of deterministic and petrified character.

Finally, Dodds imposes upon the ontological nature of IS an epistemological web of polysystems that include the neurolinguistic, psychological and linguistic polysystems for which Gran, Gile, Pöchhacker and Seleskovitch proposed models to explain some of their aspects. While the center of Dodds' polysystemic web might be occupied by any one of the neurolinguistic, psychological and linguistic polysystems, the others remain on the periphery. However, relations among the various polysystems as to whether they occupy the center or the periphery are neither deterministic nor stochastic as in the cases of the monosystems previously discussed, but are of an agnostic nature to the observer and can be explained, at best, by "probabilistic determinism" since it is virtually impossible to know exactly how the polysystemic web works due to the infinite variables within it. Dodds' position as to the infinite multitude of variables in interpreting phenomena and their importance for understanding the polysystemic web is a situation inherent in the "Butterfly Effect" of the "Chaos Theory" in physics, which -in contrast to classical notions of physics- suggests that even a seemingly very small -and therefore

according to the classical physics- practically insignificant phenomenon in a particular time and place in the physical world can actually cause disastrous effects at another time and place. The classic example of this Butterfly Effect suggests that the winging of a butterfly in Brazil can theoretically cause a cyclone in Texas [Gleick, 1996]. Therefore, although one may assume that Dodds' polysystemic web has a center and a periphery, it is not possible to know for sure, which monosystem is occupying the center and which ones the periphery. Actually, it is not even possible to know definitely whether the polysystemic web has only one or more polysystems at the center at any given time, or indeed whether it has a single center or co-centers. One explanation for this state of limbo might be the fact that every polysystem in the polysystemic web is made of an infinite number of elements (as in the case of the Butterfly Effect), and while some of these occupy the center, others may stay in the periphery, as is valid also for all the other polysystems in the entire web. Therefore, it is impossible to know exactly which polysystem/s occupy/ies the center and which are on the periphery and how far from the center. This uncertainty in Dodds' polysystemic web is also comparable to a fundamental law of physics, the law of "Heisenberg," which states that if the place of a particle is determined in the physical world, it is not possible to determine its speed or vice versa. The point to be emphasized here is that uncertainty is an intrinsic quality of the Dodds' polysystems (supposedly because of the irreconcilable differences between the ontological natures of the polysystemic web and its external observer). As in the case of the Heisenberg law, this uncertainty is not due to the fact that the external observer is momentarily without the appropriate instruments to detect it. It is rather the relationship between the "infinite" nature of the polysystems and the "finiteness" of the external observer, which does not allow the observer to obtain certain knowledge about the network of Dodds' polysystems. The external observer, being human, is finite by nature whereas the Dodds' polysystems are infinite. Therefore, in conformity with the rules of the logic, one can assume that the finite cannot have a certain knowledge of the infinite. What the finite can do, at most, is to develop instruments also finite in nature and discover aspects of the infinite which will permit only an uncertain knowledge of the infinite. Therefore, with Dodds' polysystems the only possible epistemological inquiry into the relative positions in the center and on the periphery is a probabilistic prediction postulating that under certain conditions there is a significant likelihood that all or a substantial number of one or more than one polysystem/s occupy/ies the center or a particular strata of the periphery.

Its theoretical position does not explicitly indicate whether Dodds' web of polysystems is of a dynamic or static nature. However, the fact that he sees IS as a

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

network of polysystems (an interdisciplinary discipline) implies interplay among its various polysystems (disciplines) and therefore dynamism due to this interaction.[20] The presence of various polysystems and their possible interaction as explained above, in the opinion of the author, indicate that every polysystem in the Dodds polysystemic web is an open system, which is not the case for the other monosystems discussed above.

As to the stability/instability of Dodds' polysystemic web, one may say that the more certain knowledge about interpreting phenomena that the system produces, the more stable it becomes. Therefore, the more the polysystem/s occupying the center/s and the periphery of the web are of descriptive in character, the less certainty is their relation to the entire polysystemic web since its relative certainty will work only for already observed phenomena. On the other hand, the more predictive in character the polysystem/s occupying the center/s and the periphery of the web are the higher is its certainty as to the entire polysystemic web because its relative certainty will cover unobserved phenomena as well, increasing its stability. All this implies that Dodds epistemological polysystem will never be entirely stable and therefore can never become petrified; but it is always instable in different degrees, depending on the level of certainty of the knowledge pertaining to interpreting phenomena obtained from the polysystem.

In conformity with the findings of this study, the systemic analysis above indicates that IS is a network of polysystems (an interdisciplinary discipline), consisting of such polysystems as the linguistic polysystem, the psychological polysystem, the neurolinguistic polysystem and others not discussed here [cf. Shlesinger 1995]. The researchers and/or theoreticians in the field of IS admit that it is a network of polysystems, but concentrate their efforts on a particular monosystem (model) which represents, according to them, the center of the polysystems (the most important issues of interdisciplinary phenomena in IS). At the moment IS scholars are at the stage of understanding how a specific monosystem in a particular polysystem within the network functions. Furthermore, among the various monosystems within the network of IS polysystems there is no single monosystem to explain the interpreting process either from the point of the view of the entire network or even from the point of the view of the individual polysystem itself. Every monosystem explains some aspects of the interpreting process. For

[20] It would be meaningless to postulate a network of polysystems (an inter-disciplinary discipline) if the polysystems (disciplines) did not interact with each other. An inter-disciplinary discipline by definition is a discipline in which disciplines interact with each other.

example, within the psychological polysystem Moser's monosystem explains certain issues related to information processing while Gile's monosystem, within the same polysystem, answers some questions related to shared attention. Similarly, within the linguistic polysystem, Seleskovitch's monosystem provides some answers related to the source-text in the interpreting process while Pöchhacker's monosystem offers solutions to the problems related to the target-text in the same process. In fact, the use of a model to explain the already studied phenomena within a discipline is also characteristic of physics. For example, according to one model, light is a particle whereas according to another it is a wave. Both models are used to explain light phenomena. However, while the phenomenon of the "photoelectric process" can be explained only by the particle model, the phenomenon of "light interference" can be explained only by the wave model. In the IS polysystemic network, various monosystems operate in order to explain the interpreting process. Although sometimes there is a dichotomy among these monosystems, at other times they complement each other; they always explain a larger or smaller part of the interpreting process. Therefore, it seems necessary to have a set of monosystems rather than one single monosystem to explain the infinite and complex phenomena related to the polysystemic network of IS. Furthermore, the monosystems discussed above such as Gile's, Gran's or Seleskovitch's - as well as those monosystems not discussed above such as Gerver's (see p. 90) and Moser's (see pp. 90-91) - are related to immediate aspects of the interpreting process. On the other hand, Dodds' polysystem and other systems not discussed in the above systemic analysis, such as Gran's (see pp. 86-87), Salevsky's (see p. 87), and Pöchhacker's (see p. 86) systems, deal with epistemological and ontological issues of the interpreting process which are particularly influential on the functioning of the former monosystems and seem to form the center of the polysystemic web of IS "superstructure." One can say that while the former monosystems belong to the "base structure" or the "polysystem infrastructure," the latter form its "polysystem superstructure" [cf. Bengi 1992, Kongar 1995]. Finally, the reason why the monosystems belonging to the basestructure or infrastructure polysystem are particularly influenced by the polysystems of the superstructure can be explained by the fact that the IS polysystemic web is still at an initial stage in its formation [cf. Even-Zohar 1978]. Therefore, one can argue that once this initial disciplinary formation has been completed, the center of the superstructure polysystem, which is momentarily occupied by the polysystem of the philosophy of science (dealing with ontological and epistemological issues related to IS and dictated by the principles of neuroscience) can be replaced by other philosophical and/or historical issues of the relevant polysytems.

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

According to Toury, apart from literary and linguistic constraints, translated texts operating in a systemic framework are primarily determined by the cultural constraints stemming from the target rather than the source system. The findings of this study indicate that constraints (see pp. 107-114), culture (see pp. 100-105), source (see pp. 74-79) and target (see pp. 79-85) are important concepts in IS and suggest that interpreting phenomena operate in terms of constraints, too, supporting the TOA. Therefore, in addition to the psychologically - e.g. psychology of the interpreter - (see pp. 109-114), cognitively - e.g. knowledge of the subject matter - (see p. 109-114), and biologically - e.g. sex, cerebral organization, memory - (see pp. 62-63, 112-113, 37) determined constraints, interpreting phenomena are also governed by constraints of the social - e.g. power structure, social relations - (see p.106), cultural - e.g. religion - (see pp. 100-106) and linguistic - input language syntax, speaker's pronunciation and accent, target language - (see pp. 113, 79-85) nature as postulated by the TOA for translation. The constraints above, in addition to what the TOA suggests, are determined by the meeting typology - e.g. the mode of interpreting: consecutive or simultaneous, the type of speech, (see pp. 108-109,112, 114), the source - e.g. visual clues, rate of speech input, clarity of source input, style of delivery, input language syntax, the speaker's pronunciation and accent, the use of the microphone - (see pp. 74-79), the interpreter - e.g. knowledge of the subject matter, age of L2 acquisition, sex, training, cerebral organization, type of L2 learning, memory, individual factors, the use of earphones - (see pp. 94, 61, 63) not to mention the target - e.g. target audience, target language, the sound quality of earphones - (see pp. 109, 113-114, 111).

As mentioned before, Toury calls for a systemic inquiry of translation norms in order to reconstruct the translation process, which is the ultimate goal of translation theory.

The findings of this study illustrate that the concept of norms is fully valid in IS as well. Therefore, IS, like TS, involves initial, preliminary and operational norms.

In relation to the initial norm, interpreters decide to employ either the word-for-word or the meaning-based strategy a priori. In the case of the former strategy the interpreters subject themselves to the textual relations and norms of the source-text whereas in the latter case they comply with the norms of the target-text.

Conference and target audience typologies play a determining role in the interpreters initial norm choice. If the conference is about a technical subject and/or the target audience shares the same expertise with the source-text

speaker about the subject matter while the interpreter does not posses the same knowledge about it, the interpreter prefers to use the word-for-word strategy as much as possible, subjecting him/herself to the norms of the source-text. On the other hand, if the conference is about a non-technical literary or political subject; and/or the target audience does not share the cultural patrimony of the source-text speaker while the interpreter does, or finally if neither the target-text audience (perhaps of a hybrid nature) nor the interpreter shares the same cultural patrimony of the source-text speaker, the interpreter will choose the meaning-based strategy, subjecting him/herself to the norms of the target-text.

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

CONSTRAINT	NORM	SYSTEM
Conference Typology (1) Technical. (2) Political/Literary.	Strategy (1) Word-for-word. (2) Meaning-based.	Type (1) Source. (2) Target.
Target Audience Typology (1) The Speaker and target audience share the same expertise, but not the interpreter; (2) The target audience and the interpreter share the same cultural patrimony, but not the speaker; (3) The speaker, interpreter and target audience all belong to different cultures.	Linguistic Register (1) Cold scientific precision. (2) Literary use of language. (3) Simple language.	Type (1) Source. (2) Target. (3) Target.

Fig. 4.2. Initial norms in interpreting

As to the preliminary norms, the findings of this study suggest that in addition to general policy decisions, interpreters make other decisions prior to the actual interpreting process due to social, cultural, psychological, cognitive and temporal constraints. Such decisions include delivery in the first or third person, the number of interpreters employed in a booth, the direction of the language combination, the interpreter's identification with his/her clients, the choice of simultaneous or consecutive interpreting, a preference for the type of speech, preparation on the conference subject matter, and the possibility of a direct and unobstructed view of the room.

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

CONSTRAINT	NORM	NATURE OF CONSTRAINT
Invisibility of the Interpreter. Speaker and interpreter are the same person for the target audience.	Interpreter speaks in the 1st person singular.	Cultural/Temporal.
Time. Conference duration is more than 20 minutes.	Two interpreters work in a booth.	Individual factors (Stress).
Theory. (1) Understanding is important. (2) Expression is important.	(1) Interpreter works from the A into the B language. (2) Interpreter works from the B into the A language.	Cultural/Individual factors.
Social Power (1) Interpreter is powerful. (2) Interpreter is not interested in power. (3) Interpreter needs power.	(1) Interpreter is a non-partisan social actor. (2) Interpreter is a detached social actor. (3) Interpreter is a partisan social actor.	Cultural/individual factors.
Physical Environment. (1) Face to face. (2) Isolated.	(1) Interpreter undertakes consecutive mode. (2) Interpreter undertakes simultaneous mode.	Individual factors.
Visual clues. Facial expressions, nods, gestures.	Interpreter sits a place where s/he can see the room.	Cognitive.
Knowledge of the subject matter. Technical/Non technical.	Interpreter chooses the content of the speech to be interpreted.	Cognitive.
Knowledge of the subject matter. Technical/ Non technical.	Interpreter reads documents before the conference.	Cognitive.

Fig. 4.3. Preliminary norms in interpreting

Finally, regarding the operational norms - in compliance with cognitive, psychological, temporal, biological, linguistic and cultural constraints - interpreters also make choices during the actual interpreting process (see pp. 110-114). These decisions include shifting from the word-for-word into the meaning-based strategy or vice-versa, increasing attention and speed, not interpreting, delaying the processing of input material at the beginning of a sentence and during the processing, listening to the input material with the left ear and the output rendition in the target language with the right ear, the use of phrases to fill pauses during

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

analysis of the incoming message, monitoring input and output, acting in accordance to requests of the client, and taking notes according to a particular note-taking system.

CONSTRAINTS	NORMS	NATURE OF CONSTRAINT
(1) Noise. (2) Relay interpreting.	Interpreter increases his/her attention.	(1) Technical. (2) Linguistic.
(1) Input rate. (2) Type of input-text.	Interpreter decreases/increases his/her rate accordingly	(1) Temporal. (2) Linguistic.
(1) Time-lag.	Interpreter uses filling phrases.	(1) Cognitive.
(1) Type of input-text.	Interpreter adopts a particular interpreting strategy.	(1) Linguistic. Cognitive
(1) Redundancy in input-text.	Interpreter adopts a particular interpreting strategy.	(1) Individual factors, cultural.
(1) Cerebral organization.	Interpreter covers one ear with the headphone and leaves the other free.	(1) Biological.
(1) Syntactic structure of the input-text language.	Interpreter delays his/her output.	(1) Linguistic.
(1) Semantic density of the input-text.	Interpreter monitors both input and output-messages.	(1) Cognitive.
(1) Use of religious words.	Interpreter laicises his/her output.	(1) Cultural.
(1) Time (In CI).	Interpreter adopts the principles of a particular system of note-taking.	(1) Temporal.
(1) Emotional interference (In CI).	Interpreter answers the questions of the interlocutor without interpreting.	(1) Psychological, Social.
(1) Client's will (In CI).	Interpreter acts in conformity with the will of the client.	(1) Social.

Fig. 4.4. Operational norms in interpreting

The findings of this study indicate that initial, preliminary and operational norms certainly do exist in IS, they include, however, not only the linguistic and cultural-historical facts, as posited by the TOA, but are determined by cognitive, psychological temporal, biological, individual and technical factors as well. Another reservation about Toury's concept of norm is that his operational norms in TS are always determined by the target system; the findings of the study reveal that such norms in interpreting depend on the source linguistic system as well (see p. 113).

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

All the points so far discussed indicate that IS can be viewed as an empirical science consisting of three branches: theoretical, descriptive and applied. The ultimate purpose of the theoretical branch, a set of interconnected hypotheses, is to explain the interpreting process so that it can be more effectively taught, orienting interpreters on more scientific grounds for a better performance. It is the descriptive branch which supplies material for the theoretical branch. By means of either purely descriptive or empirical research, hypotheses are developed, tested and refined for the theoretical domain. Research is generally dependent upon empirical process-oriented studies, although descriptive synchronic or diachronic product-oriented studies are also employed. A systemic approach within the discipline of IS has not been explicitly discussed, but this study clearly shows that the nature and functions of IS would allow such an approach to explain interpreting phenomena. From this study it is also obvious that various constraints stemming from the source and target systems determine interpreting norms and that initial, preliminary and operational norms certainly do exist in IS.

At this stage of the discussion, the answers to the research questions formulated to test the applicability of the major assumptions of the TOA to IS can be illustrated schematically as follows:

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

RESEARCH QUESTIONS	TOA	IS
What kind of discipline is it?	Empirical.	Empirical.
What are its branches?	Descriptive, theoretical, applied.	Descriptive, theoretical, applied.
What is theory?	A set of interconnected hypotheses.	A set of interconnected hypotheses.
What is the function of theory?	To understand, explain and predict the translation process.	To understand, explain and predict the interpreting process.
What does theory serve?	To teach process and to orient professionals.	To teach process and to orient professionals.
What is the function of research?	To develop, test and refine hypotheses.	To develop, test and refine hypotheses.
What does research serve?	To supply material for theory.	To supply material for theory.
Is there process-oriented research?	No.	Yes.
Is there product-oriented research?	Yes.	Yes.
Is there synchronic research?	Yes.	Yes.
Is there diachronic research?	Yes.	Yes.
Is there descriptive research?	Yes.	Yes.
Is there a systemic approach?	Yes.	Possible.
Is culture important?	Yes.	Yes.
Is source system important?	Yes.	Yes.
Is target system important?	Yes.	Yes.
Are there constraints?	Yes.	Yes.
Are there norms?	Yes.	Yes.

Fig. 4.5. The comparison between the TOA and IS as determined by this study

According to the author, these findings provide satisfactory evidence that IS quite extensively uses the various terms, concepts, hypotheses and arguments developed for the TOA. The writer believes that any incompatibilities between the TOA and IS are due to two major reasons: (1) that - although translation and interpreting belong to the same ontological category, inter-lingual phenomena - they operate in two different modes: written and oral; and (2) that the TOA is not a general, but a "special theory"[21] of translation which explains translation

[21] For the terminology used cf. Salevsky p. 87.

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

phenomena related to culture-specific issues. Therefore, the premises of the TOA cannot always fully explain the specifics of the interpreting process. This does not mean that the premises developed for the TOA are wrong. They explain interpreting phenomena only partially because they explain translation phenomena only partially: in terms of cultural-specific issues.[22] On the other hand, even if the TOA were a general theory of translation, it would still not be able to explain interpreting phenomena fully because of the difference mentioned above: the diverse modes of translation and interpreting.[23] Nevertheless, in the light of his findings it is the full conviction of the author that the assumptions of the TOA provide a useful theoretical framework to explain a substantial number of phenomena in IS as well as in TS.

The next section focuses on a critique of the TOA, demonstrating that Toury's TOA is not a general, but a "special theory" of translation.

4.2.2 CRITICAL REFLECTIONS ON THE TARGET-ORIENTED APPROACH AS A GENERAL THEORY OF TRANSLATION

Toury asserts that his TOA is a general theory of translation (GTT) which attempts to explain all translational phenomena. He believes that its comprehensiveness is guaranteed by the fact that -within a target system- it postulates systematic descriptive product-oriented observations (synchronical or diachronical) of all phenomena regarded as translation. The aim of such systematic observation is to explore the so-called "translation norms," or cultural-historical facts, which govern translation and therefore also the decisions made by the translators before and/or during the translation process.

The "observation," "translations," "descriptive product-oriented studies," "exploration," "norms," and "cultural-historical facts" within the framework of his TOA indicate that Toury, philosophically, argues for an "interpretative perspective" of reality. In other words, he believes that TS is an empirical science dealing with research on translation norms, a reality which has been socially, historically, and therefore culturally constructed in the minds of people and, based on the definitions they attach to it [cf. Sarantakos 1994, Silverman 1995]. For Toury, therefore,

---

[22] This is the reason why the TOA cannot explain, for example, biological and cognitive constraints in translation or in interpreting processes.

[23] This is the reason why the TOA cannot explain the temporal and technical as well as certain cognitive constraints peculiar to the interpreting process. The linguistic constraints stemming from the spoken source language in the interpreting process remain also beyond its scope.

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

reality is not objective but subjective; it is what people see it to be. In this conception, knowledge is not derived primarily through the senses, but by the understanding and interpreting of meaning. Therefore, the investigation of reality in his TOA, structured with the principles of an interpretative paradigm, adopts a "qualitative methodology" in which the whole phenomenon is understood as a complex dynamic system with historical and temporal context, and the purpose of the scientist is to identify the processes of reality which manifest themselves in the above mentioned complex dynamic system. In qualitative methodology, observation is the method most commonly used to explore subjectively constructed reality. Observations focus most particularly on meanings and interpretations, so that a deeper understanding of the phenomena under study can be achieved. Consequently, Toury's TOA approach is the result of an interpretative paradigm and a qualitative scientific methodology calling for exploration of the culturally and historically determined norms by means of product-oriented DS. It concentrates on culture and its effects on translators, limiting TS to a cultural description of how translators see things within cultural-historical constraints.

Although a theoretical framework such as the TOA, based on an interpretative perception of reality, (which, needless to say, has valid theoretical and philosophical foundations in phenomenology, hermeneutics and symbolic interactionism) explains a substantial number of phenomena in translation, it does not explain everything. For example, different translators belonging to the same target system and historical period produce different versions of the same source text although they undergo the effects of the same historically and culturally determined constraints. Unfortunately, Toury's TOA cannot explain the causes of these differences, implying that, for a GTT, it remains insufficient to explain the translation process seen only as a subjectively constructed reality explained in terms of historical and cultural norms. The author suggests that a GTT needs a different philosophical paradigm in science with a different methodology in research. One might argue that the interpretative paradigm and qualitative methodology are useful in a GTT since the TOA, which adopts them, works quite satisfactorily to explain cultural issues related to translation phenomena. A GTT, which by definition must explain all phenomena related to translation, in the mind of the author, should possess the philosophical paradigm and the research methodology incorporated by the TOA plus a new philosophical paradigm and research methodology. As mentioned above, the TOA, with the interpretative paradigm, suggests that reality is constructed subjectively. The elaboration of this concept automatically entails its antithesis: an objective reality not constructed in the minds of people, but exiting "out there" independently of human consciousness. This objective conception of

reality in science is a "positivistic" conception which normally involves a "quantitative methodology" in research.

It is the conviction of the writer that a GTT, philosophically, should adopt both positivistic and interpretative paradigms for the perception of realities related to translational phenomena. Actually, Toury himself admits that the object of TS belongs primarily to a positivistic domain of reality, namely the translation processes, or those processes which take place in the human mind. However, although he recognizes the human brain as part of the reality determining translational phenomena, he ignores it, claiming that it is impossible to examine it properly as it represents a "black box" (sic) to the external observer. However, if a scientific discipline postulates a priori that it does not have the analytical methods to examine all phenomena belonging to its domain (or that part of these phenomena cannot be examined due to their agnostic nature), then it naturally follows that it is impossible to develop a general theory to explain all the phenomena under investigation by that discipline. However, the empirical research carried out in the field of IS clearly indicates that it is possible to examine the oral thinking of the human brain by means of dichotic listening, tapping and the electroencephalogram. Furthermore, magnetic resonance should prove a much more powerful neurological tool in future investigation of the human brain in terms of its functions.

The various aforementioned methods used by IS to analyze the human brain clearly show that the metaphor "black box" is not appropriate to describe the epistemological status of the human brain. One can say that Toury neglected much of the translation process for two major reasons: (1) the academic literary background he received from the Russian Formalists led him to perceive reality from an interpretative perspective [cf. Güvenir 1994]; and (2) in the 1970s, when he put forward the TOA, translation research had not yet become involved in the psycholinguistic aspects of text comprehension and production, probably due to the lack of analytical tools for the psychological and neurological aspects of translation.

There is no doubt that today a GTT requires both interpretative and positivistic paradigms with both qualitative and quantitative methodologies so that both the subjective and objective realities of translation can be described, explained and, possibly predicted by product- and process-oriented studies.

The logical argument for both product- and process-oriented studies in the translation process is that it is impossible to understand a phenomenon properly by simply studying its product since a combination of variables may determine a product (cf. the Butterfly Effect, p. 122) and one single variable may have different

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

products. On the other hand, it is equally impossible to understand a phenomenon properly by studying simply the process, because the product of every process is actually the component of a greater process. Therefore, a GTT must involve both process- and product-oriented studies and requires the adoption of both the interpretative and positivistic philosophical perspectives in a science/discipline with both qualitative and quantitative research methodologies.

As mentioned before, the importance of decision-making operations in the human brain is stressed in the TOA to translation. However, in a GTT, the translation process should be restricted neither to a subjective reality manifested in terms of cultural-historical translation norms, nor to a reality purely objective in nature, involving only the cognitive tasks and cerebral structures of the human brain. In other words, a GTT, according to the author, needs a broader concept of translation process limited neither to cultural-historical nor to psychological-neurological phenomena.

The writer's view is that a GTT needs a wider perception of functional processes: one which considers the translation process in the context of an entire "ideological-communicative process." Such a concept is actually a polysystem comprising interrelations among the writer, the translator, the source and target texts, and the target receiver during the act of translation at a micro level as well as ideological relations among institutions of prestige and power in society at a macro level.

An ideological-communicative process requires examination, for example, of the psycholinguistic factors involved in the text production and/or comprehension of the writer, the translator and the target reader. It is important to understand the writer's psycholinguistic mechanisms involved in text comprehension and production; otherwise we cannot compare them to the mechanisms responsible for text comprehension and production on the part of the translator. No doubt the similarities and differences in these mechanisms will also help us better understand the thinking processes taking place in the translator's brain. Psycholinguistic mechanisms are important for text comprehension on the part of the target reader as well, since comprehension is by no means an automatic or universal process. Similarly, how the historical-cultural norms that influenced the translator influence the target reader of a specific translated work is another important issue to elucidate the translation process within the ideological-communicative framework.

The definition of the translation process as an ideological-communicative function is necessary for a GTT; it does not reduce the act of translation, (a human

activity) to the one-dimensional status of culture as the TOA does. The human being, anthropologically, is not solely a cultural, but rather a "bio-cultural being," manifesting a bi-dimensional nature [cf. Güvenç 1994].

A final point to be discussed in relation to a GTT within the framework of an ideological-communicative functional process is that translation equivalence is not only source- or target-oriented as in Toury's TOA, but can be source-, target- or "translator-oriented." According to the author, a "real" translation, especially a literary translation, is "translator-oriented;" it is not the product of one who is totally enslaved by historical-cultural constraints, but the product of a creative person who, although oriented by the above-mentioned constraints to a certain extent, can manipulate them in such a way that the translated text, especially the literary translation, becomes a work of art. It is the full conviction of the writer that translated texts will not acquire the respectable status within national literatures to compete with originals (as suggested in the PT and the TOA [cf. Kuran 1992]) unless the translator's status as a creative "artist" is recognized. The translator must not be reduced to a sort of tool with merely the intermediary function to transmit various constraints on a rewriting. A "real" translation, which is neither source nor target but "translator-oriented," overrides the constraints stemming from the source and target systems. The translator, on the basis of his/her individual background and creativity in textual comprehension and production, uses historical-cultural, source and target-oriented constraints to govern a creative rewriting so that his work is much more than the purely deterministic process of a slavish mediator.

To conclude, in contrast to the product-oriented and culturally determined interpretative theoretical framework of the TOA, a GTT in compliance with both interpretative and positivistic paradigms entails a triadic ontological status characterized by (as postulated by Holmes) product- , process- and function-oriented studies [Gentzler 1993, Toury 1995] determined by bio-cultural constraints; the GTT must be a continuum with individuality on the one hand and conformity on the other. It seems that there is little likelihood of one single theory incorporating an ontological framework comprehensive enough to serve as a GTT. In the opinion of the author, such a general and comprehensive objective seems plausible only through a combination of various theories, each restricted in ontological characteristics and limited in application.

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

Truth is never pure, and rarely simple.
OSCAR WILDE, "THE IMPORTANCE OF BEING EARNEST," ACT I

When we study human language, we are approaching what some might call the " human essence," the distinctive qualities of mind that are, so far as we know, unique to man.
NOAM CHOMSKY, "LANGUAGE AND MIND"

Başka dillerin tanımladığı başka dünyaların tanıtılmasıdır çeviri ...
İnsanın kendi yaşam çevresi dışındaki olgularla düşleri bilme çabasının bir sonucudur çeviri.
Bu yönüyle tek tek diller ötesinde bir ortak dildir çeviri, dillerin dilidir.
GÖKTÜRK AKŞİT, "ÇEVİRİ: DİLLERİN DİLİ" [24]

CHAPTER V

5 SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1 SUMMARY

The starting point of this study was the recognition of a problem which frequently arises in the context of interlingual phenomena, namely the lack of co-ordination in translation and interpreting - two related but separate "Translation" forms. Scientific research in translation and interpreting has been carried out separately, with authors writing on one specific domain of the interlingual phenomena not usually referring to the findings of the other domain - albeit both of them belong to the same ontological category.

Among the various possibilities to fill this gap in the scientific inquiry between translation and interpreting, one frequently mentioned -if only theoretically- is the assessment of translation theory, to see whether or not it can contribute to the theory of interpreting.

---

[24] Translation is the familiarization with other worlds previously defined in other languages ... Translation is a result of man's striving to understand realities and dreams beyond his own culture. In this sense, translation represents a common language above each and every one, a language of languages [Author's translation].

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

There is general acceptance that the TOA is influential as a general theory of translation. Its several major premises have been effectively utilized by recent translation studies, and yet there is evidence neither in translation nor interpreting literature as to whether the TOA is a useful theoretical framework for IS as well. These were the main considerations that led to this study.

The aim has been to decide whether or not the major arguments of the TOA are valid for the interpreting process by comparing and contrasting the essential assumptions of the TOA with the relevant assumptions in IS as identified, described and analyzed in its literature.

The findings have been obtained from a dataset consisting of a portion of IS literature in English and Italian written between 1971-1997 on theory, research, culture and norms.

Since the study is methodologically based on "secondary analysis", the validity of its generalizations depends on the validity of this kind of analysis.

The secondary analysis employed in the study was carried out on a dataset of 81 sources dealing with the research, theory, culture and norms in IS. These sources were selected through a bibliographic search in the library of the *Scuola Superiore di Lingue Moderne per Interpreti e Traduttori* (SSLM) of the University of Trieste. The selected data were then analyzed by content and interpreted in relation to the major assumptions of Toury's TOA.

The findings of the study and their relevant discussion indicate first of all that the TOA is a theoretical framework useful within the domain of IS - albeit developed exclusively for translation. Secondly, they reveal that the TOA is not a theory comprehensive enough to explain all phenomena related to translation, it is rather a more specific theory that accounts for a substantial number of issues particularly related to culture in translation.

5.2 CONCLUSION

A number of conclusions have either been stated or are implicit in the "Findings and Discussion" sections of the preceding chapter.

One practical outcome of the study is that it provides a rather comprehensive picture of IS as a scientific discipline, an overview especially valuable for the Turkish community of inter-lingual studies, which is still at the threshold of Interpreting Research and Theory.

The most important contribution of the study, not only for Turkish but foreign scholars as well, is that it illustrates that the TOA is a useful theoretical framework for IS, too, since the latter effectively uses various major hypotheses of the former. This implies that the TOA, as a specific theory dealing with cultural issues in translation, is an important step toward the development of a comprehensive theory of "Translation;" it not only explains cultural phenomena in the domain of translation, but also other phenomena operating within the domain of IS as well. Furthermore, the study confirms (a premise generally accepted within the domain of IS) that translation theories can be useful in IS, justifying the call for co-ordination in the research and theory of Translation and Interpreting. Finally, it also supports the claim that a general theory on interlingual phenomena must incorporate phenomena related to both translation and interpreting.

Last but not least, the results suggest that "Translation" is a human activity that influences and shapes not only the cultural domain of human existence (as demonstrated by the position of translated literature within the literary polysystem), but its biological domain as well, actually modifying the cerebral organization of interpreters' linguistic functions.

5.3 SUGGESTIONS

The author believes that the study represents a significant contribution toward the solution of his problem. However, the verification of the TOA's assumptions on translation equivalence for IS - an issue beyond the confines of the present study for practical reasons - remains an important task for future research. Likewise, research should be also carried out within TS to examine the cerebral organization of translators. This might be accomplished with the electroencephalogram and methods similar to dichotic listening and the tapping method, by utilizing visual input rather than the acoustic signals used in interpreting research.

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ 1883

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alessandrini, M. S. (1990). Translating Numbers in Consecutive Interpretation: An Experimental Study. The Interpreters' Newsletter. 3. 77-80.

Anderson, R. B. W. (1977). Interpreter Roles and Interpretation Situations: Cross-cutting Typologies. In D. Gerver & H. W. Sinaiko (Eds.), Language Interpretation and Communication (pp. 217-230). Venice: NATO Conference Series.

Arjona, E. (1977). Intercultural Communication and the Training of Interpreters at the Monterey Institute of Foreign Studies. In D. Gerver & H. W. Sinaiko (Eds.), Language Interpretation and Communication (pp. 35-44). Venice: NATO Conference Series.

Baker, T. L. (1994). Doing Social Research. Singapore: McGraw-Hill International Editions.

Bassnett-McGuire, S. (1985). Translation Studies. London and New York: Methuen.

Bengi, I. (1992, July). Çeviribilimde 'Bütünleyici bir Yaklaşım' Üzerine Eleştirel Görüşler ve Öneriler. (Critical Reflections and Suggestions as to 'a Comprehensive Approach' in Translation Studies). Varlık. 1018. 18-24.

Bengi, I. (1993). Çeviri Eleştirisi Bağlamında Eleştirel Bilincin Oluşması ve Eleştiri, Üst-eleştiri, Çeviribilim İlişkileri. (Formation of Critical Awareness Within the Context of Translation Criticism and Relations Between Criticism, Meta-criticism and Translation Studies). Dilbilim Araştırmaları (?). 25-50.

Bowen, M. (1993). Interpreting Studies and the History of the Profession. In C. Dollerup & A. Loddegaard (Eds.), Teaching Translation and Interpreting 2: Vol. 5 Insights, Aims, Visions (pp. 167-173). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Bowen, M. & D., Kaufmann, F. & Kurz, I. (1995). Interpreters and the Making of History. In J. Delisle & J. Woodsworth (Eds.), Translators Through History (pp. 245-273). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company Unesco Publishing.

Brislin, R. W. (1977). Contributions of Cross-cultural Orientation Programs and Power Analysis to Translation/Interpretation. In D. Gerver & H. W. Sinaiko (Eds.), Language Interpretation and Communication (pp. 205-216). Venice: NATO Conference Series.

Chernov, G. V. (1992). Conference Interpretation in the U. S. S. R. : History, Theory, New Frontiers. Meta. 37 (1), 149-161.

Crevatin, F. (1989). Directions in Research Towards a Theory of Interpretation. In L. Gran & J. Dodds (Eds.), The Theoretical and Practical Aspects of

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

Teaching Conference Interpretation (pp. 21-22). Udine: Campanotto.

d'Arcais, G. B. F. (1977). The Contribution of Cognitive Psychology to the Study of Interpretation. In D. Gerver & H. W. Sinaiko (Eds.), Language Interpretation and Communication (pp. 385-402). Venice: NATO Conference Series.

Darò, V. (1989). The Role of Memory and Attention in Simultaneous Interpretation: A Neurolinguistic Approach. The Interpreters' Newsletter. 2. 50-56.

Darò, V. (1990). Speaking Speed During Simultaneous Interpretation. A Discussion on Its Neuropsychological Aspects and Possible Contributions to Teaching. In L. Gran & C. Taylor (Eds.), Aspects of Applied and Experimental Research on Conference Interpretation (pp. 83-92). Udine: Campanotto.

Delisle, J., & Woodsworth, J. (Eds.). (1995). Translators Through History. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Dodds, J. (1989). Linguistic Theory Construction as a Premise to a Methodology of Teaching Interpretation. In L. Gran & J. Dodds (Eds.), The Theoretical and Practical Aspects of Teaching Conference Interpretation (pp. 17-20). Udine: Campanotto.

Even-Zohar, I. (1978). The Position of Translated Literature Within the Literary Polysystem. In J. Holmes, J. Lambert & V. Broeck (Eds.), Literature and Translation: New Perspectives in Literary Studies (pp. 117-127). Leuven: Acco.

Fabbro, F. (1989). Neurobiological Aspects of Bilingualism and Polyglossia. In L. Gran & J. Dodds (Eds.), The Theoretical and Practical Aspects of Teaching Conference Interpretation (pp. 71-82). Udine: Campanotto.

Fabbro, F., Gran, L., Basso, G. (1990). Cerebral Lateralization in Simultaneous Interpretation. Brain and Language. 39. 69-89.

Fabbro, F., Gran, B., Gran, L. (1991). Hemispheric Specialization for Semantic and Syntactic Components of Language in Simultaneous Interpreters. Brain and Language. 41. 1-42.

Fabbro, F., & Gran, L. (1994). Neurological and Neuropsychological Aspects of Polyglossia and Simultaneous Interpretation. In S. Lambert & B. Moser-Mercer (Eds.), Bridging the Gap: Vol. 3 Empirical Research in Simultaneous Interpretation (pp. 273-317). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Fabbro, F., & Gran, L. (1997). Neurolinguistic Research in Simultaneous Interpretation. In Y. Gambier, D. Gile & C. Taylor (Eds.), Conference Interpreting: Current Trends in Research (pp.9-27). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Fromkin, V. & Rodman, R. (1978). An Introduction to Language. Frome and

London: Butler & Tanner Ltd.

Gentile, A. (1991). The Application of Theoretical Constructs from a Number of Disciplines for the Development of a Methodology of Teaching in Interpreting and Translating. Meta. (?). 344-351.

Gentzler, E. (1993). Contemporary Translation Theories. London and New York: Routledge.

Gerver, D. (1971). Simultaneous and Consecutive Interpretation and Human Information Processing. (Social Science Research Council Grant No. HR566/1). University of Durham.

Gerver, D. (1975). A Psychological Approach to Simultaneous Interpretation. Meta. 20 (2). 119-128.

Gile, D. (1990 a). Research Proposals for Interpreters. In L. Gran & C. Taylor (Eds.), Aspects of Applied and Experimental Research on Conference Interpretation (pp. 226-236). Udine: Campanotto.

Gile, D. (1990 b). Scientific Research Vs. Personal Theories in the Investigation of Interpretation. In L. Gran & C. Taylor (Eds.), Aspects of Applied and Experimental Research on Conference Interpretation (pp. 28-41). Udine: Campanotto.

Gile, D. (1991). Methodological Aspects of Interpretation (and Translation) Research. In S. Lambert & B. Moser-Mercer (Eds.), Bridging the Gap: Vol. 3 Empirical Research in Simultaneous Interpretation (pp. 39-56). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Gile, D. (1992). Basic Theoretical Components in Interpreter and Translator Training. In C. Dollerup & A. Loddegaard (Eds.), Teaching Translation and Interpreting: Training, Talent and Experience (pp.185-193). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Gleick, J. (1996). Kaos (Chaos). (Translated by F. Üçcan). Ankara: Tübitak Popüler Bilim Kitapları.

Göktürk, A. (1986). Çeviri: Dillerin Dili (Translation: Language of Languages). İstanbul: Çağdaş Yayınları.

Gran, L., & Fabbro, F. (1988). The Role of Neuroscience in the Teaching of Interpretation. The Interpreters' Newsletter. 1. 23-41.

Gran, L. (1989). Interdisciplinary Research on Cerebral Asymmetries: Significance and Prospects for the Teaching of Interpretation. In L. Gran & J. Dodds (Eds.), The Theoretical and Practical Aspects of Teaching Conference Interpretation (pp. 93-100). Udine: Campanotto.

Gran, L. (1990). A Brief Review of Research Work on Interpretation Conducted at the SSLM of the University of Trieste and of Recent Similar Studies

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

Conducted in Canada and the U. S. A. In L. Gran & C. Taylor (Eds.), Aspects of Applied and Experimental Research on Conference Interpretation (pp. 4-20). Udine: Campanotto.

Gran, L., & Viezzi, M. (1995). Development of Research Work at SSLM, Trieste. Target. 7 (1). 107-118.

Gran, L. (1997). In-training Development of Interpreting Strategies and Creativity. In A. Beylard-Ozzeroff, J. Kralova & B. Moser-Mercer (Eds.), Translators' Strategies and Creativity (pp. 144-160). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Gran, L. (unpublished article). Neurolinguistic Aspects of Translation and Simultaneous Interpretation: The Interpreter's View.

Gutt, E. (1990). A theoretical Account of Translation Without a Translation Theory. Target. 2 (2). 136-164.

Güvenç, B. (1994). İnsan ve Kültür (Man and Culture). İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

Güvenir, A. (1994). Çeviri Eleştirisi (Translation Criticism). Edebiyat-Çeviri Dergisi. 4. 18-22.

Harris, B. (1990). Norms in Interpretation. Target. 2 (1). 115-120.

Henderson, J. A. (1984). A Comparison of the Personality Profiles of Professional Translators and Conference Interpreters (Doctoral dissertation, University of Bradford, 1984). The British Library Document Supply Centre.

Herbert, J. (1977). How Conference Interpretation Grew. In D. Gerver & H. W. Sinaiko (Eds.), Language Interpretation and Communication (pp. 5-10). Venice: NATO Conference Series.

Ilic, I. (1990). Cerebral Lateralization for Linguistic Functions in Professional Interpreters. In L. Gran & C. Taylor (Eds.), Aspects of Applied and Experimental Research on Conference Interpretation (pp. 101-110). Udine: Campanotto.

Ingram, R. M. (1977). Sign Language Interpretation and General Theories of Language, Interpretation and Communication. In D. Gerver & H. W. Sinaiko (Eds.), Language Interpretation and Communication (pp. 109-118). Venice: NATO Conference Series.

Isham, W. P. (1995). On the Relevance of Sign Languages to Research in Interpretation. Target. 7 (1). 135-149.

Kalina, S. (1992). Discourse Processing and Interpreting Strategies- an Approach to the Teaching of Interpreting. In C. Dollerup & A. Loddegaard (Eds.), Teaching Translation and Interpreting: Training, Talent and Experience (pp. 251-257). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Karmiloff-Smith, A. (1977). Adult Simultaneous Interpretation: A Functional Analysis of Linguistic Categories and a Comparison with Child Development. In D. Gerver & H. W. Sinaiko (Eds.), Language Interpretation and Communication (pp. 369-383). Venice: NATO Conference Series.

Katan, D. M. (1996). Translating Across Cultures: An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and Mediators. Trieste: Università degli Studi di Trieste.

Kahtan, C. (1987). Professional Interpreting Standards. ITI Conference. Vol. I The business of Translation and Interpreting (pp. 99-101). London: Unwin Brothers Ltd., The Gresham Press.

Kongar, E. (1995). Toplumsal Değişme Kuramları ve Türkiye Gerçeği (Theories on Social Change and Turkish Reality). İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

Krathwohl, D. R. (1993). Methods of Educational and Social Science Research. New York: Longman.

Kuran, N. (1992). Ties Between Approaches to Translation and Various Theories of Literature. Annali della Scuola Superiore per Interpreti e Traduttori "San Pellegrino". 2 (1-2). 219-229.

Kurz, I. (1985). The Rock Tombs of the Princes of Elephantine: Earliest References to Interpretation in Pharaonic Egypt. Babel. 31 (4). 213-218.

Kurz, I. (1995 a). Interdisciplinary Research-difficulties and Benefits. Target. 7 (1). 165-179.

Kurz, I. (1995 b). Watching the Brain at Work: An Exploratory Study of EEG Changes During Simultaneous Interpretation (SI). The Interpreters' Newsletter. 6. 3-16.

Lambert, W. E. (1977). Psychological Approaches to Bilingualism, Translation and Interpretation. In D. Gerver & H. W. Sinaiko (Eds.), Language Interpretation and Communication (pp. 131-143). Venice: NATO Conference Series.

Lambert, L. (1988). Information Processing Among Conference Interpreters: A Test of the Depth-of-Processing Hypothesis. Meta. 33 (3). 377-386.

Landon, V. (1988). Interpreting and the International Outlook. In C. Picken (Ed.), ITI Conference 2 (pp. 16-22). Surrey: Biddles Limited.

Le Ny, J. (1977). Psychosemantics and Simultaneous Interpretation. In D. Gerver & H. W. Sinaiko (Eds.), Language Interpretation and Communication (pp. 289-298). Venice: NATO Conference Series.

Lederer, M. (1977). Simultaneous Interpretation-Units of Meaning and Other Features. In D. Gerver & H. W. Sinaiko (Eds.), Language Interpretation and Communication (pp. 323-332). Venice: NATO Conference Series.

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

Moser, B. (1977). Simultaneous Interpretation: A Hypothetical Model and Its Practical Application. In D. Gerver & H. W. Sinaiko (Eds.), Language Interpretation and Communication (pp. 353-368). Venice: NATO Conference Series.

Newmark, P. (1981). Approaches to Translation. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Namy, C. (1977). Reflections on the Training of Simultaneous Interpreters: A Metalinguistic Approach. In D. Gerver & H. W. Sinaiko (Eds.), Language Interpretation and Communication (pp. 25-33). Venice: NATO Conference Series.

Niang, A. (1990). History and Role of Interpreting in Africa. In D. & M. Bowen (Eds.), American Translators Association: Scholarly Monograph Series: Vol. 4 Interpreting - Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow (pp. 34-36). Binghamton (Suny): State University of New York.

Nicholson, N. S. (1992). Linguistic Theory and Simultaneous Interpretation: Semantic and Pragmatic Considerations. Babel. 38 (2). 90-100.

Nicholson, N. S. (1993). The Constructive Criticism Model. The Interpreters' Newsletter. 5. 60-67.

Nida, E. A. (1964). Toward a Science of Translating. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Obst, H., & Cline, R. H. (1990). Summary History of Language Services in the U. S. Department of State. In D. & M. Bowen (Eds.), American Translators Association: Scholarly Monograph Series: Vol. 4 Interpreting - Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow (pp. 8-13). Binghamton (Suny): State University of Newyork.

Özben, T. (1993). Considerations on the Note-Taking Process During Consecutive Interpretation from Italian into Turkish. The Interpreters' Newsletter. 5. 42-48.

Parsons, H. M. (1977). Human Factors Approach to Simultaneous Interpretation. In D. Gerver & H. W. Sinaiko (Eds.), Language Interpretation and Communication (pp. 315-321). Venice: NATO Conference Series.

Pöchhacker, F. (1992). The Role of Theory in Simultaneous Interpreting. In C. Dollerup & A. Loddegaard (Eds.), Teaching Translation and Interpreting: Training, Talent and Experience (pp. 211-219). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Pöchhacker, F. (1993). On the Science of Interpretation. The Interpreters' Newsletter. 5. 52-59.

Pöchhacker, F. (1995 a). Writings and Research on Interpreting: A Bibliographic Analysis. The Interpreters' Newsletter. 6. 17-31.

Pöchhacker, F. (1995 b). Those Who Do. . . : A Profile of Research(ers) in

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

Interpreting. Target. 7(1). 47-64.

Salevsky, H. (1993). The Distinctive Nature of Interpreting Studies. Target. 5 (2). 149-167.

Sarantakos, S. (1994). Social Research. Houndsmill, Basingstoke, Hampshire and London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.

Schjoldager, A. (1995). Interpreting Research and the Manipulation School of Translation Studies. Target. 7 (1). 29-45.

Seleskovitch, D. (1978).L'interprète dans les Conférences Internationales-Problèmes de Langage et de Communication (Interpreting for International Conferences). Washington: Pen & Booth.

Setton, R. (1993). Experiments in the Application of Discourse Studies to Interpreter Training. In C. Dollerup & A. Loddegaard (Eds.), Teaching Translation and Interpreting 2: Vol. 5 Insights, Aims, Visions (pp. 183-198). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Shlesinger, M. (1995). What Lies Ahead for Simultaneous Interpreting Research. Target. 7 (1). 7-28.

Silverman, D. (1995). Interpreting Qualitative Data. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Skinner, W. (1990). Working Conditions at the Nuremberg Trials. In D. & M. Bowen (Eds.). American Translators Association: Scholarly Monograph Series: Vol. 4 Interpreting - Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow (pp. 14-22). Binghamton (Suny): State University of Newyork.

Snelling, D. C. (1983). Interpretation: Theory Versus Practice. (Serie: Monografie - N. 16) Trieste: Scuola Superiore di Lingue Moderne per Interpreti e Traduttori.

Snelling, D. C. (1988). An Interpretation Teaching Methodology for the Developing World. The Interpreters' Newsletter. 1. 42-48.

Snelling, D. C. (1989). A Typology of Interpretation for Teaching Purposes. In L. Gran & J. Dodds (Eds.), The Theoretical and Practical Aspects of Teaching Conference Interpretation (pp. 141-142). Udine: Campanotto.

Snelling, D. C. (1990). Interpretation and the Use of Language. In M. Jovanovic' (Ed.). XII th World congress of FIT proceedings (pp. 555-559). Belgrade: Prevodilac.

Stenzl, C. (1983). Simultaneous Interpretation: Groundwork Towards a Comprehensive Model. Unpublished M. A. thesis, Birkbeck College, London.

Stenzl, C. (1989). From Theory to Practice and From Practice to Theory. In L. Gran

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ
KÜTÜPHANE ve DOKÜMANTASYON
DAİRE BAŞKANLIĞI

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

& J. Dodds (Eds.). The Theoretical and Practical Aspects of Teaching Conference Interpretation (pp. 23-26). Udine: Campanotto.

Toury, G. (1980). In Search of a Theory of Translation. Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.

Toury, G. (1985). A Rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies. In T. Hermans (Ed.), The Manipulation of Literature (pp. 16-41). London and Sydney: Croom Helm.

Toury, G. (1995). Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Vermer, H. J. (1989). Skopos and Commission in Translation Action. In A. Chesterman (Ed.), Readings in Translation Theory (pp. 173-200) Oy Finn Lectura Ab.

Viaggio, S. (1996). Research in Simultaneous Interpretation: An Outsider's Overview. The Interpreters' Newsletter. 7. 73-84.

Viezzi, M. (1996). Aspetti della Qualità in Interpretazione. (Aspects of Quality in Interpreting). Trieste: Università degli studi di Trieste.

Volpi, P. (1991). La Ridondanza Applicata All'interpretazione: Esperimenti ed Analisi (Redundancy Applied in Interpreting: Experiments and Analysis). Unpublished M. A. thesis, Università degli Studi di Trieste, Trieste.

Wills, W. (1977). Syntactic Anticipation in German-English Simultaneous Interpreting. In D. Gerver & H. W. Sinaiko (Eds.), Language Interpretation and Communication (pp. 343-352). Venice: NATO Conference Series.

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ

MARMARA UNIVERSITESI YAYINEVI

"This certainly is an impressive scholarly contribution to translation studies."

Prof. Suat Karantay, Boğaziçi Univesity

"I find this meticulous scholarly work of Mr. Tunç Özben, interlinking the two disciplines interpreting and translation studies, an important accomplishment that I belive can stimulate other interdisciplinary research."

Prof. Nedret Kuran-Burçoğlu, Boğaziçi Univesity

"I consider this volume of great interest because the author analyzes, and compares and contrasts theory of translation and theory of the interpreting process through his personal epistemoligical conception of these two disciplines. Furthermore, in this work Mr. Özben shows new directions in which research can be carried out within the framework of the complex issues of interlinguistic and intercultural communication, both written and oral. It is therefore, I belive, a significant contribution to translation studies."

Prof. Laura Gran, University of Trieste

"The proposal that the author puts forward, in other words that the Target-Oriented Approach suggested by Gideon Toury is a theoretical instrument useful in part for the domain of interpreting studies as well as tranlation studies, deserves attention and further research."

Prof. Ruggero Campagnoli, University of Bologna

Rıza Tunç Özben is an English Language Instructor in the Department of Foreign Languages at Marmara University, Istanbul

Marmara Üniversitesi
Kütüphane ve Dokümantasyon Daire Başkanlığı

0008659

Printed on the press facilities
in the Faculty of Technical Education
Marmara University

1999