ANNA-RIITTA VUORIKOSKI

A Voice of its Citizens or a Modern Tower of Babel?

The Quality of Interpreting as a Function of Political Rhetoric in the European Parliament

■

Acknowledgments

Quality assessment is an integral part of an interpreter's career, beginning with entrance tests to schools of interpreting, continuing with final exams, and followed up with tests which give a qualified interpreter the right to work for EU institutions or any other institution employing interpreters on a permanent basis. Even if one does not apply for work at these institutions, peer assessment is an integral part of the recruitment process. Membership of professional associations is also based on peer assessment. It is not surprising, therefore, that a number of authors have been interested in the quality criteria of (conference) interpreting. As interpreters we continually ask ourselves the following questions: Have we been assessed on the basis of objective criteria? Have we received equal treatment by panels of assessors? What kind of criteria do I myself apply in evaluating colleagues and (potential) interpreters?

These are some of the questions that have followed me all through the years that I have been working as an interpreter. Therefore, I was delighted when Professor Krista Varantola suggested that I do research on simultaneous interpreting. It was not a random choice on her part, as she, in fact, had shown an interest in this subject by writing on simultaneous interpreting, an academic study which was the first publication of the Turku Language Institute in 1980.

After my Licentiate Thesis on users of SI and their quality expectations had been accepted by the University of Tampere (1995), I started working at the European Parliament on a regular basis. At the European Parliament, all the plenary session debates are recorded. There is consequently a large amount of interesting research material, which I was told would be available for scholarly purposes. It was Krista Varantola who suggested that I proceed to write a doctoral dissertation using this material. This study would not exist without her support and motivation. But the interesting material provided by the EP has been equally essential. I am greatly indebted to the Audiovisual Division of the European Parliament for the abundant material received. In this context I also wish to thank Reijo Kalvas at the University of Tampere for his professional help with the

As may be obvious from the theoretical and methodological choices of the study, I had not a solid grounding in translation theory. In fact, it hardly existed at the time when I obtained my diploma in translation. Yet, in that pre-theoretical era of the late 1960s, the Language Institute of Tampere was a brand new school full of enthusiastic teachers. Here I would like to thank two teachers in particular, Johanna Saresvuo and Gerard McAlester, who intuitively knew that there is more to translation than finding the correct lexical item in a dictionary.

At the University of Helsinki I was lucky to study under professors who inspired a keen interest in academic studies. In the Department of World Literature and Aesthetics, Professor Aarne Kinnunen taught us how to think and how to argue. In the Department of English Philology, Professor Matti Rissanen taught us how to be critical in our use of references. Whatever shortcomings in these areas are apparent in the present study, they are due to this pupil's incapacity to put into practice what was taught by experienced scholars.

Interpreting would not be so well organized in Finland without the hard work of Leena Liukkonen-Suomaa and the Finnish Translators' Association. I am grateful to the Association, Helkky Halme in particular, for the intellectual and financial support it has given me through the years. Through the Association I became acquainted with Ritva Laakso, who invited me to participate in interpreting seminars as a speaker. Thanks to her, I got the opportunity to work at the European Parliament in autumn 1994, which enabled me to observe the institution and its interpreting arrangements for three months.

Yet my first and foremost thanks are due to Kati Revell-Nielsen, without whom I would not have become a conference interpreter. As a Geneva-trained interpreter she had more to offer than anyone else in terms of interpreting standards.

The Centre of Translation and Interpreting at the University of Turku, under the direction of Johanna Mäkinen, has given me many opportunities to become acquainted with the various aspects of interpreter training. Jorma Tommola and Marianna Sunnari, both experts in interpreting, have always provided inspiration.

While all the stimuli referred to above have been important in the design of the present study, I owe deep felt thanks to Professor Andrew Chesterman for suggesting the rhetorical approach. Another source of inspiration was a book that I found lying on the table of my brother-in-law, Dr. Anssi Simojoki. This was the doctoral dissertation of Professor Lauri Thurén, who approached the letters of St. Peter from the point of view of rhetoric. This work convinced me of the applicability of the approach. Professor Thurén later helped me by suggesting key works in modern rhetorical studies.

Krista Varantola has supervised my progress all these years with great tact. Thank you for using the carrot rather than the stick! She gave me the opportunity to attend a course on methodology, organized by Barbara Moser-Mercer, as well as a Colloquium in honor of Marianne Lederer.

I am grateful to both external examiners, Professor, Dr. Franz Pöchhacker and Dr. Miriam Shlesinger, who both read the text carefully and made several suggestions for improvements. Unfortunately, due to time limits it was not possible to incorporate all of them.

The Swedish examples were checked by Marja Kivilehto and the German examples by Satu Leinonen. The German audio version was checked by Dagmar Lehtonen and the Swedish audio version by Aino Öhman. I wish to thank them most cordially for their valuable help. However, the heaviest burden has been carried by my dear friend and colleague Roger Luke, who has revised the English text not only once but twice. If there are any incorrect expressions or spelling errors, I am entirely to blame.

The support and encouragement of colleagues and friends is much in need during the solitary research process. The Soroptimist sisters have shown that they are true to the ideals of our organization. My special thanks go to my wonderful family and relatives, who have shown so much understanding and appreciation. I extend my thanks to my brothers, Mikko Louhivuori and Jukka Louhivuori, and Jukka's wife Sini, whose academic expertise has been a significant support.

The writing process required technical skills, too. My deep felt thanks are due to my two sons Antti and Heikki, without whom I would still not know how to use my computer. Heikki has played a major role in helping me overcome any software problems. His help in producing the audio versions of the sample texts has been invaluable. My whole family and my daughter, in particular, have shown tremendous patience.

This book is dedicated to my husband Timo, who likes the idea that he has a wife with some education.

Tampere 20 December 2003

Anna-Riitta Vuorikoski

CONTENTS

List of debates selected for recording

No. /Date Year 1996	Heading	No. of speeches / languages
1.	Report (A4–0257/95) on the Commission's information document	**10 speeches**
	on Structural Fund Innovatory Measures 1995–1999:	5 English
January 18	Guidelines for the second series of actions under Article 10	5 German
	of the ERDF Regulation (CE–0453/95)	
	Rapporteur Mr. Richard Howitt	
2.	Report (A4–0328/95) on the Communication from the Commission	**8 speeches**
	on the allocation of funds and the implementation of	1 English
January 18	Community initiatives in Austria, Finland and Sweden	3 German
	(COM(95)0123–C4–0282/95)	2 Swedish
	Rapporteur Ms. Riitta Myller	2 Finnish
3.	Report (A4–0001/96) on the Commission's Twelfth Annual Report	**6 speeches**
	to Parliament on monitoring the application of Community Law	2 questions, 1 answer
February 13	(COM(95)0500–C4–0233/95)	6 English
	Rapporteur Mr. Georgios Anastassopoulos	3 German
4.	Report (A4–0338/95) on the Memorandum on equal pay	**9 speeches**
	for work of equal value (COM(94)0006–C4–0084/94)	4 English
February 13	Rapporteur Ms. Colombo Svevo	1 German
		1 Swedish
		3 Finnish
5.	Oral question to Commission (B4–0011/96–0-0009/96/1)	**11 speeches**
	on the second programming period (1997–1999)	4 English
February 13	of Objective 2 interventions of Structural Funds	4 German
	Presented by Roberto Speciale (in Italian)	3 Finnish
6.	Report (A4–0018/96) on draft directive of European Parliament	**7 speeches**
	and Council modifying directive 89/552/EEC of Council	4 English
February 14	on the coordination of certain legislation in Member States	2 German
	concerning television broadcasting	1 Swedish
	Rapporteurs Mr. Gerardo Galeote Quecedo and Karsten Hoppenstedt	
7.	Northern Ireland peace process	**12 speeches**
February 14		English

List of debates continued

8.	Report (A4–0068/96) on Parliament's opinion	**14 speeches**
	on the convening of the Intergovernmental Conference;	6 English
March 13	and evaluation of the work of the Reflection Group and	5 German
	definition of the political priorities of European Parliament	2 Swedish
	with a veiw to the Intergovernmental Conference on	1 Finnish
	the proposal for amendment of the Treaties on which the European	
	Union is founded	
	Statements by Council and Commission on the preparations	
	for the European Council (Turin, 29/30 March 1996)	
	Rapporteurs Ms. Raymonde Dury and Ms. Johanna Maij-Weggen	
9.	Oral Questions to the Council (B4–0282/96 - 0-0031/96),	**4 speeches**
	(B4–0283/96 - 0-0034/96), (B4–0284/96 - 0–0052/96),	1 English
March 13	(B4–0286/96 - 0–0058/96), (B4–0293/96 - 0–0069/96),	3 German
	(B4–0294/96 - 0-0070/96)	
	on the meeting of the UN Commission on Human Rights	
	in Geneva in March/April 1996	
10.	Question Time to the Council	**4 speeches**
	(B4 – 0278/96)	2 English
March 13		2 Swedish
11.	Topical and urgent subjects of major importance	**36 speeches**
	(Rule 47)	11 English
March 14		20 German
		3 Swedish
		2 Finnish

LIST OF TABLES AND TEXT SAMPLES

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Object of study and research question

When Finland joined the European Union in 1995, simultaneous interpreting became the subject of several articles in the newspapers. Since then, issues such as the insufficient number of Finnish interpreters, or foreign interpreters learning Finnish, or the increasing number of languages following the enlargement in May 2004, are just some of the topics that journalists have found interesting.

A headline in Helsingin Sanomat told readers that minor languages are 'a tangle' in the EU Commission. "Liikanen and Wallström do not use interpreters". The article reported that the Finnish and Swedish commissioners spoke English, although interpreting had been organized for both Finnish and Swedish. According to the Finnish commissioner, he had chosen to speak English because the topic of the press meeting, the chemical industry, was difficult. "The message might not get across easily if it is interpreted via several languages". He further justified his use of English as follows: "If the topic is of a very general nature, I can speak Finnish. When dealing with issues that are technical and complicated, I prefer using a language such as English, which can be understood directly by everyone." (November 1, 2003)

Is there any justification for such a claim? My study will analyze speeches given in the European Parliament together with their interpreted versions. The question is: Do the interpreters' versions allow the listeners to gain an impression of the content and purpose of the speech which is equivalent to the one they would have received had they been listening to the original?

Simultaneous interpreting (SI) has been considered the ideal solution lowering the language barriers to communication in multi-lingual settings. It is familiar to the general public as a service that allows participants at international meetings to speak and follow proceedings in their own languages (Setton 1999: 1). What the conference participant perceives is "the interpreter sitting in a special booth. [The interpreter] listens to a speech through a headset and translates it into a microphone while the delegate is speaking". (http://europarl.eu/public/en/confint/) [Accessed 29 November 2003]

The European Parliament (EP) has underlined its democratic nature by granting its Members (MEPs) the right to conduct their business in the 11 official languages of the EP.[1] Thus, it has not been taken for granted that all MEPs would be able to follow speeches or present their own speeches in English, German or French, as is the case in many international meetings; instead, the MEPs can express themselves in their own native language, and their speeches are interpreted simultaneously into the other official languages of the EU.

The present study will analyze speeches delivered in the European Parliament and the way in which they are conveyed by interpreters. The focus of the study will be on whether interpreters' versions of the speeches allow the listeners to receive the same impression of the speakers' messages and intentions as people receive when listening to the original. This question has been on the SI research agenda all through the years that this mode of interpreting has been in use, and therefore a subject in translator and interpreter training (e.g. Herbert 1952/1968, Le Féal 1990, Gile 1991).

However, a successful SI rendition of a speech presupposes collaboration between the actors, particularly between the speakers and the interpreters, in order to guarantee an unhampered flow of communication in a meeting (cf. Kalina 2002). Therefore, another issue that my study wishes to address is the question of how the speakers could take the special characteristics of the multi-lingual communication situation into account.

The European Parliament is a special case in point. MEPs are grouped across nationality into meetings of different types, ranging from the meetings of the political groups through committee meetings and delegation meetings to the plenary sitting. All types of meetings are serviced by interpreting. The different types of meeting can be characterized on the basis of the extent to which the discourse is planned and scripted. At one end of the continuum there are meetings consisting of mostly spontaneous speeches, like the meetings of the political groups. Others, like the committee meetings, focus on a specific theme with related documentation; interventions may be spontaneous, but they are based on the report and draft legislative texts that have been presented to the meeting. Thus, planned and scripted texts are part of the discourse. At the other end of the continuum there is the plenary sitting, where most speeches have been carefully prepared and more often than not are read from scripts.

In the words of Carlo Marzocchi and Giancarlo Zucchetto, who discuss interpreting in the EP institutional context, the monthly plenary assembly is "the climax of an interpreter's work at the EP, both in terms of peer recognition and in terms of effort" (1997: 81). They justify their claim by the high demand of SI skills set by the speed of delivery and the oral delivery of written texts. As a result of these elements, the interpreter may experience a feeling of having reached the limit of what

---

[1] At the time of writing (2002) the 11 official languages are: Danish, Dutch, English, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish and Swedish.

can be interpreted. "The plenary seems therefore to provide suitable conditions for research in view of the intensity reached by such phenomena," the two authors suggest (ibid. p. 82).

That is what the present study has set out to do. The research design was made 'in the field', while working in the plenary sessions of the EP. 'The plenary' has been selected as the speech context for studying SI in a representative setting. In the much quoted Trieste Symposium of 1989, Catherine Stenzl commented on the scarcity of systematic descriptive studies on the practicalities of interpretation so that there is no data based on the systematic observation of what interpreters actually do (1989: 24). While the situation regarding IS literature has since improved, there is still room for more studies on "what interpreters actually do".

Speeches delivered in the plenary session may have many functions besides that of an immediate persuasive effect on the voting decisions of the House. That is nevertheless one of the reasons why an MEP wishes to take the floor. For his[2] speech to have the same effect on those who listen to the interpreted version as it does on those who listen to him directly, it is not irrelevant whether he takes the SI factor into consideration. A successful SI rendition of the speech conveys not only the *logos*, i.e. the arguments of the speech, but also the *pathos*, or the emotional appeal of the speech, as well as the *ethos* of the speaker, i.e. the impression he makes on his listeners as a person. These Aristotelian concepts indicate that the approach of the present study will, to a large extent, be based on argumentation theory, particularly on new rhetoric.

1.2 Interpreting quality: in search of a definition

A number of scholars have reviewed literature on interpreting quality (e.g. Pöchhacker 2001, Kalina 2002, Mack 2002). The perspectives on quality and methods of research vary due to the complex nature of the object of study. (See Pöchhacker 2001 for a comprehensive review of the research.) The design of the present study is based on research that has been interested in SI output quality, studied on the basis of comparisons of source texts and the interpreters' versions of them. Another group of studies underlying the work at hand focuses on users' expectations of SI quality.

SI quality will be approached here, first, from the point of view of its function, which is to establish communication between speaker and audience (Stenzl 1989: 24), and second, from the point of view of definitions and models describing the way in which this function is fulfilled in practice.

---

[2] Throughout the study 'he' is used as a generic reference to refer to persons who are not identified through their names.

Interpreting as communication. Theorists and professionals alike have approached interpreting in terms of communication. The International Association of Conference Interpreters (AIIC) focuses on the goals of interpreting, underlining the communicative aspect of the interpreter's task in the following terms:

> A Conference interpreter is a qualified specialist in bi-lingual or multi-lingual communication. He/she *makes* this *communication possible* between delegates of different linguistic communities at conferences, meetings, negotiations or visits, where more than one working language is used, by comprehending the concepts of speakers' message and conveying them orally in another language, either in consecutive, simultaneous or whispering.
>
> (AIIC bulletin 22 (1994) 3: 19, quoted in Kalina 1998) (my italics)

According to the above definition, the interpreter's task is to enable communication between the speaker addressing his audience in one language and the audience receiving it in another language which they understand. The instrumental aspect of this definition is the interpreter's *comprehension* of the *concepts* of the speaker's message.

The above definition has been formulated in fairly general terms. The same association (AIIC) has described the interpreting process for teachers of interpreting and for potential interpreters in the following way:

> [...] To interpret a speech is not to translate it word for word. To interpret a speech from its source language is to transfer its *semantic, connotative* and *aesthetic* content into another language, using the lexical, syntactic and stylistic resources of the [...] target language for that purpose. To interpret is first and foremost to *understand the intended message* perfectly. It can be "detached" from the words used to convey it in the original and reconstituted, in all its subtlety, in words of the target language.[...]
>
> (AIIC Advice 12/1999) (my italics)

Definitions like the one above have made me eager to find out to what extent and under what circumstances it is possible to achieve the goals set for an interpreter. Up to now, few published monographs have investigated the transferal of "the semantic, connotative and aesthetic content into another language," nor the way in which interpreters use "the lexical, syntactic and stylistic resources of the target language." There may be qualitative studies on whether simultaneous interpreters have understood 'the intended message' perfectly [sic!], and how this can be assessed, but the results of any such studies still wait to be incorporated in text books of interpreting.

Output product quality. Besides stating what interpreters are expected to accomplish, the above definition also describes what constitutes quality in SI. Its focus is on the source language speech and what elements should be conveyed in the target language version; it also states how this should be done ("using the lexical, syntactic and stylistic resources of the target language"). Other

definitions are even more specific by expressly including the recipients and their response in the definition, as the one below by Karla Déjean Le Féal (1990: 155):

> [The] standards [of professional interpretation] can be summarized as follows:
> What our listeners receive through their earphones should produce the same effect on them as the original speech does on the speaker's audience. It should have the same cognitive content and be presented with equal clarity and precision in the same type of language. Its language and oratory quality should be at least on the same level as that of the original speech, if not better, given that we are professional communicators, while many speakers are not, and sometimes even have to express themselves in languages other than their own.

The present study will investigate the interpreter's task as described by the above definitions using the empirical material recorded in the plenary sittings of the European Parliament. The quality criteria chosen for the definitions quoted above resemble those used by the Interpreting Directorate of the European Parliament in their description of SI, as quoted below:

> [...] interpreting is not word-for-word translation (which in most cases would produce just nonsense) but the *faithful* transmission of a message, captured in one language and then *accurately* rendered in another.
> [Translation and interpreting] are very similar in that they both involve the understanding of language and the underlying meaning [...] Unlike translators, interpreters have to deal with fleeting messages, and they have to do so in real time, with very little room for second guesses, let alone elegant style.
> Linguistic knowledge, in any case, is just the tip of the iceberg. [...] the interpreter must rely on a solid foundation of general knowledge and will often have to pick up bits and pieces of specialist knowledge on the job. Even more important is the ability to grasp the speaker's intention rather than words. [...] (my italics)
>
> (http://www.europarl.eu.int/interp/) [Accessed 29 November 2003]

My study will focus on the specifying terms of the above description which states that interpreting is not word-for-word translation but the *faithful* transmission of a source language message, rendered *accurately* in the target language. What scholars have meant by 'word-for-word translation' and the 'faithful' and 'accurate' rendering of a message will be discussed in Chapter 3.

1.3 Modeling the research object

While the general public is becoming more and more familiar with the conference interpreter's presence in international meetings, the actual SI and how it is carried out is still something that remains a puzzle for both the layman and the members of the profession. The SI process has been

described and analyzed from many angles. According to Jennifer Mackintosh (1995: 121), there is a generally accepted description of the interpreting process which has resulted in the following model:

> The essential features of the [SI] model are its three participants: message originator (speaker), message mediator (interpreter), message receiver (person/s for whom the message is intended in the target language – TL); the central mediating function of the interpreter who receives the message in the source language (SL), processes its informative/cognitive content and transmits it in TL; the propositional nature of discourse and the description of how the interpreter operates on the propositional, cognitive and semantic substance of the message, identifying its propositions, organizing them in terms of their semantic importance and reformulating equivalent propositions (i.e. ones having the same interlocutory effect) in the target language.

The model above contains the core elements of SI that have been studied in SI literature. The research questions derived from this compound of features have been formulated by Miriam Shlesinger (1995a: 8) as follows:

– How is it possible in the first place?
– How does it affect the text being processed?
– What are the factors that make it more or less difficult?
– How is the output perceived?
– What is its role in interaction?
– How can it best be taught?

With the help of an extensive corpus I will address one of the above questions in particular: *What are the factors that make SI more or less difficult*? This question is based on the theoretical literature on interpreting, but even more on my personal experience as a conference interpreter in numerous different conferences, and specifically in the European Parliament.

Two factors that make interpreting more difficult have been referred to above, i.e. the speed of delivery and the oral delivery of written texts. These two factors characterize much of EP plenary session discourse despite the fact that a number of authors on – and authorities of – interpreting have repeatedly argued for the thesis according to which the SI mode of translation will only work adequately for spontaneously delivered speech. The failure of interpreters to fulfill the above quality criteria will be foregrounded in the study in order to demonstrate the correctness of the thesis dating back to the 1970s.

1.4 The research strategy of the study

The present study is a continuation to my licentiate thesis of 1995 which aimed at defining some key quality criteria of interpreting from the users' point of view. The thesis aimed at supplementing the studies on users' expectations of SI quality that had been carried out at the end of the 1980's and in the early 1990's, applying their criteria in a modified way.

The study at hand has its starting point in the hypothesis based on the literature cited above, my licentiate thesis, as well as my experience as a conference interpreter. The hypothesis can be formulated as follows:

An SI performance that is in conformance with the users' expectations is based on collaboration between the speaker and the interpreter. In order for the interpreter to carry out his task successfully, the speaker has to collaborate with the interpreter.

This should be in the interest of the speaker as well. The perspective of my study will thus be shifted from user expectations to the speaker's role in constituting SI quality. Not only is this something that has been referred to in the literature, but the notion also has its roots in the everyday reality of interpreting. Interpreters frequently discuss the performances of the speakers that they have just interpreted, pointing out features that made interpreting difficult, or stating simply that someone had been 'a good speaker'. With the exception of experimental studies on presentation rate, for example, this angle has not been taken up as a research question *per se*, even though authors on interpreting have made references to several speaker-related factors that are known to complicate the interpreter's work. A practical aim of my study, based on authentic conference speeches, has therefore been to investigate the following research question: how could speakers collaborate with interpreters in such a way that the interpreted version of their message would create the same impression on listeners as those listening to the original.

The survey studies carried out on user expectations of SI indicate that 'sense consistency with the original message' is what they expect of the interpreter's version. (see Chapter 3 for a more detailed discussion of these studies.) Thus, the next task will be to define what is meant by 'sense consistency with the original message.' The definitions above aim at a holistic description of what the interpreter's task is. To repeat the relevant part of the definition by Mackintosh: "[...] the interpreter operates on the propositional, cognitive and semantic substance of the message, identifying its propositions, organizing them in terms of their semantic importance and reformulating *equivalent* propositions (i.e. ones having the same interlocutory effect) in their target language". (my italics)

The word that deserves attention here is 'equivalence'. It is an old concept in translation studies and will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3. Suffice it to say at this point that 'equivalence' has been chosen as the key concept for getting hold of the elusive idea of 'sense consistency with the original message', which, according to theories of interpreting, is not, and must never be, tantamount to word-for-word translation.

The following conclusion by Hildegund Bühler (1986: 233) is identical with the research design of my study: "The criteria of 'sense consistency with the original message' and 'completeness of interpretation', which are essential for interlingual communication and hence also the quality of interpretation, *can only be judged by comparison with the original."* (my italics)

'Comparison [of the SI] with the original' presupposes material, that is 'originals' and their SI versions. However, obtaining relevant and authentic material has been a major problem for SI studies (see e.g. Kalina 1998: 130). Another major problem is the large number of variables involved in spoken language, which means that it is difficult to make any definitive statements or conclusions about SI in general. In the study at hand, one solution to these problems has been to select a speech situation which is characterized by features that remain constant. This is the plenary session of the European Parliament, where the speech situation is governed by strict rules of procedure. Furthermore, each speech is interpreted in ten languages. The setting is thus a source for material that provides an ideal opportunity for comparing interpreters' versions with the originals.

The present study can be classified as a qualitative case study that investigates SI quality in an authentic conference situation on the basis of a corpus of source texts (120 speeches in English, Finnish, German and Swedish) and the manner in which they are rendered by professional interpreters into their target languages (English, Finnish, German and Swedish). The material was recorded in three subsequent EP plenary part-sessions, which means that for every speech there are the parallel SI versions in three languages. This corpus is not only authentic, but it is also large in comparison with the corpuses of any earlier study. It is thus possible to investigate the research question on the basis of a broad data. Furthermore, a number of empirical studies have used student interpreters, or they have the performances of two or three professionals, the number of interpreters of the present study is around 20[3] , and they are professionals who have been selected for their job on the basis of standardized tests.

Research on SI quality, as well as definitions and descriptions of (simultaneous) conference interpreting, have provided the quality parameters that are used as a basis for the theoretical framework and the method of the study. Further information for the choice of perspective was obtained through interviews conducted with five Finnish Members of the European Parliament. A lawyer was consulted in order to verify the accuracy of legal terminology produced by the Finnish interpreters. A journalist gave his opinion on the functionability of SI.

---

[3] The study is more interested in simultaneous interpreting as a task than the performance of individual interpreters. Therefore, the exact number of individual interpreters has not been considered relevant. Furthermore, it is practically impossible to tell the various interpreters apart.

On the basis of this material my study aims at investigating the research question, i.e. to investigate whether the interpreters' versions allow the listeners to create an impression that speech they are listening to is equivalent to the one they would have formed had they been listening to the original. This question is based on my personal observations on site as an interpreter working for the EP. According to my observations, various types of non-correspondences between the originals and the interpreters' versions were a normal element of SI. The next question therefore is to investigate whether there are some non-correspondencies that are typical for SI in the EP plenary session. If this is the case, this leads to a second question: What are the typical features which either facilitate or complicate the interpreter's task of producing a faithful and equivalent version of the original speech. Related to these questions is the hypothesis that interpreters aim at maximum correspondence with the original, that is, at maximum accuracy and faithfulness.

The present study owes a great deal to a number of empirical studies. They have provided useful concepts and categories for further empirical study. Errors and omissions are a fact of SI, and their significance to the overall meaning of the message has to be taken into account (cf. Gerver 1969, Setton 1999). However, interpreters are trained not to translate words but ideas (cf. Lederer 1981). Therefore, it is essential to analyze the content of the message in order to be able to say something about the quality of interpreting. In the present study I will attempt to operationalize the concept 'sense of the message' used in definitions of SI.

The overall design of the present study is supported by studies that have demonstrated the advantages for this field of study to investigate the phenomenon of SI on the basis of an authentic corpus (cf. Lederer 1981, Shlesinger 1989, Pöchhacker 1994, Kalina 1998, Setton 1999). The present study aims at enriching the existing field of SI studies with research material which has been recorded in an institution relying on simultaneous interpreting as a routine feature of its functioning. Furthermore, the material is more extensive than previous material available to an individual SI scholar in terms of the number of speeches and languages. In view of the theoretical considerations of the method used in this study, the crucial consideration of the validity and representativeness of the TT material should satisfy the conditions and requirements set for 'authentic data from a real-life setting'.

1.5 Is there need for further research on SI quality?

SI literature contains numerous suggestions for future research. Depending on the authors' interests, they may relate to research focusing on the actual SI process, or they may be practice-oriented, pleading for more data about real-life phenomena with a view to establishing quality

parameters that are unanimously accepted (Messina 2002). Efforts have been made in this direction by foregrounding SI quality as the main topic of interest. In 2001, a conference was dedicated to the issue of interpreting quality at the University of Granada. Papers and articles have been published covering the research and literature on the topic (Pöchhacker 2001), and the various variables that have an impact on the overall quality of interpreting, which also entails quality assurance (Kalina 2001), as well as the rationale and justification of a systematic benchmarking of interpreting quality (Mack 2002).

Yet, the issue of SI quality is not exhausted. In the early 1990s Pöchhacker (1993: 97) voiced the need for finding new approaches in the following words:

> [...] the perspective of SI studies should be widened to include the full range of situational and conference-related factors and variables which may have an impact on the degree of coherence established by the interpreter and the listener. *A great deal of further conceptual and methodological development will be required if we ever want to approach ways of empirically assessing the quality of text comprehension by the interpreter* and, more importantly, by those listening to the target text. (my italics)

Lederer stated the purpose of SI as being to create a situation where "[d]elegates speaking different languages and listening to the interpretation of languages they do not know [will] be able to understand each other as if they were communicating directly through one and the same language [...]" (1978/2002: 132). On the basis of the recorded material, the present study aims at finding out what some of the prerequisites could be for such an ideal situation to become reality.

Text comprehension by the interpreter is an indispensable component of SI quality assessment. It can only be evaluated on the basis of an interpreter's performance. Those listening to the target text depend on the interpreter for their text comprehension. Therefore, the emphasis of SI quality assurance has been on the recipient of SI and on the textual and prosodic material he needs in order to be able to constitute an interpretation of the speaker's message which is as close as possible to the one he would have formed had he been listening to the original directly.

1.6 The new research question

According to Bühler, an 'ideal interpreter' is "one who supplies an 'ideal interpretation' in a given situation for a given purpose" (1986: 233). Her definition is based on Reiss's functional approach, according to which "an interpretation is good if it serves its purpose, if it is adequate" (ibid.: 233). Kurz formulates her concluding remarks relying on the same theoretical basis in stating the

following: "The findings confirm the validity of the theories that view translation and interpretation as an intercultural communication process and emphasize the importance of situationality and communicative context (see Reiss and Vermeer 1984)." (1993/2002: 323)

The conclusions of Bühler and Kurz are extremely general for the purpose of defining interpreting quality. The message of the two articles referred to above underlines the importance of taking the listener into consideration. Today, this may seem like stating the obvious. Yet, in view of the short history of (S)I theory development, this may not have been stated explicitly by earlier SI theorists. What Bühler is not unaware of, either, is the fact that "the end-user might expect an 'ideal interpretation' even if it is impossible in that given situation for various reasons" (ibid.: 233).

This conclusion, together with the conclusions I had drawn from my user survey of 1995, led to a new research question which can be formulated as follows:

How can the interpreter's performance provide the listener with the same conditions for comprehending the speech, or for creating one's own interpretation of the content of the speech and of the speaker's intentions as another listener who is listening to the original speech?

The question above echoes Eugene Nida's (1969) ideas of dynamic equivalence as well as the definition by Déjean Le Féal (1990). While still keeping the user in focus, the question addresses the issue from the point of view of rhetoric. It is not possible to treat SI without taking the communicative context into account, as concluded by Bühler and Kurz. This implies that the speaker has to be included in the analysis of the quality criteria as well.

Thus, whatever the 'purpose' or 'function' of interpreting, the quality of the interpreter's product is, according to the hypothesis of the present study, determined by the speaker and his speech as well as the overall speech situation. Therefore, the emphasis has been placed on the form and content of the speech to be interpreted. The speeches will be studied in the light of an eclectic theoretical framework consisting of aspects of translation theory, including interpreting studies, and Chaïm Perelman's new rhetoric, supplemented by speech act theory and Jean-Michel Adam's text linguistics.

The analysis carried out on the basis of the theoretical framework (see Chapter 3) and the method (see Chapter 5) corroborated the early findings of SI research, according to which SI quality decreases in line with the growing number of prosodic and syntactic features which are characteristic of written language. Furthermore, as suggested by SI theory, its cognitive aspects in particular, an interpreter's knowledge of the topic discussed by the speaker correlates positively with the accuracy of the SI performance.

New rhetoric, or argumentation theory, has potential in the analysis of the 'sense of the message'. The method of analysis used here revealed a number of interesting aspects of the political

genre practiced in the European Parliament. (EP as the textual context has been discussed in Chapter 4.) However, the present study is only a first attempt to apply this methodological approach to a real-life corpus. Therefore, as much corpus material as was considered feasible has been included in the study in order to allow the reader to carry out his own analysis (Chapter 6). Furthermore, the sound of the examples has been recorded on the CD attached to the printed version. (In the internet version, the sound can be heard by clicking the code.) The audio samples offer the reader the possibility to formulate his own impression of the prosodic features of the original and the three interpreters' versions.

The results of the investigation process have highlighted the speaker's status as the primary speaker who wishes to reach his audience. SI quality can be approached in rhetorical terms, which underlines the importance of the speaker's *ethos*. The *ethos* can be conveyed to the listeners of SI if the interpreting is accurate and faithful.

2. SI RESEARCH UNDERLYING THE DESIGN OF THE PRESENT STUDY

Introduction.   One of the key elements of SI studies is to understand the process underlying the interpreter's task, which is to comprehend an aurally received text produced in one language, and to produce it orally in another language while attending to the on-going speech. This method of language processing attracted the interest of psychologists in the 1960's, and its investigation has been pursued until the present day.

This chapter will first refer to some early empirical studies which have influenced the development of SI theory. The studies by the psychologists Pierre Oléron and Hubert Nanpon (1965), Henri Barik (1969), David Gerver (1971), and Marianne Lederer (1981) have created the basis for much of subsequent SI research. Consequently, their aims and methods are well known in the field of SI studies. (For a comprehensive discussion of the status of these authors in the field of SI studies, see Pöchhacker and Shlesinger 2002.) In what follows I will take up such issues of their research that support the design of my own study in terms of its research question, its academic importance and its practical relevance (see 2.1 below).

With reference to the conceptual development of SI theory, the discussion below will concentrate on those aspects of the pioneering studies which are related to the comparison of spoken/oralized texts with their interpreted versions, which is the task of the present study. While the aim of the early studies was to analyze the process of language comprehension and production, they also noted the differences between the originals and the versions produced by interpreters. These observations are directly related to the issue of 'sense consistency with the original' and how that is defined.

Lederer, like Oléron and Nanpon, was interested in the SI process as well. She does not investigate it from a psycholinguistic point of view, however. Instead, her research is based on the interpreting theory first developed by Seleskovitch, which has its primary focus on the SI working method recommended by Seleskovitch and Lederer. According to them, the interpreter's task is to

convey the sense of the message. Therefore their research focuses on the way interpreters carry out this task.

An important recent contribution to the IS paradigm investigating the SI process is the cognitive-pragmatic analysis of simultaneous interpreting by Robin Setton (1999). Some of his empirical findings relating to the quality of interpreting will also be discussed in this chapter.

Within the context of SI studies, a second group of studies which have influenced my study are the theses by Miriam Shlesinger (1989), Franz Pöchhacker (1994) and Sylvia Kalina (1998), who have analyzed SI from a textual point of view. Their holistic approach has taken into account the multiple factors that have an influence on SI quality.

A third, and final, group of research which underlies the formulation of the research question of my study consists of surveys of interpreting quality. The influential studies by Bühler (1986) and Kurz (1993/2002) will be discussed together with the worldwide AIIC study and my own post-graduate survey conducted in the Finnish context.

2.1 Comparison of STs and TTs as a method of SI research

Time delay between original and translation. The psychological research on simultaneous interpreting by Pierre Oléron and Hubert Nanpon is based on comparing interpreters' output with that of speakers or a written translation. In qualitative terms, they have considered "the *degree of correspondence*, and hence the *accuracy*, of the translation to be assessed" (1963/2002: 43) (my italics). In the article referred to here, the authors focus on the time aspect of the SI activity, "examining the speaker's activity relative to that of the interpreter" (ibid.: 43). In order to determine the time delay between the original and the translation, the authors have devised an experimental study. One set of texts for the experiment consisted of recordings made 'in the field', subsequently selected and edited for the purposes of the study.

The issue of the research material is highly relevant for interpreting studies, and therefore some aspects will be discussed in the context of the early studies. What has to be taken into account when dealing with a study from the early 1960's is our increased understanding of the differences between written and spoken language. Oléron and Nanpon characterize the presentations produced 'in the field' as containing 'flaws'; according to them "the text is not organized 'normally', and this impacts on interpretation" (ibid.: 44). By 'flaws' the authors understand "hesitations, repetitions and incorrect language." The authors report that because of these features, producing transcriptions from the recordings was a cumbersome effort; therefore they decided to make use of a more

standardized situation (ibid.: 44). Thus, a second set of texts was selected from printed sources and read out on tape.

The design of the experiment has since been criticized as not being relevant for SI studies. The critics (e.g. Gile 2000, 1994) have asked for ecological validity in empirical studies instead of laboratory experiments based on modified or edited texts. Criticism has also been directed at comparing originals and the interpreted versions on word level. Oléron and Nanpon, too, noticed that interpreters process texts in larger chunks than single words. Thus, the quality concept of 'accuracy' cannot be used in quantitative terms to refer to the number of words in the SI version that correspond to the original text (cf. ibid.: 46, Table 2). Consequently, the quality criterion of 'accuracy' has to be assessed on a different basis.

The effect of variation in input rate on the interpreter's performance. David Gerver has played an important role in shaping the development of SI theory.[1] His study referred to here deals with "the effects of source language presentation rate on the performance of simultaneous conference interpreters" (1969/2002: 53). Gerver views SI as "a naturally occurring tracking task," where the simultaneous interpreter "is confronted with differential information load" (ibid.: 53). Some of the questions he discusses in his paper of 1969 are also present in the study at hand, such as the syntactic and/or semantic variability of the source language input, and the variability in source language presentation rate.

Relating to the discussion of SI quality criteria, Gerver enumerates deviations between the interpreters' output message and the input message[2]. He classifies the deviations into the following categories: *omissions of words, of phrases and of longer stretches of input of eight words or more; substitutions of words and of phrases*; and *corrections of words and of phrases*. According to his analysis, these deviations contributed to some *discontinuity* in the message being transmitted. In looking for an explanation to these deviations he comes to the following conclusion: "[...] any decrement in interpreter's performance was due to the effects of presentation rate on the process involved in interpretation rather than to an inability to perceive and repeat the input message correctly (ibid.: 63)". This statement confirms my personal observations which led to the formulation of the hypotheses of the present study where the issue to be analyzed is what happens to the sense of the message as a result of these deviations.

In comparing interpreters' versions with the originals, Gerver (ibid.) concludes that it is more appropriate to use the term 'discontinuity' rather than 'error' to describe the deviations between the interpreters' output and the original message. In the present study, Gerver's terms will

---

[1] For an extensive discussion of Gerver's research, see Pöchhacker and Shlesinger (2002).

[2] The input text was an extract from a speech at a UNESCO conference on Human Rights, recorded on tape at a rate of approx. 120 wpm; the rate was changed systematically during the experiment.

be used in comparing the STs with the TTs to describe the non-correspondences observed between the two sets of texts.

Regarding the key quality criteria for the SI user, i.e. 'sense consistency with the original message', it is important to bear in mind what early research has indicated: *an increase in the speaker's presentation rate will lead to a decrement in the interpreter's performance*. This finding has not been contradicted by any subsequent studies. Thus, one of the starting points of the present study is based on Gerver's (1969/2002: 66) summary of his findings, stated as follows:

> The picture emerges of an information-handling system which is subject to overload *if required to carry out more complex processes at too fast a rate* and *copes with overload* by reaching a steady state of throughput *at the expense of an increase in errors and omission*s. There is evidence that attention is shared within this system between the input message, processes involved in translating a previous message, and the monitoring of feedback from current output. Under normal conditions, attention can be shared between these processes, but when the total capacity of the system is exceeded, less attention can be paid to either input or output if interpretation is to proceed at all. Hence, less material is available for recall for translation, and more omissions and uncorrected errors in output will occur. (my italics)

Corresponding results were obtained by Tommola and Helevä in an experimental study in which linguistic complexity had a significant effect on lowering SI accuracy (1998). In another experimental study conducted by Tommola and Laakso (1997), increased input rate lowered propositional accuracy significantly. An excessively high presentation rate may thus be one answer to the research question 'What are the factors that make SI more difficult?' This finding will be considered a plausible factor that will be taken into account in the analysis of the research material of the study at hand.[3]

What Gerver has concluded about the information-handling system is relevant for the analysis of the research material of the present study. It will analyze instances of overload to the interpreter's information handling system as well as the types of errors and omissions and their impact on the propositional content of the original message. The resulting analysis will thus be a qualitative one, focusing on the content of the original messages and the changes in output form and content due to information overload caused by specifiable features in the input.

The studies cited above have provided a number of concepts and phrases that can be found in subsequent studies. For example, Oléron and Nanpon (1965/2002: 49) make the following comment:

---

[3] Hella Kirchhoff (1976/2002) formulates the issue of speed of delivery in a way that supports the approach of the present study: "Sender performance: The communicativity of the sender's delivery facilitates appropriate segmentation of the message, particularly with regard to the speaker's pauses. The presentation rate, which the interpreter cannot influence, has an impact on all operations of the process: all phases are under pressure. When language structures diverge, a high presentation rate is particularly stressful." (In: Pöchhackker and Shlesinger 2002: 113)

> [...] the interpreter is part of a *complex situation*, and the *variables* considered account for only some of its aspects. In this connection, we can talk of *strategies* designed to try to control the situation and involving various compromises either in terms of accuracy, or in terms of correctness, when time constraints – particularly those arising out of over-rapid speaker speed – become excessive. (my italics)

Recent studies employ the same concepts with the same sense as in the conclusions above. Franz Pöchhacker (1994) investigated simultaneous interpreting, calling it a *complex* activity. In his study Pöchhacker aimed at taking into account the many variables that make the SI situation a complex one. Sylvia Kalina (1998), together with her students, investigated some of the *strategies* that interpreters employ in order to control the situation.

2.2 Interpreting quality in the light of translation failures

In his doctoral dissertation of 1969, Henri Barik compared the interpreters' SI versions with the original spoken texts. According to him, there are three general categories of departure from the original: interpreters may omit material, or add material or substitute material compared with the original text. While Gerver was interested in the SI process as such, effects of the input rate being one element to be studied, Barik was interested in describing the nature of the omissions, additions and substitutions from a linguistic point of view.

Barik's (1975/2002: 89) conclusions are directly related to SI quality issues, as can be seen from the following: If omissions and errors are interpreted as *rough indices of quality of performance*, what these findings imply is that the ratio of number of words in T[ranslator]'s version to that in S[peaker]s may serve as a gross measure of evaluation. (my italics)

Barik and Gerver have provided Interpreting Studies with categories for classifying ST and TT correspondences and non-correspondencies. My study will employ the most transparent categories: (1) omissions, and (2) substitutions and errors. The labels are the same as those used by Gerver. The examples provided by Barik demonstrate how he has applied these categories. However, whereas Barik proposes that the quality of an SI performance may correlate with the 'number of instances' or 'amount of omissions and errors' which have been classified in linguistic terms, my study has a qualitative approach. A quantitative approach is best suited for experimental research. While omissions, substitutions and errors may be observed in quantitative terms, SI quality is not based on word-for-word equivalence only. This is something that Barik, too, has observed. He refers to the fact that the interpreter has retained 'the gist of the message' in spite of the translation departures he has observed. The present study will move a step forward on the basis of modern SI theory with the aim of finding a method for analyzing how to operationalize the elusive 'gist' of the message. Thus, while being aware of 'translation departures' of the kind

exemplified by Barik, my study will seek to find an approach that would make the quality criterion 'sense consistency with the original message' operational.

In addition to the linguistic categories for describing deviations in TTs, Barik's research contains two more issues that are at the core of my study. The first of these has to do with the question of the *'translation unit'* and how to approach that. The translation unit, or (SI) segmentation (or chunking), has been discussed by various authors as an integral element of SI theory (Goldman-Eisler 1972, Kirchhoff 1976, Lederer 1978, Gile 1997, Moser-Mercer 1997, Dam 1998, Kalina 1998, Setton 1998, in Pöchhackker and Shlesinger 2002). 'Translation unit' as a theoretical concept will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 3 in the context of the theoretical framework of the study. The second issue is the *'overall intelligibility'* of the SI version which can not be reflected on the basis of Barik's coding scheme alone (ibid.: 90). Consequently, other SI research has been consulted in order to solve the question of how to operationalize an expression like 'intelligibility'.

2.3 SI studies based on real-life corpuses

The field of Interpreting Studies (IS) has been developed by several scholars who have been interested in explaining the phenomenon of SI not only from a psychological or linguistic point of view but also from a point of view that takes the cognitive and communicative aspects into account. Some of the most influential early scholars have been Ghelly Chernov, Hella Kirchhoff, Danica Seleskovitch and Marianne Lederer, who developed their ideas in the 1970's in particular (cf. Pöchhackker and Shlesinger 2002). Lederer has also been influential in postulating how the 'intelligibility' of conference interpretation should be understood. The empirical study by Lederer will be discussed here as an academic study with the primary interest in simultaneous conference interpreting, relying on real-life data.

Marianne Lederer – the thesis of intelligent interpreting. According to Kalina, Marianne Lederer was the first IS researcher who analyzed interpreters' performances recorded in an authentic conference (Kalina 1998: 160). It is an important development in terms of SI research design compared with the psycholinguistic studies discussed above.

The work by Lederer is oriented to the 'intelligibility' of simultaneous interpreting. Lederer recorded material for her study on the SI process with the aim of showing at what point of the incoming speech the interpreter arrives at the *sense* of the spoken message. According to Lederer (1981: 23), her primary aims were the following: "[...] to map out the components of SI, to prove

the emergence and apprehension of the sense as the speech proceeds, and to expose the techniques used by the interpreter for controlling his/her simultaneous listening and speaking [...]."[4] (my translation)

Her research focuses on the SI process, the aspect of simultaneity in particular. The process is analyzed on the basis of transcriptions of the original STs and their SI versions which have been aligned to reflect the synchronicity of the SI in relation to the original. Using this method, Lederer hoped to be able to demonstrate the point where the interpreter had arrived at the sense of the incoming speech and how he processed it, aiming at an 'intelligent' rather than a word-for-word translation.

The corpus consists of 63 minutes of original discourse recorded in a three hour meeting of Eurifima, a company financing railway equipment. In addition to the original speeches in German, the corpus contains the SI into French by the two interpreters recruited to work at the conference. To complement the corpus after the 'real' conference, Lederer asked the same interpreters to interpret on tape those sections which they had not worked on in the 'authentic' conference situation, and added them to her corpus in order to obtain a full interpretation by both interpreters; this arrangement ensured that interpreters had the same background knowledge of the meeting. (ibid.: 24–25)

Lederer provides many examples of the problems involved in the aural perception of technical language (ibid.: 68–101). She also discusses extensively the differences between spontaneous and written language, and the difficulties involved in the reception of written texts which are read (*texts oralisés*). (ibid.: 101–103)

Lederer's theoretical orientation is reflected in her choice of languages (German into French). According to her, the need to comprehend what has been said in order to translate it is more evident in the case of languages with different syntactic structures than with languages which can be "translated" (inverted commas by Lederer) by phonetic gliding (*'glissement phonétique'*), or by transposing the first sense (*'transposition de sens premiers'*) (ibid.: 24).

In her conclusions Lederer refers to the fact that it is not only the SI process as such, but also many other factors which contribute to the quality of interpreting. She mentions, among other things, the organization of the meeting (availability of documents for the interpreters to prepare) and the presentation of the speeches (reading written papers, strange accents, etc.) (ibid.: 390–391).

Lederer focuses on the SI process, analyzing it on the basis of transcriptions of the original STs and their SI versions. These have been aligned to reflect the synchronicity of the SI in relation

---

[4] Pour cerner les composantes de la traduction simultanée, pour démontrer l'apparition et l'apprehension du sens à mesure que défile la chaine parlée, pour exposer les techniques utilisées par l'interpète afin d'équilibrer sa parole et son écoute, [...].

to the original. The present study is not interested in investigating the cognitive process, although here, too, the focus is on the 'sense' of the original message, applying Lederer's method of aligning the ST and the TTs in a modified manner (see Chapter 5, Research material and method).[5]

In an earlier article Lederer (1978/2002: 137) describes what she understands by 'intelligent' interpretation. If the interpreter has to resort to the least preferred method of following the speaker word by word, translating the speech at the level of language, he does so only until the point where he understands what the speaker is aiming at. From that point on the interpreter is able to resort to the preferred method of finding an expression that carries the sense of the message without being a literal transcoding of the source text lexical elements.

Lederer provides examples from her material which demonstrate that the interpreter has understood the speaker's intended meaning without producing exactly the same phrase or expression as the speaker. "The difference between sense and linguistic meaning is clearly revealed in the two equivalents I have just shown [...]" (1981: 137). The sense of the original message is conveyed even if the SI formulation does not correspond to the exact wording of the original. Proceeding from this analysis Lederer (ibid.: 137–138) arrives at the following claim which is at the core of her main thesis:

> This variance in the interpreter's expression as compared to the basic meanings of words is the tangible evidence that can be seized upon to probe into nonverbal thinking. The point here is not how interpreters arrange their phrases syntactically so as to fit the requirements of their own mother tongue, but the fact that their wording reflects more than the knowledge of two languages and the ability to establish equivalents between the two.

The concept 'nonverbal thinking', used in the quotation above, is something that the Paris school of interpreting has been professing since the theoretical construct and term were first coined by Seleskovitch and later developed further by her and Lederer. They emphasize the element of comprehension in professional interpreting as opposed to word-for-word transcoding. The concluding remark to the empirical observation above was expressed as follows by Lederer: "It reflects the thinking process that goes on during interpreting, something which obviously is not unique to interpreters or interpretation but applies to the understanding process in general." According to Tommola, the ideas presented by Lederer (and Seleskovitch) have their counterparts in cognitive science. (See Tommola 1999) Theoretical concepts developed by cognitive scientists, like *mental models*, *schemes* and *representations,* have replaced 'nonverbal thinking' in the SI models by Pöchhacker and Setton, for example.

While analyzing the research corpus from a textual rather than a cognitive point of view, the

---

[5] The study by Lederer, *La traduction simultanée – Expérience et théorie,* has been discussed extensively by Setton (1999: 39–43), Kalina (1998: 70–71; 160), and Pöchhacker (1994: 20–21; 26).

present study aims at taking into account the theoretical ideas of scholars like Lederer who emphasize the importance of the sense of the message. Consequently, the quality of target texts cannot be assessed on the basis of linguistic elements that are missing or that are viewed as 'errors' in the eyes of one evaluator – something that Barik's system has been criticized for.

Lederer's research has been referred to here as an early stimulus highlighting the many issues involved in SI research, such as the validity and reliability of the research results which are based on the theoretical framework, the choice of the research question, the criteria set for the corpus, and the research method. While Lederer's research has served as a global account of the essential components of SI, the M.A. study by Miriam Shlesinger (1989) as well as the dissertations by Franz Pöchhacker and Robin Setton have influenced the present study more directly with their theoretical ideas, their research question and their use of corpus material.

Starting with Seleskovitch, IS scholars have included modeling of SI as an integral element of their research. They have been interested in interpreting as a special kind of cognitive process. Depending on their background, authors have approached SI from the point of view of information processing or language processing, the starting point being the limited capacity of cognitive functions in a task (SI) that requires the coordination of many functions (cf. Gerver 1969/2002 above; Massaro and Shlesinger 1997).

Two models will be discussed here to the extent they have influenced the design and analysis of the present study. The first one is by Franz Pöchhacker, which is important in situating the SI texts in their context. The second one is by Robin Setton, applying recent pragmatic and cognitive knowledge to understand the SI process.

Franz Pöchhacker – SI and its macrocontext.   Pöchhacker has contributed in a significant way to the development of SI studies by creating a systematic and holistic view of what variables are at play when the quality of conference interpreting is evaluated. The overriding goal for Pöchhacker has been to take into account the multiple factors that are involved in conference interpreting. Pöchhacker has developed his theory on the basis of the functional - communicative theory of translation, combined with the theory of translatorial action.

Pöchhacker views SI as a complex phenomenon which has to be studied in its wide context. This means taking the situational factors into account, including the conference site with its facilities, in addition to the speakers, the audience and the interpreters. His theoretical approach contains the modeling of the actors involved in the situation (*'Aktantenmodellierung'*) together with the text, understood in its widest sense (*'Textmodellierung'*) (1994: 73, 97) Following the ideas of translatorial action, Pöchhacker has developed a multidimensional model for investigating the various levels of action that SI quality is composed of (*'Handlungsebenen'*). (ibid. 116–122)

The model also takes specific professional issues into account, such as the role played by the conference organizer. This element is closely related to the cognitive aspect of SI, i.e. the interpreter's knowledge about the substance of the conference which is partly dependent on the organizer and the amount of information and material they have given the interpreters. All these aspects are taken into account in the description of the EP as the context of the present research material (Chapter 4).

On the basis of his theoretical model Pöchhacker proceeded to investigate an authentic three-day international conference for SMEs (36th World Congress of the International Council of Small Business). The aim of the empirical study was to test the theoretical model in order to see whether the correlations are visible in practice. Furthermore, the study aimed at investigating under what conditions and for what reasons SI quality is of a high or a low standard. (ibid.: 123–142)

In line with his theory, the empirical part of Pöchhacker's research report begins with a specific description of the conference, starting with data about the role played by the organizer and the preparatory arrangements that were relevant for SI. For example, the recruitment of the interpreters as well as the provision of conference documents has been reported, complete with the timing of these organizational aspects. This information ties in with SI quality, as the possibility given to interpreters to prepare conference documents is one of the factors which, according to Pöchhacker's theory, should have an influence on the quality.[6] (ibid. 149–151)

The conference corpus that Pöchhacker has used for his research consists of 104 original speeches, 96 in English and 8 in German, together with their interpreted versions, about seven hours altogether (ibid.: 155–158). The material was recorded on sound tapes and in a 'logbook'. The recording is identical to what the listeners received in their headsets. The transcripts, together with the textual profiles and quantitative data about the speeches, are included in the research report together with a careful description of the use of the method.

Regarding the speakers' presentation rate, Pöchhacker counted the number of syllables per minute as this was a method which, according to him, was technically feasible and reliable. Today, almost ten years later, modern technology has made it possible to reproduce sound recordings in formats which allow the reader to listen to the original texts and create their own impressions of what they consider to be a 'fast' vs. 'normal' rate of delivery. Furthermore, the software provides information about the rhythm of speech, the intonation, etc. The present study has therefore included the original voice of the speakers and the interpreters in digital format for those who wish

---

[6] In her Ph.D. dissertation of 1998 on the influence of contextual factors on simultaneous interpreting, Heike Lamberger-Felber carried out an empirical study on SI with manuscripts that the interpreters had prepared prior to the SI task, SI with manuscripts without preparation, and SI without any manuscript. The aim of the study was to find out to what extent the availability of the manuscript was discernible in the end product. One of the results of her research was that the availability of the manuscript does diminish the amount of mistakes and omissions; the number of mistakes is even lower if the interpreter has had the opportunity to prepare the text in advance.

to assess not only the speech rate but also other prosodic and paraverbal features of the speech.

Pöchhacker's definition of SI is based on the 'singularity' (*'Singularität', 'Einmaligkeit der AT-Darbietung'*) and 'synchronicity' of SI. 'Singularity' refers to the fact that the source text is only presented once, creating the basis for the final target text. This is a characteristic which was also emphasized by Kade (1968, quoted by Kalina 1989: 19), as well as by Seleskovitch in her discussion of the differences between written and oral translation. 'Synchronicity' refers to the overlapping production of source text and target text. Thus, SI is, as defined by Pöchhacker, "the production of a *Translat* in synchronous action with a source speech which is presented only once" (1994: 44)[7] .

The term '*Translat*' connects the definition with Vermeer's *skopos* theory[8] and the functional theory of Reiss and Vermeer. The '*Translat*' produced by the interpreter is a text which, in accordance with the theory, takes into account such factors as the function and purpose of the text (*'skopos'*), the recipient, and the information offered. It also demonstrates intratextual coherence (the text can be understood as an independent text) and intertextual coherence (fidelity, or semantic correspondence between the ST and the TT). In his conclusions he points out that these concepts are extremely general by nature. They do not provide the specific guidance that a professional needs in his decision-making during the interpreting process. While these concepts of the General Translation Theory may be an accessible approach to the basics of translation theory, they need fine-tuning for research or professional purposes. The present study, being inspired by Pöchhacker's broad theoretical discussions, hopes to contribute, to some extent at least, to a novel kind of understanding of 'intratextual coherence'.

In his case study, Pöchhacker compares TTs with their STs. According to his findings there were various shortcomings in the SI performances. In his report Pöchhacker discusses two categories of shortcomings, i.e. those relating to textual surface quality, and those relating to the correctness of the translation (*"Stimmigkeit"*). As the theoretical and practical questions relating to SI quality and the evaluation of SI performances were one of the motivations for Pöchhacker's research, it is interesting to read his conclusions where he emphasizes the individuality of SI products. Through his analysis he has seen the multitude of factors that have an influence on the outcome of SI (ibid.: 248). Like other authors in the field (cf. Kalina 2002), Pöchhacker proposes co-operation between the organizer and the interpreters, as well as between the speakers and the interpreters for an optimal SI performance (ibid.: 233).

Concerning his findings, Pöchhacker states that the analysis was not exhaustive. He has worked out a framework consisting of a number of components that deserve to be studied on the

---

[7] "SI lässt sich [...] definieren als zur einmaligen Darbietung eines Ausgangs-Rede handlungssynchrone Translatproduktion."
[8] The standard German word for translation is '*Übersetzung*'.

basis of specific hypotheses. This is what the present study wishes to accomplish. The general ideas of the 'hypertext', or the macro-level approach to the SI situation, have been applied in the present study. Yet, conscious of the findings of earlier research which have clearly demonstrated the individuality of interpreters' performances, one of the first goals in the compilation of the present corpus was to make it sufficiently large for the individuality of the TTs to fade into the background. While accepting the overall idea of 'a functional target text', the present study aims at looking more closely at what makes a TT functional. In a speech context where many of the variables can be specified it is possible to determine the criteria of a functional TT. The selection criteria of the research material as well as of the research design are explained in Chapter 5.

Furthermore, Pöchhacker has seen that in cases where the research focuses on authentic conference material, i.e. on real people acting in a real life situation, it would seem advisable to carry out a descriptive analysis rather than a "purely" empirical study which would evaluate the data from a statistical point of view (ibid.: 244). The present study can be characterized as a qualitative case study which aims at describing speeches and their interpreted versions.

Robin Setton – a cognitive-pragmatic model. The most recent model describing the SI process has been developed by Robin Setton. His aim has been to find a theoretical framework which would do justice to SI, an activity consisting of "a peculiar combination of conditions" (1999: 3). Setton (ibid.: 3) enumerates five such conditions:

(i) Use of speech systems: overlapping simultaneous listening and speaking.

(ii) Goal orientation: comprehension is oriented to production.

(iii) External pacing: the stimulus-processing-response cycle is externally paced.

(iv) External sourcing: translation expresses the product of someone else's thoughts, assumptions, reasoning, priorities and objectives. Only formulation and articulation are the interpreter's.

Setton's aim is to describe cognitive operations in SI and correlate them with texts (ibid.: 99). His starting point is the assumption that a model can be formulated using a basic set of these operations. Furthermore, these operations can be reliably inferred from corpora in which the key variables are representative of professional practice. This means that SI is studied on the basis of authentic conference texts produced in an authentic situation, and the speeches are interpreted by professional conference interpreters. Based on his theoretical and empirical approach, Setton wishes "to establish a core cognitive-linguistic model, a kind of competence baseline for SI" (ibid.: 99). According to Setton, his primary aim is "to show how SI can be [...] modeled by integrating the operation of context and the intentional, communicative dimension" (ibid: 101). The questions for analyzing the corpus in order to achieve that aim were the following (ibid.: 101–103):

1) What kinds of cues are used by simultaneous interpreters?

2) To what extent does sentence structure affect SI?

3) What kinds of errors or failures reflect coordination problems, which linguistic competence, and which a lack of extralinguistic knowledge?

4) Are differences in structural transformation patterns or the use of cues visible either between language pairs, situations (mock/live) or discourse modes (recited vs. spontaneous oral input)?

5) What is the nature of intermediate representation in SI?

Questions (1), (4) and (5) are at the core of Setton's study, which focuses on the modeling of the SI process, whereas questions (2) and (3) are closely related to the research questions of the present study, which analyses source texts from the point of view of the 'sense' of the message. Question (2) is relevant due to the fact that a great deal of the research material of the present study consists of written speeches recited from notes. Therefore it can be expected that sentence structure is a crucial feature affecting the interpreters' speech reception and comprehension. Question (3) reflects the observations by the studies of Oléron and Nanpon (1965/2002), Gerver (1969/2002) and Barik (1975/2002), admitting the occurrence of errors and failures even in the performances of professional interpreters.

Setton discusses the specific errors and problems that have been apparent in his corpus. The present study will refer to 'errors' and 'failures' as discussed by Setton. He is interested in "significant losses or distortions of the Speaker's meaning", distinguishing "failure originating in the primary assembly of the basic proposition (due to missed semantic or syntactic information)" from "failure in a subsequent process, in the organization of propositions relative to each other or their embedding in speech acts or attitudes [...]" (ibid.: 253). According to him, failures in these categories may result from problems relating to pragmatic competence, or coordination problems, or information overload (ibid.: 253).

While applying Setton's basic division into two major categories of failure, my study will not attempt to explain the cognitive causes of failures. Instead, STs and TTs will be analyzed, and failures belonging to one or several of the above categories will be discussed in terms of the degree to which they influence the SI recipients' possibilities of forming the same interpretation of the speech as those who listen to the original speech. This is assessed on the basis of the linguistic material of the ST that is carried over in the TT.

According to Setton, the existing SI corpus pool is too thin for the creation of a theory with real explanatory power. Besides the scarcity of authentic corpus material, the building up of a unified explanatory theory has been hampered by the researchers' differing views of language processing and of the nature of intermediate representation for translation. In Setton's words, his

"own small contribution to the corpus base highlights structural and typological contrasts between the source and target languages" (ibid.: 100). His corpus consists of tape-recorded samples from real and simulated conference sessions with transcripts for reference. He has two language combinations: German into English and Chinese (Putonghua) into English, with three original speakers and five different interpreters. In addition to these, his corpus has a third Chinese sample with three different interpreters, and a second text from the German conference (originally used by Kalina) with two interpreters. The texts were selected both for their representativity of professional practice and their suitability for an exploratory study (ibid.: 104– 105). Setton characterizes them as 'semi-rehearsed, discursive speech' (ibid. 104).

Setton's model is based on modern theories of monolingual speech comprehension and production (ibid..: 64). The model (ibid.: 65– 67) comprises the following components:

(i) inputs: speaker input, other audiovisual input, interpreter's own speech;
(ii) processes: word recognition, assembler, executive, formulation and articulation;
(iii) adaptive (working) memory;
(iv) stores: linguistic knowledge for SL and TL, situation knowledge and world knowledge.

Setton's model is an eclectic one, drawing on many authors and theories, and in Setton's words is "a strictly functional and synchronic one, representing the interpreter's competence and functional potential at the time of performance: it is neutral as to the ontogeny of mental functions, or its neural architecture". (ibid.: 67) Setton views his model as a "creative and constructive" one for describing "how cognition adapts itself to complex communication involving extended discourse and multiple participants. The provisional model is [...] necessarily a hybrid of best available theories." (ibid.: 63) The eclectic nature of the study at hand is thus enhanced by the eclecticity of Setton's model. Subsequent authors such as Pöchhacker and Shlesinger have applauded the model as "one of the most significant advances in interpreting research" (2002: 177). The model can thus be considered to represent 'the state of the art' in SI theory. Furthermore, as a holistic model, it helps the analyst by providing an overview of the various components of the SI process and how they are interlinked.

For speech production, Setton has chosen to apply Levelt's model, according to which sovereign speech production starts with the conceptualizer. In the SI process this is replaced by inferring the meaning from the speaker's message. This activity is supported by the permanent and temporary memory. The interpreter becomes the speaker at the point where his own speech acts are formed. (ibid.: 225; Levelt 1989) The same model has been suggested for SI research by Kees de Bot (2000: 65–88).

In explaining his model, Setton discusses at length the inputs required for discourse comprehension. This is, of course, the core of all interpretation, including SI, and the very angle from which the present study will approach the research corpus. According to Setton, "the task of the interpreter is to appropriate and recreate the extended speech act of another individual" and "an adequate psychological model must explain how [the interpreter] retrieves and recreates the Speaker's intentionality through indications of illocution and propositional attitudes" (1999: 6).

In order to include this element in his model, Setton has chosen the relevance theory of Sperber and Wilson for SI research as a "most coherent articulation of pragmatics and cognitive psychology so far" (ibid.: 6). Since relevance theory focuses on conversation, and SI has to deal with extended discourse, Setton's model also takes into account the cognitive semantics of Fillmore and the theory of mental models by Johnson-Laird and Garnham, which provide accounts of how long-term memory and working memory operate. The speech act theory of Searle is also present in the model, providing the theoretical framework for intentionality in language. This approach is directly linked with relevance theory, according to which communication is based on the principle of relevance. In this context the key concepts are 'ostension', i.e. the communicative intent, and 'inference'. (ibid.: 5–7) With a view to the research question of the present study, relevance theory suggests that the more conscious a speaker is in his use of ostensive devices, the more likely it is that the interpreter is able to render his argumentation in the target language. The use of ostensive devices is one linguistic element that is analyzed in the present study.

Even if the study at hand will not analyze the recorded material from a strictly cognitive-pragmatic angle, Setton's model will be used as an element of the theoretical frame. It provides the theoretical basis for understanding some of the phenomena in the interpreters' output that are relevant for the research question. Setton's account has been supplemented by further information about the neurolinguistic processes involved in SI as explained by Michel Paradis (2000: 17–24), as well as the attentional mechanisms in SI as discussed by Michael Sharwood Smith (2000: 25–44).

SI monitoring. Monitoring is an important component of the cognitive operations at use in SI. With reference to errors and failures, authors discussing the differences between translation and interpreting have considered the key distinguishing feature to be the fact that the simultaneous interpreter works under circumstances where it is practically impossible to control or correct mistakes. *Sylvia Kalina* (1998) has studied the *strategic processes* in simultaneous interpretation. According to Kalina, 'monitoring' is one of the global strategies employed. In her view it is more than speech control. In the part-process of monitoring, Kalina also includes the input text, the relationship between the input and output texts, and the production of the output text. Monitoring obviously involves varying degrees of memory capacity. (See Isham 2000: 133–149 for an interesting account of the phonological interference on short-term memory.)

2.4 Written texts vs. spontaneous speech

Starting with the first empirical studies on SI (see Oléron and Nanpon 1965/2002, Gerver 1969/2002 above), authors have commented on the impact on interpreting of written and oral texts. Regarding the differences between oral and written texts, the study by Miriam Shlesinger (1989) has been particularly influential. Shlesinger has attracted attention to the differences that can be observed between written and spoken language, and how these are reflected in SI discourse. She has enumerated factors contributing to these differences, one of the key elements being the role of planning involved in the two modes. Shlesinger (ibid: Abstract) has defined the object of her study as follows:

> [...] to observe the relative orality of two ontologically different texts. Specifically, it [examined] the effect of simultaneous interpretation on the orality of the target text as compared with that of the source text, based on the relative incidence of features associated with oral (spoken-like) and with literate (written-like) discourse.

The texts were obtained in authentic conference settings. The corpus includes four STs in Hebrew and four in English as well as the TTs produced by three professional interpreters in two authentic conference situations, 16 texts altogether. Half of the corpus was recorded during a criminal trial (Hebrew –> English, the two interpreters being native speakers of English), and the other half in a conference on Jewish education (English –> Hebrew, the two interpreters being native speakers of Hebrew).

Shlesinger uses 'orality' to mean the spoken-like vs. written-like character of the text, as distinct from its mode. She applies four parameters for isolating the features relevant to textual orality: (1) degree of planning; (2) shared context and knowledge; (3) lexis; and (4) degree of involvement. The first of Shlesinger's three hypotheses is formulated in the following terms: "[SI] diminishes the orality of markedly oral texts and the literateness of markedly literate ones" (loc.cit.). While her findings confirmed the latter part of the hypothesis, i.e. that SI "does have a consistent tendency to render a literate text more oral," the findings for the first part of the hypothesis were "less unequivocal" (loc.cit.).

The findings were based on texts which were selected from segments of more extensive texts in order to isolate parts of texts that were clearly more oral or more literate. (ibid.: 99) Thus, both

the English and the Hebrew sets of STs included two texts that represented the more oral type of discourse and two that represented the more literate type of discourse, their lengths varying between 14 to 32 lines (with some lines containing only one lexical element).

The design of Shlesinger's study has influenced the present study in several respects. First, Shlesinger emphasizes the importance of having an authentic conference corpus for the type of research objective selected for the study. Secondly, her corpus, too, contains discourse which has involved planning, but which was translated extemporaneously by the interpreters. Two of the parameters of her study are relevant for the present study: (1) the **degree of planning** which can be measured by the textual density of the original and the disfluences in the SI versions, and (2) the **shared context**, which includes knowledge pertaining to the speaker; the intention of the utterance; situational and circumstantial parameters, and other extralinguistic knowledge. All these parameters have been discussed by authors of IS, including Lederer (1978), Kopczynski (1980), Seleskovitch (1982) and Déjean le Féal (1982). The same elements were later incorporated into a comprehensive theory of SI by Pöchhacker, as discussed above.

Shlesinger's study has served as an important influence for my study with regard to the research questions and focus, since the corpus at hand contains mostly speeches which have involved a considerable degree of planning. Consequently, the effect of oral/spoken vs. literate/written texts on SI performances is a variable that must be taken into account when analyzing the TTs of the interpreters. This effect has been observed in the present study as well.

When evaluating the performances of the interpreters in the present corpus, the parameter of shared context is crucial, and the aspect of shared knowledge in particular. This is all the more significant as the members of the audience meet regularly, almost on a daily basis. Therefore the concept 'shared context and knowledge' acquires a different dimension compared to what it refers to in theoretical texts discussing conferences in general. In the EP, the speeches have been produced in a context which is familiar to all the members of the audience. In practice this means that speakers will take it for granted that their audience may not need more than a term, or a name or an acronym in order to understand what the speaker is referring to. The question to be taken into consideration is whether the interpreters working for the EP are party to the shared knowledge of the EP audience.

2.5 Quality of interpreting as the object of survey studies

Definitions of (S)I abound in quality criteria. Quality of interpreting has been a pervasive theme of SI studies going back to the first textbooks of the 1950's. SI quality from the point of view of the recipient has been in the focus of my earlier studies as well.

Interpreters' prioritization of quality criteria. Interpreting quality as seen *by interpreters* was taken up as a research question by Hildegund Bühler, who wished "to establish criteria for the evaluation of conference interpretation and interpreters with emphasis on the expectations and needs of users" (1986: 231). Bühler investigated the "linguistic (semantic) and extra-linguistic (pragmatic) criteria for the evaluation of conference interpretation and interpreters" used by professionals in assessing their colleagues or, in a more specific case, when deciding on the admission of new members into AIIC. The research question was based on the assumption that the views of professionals would also reflect user expectations and needs.

The 16 criteria chosen by her were the following (presented in this order): *native accent, pleasant voice, fluency of delivery, logical cohesion of utterance, sense consistency with original message, completeness of interpretation, correct grammatical usage, use of correct terminology, use of appropriate style, thorough preparation of conference documents, endurance, poise, pleasant appearance, reliability, ability to work in a team, and positive feedback from delegates.* Bühler received 47 replies from professional interpreters (members of AIIC). She summarized her findings by stating that "practically all linguistic criteria ('sense consistency with the original message', 'logical cohesion of utterance', 'use of correct terminology', 'fluency of delivery', 'completeness of interpretation' and 'correct grammatical usage') were rated high by informants" (ibid: 233).

The aim of Bühler's investigation was to find the criteria which would describe an 'ideal interpreter.' She (ibid.: 233) formulated her conclusions as follows: "The criteria as discussed in this paper reflect the requirements of the user as well as fellow interpreter in a (hopefully) well-balanced mixture. [...] The 'ideal interpreter' will be the one who performs adequately and produces an 'ideal interpretation' in a given situation."

Listeners' prioritization of interpreting quality criteria. Bühler had set out to investigate (S)I quality criteria with an emphasis on user expectations. Although her questionnaire was only

addressed to professional interpreters, she concluded that the criteria reflected the requirements of the user as well. There were other scholars, however, who were not totally convinced by Bühler's final comments. Consequently, they decided to carry out surveys addressing conference participants directly. The specific aim of these studies was to find out the most relevant quality criteria *for the end-users of SI.*

The first study was carried out by Ingrid Kurz (1989), its aim being to test Bühler's claims, referred to above, against the response of actual end-users of SI at a medical conference. Kurz further investigated whether different user groups have different expectations of interpretation (1993/2002). She examined three different user groups, employing the first eight criteria of Bühler's study (native accent, pleasant voice, fluency of delivery, logical cohesion of utterance, sense consistency with original message, completeness of interpretation, correct grammatical usage, use of correct terminology). Based on 124 completed questionnaires (including the response by interpreters to Bühler's questionnaire), Kurz arrived at the following conclusion: "While there was fairly high agreement by all groups on the importance of some of the criteria, conference interpreters and users as well as different user groups among themselves differed in their assessment of other criteria" (ibid.: 323). As a final outcome of these studies the one criterion that all groups, including the professional interpreters of Bühler's study, considered to be the most important one was 'sense consistency with the original message'.

Another study, commissioned by AIIC, arrived at the same conclusion as Kurz regarding the most important SI quality criterion. The survey was executed by a professional research company on the basis of interviews carried out by interpreters on conference sites, using structured question sheets. (201 interviews carried out in 84 different meetings representing and covering 17 languages) (Moser 1995). The quality criteria were grouped according to those related to content match ('completeness of rendition', 'terminological accuracy', 'faithfulness to meaning') and those related to formal match ('synchronicity', 'rhetorical skills', 'voice'). Conferences were classified into four different types of meeting (large technical conference, small technical seminar, small general meeting, large general assembly). The results indicated that the quality criteria related to content match are more important to listeners than the criteria related to form. Furthermore, a considerable percentage of the respondents preferred 'concentration on the essentials' to 'completeness of rendering'. The response also indicated that an important criterion for the user of SI is 'faithfulness to meaning'.

Such results give rise to many questions. On the whole, to what extent can one assume that the criteria supplied by the questionnaire are understood by the respondents the way they were intended to be understood? How do respondents differentiate between the various options supplied by the questionnaires? For example, what do conference participants understand by 'the essentials' of a presentation? Or how do they differentiate 'faithfulness to meaning' from a 'literal reproduction'? One may also ask what has been the impact of these studies on interpreting theory,

or on definitions of interpreting. How do they guide interpreters in their everyday work? For example, in a large general assembly, to what extent and in what way do they help the interpreter to know what is essential for the listener?

Simultaneous interpreting as experienced by users.   These questions had not yet been formulated when I started investigating the same issues as the authors cited above. In their conclusions they propose that "similar studies should be conducted among other groups of end users so as to develop a broader base of observational data" (Kurz 1993/2002: 323). Motivated by these suggestions, I decided to consult users of SI in Finland. My licentiate thesis has the same aim as the studies of Kurz and AIIC/Moser, i.e. to carry out a survey on the way in which users prioritized the given quality criteria, as well as how they evaluated the interpreting that they had been listening to. Furthermore, in addition to their evaluation, other data about their reasons for listening to SI was also obtained. (Vuorikoski 1997, 1995, 1993)

Regarding the research question, my study aimed at gaining a wider and deeper view of the audiences than the ones referred to above. In addition to having the previous studies support my research question, I benefited greatly from the theoretical approach to SI by Pöchhacker's study of 1994, which represented the state-of-the art of SI studies at the time. Thus, compared to the ones cited above, my study contained some theoretically grounded modifications relating to communication theory and translation theory. First, it focused on one conference type only in order to reduce the number of variables to be taken into account. I chose 'the seminar' as the speech context, because it offered a setting and audience that could be defined in a relatively reliable manner. The purpose of the speech situation and the roles of the actors could be characterized in theoretical terms. My study covered five seminars. The members of the audiences were Finns, invited to the seminars in order to be informed about a clearly specified topic by experts from abroad.

Further modifications related to the quality criteria. Since the earlier studies had shown that the vast majority of users of SI expect interpreting to be 'faithful' to the original, or, in other words, they expect 'sense consistency with the original message', that criterion was not included in my survey. After all, most members of the audience do not concentrate on comparing the original with the interpreter's version even if it were technically possible. Such comparisons are carried out in special situations, such as interpreting tests. Instead of investigating the importance of a criterion which had proven to be more or less self-evident, I wanted to find out whether the sense of the message had been conveyed successfully from the listener's point of view. Theories and definitions of interpreting singled this out as the interpreter's core task, so it was relevant to find a way of capturing this element in the questionnaire. Thus, respondents were asked to assess whether interpreting had been 'informed.' SI theories emphasize the importance of a sufficient amount of knowledge of the topic as a prerequisite for high standard interpreting. Therefore, the assumption was that a positive response to the interpreting being 'informed' would be an indication of a

successful rendering of the speaker's message.

The section of the questionnaire consulting the listeners' evaluation of the interpreting in the seminar that they had attended was formulated as follows: "Interpreting was 1) informed; 2) clear (easy to follow); 3) accurate; 4) fluent; 5) delivered with a pleasant speech rhythm; 6) terminologically correct." Out of 480 questionnaires handed out in five different seminars, 173 were returned.

Following the approach of the AIIC/Moser survey, I also wanted to know who the actual users of SI were, what their reasons for using SI were, and how they used SI. The response relating to the quality criteria could be analyzed against the data about the respondents. However, the response obtained with a questionnaire always omits many nuances. Therefore I collected further information about the listeners' experience of the SI through telephone interviews.

The results of my survey of 1995 gave rise to many questions. Quality criteria like 'accuracy' may be taken to be self-explanatory. Yet a telephone interview with one of the respondents directed my attention to the problematics involved in the verbal criteria. According to his response in the printed questionnaire, interpreting had not been accurate in the seminar. When he was asked for the reason why, his answer was: "Because the interpreter was lagging behind."

This answer is illustrative of a layman's view of simultaneous interpreting. Those familiar with theories of SI know that one of the first observations of SI studies from the late 1950's onwards was the notion that interpreters have to 'lag behind' in order to convey propositions formulated in a comprehensible, or 'intelligent', way. Consequently, one conclusion of my survey study was that the quality criteria were not operational for research purposes as they meant different things for different people. Furthermore, there were many indications in the response to the questionnaire that the quality of interpreting, as assessed by the audience, was closely linked to the characteristics of the original speech and how it had been presented.

The theoretical views and methodological solutions of the studies discussed in this chapter, together with the theoretical approaches presented in Chapter 3, constitute the basis for the method of analysis, described in Chapter 5.

3. THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

3.1 Introduction: why an eclectic approach?

The previous chapter pointed at several empirical findings that have been important for the formation of SI theory. They have provided essential elements for the general approach of the present study. Because of their research orientation, which is different from that of the present study, I have supplemented them with others of a strictly textual approach. While it is important to have a theoretical overview of the object to be studied, guiding the formulation of the research question and the collection of research data, the reverse is also true, i.e. the data determines, to a large extent, the structure of the theoretical framework. It is therefore appropriate to say some words about the material of the present study to justify its eclectic approach.

My study deals with two types of texts; first, source texts (STs), which are speeches delivered in the European Parliament as part of the normal daily agenda, and second, target texts (TTs), which are their SI versions produced by professional conference interpreters in the course of their normal daily routine. This was the primary selection criterion for the material: it had to be both authentic and representative. The second criterion was to have a sufficiently large corpus in order to be able to suggest features which can be considered 'standard' or 'typical' of TTs in the specified context. On the basis of this material, the present study aims at answering the question of how the reality of SI meets the ideals of the definitions of SI. *Do the TTs convey the 'sense of the original message', enabling those listening to the interpreters to have the same basis for creating an impression of the incoming speech as those listening directly to the original?* With a view on the research question and the research material, the theoretical framework of the study should be composed of elements that approach the question in a reliable way.

Earlier empirical studies comparing TTs with their STs suggest that the theoretical framework should include an understanding of the psycholinguistic and cognitive factors involved in

SI. Furthermore, a comparison presupposes an appropriate analysis of the two sets of texts in terms of their linguistic and semantic content. Therefore, translation theory is by definition an integral element of the theoretical approach. The quality criteria *'sense consistency with the original', 'accuracy'* and *'faithfulness',* which have been prioritized by users of SI as well as the Interpreting Directorate of EP (see Introduction), are used in literature on both spoken and written translation. A comparison of STs and TTs requires tools for the description of the texts; consequently, the theoretical framework must also include linguistic and text analytical approaches that support the methods of analysis.

The quality criteria discussed here ('sense consistency with the original', 'accuracy', 'faithfulness') can not be regarded as synonyms of 'semantic content' or 'propositional content'. Semantic accuracy has been considered the core parameter, although different authors have discussed this referent using a variety of terms. 'Sense consistency with the original message' has been used by Bühler (1986) and Kurz (1989); others include 'adequacy' (Barik 1971), 'message integrity' (Mackintosh 1985), completeness of information (Marrone 1993), etc. (Tommola 2003). Tommola further argues that not only is there variance in the concepts used to refer to the object of an interpreter's basic task, but "what is actually understood by the accurate conveyance of semantic information in interpreting tends to be defined in impressionistic, general and vague terms" (ibid.). Therefore, propositional models of discourse processing have been suggested in order to avoid a merely intuitive approach to semantic accuracy. While that may be a sound methodological solution for experimental studies with a limited number of texts, Stubb's rationale for not applying it to extended texts is relevant for the present study: "A formal analysis of any complete text of more than a few hundred words is so complex that probably no one would ever want to read it" (1988: 214). Therefore, a different approach was sought which would provide methods for highlighting the crucial constituents of the ST message.

As has been shown by pragmatists, the semantic meaning of an utterance may vary considerably depending on the context. Considering the material at hand (120 short political speeches and their target texts in three languages), it seemed advisable to begin by analyzing the original speeches in order to find some characteristics that are common to the EP source texts. These context-related characteristics, together with the semantic content, would help to define in specific terms what is required of an accurate and faithful rendering of a ST in the EP context.

The eclectic framework of the present study is presented below, describing the approach which was introduced above. Translation theory will only be discussed to the extent that it directly relates to the present research question. Next, the components of the textual and cognitive models of SI that underlie the analysis of the material at hand are discussed briefly. The last section of this chapter focuses on the theoretical basis of analyzing the texts with a view to determine in what way the criterion 'sense consistency with the original message' can be approached in operational terms.

Furthermore, the theoretical framework has been used as the basis for the choice of analytical tools, which are the topic of Chapter 5 (Research material and method). It is also used as the basis for selecting certain segments of the research corpus for analysis (Chapter 6).

3.1 SI and translation theory

Translation theory contains many elements of communication theory.[1] Basil Hatim and Ian Mason build their definition of translation on the idea that all texts are seen "as evidence of a **communicative transaction taking place within a social framework**" (original emphasis). This view allows translating to include "such diverse activities as film subtitling or dubbing, simultaneous interpreting, cartoon translating, abstracting and summarizing, etc." According to them, translation – including simultaneous interpreting – is communicative discourse. (1990: 2–3)

Professional interpreters, too, see SI as communicative transaction. Within the profession, emphasis has been placed on the interpreter's role as a mediator in a communication situation. This is also reflected in the way professional interpreters have described the task of the interpreter. They highlight the fact that the basic questions underlying interpreting have to do with the core issues of communication, that is, how ideas are expressed and how the ideas of others are understood. SI professionals have seen their task in the following terms: "A conference interpreter [...] *makes* [bilingual or multi-lingual] *communication possible* [...] by *comprehending the concepts* of speakers' messages and *conveying them* orally in another language [...]." (AIIC bulletin 22 (1994) 3: 19, quoted in Kalina 1998: 16) (my italics)

Translation studies and interpreting studies are both concerned with the mental task known as 'translation'. Scholars focusing on interpreting studies (IS) (e.g. Gile 1993, Pöchhacker 1994) use the term as a umbrella term to refer to both written and oral translation. The fact that there is a translator who acts as a mediator (see the AIIC description above) is an important element which makes translation communication different from primary communication. Consequently, translation has been labeled 'secondary communication', where the translator is not the intended recipient of the message (see discussion in Setton 1999: 8– 9).

While there are numerous theoretical approaches to translation, the starting point for

---

[1] Here 'translation theory' is used to refer to the extensive corpus of theoretical literature by various scholars who have contributed to the development of translation theory as an independent field of study, while conscious of the fact that individual scholars have formulated their own translation theories.
 'Communication theory' is also used here as a general canopy term to refer to the many branches and approaches existing within the wide field of communication studies.

theorists has traditionally been the activity of interlingual translation.[2] Simultaneous interpreting can be labeled as a sub-category of interlingual translation, its basic function being that of conveying the meaning of the source text, delivered orally in one language, into a target text, delivered orally in another language. With a view to the research material of the present study, focus will be on the aspect of multilingualism as the key motivation for interpretation activity. By definition, SI belongs to the category of interlingual translation[3] (see Halverson 1998: 2/ III for a discussion of translation categories).

Source Text and Target Text. Translation theory has provided many of the terms and concepts used by IS researchers. Depending on their approach, they may opt for the (speaker's) 'input' and (interpreter's) 'output',[4] which are used by information theorists and psycholinguists for example. The present study will use the terms source text (ST) and target text (TT) for two main reasons. First, within translation theory it has become a standard way of denoting the two sets of texts as STs and TTs, regardless of whether the mode of production is written or oral. Discourse analysis refers to recorded spoken language as 'spoken texts' (Brown and Yule 1983/1993: 9). The second reason for these labels is that the source texts contained in the research material tend to be written speeches that are read out, and they will be analyzed as textual entities. 'Message' is another term shared by studies of written and oral translation. Setton defines message as "what a translator or interpreter is supposed to convey from a Speaker to his Addressee." (1999: glossary)

Translation theory has historically been interested in the relationship between the ST and the TT. One of the key concepts of this theoretical discussion has been 'equivalence'. Since this concept underlies the comparative analysis of the present corpus, a short explanation is given below regarding its role in the theoretical framework of the study at hand.

Equivalence. As the main object of the present study is to obtain information about the nature of the relationship between the two sets of texts from the point of view of 'sense consistency with the original message', it is appropriate to provide a rationale for comparing STs with their TTs. This method has been discussed by translation theorists, often in a critical fashion (cf. Snell-Hornby 1988: 13–22).

---

[2] See Halverson for the concept of 'translation' and the internal structure of the translation category (1998: 2: III). See also Ruth Evans, 'Metaphor of translation' in Baker (ed.) Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies (149–153).

[3] There are many types of interpreting where the issue of cultural mediation is just as important, or even more important, than interlingual mediation. This is not the case in the European Parliament.

[4] Setton uses these terms in his theoretical model.

Some of the metaphorical terms[5] describing the relationship between the ST and TT include the words 'faithful' and 'free' [translation].[6] (See Robinson on 'Free translation' 1998/2001: 87–90). The evaluation of the 'fidelity' of a translation presupposes concepts and methods of comparison for determining the resemblance between the two texts in terms of form and content as well as their function. One of these concepts is 'equivalence', developed by "the linguistically oriented schools of translation theory" (Snell-Hornby 1988: 15).

My study will emphasize the role of languages as different codes that professional interpreters have learned to master. Therefore, the discussion is based on the premise that SI is a translation task in which the interpreter's task is to convey a message, produced in one language and received on-line, and to express it in another language. The linguistic aspect and command of languages are therefore foregrounded more than what is customary in today's translation theory which deals with written texts.

Furthermore, in a given context (the European Parliament) the function of the ST and the TT is the same ('equal'). By definition, too, the task of the interpreters working for the EP is always the same; that is, they are expected to produce 'accurate' and 'faithful' TTs of the STs.[7] Their task could also be defined in terms of achieving the greatest possible 'equivalence' between the two texts.

As mentioned above, the concepts 'fidelity' or 'faithfulness' are closely connected with the concept of 'equivalence'. IS scholars cited above have frequently employed this concept, although with different denotations and connotations. In 1978 Lederer used it in her conclusions of the way in which interpreters process the input message (see Chapter 2): "The difference between sense and linguistic meaning is clearly revealed in the two *equivalents* I have just shown [...]. [...] their wording reflects more than the knowledge of two languages and the *ability to establish equivalents* between the two." (1978/2002: 137–138) (my italics) Lederer uses the concept in a 'linguistically oriented' sense (cf. Snell-Hornby 1988, above). Thus, for her, 'equivalents' refer to the word-for-word method of translation, which looks for TL lexical items that have corresponding (dictionary) meanings with the SL items.

Mackintosh formulates SI, using the same concept in her definition (cf. Introduction). According to her, one of the essential features of the SI model is "the description of how the

---

[5] A large number of translation studies are devoted to the theoretical discussion of what the TT is/should be like and how it has been/will be/should be achieved. Much of this discussion is expressed in metaphorical language. The very terms 'to translate' and 'translation' are metaphors of the activity, having their roots in the latin word which means 'to carry over', 'something that has been carried over' (Halverson 1998: 2/ IV, 12-15). With a view to the definitions of SI they, too, formulate the task in metaphoric terms of a message being transferred, or the sense being conveyed (from one language into another, or from source text into the target text).

[7] [...] interpreting is not word-for-word translation [...] but the faithful transmission of a message, captured in one language and the accurately rendered in another. (www.europarl.eu.int/interp/)

interpreter operates on the propositional, cognitive and semantic nature of the message, identifying its propositions, organizing them in terms of their semantic importance and *reformulating equivalent propositions* [...] in their target language". (1995: 121) (my italics)

The two authors use the concept for different purposes. For Lederer, finding an 'equivalent' expression in the TL is not the best method of interpreting. In her view, the important element of 'intelligent' interpreting is to be free of the wording of the original speech. According to her theory, the best method is to produce an 'intelligent' interpretation instead of *merely* establishing equivalents between two languages. According to her observations, this procedure is resorted to by interpreters until they have accumulated shared knowledge with the speaker(s). Once the interpreter begins to understand the theme and topic of the speech he is translating, he probes more and more deeply into the intended meaning of the speaker, leading to a different SI technique where the interpretation departs from the linguistic meaning of the source text (1978/2001: 132).

Mackintosh also considers it essential for SI to focus on the content of the message. Compared to Lederer, however, her use of the concept 'equivalence' does not carry any negative connotations. Instead, she aims at specificity in defining the interpreter's task as "identifying [the] propositions [of the message], organizing them in terms of their semantic importance and reformulating equivalent propositions." (1975: 121) For Mackintosh, equivalent propositions are the "ones having the same interlocutory effect in their target language [as in the source language]." (loc.cit.)

The discussion above demonstrates the variance in the use of the same concept. Therefore, some conceptual clarification may be justified in view of the analysis of the present research material, where the primary aim is to create a tenable basis for the quality criterion 'sense consistency with the original message'.

According to Sandra Halverson the concept of 'equivalence' is "perhaps the most divisive issue" in the field of translation studies; it "has served as one of the main lines of demarcation between the 'linguistically oriented school', and its counterpart, the historical-descriptive group" – two groups that have been most vociferous about the concept (Halverson 1998: 2/ I, 1).

Halverson discusses the relationship between the ST and the TT from a point of view which is closely related to the present research question. In her own words, her survey of the concept of 'equivalence' has indicated the following: "[...] any utilization / operationalization of the concept of equivalence touches on several fundamental philosophical problems, most notably the possibility/necessity of comparison and the nature of sameness. (ibid.: 2/ I,3)

The questions posed by Halverson are the same questions that I have tried to find solutions to in the present study, that is: "What entities are or could be 'equivalent', how alike/similar/equal are they and how do we define 'alike/similar/equal', and in which feature are they equivalent?" (ibid.: 2/ I,4) My study aims at finding answers to these questions, first, by applying appropriate models

and theories for the research questions, and second, by using them for the analysis of the empirical material at hand. Instead of rejecting the concept of 'equivalence' as imprecise or lacking in explanatory power, which would follow from the premise that there is just one single true and objective essence of translation, we might review our ideas of translation to fit the concept. (See the philosophical argumentation in Halverson 1998: 2/ I).

The crucial question from the point of view of translation theory is: Is it feasible or even necessary to compare source texts with their translations? In her concluding remarks, quoted in Chapter 1 of the present study, Bühler says: "The criteria of 'sense consistency with the original message' and 'completeness of interpretation', which are essential for interlingual communication and hence also the quality of interpretation, *can only be judged by comparison with the original."* (1986: 233) (my italics)

If by definition "the interpreter's job is to ensure that speeches delivered in one of the official languages of the European Union are accurately rendered into the other official languages," and if we want to learn in what ways and to what extent this quality target can be achieved in reality, then one method of obtaining this information is to compare the SL speeches with the interpreters' TL versions. That is theoretically acceptable, on the condition that "the comparability of the things being compared [has been] catered for", as Halverson concludes (ibid.: 2/ I, 17).

Thus, in studying SI and in analyzing the empirical material, it is justified to compare the STs with the TTs as long as there is a clearly specified basis for the comparison. If the study presents a clear definition of what is included in the concept of 'equivalence', then it is possible to operationalize the concept, which has been considered imprecise by some scholars, and turn it into a methodological tool. The present study will analyze STs and their TT versions with a view of indicating the essential elements of the STs that should be rendered in the TTs. The next task is to relate the findings to the definitions formulated by various authors (see 1. Introduction). These include:

1) SI is communication. Therefore, what aspects of communication should be emphasized in relation to SI?

2) Interpreters are expected to transfer the semantic, connotative and aesthetic content of the original message. Furthermore, they are expected to convey the lexical, syntactic and stylistic resources of the target language. Yet, interpreters should not translate word-for-word. The present study is interested in finding out whether it is possible to fulfill these expectations in the simultaneous interpreting mode.

3) The foremost task of the interpreter is to understand the original message. Therefore, SI theory should develop an approach whereby it is possible to create tools that help the interpreter in this task; furthermore, people evaluating interpreters should also have tools for

analyzing the original message, as well as for assessing whether the interpreter has conveyed it adequately.

The aim stated above is based on the quality expectation according to which the listener should be allowed to create an impression of the speech which is as close as possible to the one he would have created had he been listening to the original. Once these elements have been pinpointed, it is possible to specify what elements constitute the basis for assessing 'SI equivalence'.

On-line aural/oral translation of written texts. The differences between oral and written language, as well as the degree of planning involved in the two modes, have been discussed by Shlesinger and Pöchhacker (see Chapter 2). The present study of a multilingual corpus will not discuss these differences in detail as they vary from language to language. Some features of spoken and written language are common to the languages of the study at hand (English, Finnish, German and Swedish) regarding syntax and lexical choices. Spoken language uses paratactic syntax more than hypotaxis. Most importantly, cohesion and structure are created by paralinguistic means, where pauses and emphasis are some of the most important features from the point of view of SI (cf. Lederer 1978/2002: 132). Written language is characterized by complex nominal groups, qualifiers and epithets. Moreover, it is lexically dense, containing a higher number of content words than spoken language. (Leiwo et al. 1992: 83–87)

The differences between written and oral translation need to be highlighted in comparing STs with their TTs. These differences have to be borne in mind when reading and analyzing transcripts of the interpreters' spoken products. Therefore, a few points relating to the differences between the translator's and interpreter's tasks will be discussed below.

Differences between written translation and simultaneous interpreting have been discussed by a number of translation and interpreting theorists. Contrary to Vermeer, who states that everything he says about translation also refers to interpreting, and *vice versa* (1989: 83–84), others like to discuss the two tasks separately, because in their view they are based on different processes. This view is based primarily on the physical characteristics of the source text determining the components of the translation process.

Seleskovitch considers the form of the source text as constituting the key difference; written translation is static, allowing analysis and reflection before the text is reformulated in another language, whereas the text to be interpreted will only be heard once, and what one will remember of the text is its content and meaning, not its form (1978: 2). Gideon Toury has also written on the differences between written and oral translation. Where Seleskovitch speaks about the different *processes*, Toury refers to the different *strategies* on which the two activities are based. Toury cites authors on interpreting according to whom it is misleading to assume that a written product can be

turned into an oral product with all the characteristics of the original, even in cases where the interpreter has the written text in front of him. The issue is not only about different modes (written vs. spoken), but of different systems (written language vs. spoken language). According to Toury's definition, interpreting is spoken translation *par excellence*. (1995: 235)

Scholars may disagree about whether the cognitive processes or the strategies underlying written and oral translation are the same or not. A crucial point that has not been contested by anyone is the difference in the working conditions of the translator (of written texts) and the interpreter (of aurally received texts). While the translator has the whole text at his disposal and is able to familiarize himself with the text at his own pace, the interpreter conveys the spoken message on–line, as the speaker proceeds. Due to the externally determined speech rate, the interpreter has very few opportunities to correct himself, whereas the translator may normally check his translation afterwards. Otto Kade (1968: 35)[8] and Reiss and Vermeer (1984) regard the opportunity to make corrections as the key feature distinguishing written translation from interpreting. Another difference in the working conditions is that the interpreter works in the same room with the audience, whereas the translator does not necessarily know who the end-users of his translation are.

There is general agreement among IS authors that situational and processual factors have an immediate influence on the SI product. Gile suggests that in addition to the differences mentioned above, there are qualitative features that differentiate written translation from interpreting. Since interpreting is intended for the immediate use of the recipients, Gile assumes that they do not expect the same kind of terminological accuracy as they would expect in a written translation, nor can they expect the same polished style as in a written translation (cf. Toury above). Furthermore, while the task of the interpreter, like that of the translator, is to convey the message as faithfully and completely as possible, information is often omitted due to the special conditions of SI; according to Gile, this does not lead to a tangible loss in the overall information received by the audience. (1993: 74 – 75)

The issues of terminological accuracy, style and the potential effects of information loss raised by Gile are, in fact, important research questions for the development of interpreting theory, and they can only be answered through a systematic analysis of empirical material. The present study aims at adding real-life data to the existing theories by providing information about the degree of accuracy and completeness of interpreting in an authentic context.

According to Gile, written and oral translation may also require a different type of command of the working language(s), as the interpreter has to recognize expressions instantly and produce them immediately. Gile further suggests that what the interpreter is lacking in the command of languages may be compensated for by a thorough knowledge of the subject under discussion. (ibid.: 75) The study at hand will look at this aspect, too, particularly in the light of languages of limited

---

[8] "[Dolmetschen ist] die Translation eines einmalig (in der Regel mündlich) dargebotenen Textes der Ausgangssprache in einen nur bedingt kontrollierbaren und infolge Zeitmangels kaum korrigierbaren Text der Zielsprache."

diffusion (Swedish) as well as of interpreting into interpreter's non–native language (Finnish into German).

My study is based on the assumption that the tasks of oral and written translation are carried out under conditions which are too different to justify the same theoretical approach for the assessment of interpreting quality. The common denominator for the two types of translation is the linguistic component, which means that the ST and the TT are produced in different languages. Yet, as evidenced by the literature cited above, the two modes of translation require different working methods and skills. In SI, extended texts are received aurally and translated in chunks; comprehension has to be immediate; encyclopedias or dictionaries cannot be consulted during the interpreting process; consequently, if the interpreter faces problems, they will be discernible when STs and TTs are compared.

Thus, in view of the present research material it is important to bear the authentic situation in mind. SI work procedure and the resulting product are characterized by certain features that are due to the specific nature of oral translation as well as the speech situation where the spoken texts to be translated are produced. Even if the ST of the original speaker and the TT produced by the interpreter can be transcribed and analyzed in written form, it should be remembered that in the real-life situations the texts were not in front of the audience's or the interpreters' eyes to be seen as textual entities. Therefore, samples of the spoken texts and their SI versions have been included here. The listening experience in a meeting situation is quite different from the reading experience where the features of the *ad hoc* translation process are visible. Consequently, the quality criteria of SI cannot by definition be the same as those of written translation regarding grammatical or terminological correctness, style, or any other linguistic detail.

No one has contested the thesis presented by both Lederer (1978/2002) and Seleskovitch (1982), according to which we focus on conveying our thoughts when we speak, whereas our thinking has already taken place when we read out a text. The difference in the two modes of presenting a speech/text influences the interpreter's performance. (1978/2002: 132) This is the issue I wish to tackle in Chapter 6, where I present examples of the relationship between the written-like syntax of speeches read out and the reduced accuracy of the SI performances.

One aim of the study at hand is to create an approach for the evaluation of SI performances which can be used as a complement to the existing ones. This approach has been formulated on the basis of empirical data. An evaluation presupposes comparison of the originals with the interpreters' versions. It is difficult to see how else it would be possible to draw conclusions about features influencing interpreting quality. Once the theoretical approach and the method of analysis are appropriate, it is possible to evaluate the sense consistency of a TT with its ST. In order to carry out this analysis in accordance with the requirements presented by the research material, the

present study views the TTs as extemporaneous oral translations of STs, using text analysis as the methodological approach.

3.3   Argumentation theory

A review of the recorded corpus, followed by a pilot analysis of the speeches and the interpreters' versions of these speeches, brought up the need to analyze the material from the point of view of a theory which would provide a global approach to the speeches as extended messages. (See Chapter 5, Research material and method) Thus, content analysis became an integral component of the theoretical framework of my study, the other components being the views provided by interpreting and translation theory, expanded with some relevant ideas from psycholinguistics and pragmatics, as discussed above.

According to the interpreting and translation theories that have been referred to here, the interpreter's core task is to convey the sense, or meaning, of the speaker's message. Yet, with the exception of Setton, these theories do not provide the methods for analyzing or determining what that sense/meaning is. Pragmatics together with cognitive linguistics, not to mention the key philosophers of language, provide a number of approaches to and definitions of what is meant by 'meaning'. (See e.g. Meyer 1986; Leech 1991/1983: 30–35). What my research needed, however, was an approach which was suited for analyzing more than 100 speeches that are delivered orally and received aurally. The analysis of speeches that are processed on–line has to be based on a theoretical approach which lends itself to capturing the relevant meaning of extended spoken texts. Furthermore, it had to be possible to operationalize the approach for research purposes.

The theoretical or methodological approaches of the empirical studies discussed in Chapter 2 cannot be applied in my research *in toto*. Barik (1975/2002)[9] focuses on linguistic description rather than on the content of the extended message. The study which investigates interpreters' performances has given the classification method and categories for subsequent studies. My study is a continuation of that line of research in investigating interpreters' 'errors' and 'omissions'. Yet, while providing a transparent coding scheme, the linguistic method does not supply the tools for analyzing the overall intelligibility of the message, as has been pointed out by Barik himself (1978/2002: 90). Gerver (1971) has supplied IS with an important element by suggesting psycholinguistic reasons for interpreters' errors and omissions which may be due to ST features. The theoretical framework of my study thus leans on this line of research and the conclusions based

---

[9] The paper referred to here is based on Barik's doctoral dissertation of 1969.

on psycholinguistic theory and data.

The research of Lederer and Setton, who both focus on the SI process, supports the ideas proposed by psycholinguists. In Setton's work the SI process is investigated by analyzing to what extent the sense of each text segment has been conveyed in the output text. Errors, failures and omissions are discussed in this context, too. However, his analysis of the originals and their interpreted versions is an extremely detailed one, consisting of both a cognitive and a pragmatic analysis. This is justified by the goal and purpose of his study. Yet it also means that the material to be studied, while representative, is limited in size.

Contrary to Setton, my study sets out to analyze a large corpus of more than one hundred speeches and their interpreted versions in three languages. Therefore it has been necessary to create a theoretical framework which allows a macro-level analysis of the corpus in order to pin-point some of the key features that characterize the discourse produced in one specific setting, the European Parliament. Pöchhacker (1994) has supplied the theoretical approach to analyzing the EP as the macrocontext of the texts. He also well provided the stimulus for looking at specified speech characteristics in a systematic manner. Shlesinger (1989) has indicated the theoretical and methodological significance of the style of the original speech.

The purpose of my study is not to carry out a detailed linguistic analysis of all the speeches and their interpretations; instead, the focus is on the substance of the speeches and on the issue of the interpreter's primary task of conveying this substance to the listeners. The primary aim of this study is to contribute to a method of defining the elements which constitute 'sense consistency with the original message'. Rhetoric, or argumentation theory, was selected as a tested approach to studying the meanings conveyed in political language.

An analogical approach has been described by scholars within the field of translation studies have struggled to find ways of assessing large numbers of translated texts in test situations, for example. Malcolm Williams has investigated this problem, proposing a full-text, argumentation-centered approach to Total Quality Assessment. He, too, justifies his endeavors by referring to the shortcomings of the quality assessment model by such researchers as Sical, Nord, and House which tend to focus on microtextual analysis and error counts. These are the same problems for which Barik's study has been criticized.

Williams quotes comments made by organizers of a conference on translation quality: "[...] there are no generally accepted objective criteria for evaluating the quality both of translations and of interpreting performance. [...] The result is assessment chaos." (1999, Institut für Angewandte Linguistik und Translatologie; quoted in Williams 2001: 327) In his article Williams proposes "a full-text, argumentation-centered approach to Total Quality Assessment as a means of resolving this dilemma" (ibid. p. 327). This approach is practically identical to the reasoning I have used above to motivate a macro-structural approach.

Williams has applied argumentation theory to translation quality assessment which includes the analysis and comparison of ST and TT argument macrostructures. In his view, it is "an efficient means of determining translation quality" (ibid. p. 327).

Williams has created his assessment system for written translations that are based on a different working procedure than spoken translations. Therefore, while the basic approach applying argumentation theory is the same, the system as devised by Williams cannot be transferred *in toto* to determine the quality criteria of simultaneous interpreting. In the present context, argumentation theory will provide the basis for content analysis, but the emphasis will be on rhetoric aspects of spoken communication.

While rhetoric has been the classical discipline for composing speeches, it is also studied and used for the analysis of written texts, including political language and thought. Rhetoric is understood here in a wide sense, i.e. the basis of rhetoric is considered to be argumentation, and rhetoric effects are seen as complements to argumentation, as explained in Aristotle IX. (1997/2000)

New Rhetoric – Chaïm Perelman. Chaïm Perelman and Stephen Toulmin are considered to have started modern rhetorical studies that emphasize argumentation. Their work has been continued by the Amsterdam and Brussels schools. (Palonen & Summa 1998: 10–11). Together with Kenneth Burke they have 'rehabilitated' rhetoric by challenging the negative, and even pejorative, attitude towards rhetoric and natural language argumentation in the 1950's (Summa 1998: 51). Perelman (1912–1984) was a professor of philosophy, whose work deals primarily with philosophy of the law. Researchers in the fields of arts and humanities as well as in social sciences have applied his theory, but he is also considered to have given the impetus for the linguistic-philosophical branch of studies interested in natural language argumentation, represented by such scholars as Meyer and Plantin (ibid.: 62–63).

Collaborating with Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca, Perelman studied the art of persuading and of convincing, the technique of deliberation and of discussion, presenting the work as a *new rhetoric* (1969/1971: 5) According to Carroll C. Arnold, the questions Perelman has asked are, first: By what processes do we *reason* about values? And second: What does justification of values "look like" in actual, verbal discourse? (Perelman 1982: vii–viii) (Italics and inverted commas by Arnold) Values are at the core of political language. As one becomes familiar with the discourse in the European Parliament, it becomes evident that values are an integral element of the majority of speeches given in the plenary sitting.

In Perelman's view, there is no argumentation without an audience. Following Aristotle, Perelman emphasizes the role of the audience in argumentation. "To make his discourse effective, a speaker must adapt to his audience" (Perelman 1982: 21). In order to modify an audience's convictions or dispositions, a speaker tries to gain 'a meeting of minds'. For Perelman, the audience

is "the gathering of those whom the speaker wants to influence by his or her arguments" (ibid.: 11, 14). Thus, in terms of methodology, it is not sufficient to conduct a propositional analysis of the speeches if the speaker has used a specific means of influencing his audience.

Perelman's angle has been considered here to make new rhetoric particularly suitable for analyzing the speeches given in the European Parliament, as one of the primary aims of the speakers is to 'gain a meeting of minds'. Furthermore, it is considered obvious that the MEPs want to influence their audience with their arguments. Because the interpreter's role is that of a mediator who conveys the speaker's message to the audience, an essential point of view for the analysis in this context is to compare the original argumentation with that produced by interpreters.

New rhetoric covers all discourse that does not aim at general truths. In new rhetoric, 'argument' refers to the various textual means of aiming at either accepting or rejecting the thesis under dispute. According to Perelman, what differentiates argumentation from formal demonstration is the rationale underlying arguments. Thus, argumentation is usually based on a corpus of premises that are ill defined. Moreover, the claims underlying the argumentation may be only partly understood or implicit, as argumentation does not follow any formal system. (ibid.: 48–49) Perelman (ibid.: 9–10) defines the aim of argumentation as follows:

> The aim of argumentation is not to deduce consequences from given premises; it is rather to elicit or increase the adherence of the members of an audience to theses that are presented for their consent. Such adherence never comes out of thin air; it presupposes a meeting of minds between speaker and audience.

The definition above contains several elements that make the theory particularly fit for analyzing political speeches. What politicians aim at in addressing their audiences is to persuade them to see the issues under discussion from the point of view they advocate.

The following speech, which was held during the EP session for questions to the Council, can be presented here as an instance of such argumentation:

> Mr. President,
> (I) We have established or are seeking to establish in the European Union *a union for progress and a union for peace.* **And yet** we continue with one of the <u>most</u> <u>undesirable,</u> <u>hypocritical</u> <u>and</u> <u>destructive</u> areas of our industrial policy, that of the production of arms and their sale to third countries.
> (II) And we have countries within our Union falling over each other to export arms to places where we can be sure they will be used in a way where frequently we will be putting in money to resolve the problems caused afterwards.
> (III) And I am grateful to you for what you say about the working group and its work, but I feel that *<u>unless we have the establishment of a European code of conduct</u>*, including a code of export guidelines and criteria for the categorization of importing countries, common lists of arms and dual use technology subject to regulation, *<u>then we will never get anywhere</u>*.
> *<u>We need moves</u>* across the European Union *<u>to end government promotion, financial support and</u>*
>
> *<u>export credit insurance for arms</u>,* except those for defensive use.
>
> (IV) And anything you can do to promote that I will be very grateful for.

The speaker first establishes a common ground with his audience by stating the very *raison d'etre* of the European Union, which is to establish a union of progress and a union of peace (in italics). The conjunction 'and yet' (in bold) is a signal to his audience indicating that the speaker will present a critical claim. His claim about the export of arms from the EU to third countries is enhanced by qualifying words with both an emotional and an intellectual load (underlined) ('undesirable', 'hypocritical', 'destructive').

Argument (II) is an indirect accusation aimed at EU Member States for carrying on arms trade. It would be difficult to contest the speaker's main argument, according to which it is not only unethical to export arms, but it is irrational as well, since the exporting countries will have to pay for the damage caused.

Argument (III) is a motion for action (in italics and underlined) ("a European code of conduct [should be established] including a code of export guidelines and criteria for the categorization of importing countries, common lists of arms and dual use technology subject to regulation"). It is a very specific motion, appealing to the intellect and the rational, suggesting that the speaker has carried out in-depth research into the issue of the arms trade. The speaker constructs the argument based on the cause and effect formula: if [we do not act like this], then [we will not get anywhere].

The speaker concludes (IV) on a positive note, implying that he does not demand that everything be changed overnight; in a respectful tone he exhorts the Council by saying that anything they do to end government support for the arms industry is a step forward.

The above speech illustrates the fact that the contact between the speaker and the audience involves not only factual information but also information about the speaker's propositional attitude. This critical attitude is not expressed explicitly in metatextual terms; instead, it is left for the hearer to interpret the speaker's intentionality. Such textual features constitute the illocutionary force of the speech.

The task set for the study is to analyze what these theses are. Another task is to identify the ways and means whereby a speaker aims at 'eliciting' or 'increasing' the adherence of the audience to the theses he is advocating. Such an analysis will result in an interpretation of the sense and meaning of the text. With reference to the primary quality criterion of SI, 'sense consistency with the original message', these are some of the key components constituting the sense of the message. An important asset of this approach is that it is not bound to one language and the verbatim equivalence of lexical items. Instead, an analysis of argumentation penetrates the lexical surface of texts in order to arrive at the point the speaker is making.

In summarizing his theory, Perelman refers to something which can be traced back to the Aristotelian views of successful communication. In order to achieve the desired effect, a (political) speaker appeals to both the intellect and the emotions of their audience. Perelman (1982: 161–162)

formulates this as follows:

> Philosophical, like juridical, argumentation constitutes the application to particular fields of a general theory of argumentation which we understand as a new rhetoric. In identifying this rhetoric with the general theory of persuasive discourse, which seeks to gain both the intellectual and the emotional adherence of any sort of audience, we affirm that every discourse which does not claim an impersonal validity belongs to rhetoric.

Researchers who have chosen rhetoric as their approach to political studies agree with Perelman in saying that each text can be interpreted as a political situation. The question for the interpretation of texts is to identify "who is appealing to whom and with what arguments". Palonen and Summa (ibid.: 7–13) propose, in accordance with Perelman and others, that rhetoric as a field of study not only refers to the use of rhetoric figures but also to the theory of argumentation in general.

Perelman has extensively studied the various rhetoric elements which have an impact on the reception of speech. He proposes something which is directly applicable to political speeches; according to him, argumentation does not only endeavor to win the audience's intellectual adherence, but the aim will often be to "incite action, or at least to create a disposition to act" (1982: 12). An argument can be anything that the speaker thinks will persuade his audience. Arguments focus on views and the interpretations of these views.

The pilot analysis of the research material (see Chapter 5) highlighted elements that characterize political language. Consequently, the theoretical views quoted above constitute the rationale for selecting Perelman's approach for the analysis of the EP plenary speeches which typically present claims in order to win the listeners' intellectual support, such as for an amendment in draft legislation, leading to a disposition to act, i.e. vote for the amendment. New rhetoric as a general theory of argumentation is an approach which can be flexibly applied to the analysis of political speeches and their interpreted versions. After all, rhetoric was originally developed to teach the art of speaking in a society where the orator needed his skills to influence his listeners through the power of speech. Although modern politicians may not consciously follow the doctrines of classical rhetoric, their speeches are structured as argumentation, thus lending themselves to rhetorical analysis.

For rhetoric analysis, the object of study is the text and the methods used to influence the hearer. Further objects of study include the social context surrounding the text. An important concept here is the *rhetoric situation* which includes the speaker, the audience and the forum. These are social concepts, since the "who is speaking to whom" and "under what conditions" is socially determined (cf. the definition by Hatim and Mason). Rhetoric takes into account the audience of the speaker as well as the group that the speaker may represent. These theoretical considerations have been an integral element of communication theory and translation theory. What new rhetoric can add to the established principles of translation theory is the element of content analysis and textual

interpretation, using the approach and categories developed by Perelman.

The purpose of my study is to analyze the original EP speeches from this point of view. The rhetorical situation, i.e. the EP plenary session, will be described in order to contextualize the speeches and their interpreted versions. Furthermore, the analysis of the original speeches will pay attention to the elements that, in Perelman's terms, handle the contact between the speaker and the audience. By definition, these elements are an essential feature of the ST and should be transferred to the TT.

The contact between the speaker and the audience involves not only factual information but also information about the speaker's propositional attitude. This is an aspect which has to be taken into account when assessing whether the TT conveys the sense of the original message. This analysis aims at giving information about what constitutes 'accurate' – and 'faithful' – interpreting in the EP context.

Speech Act Theory   If, by definition, interpreters are expected to grasp the speaker's intention rather than mere words, it is crucial to define the concept, 'the speaker's intention', in theoretical terms. Combined with new rhetoric, speech act theory provides tools for this analysis. The analysis of speech acts is an organic complement to the analysis of argumentation.

Setton has incorporated the views of Austin, Searle and Grice in his SI model. For Setton, the "speech act in its strongest sense [is] an act performed by an utterance (a bet, promise, investiture, curse, etc.); in the wider sense used [...], [it is] an intentional utterance." (1999: 370) In his lectures Austin (1962/1975/1990) used the concept 'performatives'; Searle (1979/1989) refers to 'illocutionary point'. The present study will use the term 'speech act' to describe a specific intention of a political speech in accordance with Searle. For analytical purposes, a distinction is made here between the illocutionary point and force of an utterance and its propositional content, as discussed by Searle. The analysis focuses on the illocutionary point of the speech act (ibid.: 2–3) as well as the verbs marking the illocutionary point (ibid.: 28–29). The following conclusion presented by Searle (ibid.: 29), supported by reference to Wittgenstein and others[10] is extremely relevant considering the basic task of the conference interpreter:

> If we adopt illocutionary point as the basic notion on which to classify uses of language, then there are a rather limited number of basic things we do with language: we tell people how things are, we try to get them to do things, we commit ourselves to doing things, we express our feelings and attitudes and we bring about changes through our utterances. Often, we do more than one of these at once in the same utterance.

Stubbs analyzes the strengths and weaknesses of Austin's and Searle's theory, adding elements to it which are based on extensive corpus analysis. He gives real-life examples of how speakers and

---

[10] This is clearly stated in Aristotle (*Rhetoric,* Book I, Chapter 3;1358b: 1–10).

writers express their stance towards the information they are conveying; for example, how much reliability or authority they mean it to have (1996: 197). He summarizes his argumentation by stating that "utterances express two things: propositional information, and also the speaker/writer's attitude towards this information" (loc.cit.). Stubbs's ideas relating to the original speech act theory have been incorporated in the analysis of the research material.

In accordance with the research question at hand, the purpose of the analysis is to see whether the speaker's speech act has been conveyed by SI. It is a crucial issue in interpreting to find out whether the SI version allows the listener to formulate an interpretation of the TT message which corresponds to the one he would have formulated if he had been able to understand the original speech. The specific types of speech act will be discussed in connection with examples from the research material in Chapter 6.

One component of speech analysis which is closely combined with the illocutionary force of speech consists of nonverbal aspects of speech. Prosodic features and intonation are essential elements of SI (see e.g. Barik 1975, Williams 1994, Shlesinger 1994, Collados Aís 1998/2002, Setton 1999, Ahrens 2002). The significance of these features for speech comprehension is taken into account in the theoretical framework of the present study, although they are not discussed here in more detail. As discussed by Stubbs, "important cohesive features are to be found in systems of intonation, in paralinguistic features such as tempo, rhythm and voice quality" (1988: 19). (For a detailed discussion of the reception of spoken language and the role of prosody, see Selkirk 1984, Cutler et al. 1997, Segui and Ferrand 2000, Chapter X.)

However, prosodic features may be more crucial for the correct interpretation of meanings in spontaneous spoken discourse. When written texts are read out, prosodic elements are not necessarily employed consciously for the enhancement of clarity or effectiveness of expression. Therefore, instead of careful transcriptions of prosodic features, or a learned analysis of them, an alternative solution was sought. Because of the significant role of prosodic features in speech perception, the original recorded material of the examples discussed in Chapter 6 has been included in the form of a CD record as an Appendix[11] . The reader may thus create his own impression of the prosody of the original speeches.

3.4 Text linguistics

The framework of my study would not be complete without a theoretical approach to analyzing the textual structure of the STs and TTs. This is necessary, firstly for the purpose of having a system of classification that is understandable for the readers of the study, and secondly, it is necessary for

---

[11] The speeches and text samples that are used to illustrate the analysis have been recorded in CD-format.

defining in theoretical terms the linguistic features that impact the interpreter's aural reception of texts.

Translation unit.   According to definitions, the primary task of an interpreter is to convey the sense, or the propositional substance, or informative/cognitive content, etc. of the message. Therefore, one of the first steps in the present investigation process has been the search for an appropriate theoretical model which would help define the *unit of translation* relating to the sense of the message. This is a concept that translation theorists have discussed extensively (for a condensed review of the discussion, see Malmkjær 2001: 286–288). It is also referred to by Barik as a "vital factor" (1975/2001: 90).

The SI literature reviewed above is primarily interested in the SI process, whereas my interest, like that of Shlesinger and Pöchhacker, focuses on the initiator as well as the end product of the process. A process-oriented basis for approaching the unit of translation is therefore not compatible with the textual-communicative orientation of my study. Discourse analysis could have been a feasible approach. According to Stubbs, discourse analysis is a very ambiguous term. He uses it to refer to "the linguistic analysis of naturally occurring connected spoken or written discourse ... to study larger linguistic units" (1988: 1). Discourse analysts have devised their own methods of analysis. For the present study, it seemed advisable to find a method of analysis which is suited to the investigation of (written) speeches. A second criterion for the selection of a suitable method was to find an approach which is compatible with translation theory and argumentation theory. The theory of Jean-Michel Adam combines text linguistics with syntactic, semantic and pragmatic analysis. Furthermore, it offers theoretically grounded solutions for analyzing cohesion and segmentation, which underlie the issue of a 'translation unit'.

The syntactic features of the speeches have been described with terms adopted primarily from Halliday (1985/1990). This means that terms relating to the clause complex as well as the types of relationship between clauses and types of interdependency are used in the Hallidayan sense. His functional view of the organization of speech fits the overall rhetoric approach, because Halliday, too, concentrates on the pragmatic function of syntactic structures. However, his work is based on the English language. Therefore, a broader framework than a grammatical approach was needed for analysis, in order to have a method for studying STs and TTs in different languages. The model by Jean-Michel Adam, based on a comprehensive view of text linguistics (with specific reference to rhetoric), provides a flexible approach for analyzing the speeches of the study.

The theory and model of Jean-Michel Adam.   Jean-Michel Adam has combined discourse analysis and text linguistics as mutually complementary approaches. He applies his model to analyze texts belonging to different discourse genres. Genres can be characterized by textual properties, but

particularly as linguistic interaction in a speech situation involving participants, an institution, a place and a time as well as the constraints of a given language (or several languages) (Adam 1999: 36). Genres are the result of socio-discursive practices acquired by text producers. Text linguistics analyses texts as parts of a whole, taking into account the various factors that have influenced the text(s) to be studied. (ibid.: 41) This theoretical basis rests on linguists and philosophers of language.[12]

Unlike a number of linguists (such as E. Werlich, H. Isenberg, R. E. Longacre, J. B. Casagrande), and translation theorists (such as K. Reiss, A. Fedorov, R.W. Jumpelt, O. Kade), Adam considers texts far too complex and heterogeneous to be classified into 'text types'. Instead of referring to text typologies, Adam prefers to call homogenous text passages 'sequences', justifying this choice of terminology by the observation that one textual entity, such as a political speech, may contain elements like narrative sequences. On a global, higher level it would be appropriate to talk about 'genres' as types of socio-discursive practice. He quotes François Rastier's definition, according to which "the genre relates the text to a discourse"[13] (ibid.: 83).

The concept 'genre' serves as the wider context for texts in Adam's model of textual analysis. Adam specifies the concept of 'genre' by enumerating such examples as the genres of journalistic discourse, the genres of political discourse, the genres of literary discourse, etc., which are based on the discursive practices that have been adopted through a socio–discursive process. During the process of transcribing and analyzing the research material it became apparent that the EP parliamentary speeches can be seen to represent a genre with many of the recurring textual features exemplifying a certain socio–discursive practice.

In discussing the concept of 'genres', Adam quotes Bakhtin and his definition of the functions of genres. Bakhtin proposes that for the reciprocal intelligibility of language, the genres of discourse are just as important as the grammatical forms of language. Compared with the grammatical forms, the discourse genres are more changeable and more flexible while still possessing a normative value for the individual speaker; the speaker has not created them himself, they have been given to him. (Bakhtin 1984: 287, quoted by Adam 1999: 90)[14] Adam further demonstrates correspondences between Bakhtin's theories and classical rhetoric. (ibid.: 91–92)

The discourse of the European Parliament can be viewed from this perspective. It is an example of a genre created within one institution, and the features of this genre can be studied from

---

[12] Adam's references include Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault, M.A.K. Halliday, R. Hasan, Kintsch, Van Dijk, Lita Lundquist, Michelle Charolles, Bernard Combettes, and many more.

[13] "un genre est ce qui rattache un texte à un discourse" (Rastier 1989: 40; quoted by Adam 1999: 83).

[14] "... les genres du discours – pour une intelligence réciproque entre locuteurs ces derniers sont aussi indispensables que les formes de langue. Les genres du discours, comparés auz formes de langue, sont beaucoup plus changeants, souples, mais, pour l'individu parlant, ils n'en ont pas moins une valeur normative: ils lui sont donnés, ce n'est pas lui qui les crée." Bakhtin 1984 (1952-53) Esthétique de la création verbale. Paris: Gallimard

the point of view of discourse analysis, pragmatics in particular, and text linguistics. Following the definition by Adam and the ideas of Bakhtin, it is also interesting to investigate to what extent the speakers in the EP apply these features in their individual speeches, and to what extent the interpreters do the same.

If what Bakhtin says is true, if the speaker and the interpreter adhere to the EP genre, this should raise the level of mutual intelligibility. By applying features characterizing the EP genre, interpreters may facilitate the contact between the speaker and his audience, thereby contributing to the 'meeting of minds' in the speech situation. The theoretical framework for comparing the STs and TTs will therefore include the idea of an EP genre, with the purpose of determining elements that constitute the 'sense of the message' in one particular speech context.

Adam's method of analysis. One starting point for Adam is the statement by M. M. Bakhtin, according to whom a proposition is "a significant element of the whole utterance and [which] acquires its definitive sense only within the whole" (Adam 1999: 35; my translation).[15] The smallest textual unit adopted by Adam for analysis is a 'propositional utterance' (*'proposition énoncée'*). This label has been chosen to emphasize the fact that it refers to a unit which is the result of a speech-act as well as to a unit which is linked to other units by constituting acts of discourse and of textuality. Propositions do not exist in isolation; even if they are analyzed as individual propositions, one proposition is a response to one or several others, and makes an implicit appeal to one or several other propositions. The propositional utterance consists of three parallel acts:

(1) the act of reference;
(2) the act of utterance; and
(3) the act of discourse.

The first act refers to the semantic content of the proposition. The second act refers to the stance of the proposition, reflecting the attitude of the speaker. The third act consists of the illocutionary force and argumentative orientation of the speaker.[16] (ibid.: 50–52) This approach constitutes the basis of the method of text analysis as described in more detail in Chapter 5.

Segmentation. The segmentation of propositions as an analytical tool is included in the method of the present study. A preliminary analysis of the material underlined the need to have a theoretical

---

[15] "... [un] élément signifiant de l'énoncé dans son tout et [qui] acquiert son sens définitif seulement dans son tout." (Bakhtine 1984 (1952-53). Le probléme du texte. in Esthétique de la création verbale. Paris: Gallimard.

[16] Proposition énoncée: 1) Acte de référence: représentation discursive; 2) Acte d'énonciation: prise en charge énonciative; 3) Acte de discours: valeur illocutoire et orientation argumentative.

basis for analyzing the role of propositional links in spoken discourse. The textual elements that have the function of orienting the argumentation as well as of creating inter-propositional coherence are particularly important here.

Yet, for the analysis to be adapted to the material to be studied, it is necessary to keep in mind the SI process as described by Setton. While the speaker may produce his ideas on the basis of a more or less carefully thought-out plan, the interpreter receives and processes the speech linearly, incrementally, in chunks. The rhetoric approach provides a means for comparing the STs and TTs in terms of their form and content for the purpose of analyzing the meaning. Text analysis, particularly the model by Adam, is used as a supplement to delineate the meaning-carrying units and segments from a textual point of view.

Adam discusses the segmentation of propositions from many points of view. His model places the linguistic elements that organize the text in the same functional category as connectors. Elements organizing speech include, according to Adam, such items as indicators of temporal sequence ('then') and of space; markers of conversational structure ('well'; 'O.K.') as well as other phatic expressions; markers of linear integration ('on the one hand – on the other hand'; 'finally'), as well as metalinguistic expressions introducing reformulations ('in brief'; 'in summary'; 'to conclude'). Linguistic elements introducing the universe of the discourse may also be included in this category if they serve as limiting the text ('according to'; 'in order to'). For Adam, one common function of such linguistic units is to segment propositions by indicating where they begin and where they end. (ibid.: 58–59)

These elements have also been discussed by Setton (1999: 201), who calls them procedural elements "which function as 'directives', or instructions to hearer on logical and thematic processing." This means that oral discourse in particular "contains a large number of items and features [...] [which] do not themselves encode propositional content, but [...] [indicate] to hearers how they should 'take' propositions, contrast them, treat them as ironical, as evidence, as concessionary, etc." (ibid. 203) What Setton has observed in his corpus is something the present corpus has confirmed, that is, such procedural elements are treated by interpreters differently from the propositional content of speech. (See Setton 1999: 201–206) In the present study they will be examined as important elements of the rhetoric intent of the speaker. By using such communicative-rhetoric devices the speaker facilitates the listener's task of following his line of argumentation. Therefore attention will be paid to the extent to which interpreters employ equivalent devices for the same purpose.

In addition to the elements referred to above that create coherence in an extended speech and facilitate its reception, coherence can be created by rhythm, which manifests itself in texts in various ways and on various textual levels. On the micro-level, rhythm may be created by such devices as alliteration or the repetition of intra-lexical sounds or syllables. On the macro-level, rhythm (and

coherence) can be created through the composition and structure of the text. On the global level, coherence is created by the semantic macro-structure of the texts. (Adam 1999: 60–79) These features are present in a number of speeches contained in the research material of my study. In terms of the theoretical framework, they serve as an example of the way in which text linguistics and rhetoric are closely intertwined with translation studies (cf. e.g. Hatim and Mason 1990) and interpreting studies (cf. e.g. Shlesinger 1989, 1995). To what extent such features of the ST are or can be conveyed in the TT is an interesting research question as such.

Ethos.   Another concept of classical rhetoric which will be proposed as an important component of interpreting quality concerns how the 'ethos' of the speaker is conveyed by interpreters. According to Adam, pragmatics and linguistics have only recently included the concept of '*ethos*' in the analysis of speech. He refers to Dominique Mainguenau, according to whom the *ethos* of classical rhetoric corresponds to the idea of the implicit as conveyed by a speaker. (ibid.: 112) Adam also quotes Oswald Ducrot who writes about the impression that the speaker may give when he aims at influencing the views of his audience. The speaker's *ethos* communicates something of his moral stance to his audience, not so much through the factual information of what he says, but rather through his intonation, his tone, his choice of words and arguments, etc. (Ducrot 1984: 200–201, quoted by Adam 1999: 112)

This is something that Perelman discusses, too. In addition to the views and opinions of the speaker, supported by the facts, the audience is influenced by the personality and status of the speaker as well as the role he has adopted in the speech situation. The ideas presented by the speaker create an image of him. This image, called '*ethos*' by Aristotle, is one of the three components contributing to the effectiveness of persuasion, the other two being '*logos*', appealing to the intellect through the arguments, and '*pathos*', appealing to the emotions of the audience. (Perelman 1982: 97–98) These are important notions for the analysis of the EP speeches and for the assessment of the image of the speaker that is conveyed by the interpreters.

Adam's approach resembles that of translation theorists in situating texts and parts of text in the context where they are produced. An important reason for applying Adam's text linguistics to the present study is due to the fact that Adam relies strongly on rhetoric, both on classical rhetoric and the ideas of new rhetoric. The three components of the framework of my study, consisting of translation and interpreting theory, new rhetoric and speech act theory as well as text linguistics, form an eclectic, yet an integrated whole. A further motivation for selecting Adam's model was its clear approach to textual segmentation, creating a basis for the comparison of STs and TTs. With a view to the analysis of extended speeches in their context, the concept of 'genre' as developed by Adam serves as a useful theoretical tool for the discussion of a large number of individual speeches.

3.5 The theoretical framework in brief

Translation theory has been developed to analyze interlingual communication (c.f. Halverson), thus serving as a starting point for the design of my study, which compares speeches produced in one language and interpreted in the simultaneous mode into three other languages. SI theories explaining the SI process (Gerver 1969/2002, Setton 1999) as well as those approaching SI from a textual point of view (Shlesinger 1989, 1995, Pöchhacker 1994) constitute the basis for the evaluation of the SI performances.

Since written translation and spoken translation – interpreting – are based on different working procedures and take place under different conditions, the evaluation criteria of written translation cannot be transferred to SI *in toto*. Therefore, starting from the quality expectations as expressed in definitions of interpreting and prioritized by user surveys, the present study has continued the search for the analytical quality criteria of simultaneous interpreting.

The basic research question is to investigate whether the substance of the ST argumentation, including the speech act of the original speech, has been conveyed by the interpreters, thereby allowing listeners of interpreting to create an impression of the speech which is equal to the one they would have created had they been listening to the original speech directly. Therefore, the elements constituting the speaker's line of argumentation will be used as the units of comparison. These have been obtained from Perelman's argumentation theory. The linguistic basis for analyzing the speech corpus, as well as for determining the speech segments and units to be compared on a linguistic level, is adopted from the text linguistics of Adam and the functional grammar of Halliday. The two levels of form and content interact to create the overall message, on the basis of which the listener will receive his impression of the speech.

A second research question is to analyze the possible reasons why interpreters have failed in conveying elements of the STs. This analysis follows Stubb's observations, according to which it may be valuable to concentrate on the "causes, forms and effects of miscommunication. [...] the researcher can concentrate on the problematic aspects of communication situations – points, for example, at which the communication encounters difficulties" (1988: 241). According to the hypothesis of the present study, SI may encounter difficulties due to certain features of the ST. The content of the STs will be analyzed, following the ideas of translation theory and argumentation theory. This analysis will be complemented by textual analysis, following Adam's theory and method.

The material and the method of analysis are described in detail in chapter 5. The next chapter

provides a background for the corpus to be studied, explaining the functioning of the EU as the initiator and context of the texts.

4 EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT – The voice of the citizens in 11 languages

Introduction   In accordance with the theoretical framework of the present study, as presented in Chapter 3, the texts produced in the EP by the speakers and interpreters will first be placed in their context. The context refers to the European Parliament as the setting where the STs and TTs are produced by participants in the communicative situation, for purposes determined by the nature of the context in question. Some basic information about the functioning of the EU institutions is required in order to understand and describe the specific genre of the European Parliament as an example of a particular kind of socio-discursive practice.

The legal and ideological basis of multilingualism.   The General Assembly of the European Coal and Steel Community had 78 members from the six founding states (Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands) and four working languages (Raunio 1996: 18). In 1996, at the time when the research material was collected, in the fourth election period of the European Parliament, the EP had 626 Members from 15 countries, elected for the period 1994–1999.[1] The number of languages had increased to 11 official languages.

It has been said that Europe is on everyone's lips, but in different languages. Preserving the cultural identity of the Member States has been considered essential in the European context, and one way of maintaining cultural identity has been the language policy which guarantees the official languages of the Member States the status of an official language in the European Union as well. A plurality of cultures has been experienced as a value that the community does not want to surrender; instead, the many ways of thinking have been seen as a challenge rather than a handicap. (Zeyringer 1991: 7) In fact, the European communities are the only international community where the languages of all the Member States enjoy the status of an official language. This policy has been seen to act as a safeguard for political and legal equality, as citizens are able to follow the functioning of the institutions in their own language . (Ramos-Ruano 1991: 61–65)

This guiding principle in the functioning of the Community, the right to the use of national

---

[1] Each country has a set number of representatives in proportion to the number of inhabitants in that country.

languages, is inscribed in Article 217 in the Treaty of Rome. This language policy has many practical implications, not least in terms of the need for translators and interpreters. The EP Rules of Procedure express the policy in the following way:

> All documents are drawn up in the official languages. Speeches delivered in one of the official languages shall be simultaneously interpreted into the other official languages and into any other language the Bureau may consider necessary. (Rules of Procedure: Chapter XIII, Rule 102).

A full multilingual environment is provided for plenary sitting, meetings of parliamentary bodies, the parliamentary committees and political groups. This is justified as follows:
Since any citizen of the Union has the right to be democratically elected as a member of the European Parliament, fluency in a widely used language cannot be expected of MEPs as would be the case for diplomats of EU officials. The right of every Member to follow debates and express himself/herself in their own mother language is explicitly provided for in the Parliament's Rules of Procedure. (Available from: http://www.europarl.eu.int/interp/) [Accessed 29 November 2003]

4.1 The European Union as the macrocontext of the texts

Introduction.   Over the past few decades a fast process of integration led to the development of the present European Union. This integration of the different EU institutions that have different historical roots has direct repercussions on the texts that are discussed in the EP plenary session. Specific features of the research corpus can be explained by the history of integration and the roles of the institutions. The EU, with its different institutions, can be regarded as the macrocontext of the texts that are analyzed in my study. The structural changes that have taken place over the years have resulted in a continuous discussion of the roles and mandates of the institutions. This is also reflected in the corpus, where one of the topics is the Intergovernmental Conference (IGC) and the role of the EP in it. Another topic which was creeping into the discussion in 1996 was the enlargement of the EU.

At the time of writing this thesis, the issue of enlargement is in the news on an almost daily basis. It has a bearing on the interpreting arrangements of the EP, where the status of national languages has been one of the questions on the agenda. Besides being a political issue, the question of having up to 10 more official languages to the existing range is also a practical issue in terms of space (interpreters' booths) and the number of interpreters.[2]

---

[2] For up-to-date information on the issue, see http://www.europarl.eu.int/interp/public/enlarge

The roles of the EU institutions and how they are reflected in the research corpus. According to Tapio Raunio, "The European Union (EU) constitutes one, and arguably the most developed, example of a new form of international governance" (ibid.: 12). The EU is the result of decades of integration, from the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) to the establishment of the EEC in 1957 (the Treaty of Rome), to the Single European Act in 1987, to the Maastricht Treaty on the European Union of 1993, and to the latest revised Treaty.

The fact that the EU was developed from three communities (the ECSC, the European Atomic Energy Community – Euratom – and the European Economic Community – EEC) is still reflected in the internal functioning of the EU. The three communities have been governed by five institutions: the European Parliament (since 1958), the Council and the Commission (single bodies since 1967), the Court of Justice and the Court of Auditors. They are supported by five bodies: the Economic and Social Committee, the Committee of the Regions, the European Ombudsman, the European Investment bank, and, as the most recent addition, the European Central Bank.[3]

The Council of the European Union consists of the representatives of the governments of all the Member States. Two of its key responsibilities are prominent in the present research corpus: 1) the Council is the Union's legislative body; and 2) it takes the decisions necessary for framing and implementing the common foreign and security policy (Available from: http://www.europa.eu.int/inst). Much of the debate is based on draft legislation or statements prepared by the Council. Moreover, at the debates it is always pointed out which Council text /piece of legislation has served as the basis for the report that has been prepared in the Parliament. Representatives of the Council are always present at the debates of the EP plenary sitting, being addressed by speakers, and taking the floor when asked to.

The presidency of the Council rotates between the member governments at six-monthly intervals. At the time of the recording of the research material (1996), Italy had the presidency, and the President-in-Office of the Council was Italian. This is reflected throughout the corpus. First, the transfer of the presidency from Spain to Italy is visible in the topics that were debated at the beginning of the new year. At the start of the Italian presidency, during the first part session of the EP in January 1996 (Tuesday 16 January), a joint debate was carried out concerning the previous Spanish presidency; the debate was based on the Council report and the Commission statement of the Madrid European Council.

Furthermore, the President of the Council presented a statement on the Spanish presidency that had just ended. On Wednesday (17 January), the statement by the Council on the Italian

---

[3] Information about the institutions of the European Union is available on the EU internet site: http://www.europa.eu.inst/

presidency's program was debated. Consequently, many of the speeches in the material were originally presented in Italian and subsequently interpreted into the four languages of the corpus, English, Finnish, German and Swedish. All these debates provide an excellent opportunity to reflect on the requirements that interpreters are faced with concerning their background knowledge of the matters that are referred to. These debates also serve as examples of the socio-discursive genre of the EP as an institution.

Another example of the presence of the Council is the attendance of the representatives of the Council at the EP plenary, where a specific section is devoted to Questions to the Council. One of the recorded debates deals with the IGC (Inter-Governmental Conference) which was due to be held in Turin (see Chapter 6: 6.2).

The European Commission consists of 20 Members[4] known as Commissioners, who are appointed by agreement between the member governments. Throughout their term of office they must remain independent of the governments and the Council. One of the core issues of the IGC of 1996 was the composition of the Commission.[5] The role of the Commission is to uphold the common interests of the EU. It acts as the guardian of the Treaties, it serves as the executive arm of the Communities, it initiates Community policy, and it defends Community interests in the Council. The Commission is accountable to Parliament alone. (Noël 1993: 7 –15; up-to-date information available from: http://www.europa.eu.in/institutions/parliament). The Commission is always represented in the plenary session of the Parliament, being addressed by the speakers, and taking the floor when a document drafted by the Commission has been debated.

For example, when a report based on the proposal for a Council and Commission Decision is being debated, it is first introduced by the MEP who has drafted the report, and the final intervention of the debate is by one of the Commissioners who responds to the MEPs who have asked for the floor. Typically they begin their statement as follows:

> Mr. President, I should like to thank the honorable Members, especially the rapporteur, Mr. Valdivielso de Cué, for their constructive comments on the draft proposals before us today, and I entirely agree with the various speakers who have stressed the importance of this issue.

Then the Commissioner touches on issues raised by the rapporteur and the MEPs. He typically concludes his response in a rather formulaic manner, as in the present example on Europe Agreement with the Slovak Republic and the Czech Republic:

---

[4] The number of Commissioners at the time of writing the thesis.

[5] One of the debates included in the research material concerns the report on the IGC.

Mr. President, I think that these are the broad outlines of the draft texts before us today. I should like to say once again how much I value the constructive approach that Parliament has adopted. I hope that matters can soon be resolved for the other countries, too, and that we will thus help to promote a certain degree of integration between the economies of the Member States and the applicant countries as part of the pre-accession strategy.

(Official Journal of the European Communities, No. 4-473, Report of proceedings from 15 to 19 January 1996)

A large part of the research material of my study is based on documents initiated or drafted by the Commission. For example, the research material contains a debate on the report dealing with the application of Community legislation in the Member States, one of the key responsibilities of the Commission (13 February 1996). This debate provides interesting views on the complicated power structure between the Commission and the Parliament, where the Members of the Parliament frequently bring up their role as representatives of the citizens of Europe. When analyzing the argumentation and rhetoric of the speeches in the plenary sitting it is important to constantly bear in mind the role of each of the institutions.

The European Council In December 1974, the President of France, together with the Heads of Government of the other Member States, decided to convene on a regular basis together with the President of the Commission. This meeting was called the European Council, often called the EU Summit in the media. The Prime Minister of the Member State in charge of the Presidency acts as the chairman of the European Council. (Noël 1993: 6) The Summit is reflected in the material by way of reference to various Summits and their locations.

The European Parliament is not a legislative body in the sense that the national parliaments are as it does not have the right to initiate legislation (Antola 1996: 63). The most important legislative body is the Council (Antola 1996: 64), which has to receive the proposals from the Commission; Parliament's involvement comes in the final stages of the legislative procedure (Noël: 1993: 26). Since the Maastricht Treaty, the EP "has increased its powers enormously, but could be described as still only on the edge of constituting a legislature" (Philip Norton 1995: 192, quoted in Raunio 1996: 18). While the powers of the EP have been on the agenda over the years, there have not been any deep-going changes since the time of this quotation even though the principle of co-decision, approved of in the Maastricht Treaty, did increase the influence of the EP in the legislative process.

The following is a summary of the three essential roles of the European Parliament:

1. It shares with the Council the **power to legislate**. The fact that it is a directly-elected

body helps guarantee the democratic legitimacy of European Law.

2. It exercises **democratic supervision** over all EU institutions, and in particular the Commission. It has the power to approve or reject the nomination of Commissioners, and it has the right to censure the Commission as a whole.

3. It shares with the Council **authority over the EU budget** and can therefore influence EU spending. At the end of the procedure, it adopts or rejects the budget in its entirety. (original emphasis)

(Available from: http://www.europa.eu.in/institutions/parliament) [Accessed 29 November 2003]

The functions enumerated above are reflected in all the debates recorded for my study. Thus, the EP as an institution can be regarded as the wider frame for the textual analysis of the present material. In the discussion below I shall take up issues that have a direct influence on the characteristics of the discourse in the EP.

The functioning of the European Parliament. "Parliament's work is divided into two main stages: (1) Preparing for the plenary session. This is done by the MEPs in the various parliamentary committees that specialize in particular areas of EU activity. The issues for debate are also discussed by the political groups. (2) The plenary session itself. [...] At these sessions, Parliament examines proposed legislation and votes on amendments before coming to a decision on the text as a whole." (Available from: http://europa.eu.int/institutions/parliament/)

The Rules of Procedure[6] define the EP in the following way: "The European Parliament is the assembly of elected pursuant to the Treaties, the Act of 20 September 1976 concerning the election of the representatives of the European Parliament by direct universal suffrage and national legislation deriving from the Treaties". (Chapter 1, Rule 1: 1; European Parliament, 10th edition 1995) Thus, Parliament is the only institution at the European level on which the citizens can have some influence. Raunio (1996: 19), who wrote his doctoral thesis on party group behavior in the European Parliament, has the following comment on the nature of the EP:

> The European Parliament is a part of a federalist political system, the European Union. EU itself is built on, and draws its legitimacy from, the citizens and national political elites of its member states. [...] Therefore the work of the representatives in Strasbourg consists of both territorial and ideological representation.

This is also reflected in the debates of the present research material. In analyzing the argumentation of the ST speeches and the way it is conveyed in the TTs, one is constantly confronted with the fact that the MEPs are acutely aware of their particular status *vis-à-vis* their electorate, their political group, and the other institutions, the Council and the Commission in particular.

---

[6] Available from: http://www.europarl.eu.int/

The political groups. In spring 1996, there were nine political groups. They were, in descending size of the group:

Group of the Party of the European Socialists (PSE), 217 members;

Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) (PPE), 173 members;

Group of the Union for Europe (UPE), 54 members;

Group of the European Liberal Democratic and Reformist Party (ELDR), 52 members; Confederal Group of the European United Left/Nordic Green Left (GUE/NGL), 33 members;

Green Group in the European Parliament (V), 27 members;

Group of the European Radical Alliance (ARE), 20 members;

Europe of Nations Group (Co-ordination Group) (EDN), 19 members; and

the Non-attached Members (NI), 31 members.

The Rules of Procedure (Rule 106) prescribe the allocation of speaking time in the following way:

2. Speaking time shall be allocated in accordance with the following criteria:

a) a first fraction of speaking time shall be divided equally among all the political groups;

b) a further fraction shall be divided among the political groups in proportion to the total number of their members;

c) the non-attached Members shall be allocated an overall speaking time based on the fractions allocated to each political group under subparagraphs (a) and (b).

3. Where a total speaking time is allocated for several items on the agenda, the political groups shall inform the President of the fraction of their speaking time to be used for each individual item. The President shall ensure that these speaking times are respected.

In practice this means that he political groups decide in their group meetings how they will distribute the speaking time allotted to them. The size of the political group has significance for the research material, because it determines the MEPs' speaking time. The speaking time, in turn, is crucial for the analysis of the STs, since the tight rules about speaking time have a direct influence on the content as well as the form and prosody of the ST. While a member of a large political group may have up to five minutes' speaking time, the member of a small group may only have one minute to speak. This results in speeches that are written and recited at a fast rate. Furthermore, this rule may also explain why the speeches tend to be extremely dense regarding their information content.

The recording attached to this thesis demonstrates what it is like to listen to speeches

produced under these constraints. The analysis in Chapter 6 will further demonstrate how these constraints affect the interpreting of speeches delivered under such circumstances.

4.2 The EP meetings as an intertextual entity

As has been highlighted by interpreting theorists (e.g. Pöchhacker 1994), the texts produced in meetings are influenced by the specific type of meeting in question. The Members of the Parliament meet in various types of meetings which are organized as follows:

- one week each month is reserved for the part-session of the plenary session in Strasbourg
- shorter sessions of a day or two can be held in Brussels
- two weeks are set aside for meetings of the parliamentary committees
- the third week is set aside for the meetings of the political groups. (Noël op.cit.: 35)

This is the way the EP operates; there are also extraordinary or ad hoc meetings that are organized when the need arises. With the exception of the meetings of the political groups, the debates of all the regular meetings are based on documents, most typically draft legislation. This has an immediate influence on the nature of the discourse that interpreters are expected to interpret. The printed documents contain not only codes, terms and concepts that are part of the speakers' discourse, but they also contain text passages that speakers may quote by reciting them from the documents.

The texts discussed in the committees and the speeches delivered in the plenary session can be seen to form an intertextual entity of 'parent texts' and 'daughter texts' in the sense discussed by Alexieva (1994). The printed documents are the 'parent texts' on the basis of which the speeches, 'the daughter texts', are given. With reference to the knowledge base of the interpreter, this means that the more experience the interpreter has had of working for committees, and the better acquainted he is with the meeting documents, the more knowledge he will share with the speakers in the plenary session.

The role of the committees is to "examine questions referred to them by Parliament, or, during an adjournment of the session, by the President on behalf of the Conference of Presidents" (Rules of Procedure, Rule 139: 1.). Committees appoint MEPs to 'examine questions' which they do in the form of reports. The present corpus contains debates on issues in which a committee has made an inquiry about a specified topic and presents it in the form of a report.[7] The report is prepared by one or several members of the committee who will be the first speakers when the debate has been opened. The corpus contains several examples of debates where the report includes

---

[7] The topics are 'cross-border television' (Chapter 5.1) and IGC - Preparations for the Turin Summit (5.2).

the opinions of other relevant committees. For the structure of the debate this means that after the introduction(s) by the rapporteur(s), the floor is given to the members of the other committees who had drafted an opinion. Only after they have spoken will the floor be given to the other MEPs.

The composition of the committees is regulated by the Rules of Procedure. In an international body, it has been deemed necessary to "ensure fair representation of Member States and of political views" (Rules of Procedure, Rule 137: 1.) Consequently, an important aspect of the analysis of the argumentation involves paying attention to the stance of the individual speakers toward the one presented in the report. With a view to sense consistency with the original message, an important criterion will be the stance of the original speech and whether it has been conveyed in the TT. From the point of view of political rhetoric it is appropriate to note the references made by the MEPs to the rapporteur and the report as elements of the EP genre; references will also be made to the Council or the Commission, as was mentioned above.

The plenary session.　　The meeting type that my research focuses on is the session of the European Parliament, known as 'the Plenary'. The plenary session is open to the public and the press; it is also broadcast via satellite. The speeches delivered in the plenary session are published immediately in the verbatim report in the original languages of the speakers and later in translation as an annex to the Official Journal of the European Communities.

According to the Rules of Procedure, "The part-session shall be the meeting of Parliament convened as a rule each month and subdivided into daily sittings.
Sittings of Parliament held on the same day shall be deemed to be a single sitting. (Chapter II, Sessions of Parliament, Rule 10)

With a view to the background knowledge of the interpreter working for the plenary session in 1996, most documents were only available in Strasbourg at the start of the part-session. For the interpreter, the important document to obtain first was the agenda. At the time when the material was collected for this study, the agenda contained detailed information of the reports that were discussed, including the name(s) of the rapporteur(s), the Committee of the rapporteur(s), the code and title of the report and the deadline of the report. All this is important information for the interpreter in guiding him how to prepare and what to read for the meeting that he will be placed in. Interpreters working for the EP know from their practical experience that the more one knows about the meeting and its topic, the better one is able to comprehend the ST messages and convey them to the listeners. This is repeatedly emphasized in theoretical literature on interpreting.

Question time.　　In accordance with traditional parliamentary practice, the MEPs have been granted the opportunity to put questions to the Council and the Commission in every part-session of the EP session. MEPs can present both oral and written questions to the Council and Commission, and

receive answers to their questions. Questions, including the oral questions, have first been submitted to the Council or the Commission. The member of the Council or the Commission who is present in the sitting will answer all the questions. The MEP who has submitted the question may then present a further oral question for clarification.

The research corpus contains samples of this session as well. They were included for two reasons. First, in order to cover all the various meeting types conducted as part of the plenary session; and second, in order to see whether the spontaneous speeches of the MEPs differ from the presentations in the 'ordinary' sitting where presentations tend to be written, or at least involve prior planning.

Topical and urgent subjects of major importance.   One more meeting type, which is a regular element of the monthly part-session, is a special kind of debate titled 'Topical and urgent subjects of major importance'. According to the Rules of Procedure, "A political group or at least twenty-nine Members may ask the President in writing for a debate to be held on a topical and urgent subject of major importance. Such a request must be linked with a motion for a resolution." (Rule 47) These typically focus on community and international affairs or violations of human rights – issues that are currently in the news and deemed by one or several individuals or political groups to warrant the attention and the joint opinion of the MEPs. Another purpose of these debates is to alert the general public via the representatives of the media who are present at the plenary.

In terms of the characteristics of the EP genre, this session, which may amount to a maximum of three hours in one or two periods, represents a global dimension of the EP genre. In January 1996, the MEPs had tabled motions for resolutions on the situation in Turkey, on Sarajevo and Mostar; on orphanages in China; on human rights in Saudi Arabia; on the disastrous situation in Afghanistan; on bad conditions in prisons in the European Union; on violence in Chechnya and Russia; on disasters in Spain, Portugal, Ireland, South of France and Madeira; and on seal hunting in Norway.

This element of the part-session was selected in the corpus because it presents the interpreters with numerous challenging features. The debate is based on written motions for resolutions which contain a large amount of detailed information about the topic of the draft resolution. At the time of the recording, interpreters received them only shortly prior to the start of the debate, which meant that there was not enough time to read the documents beforehand.

4.3 Interpreting arrangements in the EP

The sheer number of meetings and languages makes the EP an important purchaser of interpreting services. The EP interpreting service was established in 1971. At that time the EC had four languages. In 1973, with three new member states (Denmark, Ireland and the United Kingdom), the number of languages increased by two; in 1981 Greece joined, followed two years later by Spain and Portugal, the resulting number of official languages being nine. With the accession of Austria, Finland and Sweden, the number of official languages went up to 11. According to some calculations, there has been a 'geometrical' progression in the language combinations. With four languages the figure was 12; with 6 languages it rose to 30; with seven, the number of combinations was 42, with nine it was 72 and with 11 languages the number of combinations is 110.

Today, the EP employs approximately 240 permanent staff interpreters, i.e. 15–20 per language division. The Directorate has a reserve of more than 1000 auxiliary session interpreters[8] , of whom between 200 and 500 must be recruited each day to cover the needs. The share of auxiliary session interpreters in meetings is two thirds or even one half of the total number of interpreters working at any meeting. (Available from http://www.europarl.eu.int/interp/)

The Interpreting Directorate is in charge of organizing the services. The Directorate is led by a Director, who is responsible for all aspects of policy and internal organization, including financial matters such as the budget of the Directorate. It organizes the interpreting service for the Parliament in the various locations where meetings are held as well as for the meetings of the Commission and Court of Auditors in Luxembourg. Individual interpreters' work is organized by eleven Heads of Division, one for each official language. Furthermore, the Heads of the Divisions ('booths') supervise the quality of their booth.[9] (Available from: http://www.europarl.eu.int/interp/)

With a view to the enlargement of the EU in May 2004, the European Parliament "confirms the controlled full multilingualism as the only means to maintain equality between languages and keep the cost within acceptable budgetary limits." This means that the existing interpreting system will continue for the present official languages in combination with retour interpretation for the new languages. (Available from: http://www.europarl.eu.int/interp/public/enlarge/) [Accessed 29 November 2003]

---

[8] For legal reasons and reasons relating to the Staff Regulations, the term 'freelance' has been replaced in Parliament by the term 'auxiliary session interpreter' (ASI); the other groups of interpreters are 'officials' and 'temporary staff'. (PE 194.642/BUR)

[9] 'A booth' refers to the walled space containing the interpreting equipment, in which the interpreters work. For each language there is a separate booth. Thus, a meeting covering all the official languages has to take place in a room with 11 booths. They are called 'the Finnish booth', 'the Swedish booth', etc.

Selection criteria of interpreters. The European Parliament Interpreting website informs potential interpreters about the language requirements as follows:

> For the existing booths, a minimum of two passive languages will be required, but three or more are preferred. However, applicants for the Finnish booth and the countries subsequently joining the EU from 2004 onwards may also be considered if they have just one other active language equivalent to the mother-tongue, since they will be expected to work in two directions in simultaneous, both into and out of their mother-tongue (A B 'retour'). (http://www.europarl.eu.int/interp/) [Accessed on 30 November 2003]

The Interpreting Directorate defines active and passive languages as follows:

An active language is a language into which the interpreter works.

A - language is the mother-tongue (or strictly equivalent) into which the interpreter interprets from all other working languages.

B - language is the language into which the interpreter works from one or more of her/his other languages and which, although not a mother-tongue, is a language of which s/he has a perfect command.

A passive language is a language of which the interpreter has a profound knowledge, and from which s/he translates into the mother-tongue.

According to the Directorate's home page, most interpreters work from at least three languages, and some from even five or six C - languages.

Besides an "exceptionally good knowledge of languages", interpreters must have a university degree (in any field) or equivalent qualification, as well as training or experience as a conference interpreter. According to the Directorate's description of conference interpreting, "Versatility, analytical skills and complete mastery of the mother-tongue are vital. The almost unlimited range of subjects covered in parliamentary debate requires extensive general knowledge and considerable expertise in all areas of European Union activity." (Available from: http://www.europarl.eu.int/interp/)

An important factor to be born in mind when reading the transcripts of the interpreters' performances in this study, or when listening to the recording, is the fact that all interpreters working at the EP have been tested for that specific institution. At the time of the recording, tests were conducted by EU interpreter panels who were expected to have firsthand information of what is required of interpreting within the EU institutions.

Relay interpreting. Meetings with two to five working languages need two interpreters per booth; combinations of six to eleven languages call for three interpreters per booth. However, it is not the

rule that the 3–4 interpreters working in one booth would jointly have the required professional command of all the 11 languages. 'Relay interpreting' is therefore common. This means that a booth with no command of less widely known languages such as Portuguese or Greek will 'take relay' from a booth which works directly from one of these languages into more widely known languages, such as English, which the rest of the booths will use as a 'pivot' ('single-relay').

At the time of the recording of the present research material, each interpreter working at the EP would receive a printout of his schedule, complete with the names of colleagues working at the same meeting. The printout contained information about the languages being used at the meeting, the languages of each interpreter working at the meeting, the names and booths of the 'pivots' for the required 'relay' language as well as information concerning the lack of 'relay'. This means that if, for example, direct relay from Greek into English was not available, interpreters had to work through 'double relay': the first relay may be from Greek into German, and the second from German into English. Modern conference equipment allows the interpreter to see from the console whether the 'relay' is direct or a double relay. The standard procedure for the team of interpreters working in the same booth is to make sure that they do not take 'double relay', because experience has shown that this will lower the degree of faithfulness to the original speech.

In 1996, Swedish was also a language which only a few interpreters had included in their working languages. The analysis of the corpus will look into the issue of the interpreter's command of languages as it is reflected in material recorded in a real-life situation (Chapter 6).

Retour (bi-active) interpreting. Another established practice has been to work into the interpreter's mother-tongue. However, in the case of Finnish becoming an official language of the EU, this rule had to be relaxed as there were only a very small number of interpreters with an EU language as their mother-tongue and Finnish as a C-language. At the time of recording this material, non-Finnish interpreters working for the EU on a regular or permanent basis were only beginning to learn Finnish. Therefore Finnish interpreters were asked to interpret from Finnish into one of the more widely known languages of the EU, such as English, German or French.

'Retour' or bi-active interpreting means that one interpreter in the team not only interprets into his mother-tongue but also into another language whenever his mother-tongue is spoken during the meeting. The Interpreting Directorate provides the following example on their home pages:

> A meeting with 11 languages in which Finnish is interpreted into English by one of the Finnish interpreters doing 'retour'.
> When the Finnish Member takes the floor, the interpreter in the Finnish booth will push the "channel switch" button on the interpreter console. Before the meeting this button has been programmed for the Finnish booth to take over the channel of the English booth. The voice

of the Finnish interpreter, speaking English, is heard on the English channel. The interpreters in the English booth do not work. When the speaker has finished his/her speech, the Finnish interpreter pushes the "channel switch" button again. The sound from the Finnish booth now comes out of the Finnish booth channel again. (Available from: http://europarl.eu.int/interp/) [Accessed 29 November 2003]

In 1995, when Finland became a member state of the EU, and Finnish became one of the official languages to be interpreted in the EU meetings, Finnish interpreters were asked, individually, if they wanted to act as 'pivots'. Eventually it became evident that special training had to be arranged in 'retour interpreting'. This training is not yet reflected in the research material of the present study.

Interpreters' working conditions.   The maximum length of an interpreter's shift is three and a half hours; interpreters may be allocated to two meetings of this length per day with a minimum break of one and a half hours.

In 1996, the interpreters' booths, the control booth and the access corridors occupied +/- 45% of the surface area of medium-sized meeting rooms. In Strasbourg, many interpreter booths did not have a full view of the meeting. Moreover, interpreters only saw the speakers from a far distance. Speakers did not go to a podium; instead, they stood up, delivered their speech, and sat down again. Therefore, extra-linguistic features such as expressions, gestures, etc. are not relevant for analysis as interpreters could not see them clearly. Interpreters' booths were equipped with monitors, which gave the speaker's name and political group, or institution. This arrangement helped the interpreters not only with the names but it also helped them to anticipate what languages were to be spoken in the House. No other visual aids were used in the plenary sittings at the time.

Documents relating to any on-going meeting were distributed in the booths prior to the start of the meeting in the language of the booth. Thus, if an interpreter wished to familiarize himself with the topic and the keywords of the meeting in advance, it was up to the individual interpreter to get hold of the documents at the information desk. This was particularly important for the 'pivots' who needed the documents in their 'retour' language as well. A 'pivot's' workload was heavier than that of interpreters working into one language direction only, because they had to master the specialized vocabulary actively in two languages. This, together with the limited time for preparation, has to be borne in mind when reading Chapter 6 transcriptions and analyzes of TT performances.

Quality of interpreting in the EP context.   All the above information constitutes the framework for the interpreters' working conditions at the EP plenary sitting. In order to fulfill the quality criteria

set by the EP interpreting directorate[10] , the interpreters are expected to be well informed about the functioning of the EP. Interpreters are also expected to understand how the institutional structure determines the textual basis of the discussions and the debates of the various types of meetings.

As experienced professionals, interpreters are expected to achieve the set standard with the help of the Directorate, the Head of the Division, as well as colleagues and team mates. Yet every individual interpreter is primarily responsible for the quality of the interpreting. These factors have to be borne in mind when analyzing the interpreters' performances.

---

[10] "Interpreting is the faithful transmission of a message, captured in one language and then accurately rendered in another." "The interpreter's job is to ensure that speeches delivered in one of the official languages of the European Union are accurately rendered into the other official languages."

5. RESEARCH MATERIAL AND METHOD

Introduction. It was pointed out in the Introduction that such quality criteria as 'accuracy' and 'faithfulness' were not operational, because they meant different things for different people. On the basis of this conclusion and the theoretical survey of SI research it became evident that these criteria (accuracy, faithfulness, etc.) will not advance our understanding of SI quality unless they are linked with a theoretically grounded analysis of empirical material. (See Mack and Cattaruzza on 'relative' and 'absolute' quality, and the need for 'rationally defined criteria' in Tommola 1995: 37–49.) In order to find a new approach to SI quality criteria, the research question in this study was formulated as follows:

> *How can the interpreter's performance provide the listener with the same conditions for comprehending the speech, or for creating one's own interpretation of the content of the speech and of the speaker's intentions as another listener who is listening to the original speech?*

This research question led to the following main hypothesis:

> *Collaboration between the speaker and the interpreter is a prerequisite for an SI performance to provide a person listening to the SI with equivalent opportunities to comprehend the speaker's message in the same way as another listener listening to the original.*

According to this hypothesis, the speaker plays a crucial role in the achievement of quality in interpreting. In order for the interpreter to be able to achieve what is expected of him, the speaker should take into consideration the fact that his speech is to be interpreted. The key question therefore is to explore what facilitates this collaboration and what may obstruct it.

The underlying hypothesis of my study and the questions posed require an appropriate

method for approaching and answering the research question. Earlier[1] interpreting research and its methods have been criticized for not being up to academic standards (Gile: 1990: 28; 1992; 1997; 1998; 2000), or for being narrow in scope (Pöchhacker 2003). Gile justifies his claim by characterizing early theories as 'personal theorizing,' and individual studies as being based on neither carefully and critically selected data, nor on data collected in a systematic way. Furthermore, Gile claims that literature on interpreting seldom provides the reader with the chance of assessing the correctness, representativeness or validity of the claims. In spite of strong criticism, Gile gives credit to earlier research for supplying interesting ideas and research questions. (Gile 2000; 1990: 31)

Like Gile, Kalina, too, has given much thought to the reasons why a considerable number of the earlier empirical studies have been based on weak research methods, or why their results have not the expected validity. With reference to the complaints that much of the research carried out by psychologists and linguists is not relevant to the reality of SI, Kalina suggest that researchers in these fields might not have the necessary know-how about the variables that can be used to measure the reality of interpreting. Some of the key variables that should be taken into account in Interpreting Studies are, according to Kalina, the individuality of the interpreting performance, the conference type, and the languages involved. According to her, psychologists and linguists can extend their research hypotheses to real life phenomena only if all the various phenomena that are potentially present in an authentic interpreting situation are taken into consideration. (1998: 172–173)

I have attempted to avoid the problems enumerated above by taking into account the weaknesses in the research material and methods as discussed by the authors cited above. First, as an active conference interpreter, I am aware of the individuality of interpreters' performances. Consequently, the research material and method have been designed in such a way that this aspect is one of the key considerations (see 5.1). Second, the crucial variables in the design of the present study are the specific type of conference involved as well as the features that have an influence on the discourse produced there (see Chapter 4). Furthermore, the selection of the variables to be studied has had the aim of reflecting the reality of interpreting .

With reference to the reality of interpreting, on the one hand, and the expectations expressed in the definition of SI by the Interpreting Directorate of the EP on the other hand,[2] on-the-job experiences both in the EP and elsewhere have repeatedly confirmed the observation that non-

---

[1] The IS period which is typically covered by authors discussing earlier research ranges from the 1950s up to late 1980s.

[2] [...] interpreting is not word-for-word translation [...] but the faithful transmission of a message, captured in one language and then accurately rendered in another. [...] Even more important [than linguistic knowledge] is the ability to grasp the speaker's intention rather than words.

correspondences between the original speeches and their interpreted versions are the rule rather than an exception. This observation has been confirmed by IS scholars starting with Oléron and Nanpon (1965/2002), Gerver (1969/2002), and Barik (1975/2002), cited in Chapter 2, as well as by subsequent research. We can take it for granted, however, that *interpreters strive for maximum correspondence with the original speech, including maximum accuracy and faithfulness.*

With this hypothesis in mind, the present study aims at exploring the nature of these non-correspondences. The key question to be answered is, to what extent these non-correspondences may hamper the listener from creating an equivalent representation of the speaker's message to that of a fellow member of the audience listening to the original speaker.

As argued above (Chapter 3), the concept 'correspondence' implies a comparison between the entities that are expected to share certain features in common. Kalina presents a number of *caveats* against the comparison of TTs and the STs they are based on. In her view this method was picked up by empirical research for lack of alternative ones. Kalina claims that the main weakness of these studies is due to oversight of the special conditions that affect SI. Regarding the observation and description of deficient SI quality, or SI problems, their origins and impact, Kalina agrees with Gile in stating that it is not always possible to identify the source of the error directly from the TT. (Kalina 1998: 127–128)

According to Kalina (ibid.: 131), if the researcher wishes to study something which is relevant for interpreting in real situations, it is reasonable to expect that the data has been obtained in authentic situations where interpreting is carried out in accordance with professional norms and practices. Yet all the authors referred to here, i.e. Gile (1990), Kalina (1998), Setton (1999) and Pöchhacker (1994), who have wished to follow this principle, refer to the difficulty of obtaining authentic conference recordings. Some of the reasons include the unwillingness of the interpreters to have their performances recorded, as well as the organizers' or speakers' reluctance to submit the conference material for public scrutiny. Moreover, there are technical problems in making recordings which are best suited for research purposes.

Getting these prerequisites right does not solve the methodological problems alone. As interpreters' performances are individual and singular, there are problems relating to the comparison of the available versions. Kalina (ibid.: 129) makes the following reservation pertaining to the individuality and singularity of interpreters' performances:

> There are no two interpreter's performances fulfilling the same conditions, where the languages interpreted, the text producers, the addressees, the situation, the textual interdependence, the interpreter's own performance standards, etc. were *identical* and only sometimes one factor would change.[3] (my italics) (my translation).

---

[3] "Es gibt keine zwei Verdolmetschungen unter gleichen Bedingungen, bei denen Verarbeitungsrichtung, Textproduzenten, Adressaten, Situation, Textinterdependenz, eigenes Anforderungsprofil des Dolmetschers etc. identisch wären und nur jeweils ein Faktor varierte."

In Kalina's (ibid.: 130) view, this is a problem for empirical research, as data which is based on individual performances cannot be the basis for research questions which aim at finding regularities nor can it be used to determine certain predictable patterns. One solution has been to obtain, in a simulated setting, parallel SI performances of the original recorded speeches.

In the present study, an attempt has been made to solve most of the problems mentioned by Kalina. The corpus has been collected in an authentic speech situation, and it has been recorded over an extended period of time. The purpose has, in other words, been to obtain a sufficient amount of authentic material in order for (1) the languages interpreted, (2) the text producers, (3) the addressees, (4) the situation and (5) the textual interdependence to stay as close to 'identical' (see Kalina above) as is possible in a real-life situation. In case of real-life data, however, it may be more appropriate to speak about 'similar' rather than 'identical' conditions.

With a view to the five elements listed by Kalina, the conditions prevailing between the different recordings can be described as follows. First, interpreters have been assigned to work into a set direction (from the SL into English, Finnish, German and Swedish).[4] Second, the text producers are members of the two institutions, the Commission and the European Parliament, which determine their way of formulating their contributions. Third, the primary addressees are the same members of these institutions. Fourth, the situation is the same, namely the part-session of the European Parliament plenary session in Strasbourg. Fifth, the text context is also the same for the STs and TTs as individual speakers' texts depend on the same primary texts (reports on draft legislation, on Commission statements, on questions to the Council and Commission and on draft resolutions on topical and urgent subjects of major importance). Furthermore, the same rules govern the production of texts. (Concerning the rules guiding text production and speaking in the plenary sitting, see Chapter 4 on the production of texts within the EU.) By picking a real-life conference with a number of variables that can be regarded as 'constant', the present study has attempted to solve the problem of the large number of variables involved in spoken discourse. This research design was considered more interesting than an experimental study which would enable the controlling of variables, as the aim of this study is to analyze and describe real-life phenomena rather than to arrive at objective, conclusive results.

The speech situation and the discourse produced in the Plenary sitting of the European Parliament are governed by strict Rules of Procedure, as described in Chapter 4. These rules diminish the number of variables to be taken into account by specifying the roles of the speakers, the speaking times and the topics to be discussed. For the speakers, the setting is always the same, the EP plenary session in the Council of Europe building in Strasbourg, the meeting hall known as 'the Hemicycle'. From the speakers' point of view, the components of the speech event (as defined

---

[4] In addition to the normal direction of working into one's mother tongue, or A-language, the Finnish interpreters act as pivots in interpreting Finnish originals into German, the interpreters' B-language.

by Pöchhacker 1994, for example) remain the same.

5.1 Research material

As has been mentioned above, the material has been recorded in the part-sessions of the European Parliament plenary session. Because of the on-going succession of similar meetings with large numbers of speakers and interpreters taking their turns in a routine manner, it has been possible to obtain an extensive amount of material which is representative both of EP discourse as well as of professional SI practice.

The corpus consists of 120 speeches and interventions given on five different dates (18 January, 13 and 14 February, and 13 and 14 March 1996). The reason for selecting material presented on different dates and on different days of the week and at different hours was to eliminate any one-off psychological factors that may influence an individual interpreters' state of alertness. Some interpreters may achieve their best performance levels in the morning while others may find themselves in their best form during the hours after lunch. Late night working hours may also have an impact on interpreters. Furthermore, it was considered that a considerably large number of recordings of the interpreters' performances on different dates and hours of the day would provide a kind of cross-section of interpreting in the EP. This would help to give an idea of what is the standard of interpreting and, what is more crucial for the hypothesis of the present study, what are the standard cases of non-correspondence between the STs and TTs in the light of the corpus.

The 120 speeches recorded for the present study are in English (54), Finnish (11), German (44) and Swedish (11). In addition to the original speeches, the corpus also includes the interpretations of these speeches into these four languages, i.e. three TT versions of each speech.

The research material also includes the verbatim reports of the sessions, which are produced immediately on site after each sitting of the part-session. They contain slightly edited versions of all the speeches in the original languages. The material also includes the agendas for the part-session concerned, the agendas for the daily sitting, some of the reports that were discussed, as well as the written questions to the Council and the Commission.[5]

The initial impulse for this study came while I was employed as an interpreter for the EP. This gave me ample opportunity to make observations about the speech context. As certain elements of the EP genre became increasingly dominant for the research plan it seemed advisable to

_____
[5] See Appendix 1 for a list of the research material.

interview a few Finnish MEPs for their views of the way in which the meetings function. The background material of the study includes interviews conducted with five Finnish MEPs. Since much of the EP discourse deals with draft legislation, I asked a lawyer to give advice concerning the accuracy of the legal terms in the Finnish interpreters' versions, based on the tape recordings. Large numbers of journalists report on the Strasbourg week. In order to obtain an idea of the usefulness of interpreting for their professional purposes, I asked a journalist to give his views regarding both the fluency and comprehensibility of the interpreting on the basis of the recordings. The interviews and the comments were recorded and transcribed for further reference.

The speeches and their interpreted versions were recorded at the Council of Europe Hemicycle in Strasbourg by the Audiovisual Unit of the EP. Each of the four languages was recorded on a separate *beta cam* tape; later they were transferred to ordinary VCR cassettes for easier viewing, and ordinary sound cassettes to enable easier transcription. The transfer operation was carried out by professionals using professional equipment.

5.1.1 Selection criteria of the recordings

There were theoretical and pragmatic reasons for distributing the recordings over a period of time and on different hours of the day and of the week (see 4.1 Research material). Furthermore, the present study specifically wanted to take into consideration SI theorists' criticism of earlier studies. These criteria will be discussed below.

The Source Texts.   To start with, the first goal was to focus on the characteristics of the STs. Therefore it was deemed necessary to include a sufficient number of topics and speakers in the research material. This had the aim of diminishing any distortions in the ratio of certain features and characteristics which would be due to the idiosyncrasies of the speakers. It would not be possible to conclude on the basis of a few select speeches what is typical of the EP genre, or its rhetorical characteristics.

In line with the hypothesis of the study, the aim was to collect a corpus that would illustrate the specific characteristics of EP discourse. Consequently, the corpus covers a broad range of topics. Two years' experience of working for the EP plenary session provided information about the standard features of the part-sessions. From the point of view of the representativity of the material, recordings were made in all the different kinds of debates that are conducted during the part-session of the plenary sitting according to the Rules of Procedure of the European Parliament (see Chapter 4). An analysis of the various kinds of debates was considered necessary in order to obtain a full view of any recurring textual elements that characterize the EP discourse.

The corpus contains the joint debates of six different reports. They are based on the Commission's Information Document; on the Communication from the Commission; on the Commission's report; on the Commission's memorandum; on the Council's draft directive; and on Parliament's opinion. Samples of other types of debates are also included in the corpus. These are the Question time and the debate on topical and urgent subjects of major importance. One recording was also made of the voting session, as voting is an integral part of the functioning of the EP.

The list below gives the eleven debates selected for the study.[6] It gives the number of the debate that is also used as a reference in the examples; the date of the debate; and the heading of the debate as indicated in the final draft agenda and the verbatim report of the proceedings. Finally, it gives the number of speeches that were made in the languages of the study as well as the distribution of the languages.

List of debates selected for recording:

1.

18 January 1996

Report (A4–0257/95) on the Commission's information document
on Structural Fund Innovatory Measures 1995–1999:
Guidelines for the second series of actions under Article 10 of the ERDF Regulation (CE–0453/95)
Rapporteur Mr. Richard Howitt
10 speeches: 5 English; 5 German
–––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––

2.
Report (A4–0328/95) on the Communication from the Commission
on the allocation of funds and the implementation of Community initiatives in Austria, Finland and Sweden (COM(95)0123–C4–0282/95)
Rapporteur Ms. Riitta Myller
8 speeches: 1 English; 3 German; 2 Swedish; 2 Finnish
–––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––

3.

13 February, 1996

Report (A4–0001/96) on the Commission's Twelfth Annual Report to Parliament on monitoring the application of Community Law (COM(95)0500–C4–0233/95)
Rapporteur Mr. Georgios Anastassopoulos
6 speeches: 2 questions, 1 answer: 6 English; 3 German
–––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––

4.
Report (A4–0338/95) on the Memorandum on equal pay for work of equal value (COM(94)0006–C4–0084/94)
Rapporteur Ms. Colombo Svevo
9 speeches: 4 English; 1 German; 1 Swedish; 3 Finnish

5.
Oral question to Commission (B4–0011/96–0-0009/96/1) on the second programming period (1997–1999) of Objective 2 interventions of Structural Funds
Presented by Roberto Speciale (in Italian)
11 speeches: 4 English; 4 German; 3 Finnish
––

[6] See also the list on page 11.

6.

14 February 1996

Report (A4–0018/96) on draft directive of European Parliament and Council modifying directive 89/552/EEC of Council on the coordination of certain legislation in Member States
concerning television broadcasting
Rapporteurs Mr. Gerardo Galeote Quecedo and Karsten Hoppenstedt
7 speeches: 4 English; 2 German; 1 Swedish
––

7.

Northern Ireland peace process
12 speeches: English
––

8.

13 March 1996

Report (A4–0068/96) on Parliament's opinion on the convening of the Intergovernmental Conference; and evaluation of the work of the Reflection Group and definition of the political priorities of European Parliament with a view to the Intergovernmental Conference on the proposal for amendment of the Treaties on which the European Union is founded
Statements by Council and Commission on the preparations
for the European Council (Turin, 29/30 March 1996)
Rapporteurs Ms. Raymonde Dury and Ms. Johanna Maij-Weggen
14 speeches: 6 English; 5 German; 2 Swedish; 1 Finnish
––

9.

Oral Questions to the Council (B4–0282/96 - 0-0031/96),
(B4–0283/96 - 0-0034/96), (B4–0284/96 - 0–0052/96),
(B4–0286/96 - 0–0058/96), (B4–0293/96 - 0–0069/96),
(B4–0294/96 - 0–0070/96)
on the meeting of the UN Commission on Human Rights in Geneva in March/April 1996
4 speeches: 1 English; 3 German
––

10.

Question Time to the Council
(B4 – 0278/96)
4 speeches: 2 English; 2 Swedish
––

11.

14 March 1996
Topical and urgent subjects of major importance
(Rule 47)
36 speeches: 11 English; 20 German; 3 Swedish; 2 Finnish

–––

The debates listed above were selected to be recorded for the study, first, because of the topic, and second, because of the type of debate they represent. It seemed appropriate to select debates that relate to EU topics, such as the allocation of Community funds (debates 1., 2. and 5.), Community legislative process (3., 6.) as well as debates on inter-institutional politics (8.) and current political and/or international issues (4., 7., 9.–11.). According to the research design, a number of these debates concern topics and issues of which interpreters can be assumed to have prior knowledge (EU-related topics [1., 2., 3., 5., 8.], equal pay for work of equal value [4.], television broadcasting [6.]), whereas current political affairs may involve issues and proper names of which interpreters

may not have prior knowledge.

The pilot study showed, first, that the analysis has to be based on a theoretical approach which focuses on the sense of the message without being based on the semantics or grammar of any individual language. A close reading of the speeches on the application of Community Law revealed that the speeches could be analyzed in the light of political rhetoric. It was not feasible, however, to analyze all the eleven debates with all their speeches in the research report. Therefore, the report discusses three different groups of speeches that have been selected to answer the research question of the study:

(1) a debate on a general topic that is familiar from the interpreter's point of view (6. television broadcasting);

(2) debates relating to the EU institutions as instances of shared knowledge between speakers and interpreters (8. the Intergovernmental Conference, 9. and 10. Questions to the Council and Commission); and

(3) debates illustrating the impact of the lack of shared knowledge (11. topical and urgent subjects of major importance).

With the help of these three groups of debate, discussing topics that can be assumed to require different levels of world and specialized knowledge, an attempt has been made to highlight some features that make it either easier or more difficult to convey the ST message.

The Target Texts.   The original research design, created and developed on the basis of observations on site, assumed that it might be possible to single out specific ST features that have an adverse effect on SI quality. Therefore, it was considered important to collect a corpus with the SI versions of one and the same speech by three interpreters. Since it was technically feasible, this solution was considered more interesting than an experiment in which authentic SI performances were recorded on conference site, and additional versions were added at a later stage (see e.g. Lederer 1981). After all, one of the primary aims of the present study was to investigate and describe SI in a representative real-life setting.

The corpus has three SI versions of each speech in order to avoid the problem of the singularity of interpreter performances. The high number of TT performances provides a broad view of SI behavior and solutions. While quantitative information has not been included here, the high number of instances of a similar nature that were observed in the research material has made it possible to classify and categorize some typical phenomena related to interpreting in EP.

Because of the authentic setting, the SI versions of each speech are in different languages. Thus, each speech in one of the four languages of the corpus (English, Finnish, German, Swedish) has been interpreted into three languages on site as part of the normal EP routine of providing interpreting in all the 11 official languages. This solution should – to some extent at least – also

reduce the problem of the inter-individual and intra-individual fluctuations in attentiveness, in cognitive factors (such as knowledge of the topic at hand) and in linguistic competence. From the point of view of the theoretical framework and the research method, this solution underlines the focus on the key elements of the sense of the message as conveyed by the TT.

Speakers and Interpreters. The corpus contains 120 speeches by 77 speakers, some of the speakers making speeches in more than one debate. Only speakers using English, Finnish, German or Swedish have been included in the research material. Speeches in the remaining seven languages (Danish, Dutch, French, Greek, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish) have not been included in the study.[7]

Furthermore, the only interpreting that was recorded for the corpus was from the four languages of the study. One asset of this selection of languages is that a majority of the SI versions are based on the originals and not on 'relay' (see Chapter 4). The extent of the language system and the number of interpreters means that it is common for the interpreting to go via 'relay'. However, if the recording shows evidence of 'relay', it is indicated in the analysis.

The part-session agenda provides only limited information about the speakers. It gives the names of the reports and the rapporteurs, as well as the names of MEPs putting questions to the Council and Commission. It was not possible to chose the speakers in advance for the recording. Therefore, it was not possible to know in advance which languages would be used and to what extent. Consequently, some recordings have only a few speeches in the languages of the study (see List of debates, pp. 94–95 and a more complete list in Appendix 2). The limited number of speeches and languages was one criterion for not including certain debates in the closer analysis (such as the twelve English speeches on the Northern Ireland peace process).

The recording thus reflects the normal day-to-day progression of the EP plenary sitting from the interpreter's point of view. Interpreters may be informed about special guests visiting the House, but they do not receive lists of speakers in their booths. Consequently, the corpus includes those speakers who were due to speak in the selected session on the selected hour on the topic selected for this study. The same is true for the interpreters. The meetings in which the interpreters work as well as their working hours are fixed prior to the start of the Strasbourg week. The corpus therefore contains the TTs of those interpreters who had been assigned to interpret on that particular day of the part-session. (For more information, see Chapter 4.4 for 'Interpreting arrangements in the European Parliament'.) The corpus should therefore be representative of the normal working procedure of the European Parliament.

The report discusses five debates containing 65 speeches by 50 speakers. The number of speakers can be counted as they are introduced by their names both in the sitting and in the verbatim report. However, the exact number of interpreters included in the material is more difficult

---

[7] Since a debate was recorded as a whole, or a large part of it was recorded without interruptions, the TTs of speeches in these languages are included in the recording.

to count than the number of speakers. At the time of recording, the number of interpreters in sittings with all 11 languages was 37 because of extra 'pivots'. The 37 interpreters (three per language booth plus the extra pivots) take their turns according to their language combination. A rough estimate of the number of interpreters included in the corpus is 30; the report discusses the TTs of around 20 interpreters.[8]

The primary reason for having a large number of speeches and a large number of interpreters has been to cater for the demand to have relevant and reliable data on which to base the conclusions. The present data fulfills Kalina's criteria in that the SI task is 'identical' for all the three interpreters interpreting any single speech. According to the working hypothesis, if regularities and patterns can be observed in all three versions in the same speech sequence, it should be an indication that some feature in the ST explains these regularities.

5.2 Research method

Introduction. Non-correspondences have been a focus of SI research for a long time. Researchers have observed that these non-correspondences can be observed between the original speeches and their interpreted versions; they relate to both form and content. (See Chapter 2, Oléron & Nanpon 1965, Gerver 1969, Barik 1975.) Yet, the theoretical modeling of SI, together with the systematic training of conference interpreters, was only in its early stages at the time these results were published. It may be argued that, while the number of test persons was very low (cf. Kalina 1989: 129), the professional experience of the test persons may also have been on a different level to that of present day professionals. Furthermore, there was scarcely any SI-related theoretical support for the pioneering research. While their studies still receive a lot of attention in interpreting research literature, methods for studying deviations and non-correspondences have not been developed to the extent that a research paradigm has yet been accepted by the IS community. Because of the different focus of the earlier studies discussed in Chapter 2, their methods could not be applied directly in this study, and it has therefore been necessary to develop a somewhat different method to analyze the present material.

The hypotheses relating to the research question of the present study led to a number of

---

[8] According to oral information, Heads of Divisions appoint the best and most experienced interpreters for the plenary sitting. This may explain why the material has the TTs by the same interpreters, even if the recordings were made during three separate part-sessions and on different days of the week. The number of interpreters who have the right language combinations and who are able to work in the plenary sitting may not have been very high in 1996. (This may apply to the new member states Finland and Sweden in particular.)

sub-questions, such as:

1) What are the most frequent categories of non-correspondence concerning the sense of the ST in comparison with the TT?

2) Is it possible to detect features in the ST which explain these non-correspondences?

3) Do the TTs convey the substance of the messages in spite of the non-correspondences?

The questions are almost identical to the questions Gerver studied in experimental conditions. When answering these questions we can also study his conclusions in an authentic context. Gerver (1969/2002) was able to conclude that simultaneous interpreting provides empirical proof of "an information-handling system which is subject to overload *if required to carry out more complex processes at too fast a rate* and *copes with overload* by reaching a steady state of throughput *at the expense of an increase in errors and omission*s." More than thirty years after this conclusion was made I have applied a different method to analyze these 'errors and omissions', when and where they occur, and what their role is from the point of view of the recipient of SI.

One method of finding answers to the questions set for this study is to compare the STs (the original speeches) with the three TTs (their interpreted versions). In compliance with the theoretical framework, the hypothesis is not to expect a one-to-one syntactic and lexical correspondence between the STs and the TTs; instead, the comparison is based on the analysis of units carrying the propositional content and the rhetoric form of the messages.

A crucial variable to be taken into account is the individuality and singularity of the interpreter's performance, as stated by Kalina. It may always be argued that what one interpreter experiences as a 'high presentation rate' or an 'overload to the information handling system' may for another interpreter be the normal load. Even in the EP, where all interpreters are accredited on the basis of recruitment tests, there will always be old-timers and newcomers, or staff and freelance interpreters. Therefore, for methodological reasons, the recordings were made in several meetings and in four languages in order to have a large number of interpreters. The hypothesis underlying this solution for the selection of the material was the following:

Interpreters aim at maximum correspondence with the ST, or at maximum accuracy and faithfulness. Therefore, if at least two of the three interpreters fail to convey information that is relevant or important considering the speech as an entity, this failure may be caused by some characteristic in the ST.

The rationale underlying the second part of this hypothesis is a result of observation and theorizing. It can be taken as a fact that omissions and errors will be observable in SI for reasons that cannot be generalized in the case of individual performances. However, if three professional

interpreters fail to produce the sense of the same (part)message while working under the same conditions, it can be hypothesized that this is due to some feature in the ST. The analyses in Chapter 6 aim to find features in the STs that can be used to determine the *de facto* constraints of the SI method.

5.2.1 Method of comparing the Source Texts with the SI versions

This section will report how the method of analysis was developed step by step. A description is provided of the progression, starting with the first pilot survey of a few speeches based on a report on the application of EU legislation in the Member States and their SI versions. The next stage was to develop a method for comparing a large number of speeches with a large number of SI versions in three different languages. The final stage was to find an appropriate system for analyzing the sense of the messages of both the STs and the TTs.

1st Step: Analysis of the Source Texts. In order to be able to determine what components constitute the basis for establishing 'correspondence' while taking into account the theoretical views according to which SI is not, and should not be, the word-for-word transcoding of the original, the first task was to analyze the originals to find out what the key elements are that constitute the sense of the message. Or what the key elements are that constitute the 'information content' of a speech.

The pilot study indicated that 'information content' can be understood to mean the propositional content of the speeches, the semantic meaning of the utterances, as well as the speech act, or the illocutionary force of the speeches. Thus, the STs have been analyzed as textual entities, focusing on their pragmatic function, propositional meaning, as well as the genre and the way these are expressed in the argumentation of the speeches.

2nd Step: Comparison of STs with their TTs. The working hypothesis being that interpreters aim at maximum correspondence with the ST, that is, at maximum accuracy and faithfulness, the research focuses on finding out when this aim has no longer been possible to reach by comparing the STs with the TTs. Bearing in mind the premise that the STs and the TTs, both as entities and as parts of the texts, have the same function, the research strategy of the present study required a method whereby the analysis of the propositional and rhetorical content of the STs is followed by an analysis of the corresponding sequences in the TTs.

The key questions in this context are the first and third sub-questions of the present study, i.e.:

1) What are the main categories of non-correspondence concerning the information content of

the ST in comparison with the TT?

3) Do the TTs convey the relevant elements of the information content in spite of the non-correspondences?

5.3 Pilot study

In order to gain a preliminary answer to the above questions, it was necessary to conduct a pilot study on a small sample. Consequently, I first transcribed a small number of speeches delivered in each of the four languages of the corpus as well as their interpreted versions, aligning them as demonstrated below for a clearer view of the correspondences and non-correspondences.

The following sample serves to illustrate how the alignment was executed.

Alignment of the ST and the TTs

Or: Madame la Presidente, vielen Dank, Frau Präsidentin

En: Madame President,   Ladies and Gentlemen

Sv: Ja tack fru ordförande

Su: Rouva puhemies,   hyvät naiset ja herrat

Or: Herr Präsident Klaus Hänsch hat in seiner Antrittsrede gesagt

En: President   Hänsch said in his   first speech to Parliament

Sv: talmannen   Klaus Hänsch sade   då han tillträdde

Su: puhemies   Klaus Hänsch sanoi   virkaanastujaispuheessaan

Or: wir müssten   Europa in die Köpfe und in die Herzen der Menschen bringen

En: that   we must bring Europe into the heads and the hearts of ordinary people

Sv: att   vi   måste få   Europa i människornas hjärta och hjärna

Su: että meidän täytyy   Eurooppa saada ihmisten sydämiin ja päihin

Or: damit hat er uns eine sehr schwierige Aufgabe mit sehr einfachen Worten gegeben

En: and that was   a   very difficult   task for us all to face

Sv: det här är   en   svår   uppgift som han utryckte i enkla ord

Su: hän antoi meille   hyvin vaikean   tehtävän hyvin yksinkertaisin sanoin

Or: und das hat sich in dem Bericht meines sehr geschätzten Kollegen Anastassopoulos wieder einmal sehr genau gezeigt

En: and .. this has been proved again by this report

Sv: det här ser vi mycket klart av Anastassopoulos betänkande

Su: ja tämä on käynyt myöskin hyvin ..rakkaan kollegani herra Anastassopouloksen
 mietinnöstä hyvin ilmi

The typewritten transcript could be laid out in such a way that the corresponding expressions were more or less aligned. The method of the first analysis will be illustrated below by looking at the above speech sequence segment by segment.

Sample of pilot analysis

Or: *Madame la Presidente*, vielen Dank, Frau Präsidentin

En: Madame President,   Ladies and Gentlemen

Sv: Ja tack fru ordförande

Su: Rouva puhemies,   hyvät naiset ja herrat

The German speaker addresses the French chairperson of the meeting first in French, after which she thanks the President for having permission to speak, expressed in her own language, German. While two of the interpreters resort to the standard address ('Madame President, Ladies and Gentlemen) without thanking for permission to speak (*"vielen Dank"*), the Swedish interpreter only conveys the original speaker's thanks to the President without addressing her or the audience.

Or: Herr Präsident Klaus Hänsch hat in seiner Antrittsrede gesagt

En: President   Hänsch said in his   first speech to Parliament

Sv: talmannen   Klaus Hänsch sade då han tillträdde

Su: puhemies   Klaus Hänsch sanoi virkaanastujaispuheessaan

The speaker starts off by quoting the inauguration speech of the President of the European Parliament, Klaus Hänsch. The English interpreter refers to this as "his first speech to Parliament", leaving out the first name of the President, 'Klaus'). Instead of the Swedish equivalent *'installationstal'*, the Swedish interpreter conveys an equivalent sense using a temporal enhancement "*då han tillträdde*" ('when he took office'). The Finnish interpreter uses the equivalent concept to *'Antrittsrede'* (in Finnish, *'virkaanastujaispuhe'*).[9]

Or: wir müssten   Europa in die Köpfe und in die Herzen der Menschen bringen
En: *that* we   must bring Europe into the heads and the hearts of *ordinary* people
Sv: *att*   vi måste få   Europa i människornas hjärta och hjärna
Su: *että* meidän täytyy **Eurooppa saada* ihmisten sydämiin ja päihin

The above statement has been translated practically word for word by the three interpreters. However, a few minor differences can be detected between the original and the interpreted versions. The speaker refers to 'people' (*'Menschen'*) without any qualifier, whereas the English interpreter adds the qualifier 'ordinary'. This addition may be due to the different connotations of the lexical item in these two languages. The Swedish version is both elegant and accurate, whereas the Finnish word-for-word translation of 'in die Köpfe und in die Herzen' - 'sydämiin ja päihin' ('in the hearts and heads') is slightly odd. The Finnish word order deviates from the standard order; in both spoken and written language the normal word order would be for the main verb to follow the modal auxiliary, and the objective to follow the verb (*'meidän täytyy saada Eurooppa ...'*)

Or: damit hat er uns eine sehr schwierige Aufgabe mit sehr einfachen Worten gegeben
En: and that was   a   very difficult   task for us all to face
Sv: det här är   en   svår   uppgift som han utryckte i enkla ord
Su: hän antoi meille hyvin   vaikean   tehtävän hyvin yksinkertaisin sanoin

The above utterance is an interesting example of how the three interpreters solve the problem of the sentence-final position of the main verb. (*"Damit hat er uns eine sehr schwierige Aufgabe mit sehr einfachen Worten gegeben"* – '[With this phrase] he has given us a very difficult task [expressed] in very simple words'). The English TT is a condensed version of the original statement. It could be labeled as an interpretation of what the speaker intends to say, that is, of what the receiver may take the proposition to mean. The Swedish interpreter, like the English one,

---

[9] The rough translations of the German, Swedish and Finnish SI versions are mine. They have the purpose of providing the semantic content of the utterance.

does not wait for the main verb that comes at the end (*'geben'* – 'to give'). Instead of conveying the proposition '[with this phrase] he has given us a very difficult task', the Swedish TT makes a statement 'this is a difficult task which he expressed with simple words'. The Finnish interpreter conveys the ST utterance in exactly the same words as the original, leaving out only the first word, *'damit'* which functions as a deixis linking this utterance to the previous one ("He gave us a very difficult task [expressed] in very simple words.").

> **Or**: und das hat sich in dem Bericht meines sehr geschätzten Kollegen Anastassopoulos
> wieder einmal sehr genau gezeigt.
> **En**: and .. this has been proved again by this report
> **Sv**: det här ser vi mycket klart av Anastassopoulos betänkande
> **Su**: ja tämä on käynyt myöskin hyvin ..rakkaan kollegani herra Anastassopouloksen
> mietinnöstä hyvin ilmi

The final utterance of the sample is a typical example of the EP genre where generous appreciation is directed at colleagues who have drafted the report under debate, as the speaker does here (*"meines sehr geschätzten Kollegen"* – '[of] my colleague who is highly appreciated'). While the English and Swedish interpreters omit this element of the rhetoric, the Finnish interpreter says 'my beloved colleague' instead of saying 'my highly appreciated colleague'. The slight hesitation (transcribed as ..) may indicate that she cannot find the suitable qualifier immediately.

The above is an example of the kind of minor non-correspondences between the STs and the TTs which are typical for the corpus. They may shift the angle or emphasis of the original to some extent, but the audience will still get the main gist of the speaker's message. The pilot study revealed, however, that the information content of the ST may be translated incorrectly, or that essential elements of the content have been omitted.

Method of comparison.   The pilot analysis of the STs and the aligned three TT versions revealed such a large number of various types of minor and major deviations that the alignment of all the speeches and their SI versions did not seem a feasible method. In order to capture the main categories of non-correspondence in the more than 120 speeches and the three SI versions of each speech, I transcribed the speeches in columns, using the spread sheet option, where one line consisted of one unit carrying relevant semantic information. The starting point has been to follow Adam's analytical approach, in which the smallest unit is the propositional utterance (often a clause).

However, in order to obtain a clear view of the degree of correspondence between the STs and the TTs it seemed advisable to focus on the predicate, subject and object. Depending on their informational weight they are either placed on separate lines or separated by a slash [/]. The same

transcription procedure was applied to epithets, classifiers, qualifiers and modifiers containing relevant information. Similarly, lexical elements indicating the logical flow of the argumentation, such as conjunctions, were either separated with a slash or placed on separate lines. This may also reflect, to some extent, the manner in which an interpreter receives the spoken text.

Next to the first column I printed three narrow grids for each language. With the ST in view, laid out in units and sequences from the point of view of text analysis, it was then possible to listen to the interpreters and mark the units or segments or sequences that were missing or did not correspond to the original text.

The transcription of the originals was facilitated by the verbatim reports of the proceedings that contain all the speeches in the original language. The speeches have been edited to some extent, however. It was therefore necessary to listen to the originals in order to revise the edited version back to the authentic form.

The spreadsheet layout provides a visual overview of the frequency of non-correspondences. It also facilitates a quick search for ST items or segments that more than one interpreter has failed to convey accurately. Similarly, the layout allows the analyst to browse through the speeches and find ST elements that occur frequently. These elements serve as the basis for the analysis of the genre in question.

The layout. Below is a sample speech segment to illustrate what the resulting grid looked like (Speech 9. 2). The first line is the speaker's address to the President ("*Herr Präsident*"). The speaker begins by referring to the topic under discussion ("*der vorliegende gemeinsame Resolution*" – 'the joint resolution at hand'), followed by the predicate and the subject ("*verurteilen wir [einhellig]*" – 'we condemn [unanimously]'), after which the speaker reveals what is being condemned ("*den Abschuss der beiden Zivilflugzeuge*" – 'the shooting down of the two civilian airplanes'). The speaker also specifies who is responsible for this act, expressing it as an agent construction ("*durch die kubanische Luftwaffe*" – 'by the Cuban Air Forces').

The units of analysis have been selected following this approach:

(1) Omissions and errors
(Omissions are items present in the ST, which are left out of the TT; errors are gross semantic errors that change the meaning of the ST[10])
A dash (–) means that the element has been omitted; a dash on either side of the slash (– / –) means that a propositional element on either side of the slash has been omitted. A plus (+) means that the lexical sense unit has been conveyed by the interpreter.

---

[10] The definitions follow those of Barik (1975/2002: 80–85).

(2) Substitutions

Referring to the observations by Barik and later scholars, interpreters sometimes produce TT segments that deviate from the ST changing its meaning only slightly while still retaining the 'gist' of the original. Instances of this have been marked with (~), considering them to be vague or inaccurate renderings of the original. Other types of substitution, as defined by Barik, have been classified as errors (–).

(3) Syntactic/cohesive non-correspondences

Taking into account the basic fact that languages have their own rules about acceptable syntax, only those cases have been indicated where a passive form has been turned into an active one by the interpreter (*), or where interpreters have created their own links between the propositional utterances (@).

Table 1. Spread sheet analysis (Speech 9.2)

Original	En	Sv	Su
Herr Präsident!			
In dem / vorliegenden / gemeinsamen / Resolution	- /	-/	/-/
verurteilen /wir/ einhellig	-		/- *
den Abschuss der beiden /Zivil/flugzeuge	/-/	/-/	/-/
durch die kubanissche Luftwaffe.		-	
Ohne Frage,	-	-	-
und das ist auch richtig so.	-	-	-
Wie jedoch			
die /amerikanische Regierung/ darauf reagiert,		/-/	
ist nicht mehr nachvollziehbar.	-	-	
Anstatt/ bereits im Vorfeld	-	-	
jegliche Provokationen	-	~	
von seiten /der Exil-Kubaner/ in Miami	-	~	/-/
zu unterbinden,	-	~	
versucht nun	-	-	
Präsident Clinton	@	-	-
mit der Unterzeichnung des Burton-Helms-Gesetzes	@		-
den Konflikt zu verschärfen			~
und andere Länder in Sippenhaft zu nehmen.	~	-	-

Legend: – omission;

- / - an element on either side of the slash has been omitted;

~   substitution of words and phrases /vague, inaccurate;

* syntactic deviation (e.g. passive form);

@ syntactic deviation / link

Stage one of the analysis.   After the transcription and a first survey of the data, the next step was to mark those utterances or more extensive segments of the speech where at least two interpreters had deviated from the original in some way. While the analysis of TTs revealed large numbers of deviations from the originals, certain categories were significant from the point of view of the aim of the study. They were labeled tentatively as follows:

(1) Rhetoric: the rhetorical devices used by speakers;

(2) Argumentation: the devices pointing to the relevance of the propositions or creating the cohesion and coherence of the spoken text;

(3) Comprehension: segment or sequence not understood either on the level of semantic meaning or propositional content.

As discussed in Chapter 3, the material to be analyzed determines the theoretical approach as well as the methods chosen for the analysis. A first survey of the corpus made it clear that the speeches given in the EP plenary session can be analyzed as examples of political language. Furthermore, there were many recurring features which justified labeling the EP discourse as a specific genre of political language. This genre requires a suitable method for determining what the purpose of the message is and what the sense of the message is. For reasons discussed in Chapter 3, new rhetoric, or Perelman's theory of argumentation, was chosen as the method for analyzing the kind of persuasive discourse that is typical for the European Parliament.

Stage two of the analysis: new rhetoric.   The pilot phase of the analysis raised firsthand information about textual features which carry some interesting characteristics that can be considered independent of national languages. This observation shifted the emphasis of the study, giving more weight to the rhetorical analysis of the material, thus focusing on the speaker's line of argumentation. This again ties in with the core task of the interpreter, which is to convey the sense of the message for the listeners, according to the theories and definitions cited in Chapter 3.

Perelman (1979: 18–19) discusses the structure of argument as follows:
Nonformal argument consists, not of a chain of ideas of which some are derived from others according to accepted rules of inference, but rather of a web formed from all the arguments and all the reasons that combine to achieve the desired result. The purpose of the discourse in general is to bring the audience to the conclusions offered by the orator, starting from premises that they already accept [...]. The argumentative process consists in establishing a link by which acceptance, or adherence, is passed from one element to another, [...].

The rhetorical analysis of the research material therefore aims at finding out what elements in the ST are likely to have an impact on the reception of the speech. Once these have been identified,

it is possible to say on the basis of this theoretical frame what constitutes the sense of the message. In terms of the method of analysis, it is crucial to identify the theses used by the speaker to win the listeners' support as well as their intellectual acceptance, which can be turned into certain action or a favorable attitude towards certain action. The next step of the analysis is to listen to the interpreters' TTs to check whether these elements have been conveyed by the interpreters.

In order to get hold of the elusive 'sense' of the message, I set out to analyze the ST arguments with their theses and their rationale. This provides a method of determining the basic sense, or point, of the text segment, and to find out whether the same point was also discernible in the TT. The problem segments detected in the TTs were transcribed in columns and set side by side next to the ST in order to make the comparison easier (see next page).

The sample segment is transcribed from the session called 'Oral Questions to the Council'. The questions concerned the United Nations' Human Rights Commission meeting that was to be held later in the same month in Geneva. The EU was to be represented there through the Council. In the adjacent sample the speaker expresses critical views concerning the way human rights issues have been dealt with by the international community. His argumentation can be characterized in Perelman's words as "a web formed from all the arguments and all the reasons that combine to achieve the desired result". According to his main claim, human rights are being violated all over the world, including Europe. Instead of making an effort to safeguard a life worthy of human beings for everyone, the international community of nations has only made the confrontation worse.

The speaker's argumentation points at the discrepancies between good intentions and reality. He emphasizes his claims by providing examples of the political situation of the day. His demand to the Council is that they should not just make speeches but they should also justify the credibility of their political will. They could do this, for example, by making sure that the right kind of people take part in the Geneva Commission. Next he refers to a concrete case, where the wrong kind of people have been elected in a sub-committee of Human Rights:

Wenn etwa ein Minister der nigerianischen Militärregierung 1995 in den Unterausschuss für Menschenrechte gewählt wurde, braucht man sich nicht zu wundern, wenn die Versammlung auf beiden Augen blind bleibt. Der Einsatz der Menschenrechte und für die Rechte ist keine politische Rückendeckung für Regime auf anderer Ebene, sondern ein Korrektiv für Fehlentscheidungen in der politische Seilschaften keinen, aber auch gar keinen Einfluss haben dürften. [9. 2]

[If for example a minister in the Nigerian Military Regime was elected to a sub-committee of Human Rights in 1995 / it is not surprising if the meeting stays with its eyes blind /Investment in Human Rights and in the rights does not give political backing for Regimes on a different level; instead, it serves as a corrective for wrong decisions where political factions should have no influence whatsoever]

The segment above serves as an example of a speaker's way of winning the listeners' support for his position by illustrating the way in which the credibility of the Human Rights Commission has been undermined. In Perelman's terms, the speaker establishes the real by referring

to real-life examples, such as the fact that a minister of the Nigerian military regime was elected to a sub-committee of Human Rights. 'Military regime' has a number of denotations and connotations that can appeal to both the intellect and the emotional in the addressee.

The original and the interpreters' versions have been compared in Table 2 (see end of this chapter). Of the three versions, the Finnish TT is the only one that conveys the qualifying phrase *'Militärregierung'* ('Military Regime'). The Swedish version refers to 'a minister from Nigeria', whereby the connotations related to the term 'military regime' are not conveyed to the listener. The same connotative element is missing from the English version.

The figurative expression *"die Versammlung bleibt auf beiden Augen blind"* (literally 'both eyes of the meeting stay blind') enhances the main thesis, based on the logic of causality: if the participants discussing human rights represent states which are governed by military regimes, how can it be expected that they tackle the issue of human rights openly and sincerely. The figurative expression is only conveyed in the Finnish TT (*"silmät jäävät suljetuksi"* – '[then we must not wonder why] eyes remain closed'). The Swedish version infers the meaning of the figurative expression in saying *"[...] kan man inte bli förvånad över att inga resultat nås sedan"* ('[then] it is not surprising that no results are achieved'). The English version requires the addressee to actively infer what the speaker's point is ("and I think that if that's the case then what can we expect"). Substitutions like these are typical for the TTs of speeches read at a fast rate.

The reference to the biased composition of the earlier Human Rights Commission, and the demand for a Commission composed of the right kind of people, lead to the speaker's main point (lines 8–15). The German original states that an input in human rights, and in rights, does not mean political backing for governments on another level; instead, it is a corrective of wrong decisions in which political factions should have no influence whatsoever. The English version (10–15) could be seen as a summary of the gist of the speaker's message. The Swedish TT of this segment (8–13) is rather vague (*"Det krävs en .. ett annorlunda typ av arbete, som man verkligen kan påverka också"* – 'A different kind of work is required which one can also have a real influence on'). The Finnish version (8–11) misses the point to some extent in omitting the phrase *"für Regime auf anderer Ebene"* (*"Ihmisoikeuksien suojeleminen ei vaadi selustatukea"* - 'protection of human rights does not need backing'). The Finnish version also omits the propositional content of units 12–13, introducing a statement in its stead that was uttered earlier in the speech (*"vaan pitää olla myöskin poliittista tahtoa"* – 'instead, what is required is political will as well'). The last segment (13–15) could be understood as the interpreter's summary of what has been said previously (*"ja poliitikoilla pitää olla myös vaikutusta tähän ihmisoikeustilanteeseen"* – 'and politicians must also exercise their influence in this human rights' situation'.)

The above is a demonstration of the way the speeches have been analyzed. In the present study, the analysis focuses on the structure of the the argumentation as well as on the ways and means by which the speaker aims at winning the listeners' support.

Structure of argumentation

> Technique of argumentation: Appeal to the real
> Example from real life : **If** a minister of the Nigerian military regime has been elected
> in the Sub-committee of Human Rights
> Thesis: **Then** we cannot expect the meeting to achieve anything
> Argument establishes association of succession, based on causality
> > Premise: Military regimes violate human rights
> > The basis of agreement: Human rights are valuable

In the sample discussed here, the primary device is to appeal to the values shared by the speaker and his audience, i.e. the esteem and importance of human rights, as discussed in Perelman (1969). The presence of this value is foregrounded by arguments establishing the structure of reality by examples and illustrations of where and how they have been violated. A speaker may feel that the propositional content alone will not be enough to persuade the audience. Therefore he may opt to choose a tangible example from real life, and he may also make his argumentation more lively by using figurative language. (See Chapter 3 for a discussion of Perelman's argumentation theory.)

The analysis of the argumentation also looks at the flow of the argumentation, both of the ST and the TT, together with the linguistic devices indicating this flow. Here some of the important devices include the various utterances which are used for hedging, or for giving more force or color to the argument, i.e. the illocutionary intent of the speaker.

In the speech used in this discussion as an example of the method of analysis, the flow of the argumentation has been clearly marked by the speaker. To indicate what is understood here as 'the flow of argumentation', the cohesive lexical elements are highlighted.

The flow of argumentation in Speech 9. 2

Weiterhin werden [...] Rekorde in *Menschenrechtsverletzungen* gebrochen, und das <u>überall</u> <u>in der Welt.</u>
[Records in the violation of human rights continue to be broken, and this happens all over the world.]
Im ehemaligen <u>Jugoslawien, in Kolumbien, in Nigeria, in China, im Sudan, in Tschetschenien, im Iran</u>.

Aber auch <u>in Ländern der Europäischen Union</u> sind *Menschen* nicht sicher vor der *Verletzung ihrer elementaren Rechte.*

[But also in the countries of the European Union people cannot be sure of their basic rights not being violated]

Nach dem Ende des Ost–West–Konflikts sollte man meinen, die internationale Staatengemeinschaft setzte alles daran, *allen Menschen ein menschenwürdiges Leben* zu sichern.

[After the end of the East-West conflict one would expect the international community of states to make every effort to guarantee a life worthy of human beings for all people]

Stattdessen aber [...]

[Instead of that, however [...]]

(Enumeration of examples of how human rights are ignored)

Schlimmer noch!

[What's even worse!]

(Examples of discrepancies in the EU human rights implementation policy)

Wer Verhältnisse fördert, unter denen [...]

[Those who [...]]

Und wer nicht einmal [...]

[And those who [...]]

Es bleibt noch viel zu tun, sehr verehrte Damen und Herren vom Rat, **damit** [...]

[A lot remains to be done, distinguished Ladies and Gentlemen of the Council, in order [...]]

Sie sollten dort **nicht nur** [...] **sondern** [...]

[You should not only [...] but also [...]]

Es dürften nicht Vertreter von Staaten in die Ausschüsse **gewehlt werden**, die dort einzig und allein sitzen werden, um die Reputation ihres Landes zu heben.

[People should not elect representatives of states to committees who only sit there in order to raise the reputation of their country]

The sample text above serves to illustrate the method of analysis. In addition to the propositional content and structure of the arguments, attention will also be paid to the way arguments are linked together using conjunctions or lexical items as key words as well as words and concepts belonging to the same semantic field. The textual analysis is based on the approach by Adam (see Chapter 3), where text linguistics is seen as an integral part of discourse analysis. His approach, combined with the functional grammar of Halliday, provides the labels and terminology for textual analysis without taking the focus off the object of the study, which is the rhetorical analysis of the sense and meaning of the STs and their TTs.

Analysis of texts as entities. In Adam's system, the smallest unit of analysis is the propositional utterance as part of the entire text. Thus, the analysis of a propositional utterance takes into account the representation created by the discourse/text; this can be described as a semantic micro universe. Other elements that are taken into account include the text-internal references as well as

the illocutionary force and the flow of argumentation. (1999: 50–53)

The analysis of argumentation and rhetoric is very closely related to the analysis of speech acts and the function of textual segments. In studying political rhetoric and the way it is conveyed in SI, it is almost obligatory to classify the illocutionary act of the speaker (as defined by Searle 1979/1989) and compare the original with the SI version in order to evaluate whether the SI can be judged as accurate and faithful. The sample speech above, for example, is an exhortation by nature. Its intention is to alert the audience, and the Council in particular, to the important issues for the speaker. The final part of the speech includes specific exhortations to the Members of the Council (printed in bold in the above text passage): 'You should not only ... but also'; 'such representatives should not be elected on committees, who ...' Such speech acts abound in the research material, which is why they have been selected for analysis as features of the EP genre.

The subjectivity of qualitative analysis. An important aspect to remember with a view to the rhetorical analysis is that it is, by definition, a subjective one, just like any text analysis or literary analysis. In Perelman's view, language should be considered as "an instrument enabling one mind to act upon another" (1979: 82). To serve such a function, "a language must contain some expressions on which there exists a preliminary agreement as well as other elements that need clarification and interpretation, and that could only be understood in a process of discussion and even controversy" (ibid. 83).

The research material contains plenty of "expressions on which there exists a preliminary agreement", starting with notions like proper names and EU terminology. In these cases it is possible to point out items in the STs and TTs and classify them on the one hand as 'correspondences' or 'equivalents' between the two texts, or 'non-correspondences' or 'deviations', even 'errors' produced by the interpreter on the other hand. The reliability and accuracy of the textual analysis and interpretation of the 'sense of the message' of the ST depend on the analyst's competence. Different analysts may have different views of the TT's adequacy in conveying the sense of the original. Furthermore, speakers' intentions may be interpreted in different ways.

Rhetorical analysis for the purposes of interpreting studies can be defined as follows: The object of a rhetorical analysis is the text/speech/spoken utterance, and the speaker's methods of influencing the listeners. Therefore, the analyst should be equipped with empirical knowledge of the substance of the text, as well as the goals and methods underlying the production of the text. Moreover, it is important to have first hand information about the intended and potential target audiences and the way they receive the texts. Furthermore, the analyst needs to be well versed in the language of the object of study and the argumentative practices which are typical of it. While the analysis of the arguments simplifies the linguistic expression of the arguments in focusing on their substance, or propositional content, a rhetorical analysis also investigates the form of a piece of text in addition to its content. Unlike propositional analysis, rhetorical analysis alerts us to the

eloquence of language rather than to ignoring it. (Kakkuri-Knuuttila 1999: 234)

The overriding reason for selecting new rhetoric as the theoretical basis for analysis was to step above the potential constraints set by national languages to the analysis of meaning. The theory of argumentation has been selected for analyzing and comparing extended spoken discourse presented in different languages since Western civilization has been built on the classical ideas of rhetoric. They have been, and still are, an inherent part of our education. Thus it is natural that people construct arguments using similar structures and devices regardless of the linguistic code. In other words, the basic methods of reasoning and persuasion share a number of features regardless of the code or culture.

5.4 Rhetorical analysis in brief

For the purposes of the present study it seemed advisable to limit the selection to those concepts and tools of analysis as discussed by Perelman which relate to the most frequent features in the corpus and which are relevant from the point of view of the aims of the study. These include:

1. The basis of agreement
The objects of agreement on which the orator can build his argument; these include:
- facts, truths, presumptions;
- values, hierarchies, loci of the preferable;

2. Ways of creating 'presence'
From a body of opinion, convictions, and commitments accepted by the audience, the orator selects certain elements on which he focuses attention, endowing them with 'presence'
Examples of this method include: repetition, anaphora, amplification, metabole, etc.

3. Appeal to the real
Arguments based on the structure of reality can be divided into:
a) those establishing associations of succession
- causality
b) those establishing associations of coexistence
- links uniting a person to his action
e.g. argument from authority, the role of ethos in argumentation;

4. Establishing the real

Arguments attempting to establish the structure of reality; these can be grouped into:

a) arguments by example, illustration, and model;

- example: formulation of a rule through generalization from a particular case, or through putting a new case on the same footing as the older one:

- illustration: aims at achieving presence for a rule by illustrating it with a concrete case;

- model: justifies an action by showing how it conforms to a model;

b) arguments by analogy

- A is to B as C is to D

- metaphor = a condensed analogy;

5. The dissociation of ideas

Dissociation = incompatibilities that call for an alteration of conventional ways of thinking; reality is opposed to appearance (real democracy <–> apparent democracy, formal / nominal democracy, quasi democracy, 'democracy'). (Perelman 1979: 15–24)

The analysis of the material in Chapter 6 will illustrate how this system has been applied to real-life data.

Referring back to Chapter 3 and the theoretical framework of the present study, the method of analyzing the research material may be summarized as follows: The first phase in the analysis of the speeches is to identify the argument and to explicate its content. The interpretation of the arguments involves the analysis of the main argument, as well as the analysis of the claims, their grounds and the presuppositions contained in the argumentation. A key component of the rhetorical analysis is to identify the means by which the speaker aims at influencing his audience.

With a view to the research questions of the present study, the accuracy and faithfulness of the SI performances will be evaluated by comparing the interpreters' versions with the original speeches in oder to determine the degree of accuracy and faithfulness with which they have conveyed the rhetoric elements of the STs. However, any evaluation of the TTs must take into account what is known of the cognitive aspects of SI processing. While reading the transcribed SI versions of the speeches, it is essential to bear in mind the elements that distinguish simultaneous interpreting from any other text comprehension task, i.e. that the interpreter receives the text on-line in one language, and conveys it on-line in another language. This has to be constantly borne in mind when assessing the quality of the spoken *ad hoc* translation.

The material is analyzed first in terms of translation theory as it has been developed for investigating interlingual communication. Second, the TT material is seen as a special category of translation, i.e. simultaneous interpretation, a translation mode intended for international

conferences, where the focus is on communication. Quality standards have to take into account the fact that interpreters are expected to translate on-line, relying on the aural reception of the input text.

The speeches given in the EP Plenary session have been analyzed applying the approaches discussed above. After the analysis of a ST speech, the interpreters' versions have been compared with the ST. Where at least two TTs deviate from the ST with regard to the specified rhetoric elements, the ST has been analyzed for possible causes explaining the non-correspondence. The conclusions of this analysis will be used for formulating the conditions governing the accuracy and faithfulness of SI in the European Parliament.

In compliance with the theoretical views presented in Chapter 3, the ST speeches presented in the European Parliament and their TT versions, rendered simultaneously by professional conference interpreters on the spot, are analyzed in the wide textual context where they were produced. Therefore, each debate is analyzed as an entity in order to provide the context against which the argumentation of the individual speeches will be studied. Chapter 6 contains a full report of this analysis.

Sample of the method of comparison (Speech 9.2)

	Original	En	Sv	Su
1	Wenn etwa ein Minister	For example someone	Om en minister	Jos Nigerian
2	der nigerianischen Militärregierung 1995	to represent	från Nigeria	sotilasvalio.. sotilashallinnon .. ihmisiä
3	in den Unterasschuss	the Nigerian government	i ett underskott	valitaan ihmisoikeusvaliokuntaan
4	für Menschenrechte gewählt wurde,	they have got a person	i FN.. kunde säga det [han sade]	tai komissioon,
5	braucht man sich nicht zu wundern,	on committees there,	kan man inte bli förvånad över	niin ei pidä ihmetellä sitä,
6	wenn die Versammlung	and I think that if that's the case	att inga resultat nås sen.	että mitä varten
7	auf beiden Augen blind bleibt.	then what can we expect		silmät jäävät suljetuiksi.
8	Der Einsatz der Menschenrechte		Det krävs	Ihmisoikeuksien suojeleminen
9	und für die Rechte			
10	ist keine politische Rückendeckung	We don't simply want back-up	en .. ett annorlunda	ei vaadi .. selustatukea,
11	für Regime auf anderer Ebene,	and support	typ av arbete,	
12	sondern ein Korrektiv	for individual countries,	som	vaan pitää olla myöskin poliittista tahtoa
13	für Fehlentscheidungen	I think the Old Boy network	man verkligen kan påverka också.	ja politiko..poliitikoilla pitää olla
14	in der politische Seilschaften keinen,	should be banished		myös vaikutusta
15	aber auch gar keinen Einfluss haben dürften.	from .. from Geneva.		tähän ihmisoikeustilanteeseen.
16			Tack.	Kiitoksia.

6. IN SEARCH OF SI ACCURACY AND FAITHFULNESS

Introduction.   As indicated in the previous chapters, the primary aim of the analysis is to gather information about the political rhetoric of the European Parliament in order to determine the key elements constituting 'the sense of the message'. From the listener's point of view, the crucial question is whether the original speakers' argumentation is conveyed by interpreters in such a way that listeners of SI will be able to construe an equivalent representation of the speech compared to the one they would have construed had they been listening to the original speaker.

According to translation and interpreting theories, S(ource) T(ext) speeches as well as their T(arget) T(ext) versions should be analyzed in the wide textual context where they have been produced (see Chapter 4). Consequently, each debate is first analyzed as an entity in order to provide a context for analyzing the argumentation and the textual features of the individual speeches.

As a result of the analysis it will be possible to identify some basic elements of the EP genre in order to specify the SI quality concepts 'accuracy' and 'faithfulness' that are used by the EP Interpreting Directorate in their definition of SI.

The selection of the material and the method of analysis are discussed in Chapter 5. The analysis of the source texts focuses mainly on three debates that are viewed as textual entities. They have been selected to represent different text profiles from the point of view of SI processing:

(1) a topic, which does not set high demands on the general knowledge of the interpreters;

(2) a topic focusing on EU institutional issues; and

(3) speeches on issues and topics, which require an up-to-date knowledge of world affairs.

This approach has been chosen to test the theoretical premise according to which the interpreter's prior knowledge of the topic of the meeting will be reflected in his performance.

The three groups of texts are explored in separate chapters (6.1, 6.2, 6.3). According to the theoretical framework (Chapter 3), as well as the method based on it (Chapter 5), each entity is discussed from the point of view of:

(1) the main arguments of the STs,

(2) the speech act of the STs, as well as

(3) the non-correspondencies observed in the TTs in relation to the original argumentation.

To further illustrate some of these categories, additional examples have been taken from other debates. The topic and the date of the debate has been indicated in each case.

After the analysis of a ST speech, the interpreters' versions are compared with the original. Where at least two TTs deviate from the ST with regard to the specified elements, the ST has been analyzed in order to explain the possible causes of the non-correspondence.

The segments that have been selected to illustrate the analysis can also be listened to by clicking the code[1] (the internet version) or by listening to the CD attached to the book. The analysis of each group of STs and TTs is followed by a summary of the results. Chapter 6 ends with a more extensive discussion of the results and conclusions.

6.1 Debate on a familiar topic: television broadcasting

On Wednesday, February 14, 1996, the first topic of the first session was the draft directive on cross-border TV broadcasting. This debate is included in the present corpus in order to have a set of speeches that deal with a topic requiring a relatively low level of declarative knowledge. The design underlying the selection of the debate on *"TV across frontiers"* for closer analysis could be formulated as follows:

Theoretical premise: Knowledge of the topic of the meeting and of the related vocabulary is a crucial component of the SI task from a cognitive point of view. If the interpreter ha a prior knowledge of the topic, the quality of interpreting will be better.

---

[1] Each example has a code plus a 'diamond ' indicating that an audio version is available (e.g. 6.6).

Hypothesis: Interpreters have stored world knowledge of TV broadcasting together with the related terms and concepts required for creating mental representations of the input. Therefore their performances will reflect the reality of interpreting in an EP meeting which does not require specialized knowledge.

Research question : Do the TTs convey the ST argumentation in such a way that the listener will receive the speaker's main claims, their rationale as well as the speech act in the same way as someone listening to the original speech?

Sub-question 1: Do the TTs convey the speakers' ostensive devices[2] , as well as terms and concepts?

Sub-question 2: If the speech act, the argumentation and the relevant lexicon are not conveyed, are there some characteristics in the ST which are beyond the SI mode of translation ?

The subject of the debate. The English press briefing gave the following summary of the subject to be debated:

> With the number of TV channels across Europe having increased from 92 in 1990 to 129 in 1993, the Commission has come forward with a proposed revision to a 1989 directive designed to promote cross-border broadcasting and European-made programmes. In addition the proposal covers new developments in the industry such as teleshopping. It also attempts to clarify the legal situation with regard to jurisdiction over cross-frontier broadcasting, especially where the protection of minors is concerned and proposes new regulations on advertising. A time limit of 18 months before showing new films on TV is also proposed. [...] The original directive sought to oblige broadcasters to carry 51 per cent European-made programmes *'where practicable'*. [...] This phrase has now been [...] replaced by *'by appropriate means'*. The culture committee, however, is proposing to strengthen the text with the words *'appropriate and legally-effective means'*. (original italics)

The press briefing also gives more details about the other themes contained in the report, such as Pay-TV, teleshopping, advertising, coding devices enabling parents to jam programmes or channels that they consider unsuitable for children, the definition of independent producers, as well as a right of reply and implementation of the directive to broadcasters. Reference is also made to the

---

[2] Procedural encoding devices that help the listener to process the communicative intentions of the speaker, as discussed by Setton (see Chapter 3)

fact that the two MEPs presenting the report in the joint debate "favour a more flexible approach to the quotas based on subsidiarity or taking account of different national and cultural traditions." (EP Directorate for Information and Public Relations, Central Press Division)

The press release cited above contained all the key terms and expressions that were used by the speakers during the debate. The summary has been quoted here to demonstrate the level on which the topic is discussed. On the basis of this text segment, the reader can assess the level of familiarity of the topic. Compared with the other debates in the material, this was considered to represent a debate which does not require a great deal of specialized knowledge or mastery of technical terms.

Politicians use the debate to present their views of the EP *vis-à-vis* the directive as drafted by the Commission. The argumentation of the speeches reflects the stance of the MEPs toward the legal text of the Commission. This is also the purpose and substance of the rapporteur's presentation. (See Chapter 4 on the manner in which texts are produced in the EP.)

The rapporteur, Karsten Hoppensted, had been allotted ten minutes for his presentation, five minutes as the rapporteur and five minutes as the representative of his political group, the PPE (Group of the European People's Party [Christian-Democratic Group]). In his oral presentation he discusses the main points of the report that provides the background for the argumentation of the subsequent 32 speeches. Altogether 33 speeches were given, based on the report, resulting in a sitting of 185 minutes. Of these, seven speeches were given in the languages of the study (four in English, two in German (including the rapporteur), and one in Swedish). These speeches have been included in the research material (see the list below).

Table 3. List of speakers

Report on draft directive of the European Parliament and the Council modifying directive 89/552/CEE of the Council on coordinating certain legislation in Member States concerning television broadcasting 14 February, 1996
Rapporteurs: Galeote Quecedo and Hoppensted

Speech No.	Speaker	Source language	Target languages
1	Hoppenstedt	German	English, Finnish, Swedish
2	Whitehead	English	Finnish, German, Swedish
3	Ahlqvist	Swedish	English, Finnish, German
4	Perry	English	Finnish, German, Swedish
5	Banotti	English	Finnish, German, Swedish
6	Junker	German	English, Finnish, Swedish
7	Tongue	English	Finnish, German, Swedish

A survey of the material shows that the EP genre reflects the traditional conventions of composing speeches. They consist of an introduction, the main body of argumentation indicating the speaker's stance, and the concluding remarks. Arguments are often presented utilizing identifiable rhetoric devices. They are based on values and beliefs that are shared by the audience. Throughout their argumentation, and particularly at the end of it, speakers perform identifiable speech acts.

The original speeches and the TTs are analyzed following the method presented in Chapter 5. First, the rhetorical structure of the speeches is analyzed (6.1.1); second, the main arguments of the STs are identified (6.1.2), after which it is possible to infer the speakers' illocutionary points (6.1.3). Where two or all three TTs contain non-correspondences with the STs, these are analyzed in relation to the ST argumentation and textual features. The raporteur's whole speech can be found as Appendix 2.

6.1.1 Structure of argumentation

As has been mentioned above, interpreters, like the intended audience, receive the speeches on-line, utterance by utterance.[3] I will therefore first investigate the unfolding structure of the STs, followed by a discussion of its conveyance in the TTs.

Speakers' introductory comments. Speakers typically begin by indicating what they will focus on. This principle was discussed already by Aristotle, who gives the following piece of advice: "There are two parts to a speech. One must state what one intends to speak about, and after that one must present the arguments" (*Rhetoric*, Book III, 13, 1414b).

The quotation below serves as an example of an introduction that not only states the topic of the debate but also the speaker's stance towards the issue at hand.

> **Bei der heutigen Entscheidung** des Europäischen Parlaments zur Revision der Fernsehrichtlinie "Fernsehen ohne Grenzen" **geht es um vieles,** vielleicht sogar um alles oder nichts, in jedem Fall **um die Überlebensfähigkeit des öffentlich-rechtlichen Rundfunks.** (6. 6)
>
> [When the decision of the European Parliament on the revision of the broadcasting directive
> 'cross-border broadcasting' is taken today / a lot is at stake, perhaps even everything or nothing/
> in any case /what is at stake is/ the ability of public service broadcasting to survive][4]

---

[3] At the time of the recording, interpreters did not receive the speakers' notes. One exception to this rule was the Finnish booth. After consulting Finnish interpreters, Finnish MEPs often supplied the booth with their scripted speeches.

[4] The English versions of the Finnish, German and Swedish ST segments are mine. They are not mere glosses, but they are not proper translations either; their primary function is to convey the basic semantic content of the original for readers who do not have a command of these languages.

The speaker feels that the EP decision on the directive is extremely important. She gives force to her claim ('a lot is at stake') by using enhancing phrases like *"vielleicht sogar [...] alles oder nichts"* ['perhaps even [...] everything or nothing¨], as well as a strong metaphoric concept like *"Überlebensfähigkeit"* ['the ability to survive'] of public service broadcasting. The original introductory comment is printed below together with the three SI versions.

◇ ***Example 1 (6.6)***[5]

Original: **Bei der heutigen Entscheidung**[6] des Europäischen Parlaments zur Revision der Fernsehrichtlinie "Fernsehen ohne Grenzen" **geht es um viel**/ vielleicht sogar um alles oder nichts / in jedem Fall **um die Überlebensfähigkeit des öffentlich-rechtlichen Rundfunks**. 🔊

En: Today's Parliament decision on the revision of the TV without border directive involves a lot of things / **a lot is at stake**. What is the case / **+what is at stake here is the survival of European public broadcasting**. 🔊

Sv: När vi ska fatta beslut   [xx]   **idag** om en revision av direktivet
[When we are about to make a decision today on an amendment of the directive
television utan gräns **så gäller det väldigt mycket** / och det kanske gäller allt
television without borders a lot is at stake / and probably all
eller intet /   **det gäller i alla fall den public service tv:ns möjlighet att**
or nothing is at stake/ at any rate what is at stake is the public service tv's possibility
överleva. 🔊
to survive]

Su: *Tämänhetkinen* **päätös** Euroopan parlamentissa uudistukseksi direktiivistä
[The decision at the moment in the European Parliament concerning *a revised directive
televisiosta radiosta / **tässä on kysymys hyvin paljosta** / tässä on kysymys
on television radio a lot is at stake here a lot is at stake here

hyvinpaljosta / ehkä kaikesta tai ei mistään /*ennen kaikkea* <e>**julkisen** <e>
maybe all or nothing above all the public
tele +*radion* **henkiinjäämisestä**. 🔊
*tele radio's survival]

The research material shows a clear trend for the interpreters to convey the introduction faithfully. However, speakers may start off by stating something that more or less catches the interpreters off guard. For example, the introduction quoted above was preceded by a comment that all three interpreters omitted from their TTs. The speaker begins her intervention by making the following statement:

> *Scharen von Lobbyisten, die sich geradezu orgienhaft aller zur Verfügung stehenden Kommunikationsmittel bedienen, können sich nicht irren.* [6.6]
>
> [The large crowds of lobbyists that make use of the available communication media in a downright orgy-like manner cannot be wrong]

The relative clause defining the lobbyists is syntactically dense, containing unusual expressions (*'die sich orgienhaft zu Kommunikationsmittel bedienen'*). The style is typical of literary texts. This opening line serves to exemplify what Gerver observed 30 years ago, i.e. omissions are often due to the information handling system not being capable of coping with high loads presented at a fast rate.

Speakers may lead the audience into a new theme midstream by introducing what they will be discussing next, as in the sample below:

> *Just to turn briefly to some of the particular* **amendments that I think have caused problems**. [6. 4]

With this metalinguistic phrase the speaker provides guidance to the listener on what he will be focusing on and why he will be taking up these particular issues. The utterance carries the information that he will discuss the amendments because he thinks they have caused problems. The speaker has asked for the floor in order to persuade the MEPs to see the amendments from his point of view; for him the relative clause indicating his concern is relevant. For those who are about to vote on the proposed amendments, this is important information, too. Yet two out of three interpreters omit this unit.

Numbering of points   The structure of the argumentation can be clarified to the listeners by indicating the number of points to be covered, or by introducing the main points by numbering them. For example, after a short introductory comment the speaker below presents a summary of the main goals of the directive that is being discussed by numbering them (*"Ett. [...] Två. [...] Tre. [...]"*; [One. Two. Three]):

◇ **Example 2 (6.3)**

Original: (Fru ordförande! Efter månadslånga förhandlingar och intensiva diskussioner i kulturutskottet ska vi nu i parlamentet ta ställning till ett direktiv, som syftar att ge EU:s medborgare en granslös tv- marknad.

[Madame President / After months of negotiations and intensive discussions in the cultural committee we are now going to take a stance in the Parliament to a directive that aims at giving EU citizens a TV market without borders]

Även om direktivet verkar komplicerat i många av sina juridiska och tekniska

[Even though the directive seems complicated with many legal and technical

aspekter är det möjligt att summera dess huvudmål på följande sätt:)

aspects / it is possible to summarize its main goal in the following way]

Ett. Ge EU en inre marknad, som ska stärka de nationella tv-bolagen och ge dem nya möjligheter.
[One. Give the EU an internal market which will strengthen the national TV companies and give them new possibilities]

En: *First of all* / it's a question of giving the European Union an internal market which will ø ø ø give new possibilities to television.

Su: ø Kyse on siitä, että an+luodaan eurooppalaisille sisämarkkinat, jotka antavat
[It 's a question of giv +creating the Europeans an internal market which will give
uusia mahdollisuuksia televisiolle.[7]
new possibilities to television]

De: *Erst einmal* - Wir wollen einen wirklichen Binnenmarkt in diesem Bereich in
[first of all we want a true single market in this field in
Europa/ und wir wollen die neuen Kräfte in diesem Bereich für uns Europäer nutzen können.
Europe and we want to be able to make use of these new powers in this field for us Europeans]

Original: *Två.* Komplettera det finansiella stöd vi redan ger vår filmindustri
[Two / to supplement the financial support we already give to our film industry
genom att införa kvotering för att motverka en monopolsituation,
by introducing quotas in order to oppose a monopoly situation
som annars drabbar det kulturella utbudet till medborgarna.
which otherwise reduces the cultural offer to the citizens]

English: Secondly / we want to give more financial support to the cinema industry / introduce quotas / and try to stop monopolies which have been killing the amount of offer.

Su: Toiseksi. Me haluamme antaa enemmän taloudellista tukea <..>
[Secondly / we want to give more financial support
elokuvateollisuudelle muun muassa ottamalla käyttöön kiintiöt ja pyrimme
to the film industry by introducing quotas among other things and we try
estämään monopolien syntymisen jotka pystyvät supistamaan valinnan mahdollisuuksia
to stop the creation of monopolies that can reduce the possibility to make choices.]

---

[7] It can be heard from the sound track that the Finnish interpreter is taking relay from the English booth.

De: <u>Ausserdem</u> soll die ..mm..Filmindustrie auf eine gesunde finanzielle
[Furthermore // the film industry should be placed on a healthy financial
Grundlage gestellt werden ø ø ø denn jetzt ist das ja ein reines Monopol
basis   because it is now   a pure monopoly
wo europäische Möglichkeiten praktisch abgetötet werden durch die
where European opportunities are practically annihilated   through
Übermachtstellung der anderen.
the supremacy of the others]

Original: *Tre*. Harmonisera medlemsländernas lagstiftning på viktiga och
[Three / to harmonize the Member States' laws on important and
känsliga punkter, som till exempel medlemsländernas juridiska ansvar mot tv-
 sensitive points   like for example the Member States' legal liability towards TV
bolagen, genom reglering av reklam   och teleshopping, samt
companies through the regulation of advertising and teleshopping as well as the
skydd av minderåriga.
protection of minors]

En: <u>And then</u> we have to harmonize Member States' legislation in +the most important and sensitive areas such for example as legal liability of Member States concerning television companies / teleshopping and <er>the protection of minors.

Su: Pyrimme <u>myöskin</u> harmonisoimaan jäsenvaltioiden lainsäädäntöä kaikkein
[We also aim at   harmonizing the Member States' legislation in the most
tärkeimmillä ja arkaluontoisimmilla alueilla kuten esimerkiksi mitä tulee jäsenval..
important and most sensitive areas like for example concerning the *Member St..
+mitä tulee televisioyhtei +yh +yhtiöiden velvollisuuksiin ja vastuuseen,
 +concerning *television communi +com companies' duties and responsibility
tele<..>ostosohjelmiin   ja alaikäisten suojeluun.
tele.. shopping programmes and protection of minors]

De: <u>Dann noch</u> ø ø einige wichtige andere Punkte   nämlich die
[Then still   some other important points   / that is /
Rechtsverantwortung der Mitgliedstaaten gegenüber den <ööö>
the legal responsibility of the Member States towards the
Fernsehgesellschaften +ich denke an Jugendschutz, Werbezeit und so weiter.
TV companies / I think of protection of minors / time for advertisements and so on]

The rhetorical device of numbering points is often resorted to by the speakers, whereas it is only seldom that an individual interpreter conveys this device systematically throughout the whole speech. For the audience it may be even more distracting to listen to an unsystematic numbering than not to hear the numbers at all.

The final points of the speeches   Speakers typically finish off by presenting the key points of their speeches. In the example below, the speaker leads the audience to his conclusions by first enumerating what his Committee (the Environment Committee) does not oppose. Next, he moves on to state what the Committee does, in fact, stand for. His argumentation is based on the values that are an integral part of EP (conservative) rhetoric: European culture and heritage, including

diversity, as well as a fair and balanced market economy. The speaker aims at creating adherence to his views by enumerating facts and values on which there is a wide agreement in the EP, as discussed by Perelman.

> **We are not opposed to** teleshopping, for example – that is something that
> benefits the consumer.
> **We are not opposed to** systems financed by advertising. Under proper
> regulation that, too, benefits the diversity of services.
> **But we are saying that a system** that is entirely dominated by transatlantic norms, by the power of the market place, by the ability of the great monopoly cartels to destroy all competition, will take away with it more than just freedom of choice or diversity, **it will also take away a part of the heritage that this Parliament was elected to protect**.
> Thank you. [6. 2]

In the corpus at hand, interpreters often omit material from the final points of the speech. This may be determined by the speech situation where interpreters have to finish speaking immediately after the speaker has stopped, as the President will give the floor to the next speaker, mentioning his name and political group. These are items that must be rendered by the interpreters, too. Here is a paradoxical situation. Interpreters are instructed to lag behind the speaker in order to get hold of the idea he is developing before producing their SI version. Yet in the fast moving debate interpreters must stop speaking as soon as the speaker finishes. Thus, even if they only lag a little bit behind the speaker they may have to skip several items of the speech, or condense the final phrases into something that sounds logical in the context. Consequently, the rhetorical effect of the original speech is lost in the TTs.

6.1.2 Main arguments of the Source Texts – Values shared by EU

As was mentioned above, MEPs base their argumentation on facts, truths, values and presumptions about which there is wide agreement. From this body of opinion, convictions, and commitments accepted by the audience, the orator selects certain elements on which he focuses attention, endowing them with 'presence' (Perelman 1979: 17). According to Perelman, the means of argumentation have many functions, the most important ones being the following three:

    1) to make the audience adhere to the argumentation;

    2) to make the argumentation more effective;

    3) to make the argumentation more persuasive.

The cross-border broadcasting directive turned the MEPs into guardians of European culture which is regarded as an inalienable value. Speakers resort to various rhetoric devices such as the question form to highlight this point, as in the example below:

> *For me the important question it has raised is:* **have we faith in European culture** *or are we afraid that it cannot stand on its own against American culture?* [6.4]

National interests and references to national politics tend to crop up, too. The following is an example of an MEP from the UK who uses British broadcasting as the measure of high standard.

> *And that is important for everybody, not for self-important cliques, not for elite minorities but for all of the people of Europe who are shut off from a part of their national heritage* ***if we cannot defend the kind of broadcasting that has traditionally emerged in Britain.*** [6.2]

Speakers may also see the issue from both a European and a national point of view. In the segment below the speaker presents her main argument according to which the European film industry has to be kept alive as part of European culture. She enhances her argument with references to Irish and to Italian films as examples of the kind of film industry the Europeans do not want to lose.

◇ ***Example 3 (6.5)***

Original: [Mr. President
As regrettable as it is to say this, we have let *our own European cinema industry go.* I believe, *coming from a small country that has very successfully attempted to regenerate and, in fact, grow a cinema industry that we have some of the best ideas in Ireland.* But we cannot allow, as we've already said again and again, the American domination of our own culture, of our own cinemas. But if we want to turn that back it is us who have to do it. We cannot turn it back simply by constantly bad-mouthing them. We have to take responsibility in all our countries.)
I can remember, Mr. President, when ***the best films in town and only films in town that were worth seeing were the wonderful Italian cinema productions of the 1950s and 1960s. And it is far too long since we've had some similar great cinematic works from Italy and from many of the other countries in the last few years.***

De: Ich kann mich daran erinnern als **die besten Filme und die einzigen**
[I   can remember   when the best   films   and   the only
Filme die   man bei uns gesehen haben **waren die italienischen Produktionen**
films   that were   seen here   were   the Italian   productions
 die tollen Filme der 50er und 60er Jahre.
the great   films of the 50s and 60s]

127

Su: ø ø Parhaat elokuvat kaupungissa <u>ovat ainoita // joita // tehdään</u> //

[The best movies in town   are the only ones that are made
50 - 60-luvun italialaisetelokuvat olivat tällaisia erinomaisia elokuvia.
The Italian movies of the 50's and 60's were such excellent movies.
<u>Hyv +aivan liian pitkään meillä on ollut saman tyyppisiä <ää>elokuvatuotoksia</u>
Ver.. for far too long   we have had similar kinds of   *movie works
<u>Italiasta   ja muista maista   viime vuosien aikaan.</u>
 from Italy and other countries over the past years.]

Sv: Jag kommer ihåg / herr talman / **när de bästa filmerna och de enda**
[I remember   Mr. President   when the best   films   and the only
filmerna i stan som var värda att se var de underbara italienska
films   in town that   were worth seeing were those wonderful   Italian
filmproduktioner från femtio- och sextitoalen och det är alldeles
film productions   from the 50s and 60s   and it is far
för länge sedan som vi hade liknande film produktion från Italien
too long   since   we had   similar   film production   from Italy
och andra länder under de senaste åren.
 and other   countries over   the   past years]

From the point of view of sense consistency with the original message, the TTs above demonstrate the difficulty of conveying both the semantic content and the illocutionary force of an argument. The qualifying phrase "the best and only films in town that were worth seeing were the wonderful Italian cinema productions of the 1950s and 1960s" is a typical argument attempting to establish the structure of reality by providing examples.

The effect of this example is lost in the German and Finnish SI versions. Judging by the propositional content of the TT, the German interpreter is not monitoring her speech production ('the only films that were seen [in Ireland] were the Italian productions, [...]'). What the Finnish interpreter says does not make much sense either ('The best films in town are the only ones that are made [...]'). Moreover, the Finnish SI omits the introduction ("I can remember, [...]"), whereby the Finnish audience will not have been aware of the fact that the speaker enhances her argumentation not only by giving examples of current trends in Irish film industry, but also with an example based on personal memories from the past.

The Finnish SI follows the surface structure of the ST in a sporadic way with the result that the TT is an incoherent collection of lexical items which have been picked from the original. The Swedish TT also follows the surface structure of the ST, but in this case the result is a faithful reproduction of the original argumentation. This could be due to the fact that the Swedish syntax makes it possible to follow the English syntax rather closely. The corpus contains numerous examples of the Swedish interpreters staying very close to the original textual structure, the resulting TT being a faithful and accurate rendition of the original in addition to being acceptable Swedish.

MEPs as guardians of democracy.   Democracy is one of the primary values upheld by the EP rhetoric; a quantitative analysis revealed that 'democracy' appears in the EP speeches more frequently than in ordinary journalese (Wordsmith analysis against a million word corpus of UK journalistic texts).

The concept of democracy also includes the idea of open markets. Thus speakers have to balance between being pro European but not anti-American, or between favoring European film and TV production without being restrictive or protectionistic.

According to Perelman, the purpose of discourse in general is to bring the audience to the conclusions offered by the orator, starting from premises that they already accept – in this case the supremacy of an enlightened democratic system. (1979: 18) These issues represent the core of the debate for one MEP who introduces his argumentation by setting as opposites the shared values on the one hand, and policies that are alien to true democracy on the other hand. Incompatible values can be expressed in the form of rhetorical questions:

> *Do we believe in free choice or rigid controls?*
> *Do we believe in free enterprise or protectionism?*
> *Do we trust the people of Europe to determine their own viewing habits or not?*
> [6.4]

Frequently, the key concepts describing the fundamental role of the EP are emphasized in the final point of the speech, as in the following two examples:

> *To bow or back away from our position would be a betrayal of **our democratic mandate**.* [6.7]

> *Die alles entscheidende Frage jedoch ist: Was ist überhaupt Rundfunk bzw. Fernsehen?*
> *Diese Frage wird bereits in Artikel 1 gestellt, und schon mit dieser Abstimmung wird das Urteil über die Zukunft des öffentlich-rechtlichen Rundfunks gefällt. [...]. **Die Zerschlagung des dualen Systemz zu Lasten des öffentlich-rechtlichen Angebot**s, wie Medienmogule à la Kirch in Deutschland das unverhohlen anstreben, hätte **demokratiegefährdende** Wirkung.* [6. 6]

The German speaker, a journalist, wishes to make it clear to everybody that the crucial question of the debate is to define the concept of broadcasting. According to her, the vote will decide the future fate of public service broadcasting. Furthermore, the destruction of the dual system and of the public services would have consequences that would put democracy at risk.

The material at hand reveals an unsystematic rendering by the interpreters of these key concepts and key points that are related to democracy. The word 'democracy' in its various forms is often omitted as if it were something self-evident that does not have to be repeated.

MEPs as spokespersons of the citizens.　　In their role of guardians of democracy the MEPs also act as spokespersons of the citizens (as in speech 6. 4 above: "Do we trust the people of Europe to determine their own viewing habits or not?"). During the debate, speakers frequently refer to the citizens, the people, or the consumers as their primary concern. One of the topics of the draft directive under discussion, the protection of minors, is an issue which touches on the MEPs' duty to advance the interests of the citizens.

In political argumentation, shared values (the need to protect children) may be related to hard facts and authorities (scientific evidence), but also to more personal aspects which have an emotional appeal to the listeners, as in the following example:

> **Original**: [Skydd av minderåriga] är en sak som ligger mig mycket varmt om hjärtat.
> **I min familj har jag sett** vad också **vetenskapliga studier** hävdar // nämligen att reklam har en mycket negativ påverkan på barn. De är inte i stånd att skilja mellan subjektiv vägledning och objektiv information. (6. 3)
>
> [[The protection of minors] is something that is very close to my heart. In my family I have seen what scientific studies point out, too, that is, advertising has a very negative influence on children. They are not capable of seeing the difference between subjective persuasion and objective information.]

The speaker is appealing to both the intellectual and the emotional faculties of his audience by referring to scientific studies on one hand, and to her personal experience as a mother and representative of the citizens on the other hand. She enhances the tone of her arguments with the emotional phrase "this is close to my heart".

◇ ***Example 4 (6.3)***

> **Original**: Det sistnämnda är **en sak som ligger mig mycket varmt om hjärtat.**
> [what was mentioned last/ is something that lies very close [warmly] to my heart.
> **I min familj har jag sett vad också vetenskapliga studier hävdar** /
> In my family I have seen what scientific studies point out / too /
> nämligen att reklam har en mycket negativ påverkan på barn. De är inte i stånd att
> that is advertising has a very negative influence on children / they are not capable of
> skilja mellan subjektiv vägledning och objektiv information.
> differentiating between subjective persuasion and objective information]
>
> **En**: Now that is a point *which concerns me a lot*. ø ø ø there <..> have been scientific studies which have shown that advertising +for example has very negative effects on children because children cannot in fact distinguish between subjective ø and objective information.

Su: Tämä viimeinen *sektori huolestuttaa minua kaikkein eniten* ø ø ø

[This   last   sector   concerns   me   most of all.

On tehty tieteellisiä tutkimuksia, jotka osoittavat, että mainonta esimerkiksi vaikuttaa
 Scientific studies have been made which show   that advertising for example
 hyvin negatiivisesti lapsiin, koska lapset eivät voi
 has a very negative influence on children, because children can not
tehdä eroa subjektiivisen ø ja objektiivisen tiedon välillä, [...]
differentiate between   subjective and objective information]

De: Und ein weiterer Punkt *der mir sehr wichtig erscheint* - - ø ø ø   es gibt

[and a further point that seems very important to me   there are
nämlich wissenschaftliche Studien die zeigen, dass Werbung einen sehr
      scientific studies   that demonstrate that advertising has a very
negativen Einfluss auf Kinder hat, denn das Kind kann nicht den Unterschied
negative   influence on children   since a child   cannot see the difference
sehen zwischen subjektiver ø und objektiver Information.
       between subjective   and objective information]

A comparison of the ST with the TTs is a vivid demonstration of the difficult task set to the interpreters which is to convey 'the sense of the message.'

It is up to each interpreter to decide what that 'sense' is. They may decide to omit something which may seem less relevant in terms of information content without paying attention to the fact that a personal note may be a conscious rhetoric device. This relates to the speaker's *ethos*, an issue that will be discussed in the conclusions of this chapter.

Regarding the research question concerning the 'sense consistency with the original message', appealing to the emotional as well as the rational faculties of the listeners is an important component of the message. The speaker focuses attention on the issue of the protection of minors by creating presence of this reality, in the sense discussed by Perelman. She does this by appealing to her own experience and her own family. This is a way of making the audience see children as something real rather than just an abstract entity mentioned in the legal text. (See Perelman 1971: 115–117.) In terms of the propositional content of the speech, the omission of the reference to the speaker's family may not seem significant; yet, from the point of view of rhetorical effect, it can be considered an equally important propositional utterance as the reference to scientific studies.

Taking citizens in the widest sense, the MEPs refer to the market players and the social partners. The information content of the speeches is enriched by a versatility of shades as the speakers wish to present their views in a balanced manner, taking all the various parties into consideration.

Original: We want a sophisticated and flexible system of contributions to European programming
from all for the benefit of all*.* 🔊

De: ø ø ø ø ø ø ø Das europäische Program soll von allem für ø_alle sein.
[the European programming must be from all   to all]

Sv: Vi vill ha ett sofistikerat   och flexibelt system som bidrag
[We want to have a sophisticated and flexible system that contributes
 till det europeiska programutbudet   ø   **till allas fördel**
to   European   program offer   to the benefit of all]   🔊

Su: ja haluamme hienon ja joustavan järjestelmän joka vaikuttaa
[and we want a fine   and flexible   system   which will have an impact on
eurooppalaiseen ohjelmateollisuuteen *niin että me kaikki saamme tästä hyötyä.*
the European   program industry   so   that   we all   benefit   from this] 🔊

What the speaker requests is versatility in programming as against one-sided imports from the States. The German interpreter omits the unit qualifying 'European programming', thus reducing the argument into a simple statement. Instead of the grand speech act ("We want") requesting something that is described in terms of 'sophisticated' and 'flexible', the German audience received a command ("The European program must be from all to all"). The Swedish and Finnish versions can be seen as pragmatic inferences of what they consider to be the speaker's intended message. The original noun complex 'system of contributions to European programming' is not a fixed phrase; interpreters seem to focus the sense of the argument ('we want a flexible system which [...]').

The role of the European Parliament.   The MEPs frequently take up arguments that have the function of reminding everyone of the importance of the EP. These arguments go together with the MEPs' role as defenders of the rights of the citizens, as in the citations below:

> *On the constitutional point, Mr. Commissioner, the European Parliament as you know is a force for change. The directive will be a major test for the new codecision powers under Maastricht.* [6.7]

> *We want a sound legal basis for jurisdiction so that the citizen knows where legitimacy in broadcasting lies and where the source of complaint can be.* [6. 2]

The various elements referred to above (i.e. the values shared by the audience, such as 'democracy', 'citizens' and 'the role of the European Parliament') thus constitute the basis of agreement on which

speakers build their argumentation. Through the analysis of the material they have been identified as an essential element of the EP genre. They could thus be classified as features that should be conveyed in the SI target texts if they are meant to supply the listener with the same possibility of creating an impression of the speech as those listening to the original speaker.

The speaker's stance: For or against the report. The debates on draft legislation focus on proposed amendments. In addition to indicating their alliance to the views of their Committee and to their political group, speakers may also bring up other interests as exemplified by the speech below by the draftsman of the Statement of the Environment Committee:

> **Original**: **I declare an interest here** as a..a television producer of long standing and there is one clause in the..in the report which I did not think I should personally vote on about independent producers.
> **My interest** like that of the rapporteur Mr. Hoppenstedt , who has worked long and hard on this, as have many of us, **is in the quality of the system of broadcasting** and that is exactly what I want to condem to +to commend to the Parliament today. [6.2]

The speaker indicates his support for the final report, referring to the fact that the amendments of the Environment Committee have been included in the final report. He then proceeds to declare his personal interest as a television producer; according to him there is one clause in the report on independent producers which makes it impossible for him to vote for the report – although the fact that he is probably referring to the whole report only becomes evident at a later point of his speech. After having stated his grounds – his interest is in the quality of the system of broadcasting – he continues with the speech act of exhortation ("My interest [...] is in the quality of the system of broadcasting, and *that is* exactly *what I want to commend to the Parliament* today").

People listening to the SI have expressed the expectation according to which the sense of the TT should be consistent with the original. If consulted, speakers, too, might express the same basic requirement concerning SI. For example, the point made by the speaker above to justify his position is most probably an important one for the speaker himself, yet it is omitted by interpreters. They do not convey the sense of his message, according to which he is biased as a member of the profession, nor do they convey his grounds for not being in favour of the views expressed in the report, as can be seen in the transcriptions below:

Original: **I declare an interest here**   as a..a television producer of long standing and there is one clause in the..in the report which I did not think I should personally vote on about independent producers.

My interest   like that of the rapporteur Mr. Hoppenstedt, who has worked long and hard on this, as have many of us, **is in the quality of the system of broadcasting,** and that is exactly what I want to condem to +to commend to the Parliament today.   🔊

De: Ich muss sagen dass <öö> ein Punkt ich <öö>mich besonders interessiert
        [I must say   that   one point I   I'm particularly interested in
als unabhängiger Produzent zu den unabhängigen Produzenten nämlich Herr
as an independent producer   regarding independent producers   that is Mr.
Hoppenstedt hat da lange und hart an dem Bericht gearbeitet und das
Hoppensted has worked long and hard on the report   and the
Schwierige ist eben die Qualität der Sendungen und das ist eben etwas was ich
difficulty lies in the quality of the broadcast and that is exactly what I would like to
dem Parlament heute nochmal ans Herz legen möchte.
place on the heart of the Parliament once more today]   🔊

Sv: **Jag förklarar ett intresse här** / **eftersom** jag är en TV- producent / det har
[I declare an interest   here   since   I am a TV producer I have
jag variten lång tid och det finns en klausul i betänkandet som jag personligen
been one for a long time and there is one clause in the report that I personally
inte ansåg att jag inte skulle vara i stånd här om självständiga producenter /
did not in my opinion I would not be capable here on independent producers
ø   / men liksom föredragaren Hoppenstedt / han har ju arbetat länge med detta
      but like the rapporteur Hoppenstedt   he has worked on this for a long time
det är många av oss som har gjort detta *men det handlar om* <er>
there are many of us who have done that but what we are dealing with here
utsändningssystemskvalitet och det är just det som jag vill berömma
is the quality of the broadcasting system and that is what I want to commend
inför parlamentet i dag.
to the Parliament today]   🔊

Su: Televisiotuottajien joukossa +kannalta on erittäin tärkeä lause
[Among the television producers +from the point of view /there is a very important sentence
+lauseke jonka puolesta en välttämättä haluaisi äänestää.
+clause   for which I would not necessarily   like   to vote
Minun intressini tässä asiassa / tiedän että   Hoppenstedt on tehnyt hyvin
My   interest in this matter / I know that   Hoppenstedt   has   worked
pitkään työtä tämän eteen niin kuin monet muutkin ihmiset / /
very   long for   this   as have many   other people   /
hänen intressinsä on lähetystoiminan laatu
his   interest is in the quality of broadcasting
ja *tämä on se syy miksi* minä halusin suositella parlamentille tänään [että ..] 🔊
and this is the reason why   I   wanted to recommend to the Parliament today [that]]

The above example has been chosen to illustrate some elements of political rhetoric that are typical for the EP genre. The speakers' overall goal of persuading or convincing the audience is based on specific arguments. There is a general tendency of the SI versions to lose much of this specificity. In

the worst cases this leads to distortions in the logic of the argumentation, as in the example above. The speaker first specifies his position: (1)"**I declare an interest here**". Second, he specifies his speech act: (2) "**I want to commend** to the Parliament [an interest in the quality of broadcasting]." Both the German and the Finnish interpreters fail to convey the first statement. It is apparent that the German interpreter does not comprehend the semantic meaning of the English utterance correctly, which results in a misinterpretation of the statement. The original statement is expressed in the following words:

> *I declare an interest here*   as a..a television producer of long standing and there is one clause in the..in the report which I did not think I should personally vote on about independent producers.

The German and Finnish interpreters produce statements which are not equivalent with the original:

De: Ich muss sagen dass <öö> ein Punkt ich <öö>mich besonders interessiert als unabhängiger Produzent zu den unabhängigen Produzenten nämlich Herr Hoppenstedt hat da lange und hart an dem Bericht gearbeitet und das Schwierige ist eben die Qualität der Sendungen und das ist eben etwas was ich dem Parlament heute nochmal ans Herz legen möchte.

[I must say that there is a point that I am particularly interested in as an independent producer regarding independent producers [that is Mr. Hoppensted has worked for a long time and hard on the report and the difficult thing is the quality of broadcasting and that is exactly what I would once more place at the heart of the Parliament]

Su: Televisiotuottajien joukossa +kannalta on erittäin tärkeä
[Among the television producers +from the point of view /there is a very important
lause +lauseke jonka puolesta en välttämättä haluaisi äänestää.
sentence +clause for which I would not necessarily like to vote]

The utterance 'I declare an interest here', and the lexical item 'interest' are not conveyed in the German and Finnish TTs. While the German version is a mistranslation, the Finnish version only begins where the speaker starts his second clause ("[...] and there is one clause in the report which I did not think I should personally vote on about independent producers.") The first phrase, 'I declare an interest here as a television producer' is omitted. From the point of view of the speaker's argumentation this would have been important information for the listeners, as this is one of his main justifications for being against the views presented in the report. He indicates his professional involvement as well as his professional background against which he will select his arguments.

Another integral element of the EP genre is interaction between the MEPs as well as the MEPs and the Commissioners. Speakers frequently include statements about their stance to the views presented by another speaker, usually a previous one, as above (i.e. the reference to Mr. Hoppenstedt). Reference can also be made to the views presented in another report, as Mr. Hoppenstedt does in his presentation, referring to the report by Mrs. Junker (see Appendix 3,

speech 6. 1: 19). This reference is significant for the person referred to as well as for the rest of the audience. For example, speaker 6. 2 presents an opposing view to the definition of broadcasting to that of the rapporteur, Mr. Hoppenstedt. He expresses this very clearly, making a specific reference to Mr. Hoppenstedt:

◇ **Example 7 (6.2)**

Original : *It is essential to understand that* when we ask for a broad and comprehensive definition of broadcasting **rather than the narrow one** *of which Mr. Hoppenstedt spoke* we are doing it because that is in the interest of the consumers of broadcasting and [...]

De: *øøø* Wenn wir eine / / weite Definition der <..>s.s.Sendetätigkeit <er>
[if we demand a broad definition of broadcasting
verlangen *øøø* dann deswegen weil das im Interesse der Verbraucher liegt.
                it is because it is in the interest of the consumers]

In the example above the German interpreter does not convey the specifying unit referring to Mr. Hoppenstedt. It is evident that the more specific the speaker is, the easier it is for the listener to follow his argumentation and compare the weight of his arguments with those of the other speakers. In the case above, for example, those listening to the German SI would have needed to be more attentive than those listening to the original in order to detect the differing view of speaker 6.2 in comparison to that presented by the rapporteur.

Thus, in addition to identifying the objects of agreement presented by the speakers, interpreters will also have to identify elements of the speech that indicate the stance of the speaker and his group toward the issue that they are discussing.

6.1.3 The role of speech acts in constituting the sense of the message.

In Aristotelian terms, political speeches can be classified into two types of speech: those which aim at exhorting the audience and those which aim at warning it. These speeches give advice on future action, with the aim of demonstrating the usefulness or harmfulness of some action. (*Rhetoric*, Book I, 3, 1358b) From the point of view of a faithful conveyance of the sense of the original message in the SI version, it is not insignificant whether the speech act is conveyed or not.

A survey of the research corpus showed that speech acts are an integral element of the political genre of the EP. The taxonomy first in Austin and after him in Searle is based on the semantics of English verbs. However, the basic Aristotelian ideas can be identified in Searle's discussion of an alternative taxonomy to that of Austin. (1979/1989: 12–20) Thus, Searle presents a

list of basic categories of illocutionary acts, the first of them being 'assertives', another one 'directives'. The purpose of the utterances in the class of assertives is to commit the speaker to something. The illocutionary point of 'directives' is to get the hearer to do something. The study at hand uses the concept 'speech act' parallel with 'illocutionary point', based on Searle's conclusions (see Chapter 3). For him an illocutionary point is "the basic notion on which to classify uses of language" (ibid.: 29). Furthermore, following Searle's method, not only verbs but the whole utterance have been analyzed in order to interpret the illocutionary point.

Some of the most frequently occurring speech acts in the present corpus are *directives* as defined by Searle, their illocutionary point being to get the hearer to do something. I have further divided the general class of 'directives' into the subclasses of *exhortation, request,* and *appeal.* In terms of pragmatics, a second class – though less clearly recognizable – which can be identified in the present corpus of political rhetoric is that of *implied criticism.*

Exhortation   The main argument of most of the speeches on cross-border TV broadcasting is to raise, or demonstrate, the political will to protect European culture as something of great value for everyone. This underlying premise is combined with another one, according to which MEPs have the role to act as guardians of European values and protect them on behalf of the citizens of Europe. A speaker may therefore exhort others to act for the preservation of these values.

In order for the SI to be accurate, it should convey this speech act. In addressing the House, the speaker below first refers to the House as a collective by using the first plural form ("*we* are dealing with something [...]"). In the following utterance he may be referring to himself, or himself and his group, in using the first plural form 'we' ("and *we* are saying [...]"), followed by the exhortation "*you* can only help this, *you* can only preserve it [...]".

◇ ***Example 8 (6.2)***

Original: But in the here and now **we** are dealing with something of enormous cultural power, something which is under threat, and **we** are saying **to the House** that **you** can only help this, **you** can only preserve it by an act of will.

De: Aber es geht doch um etwas was kulturell von äußerster Wichtigkeit ist /
[But the issue is about something that is of extreme cultural importance
was bedroht ist / und deswegen kann ich ø nur sagen / das kann man nur
something that is under threat and therefore I can only say one can only
erhalten+schützen indem man einen klaren Willensakt abgibt.
preserve ... protect it by giving a clear act of will]

Sv: Men just nu / här och nu / så behandlar **vi** någonting som är av
[But right now in the here and now we are dealing with something that is of
enorm kulturell genomslagskraft / någonting som är hotad / och **vi** säger
enormous cultural power   something which is under threat and we are saying
till kammaren att det enda sätt att <u>vi</u> kan bevara detta är genom att *agera aktivt.*
to the House that the only way that we can keep this is by acting in an active way]

Su: Tänä päivänä **me** käsittelemme asiaa jolla on hyvin paljon kulttuurillista
[Today   we are dealing with something that has a great deal of cultural
vaikutusvaltaa **ø ø ø** ja **me** sanomme **parlamentille** että **te** voitte auttaa
power   and we say   to the parliament that you can help

tässä asiassa / **voitte** säilyttää hienoja asioita pelkästään osoittamalla **tahtoanne**.
in this matter / you can preserve great things   simply   by showing your will.]

In the example above, the illocutionary point is expressed as an exhortation: "*you* can only help this, *you* can only preserve it [...]". The exhortation implies "if you do not do it, no one will". However, the German interpreter uses the passive form '*man*' ('one'), which may, of course, be the interpreter's interpretation of the 'you' form used by the speaker; it can be taken to refer to people in general (*"das kan man nur erhalten* [*…*]*")*. The Swedish interpreter continues to use the first plural form (*'vi'*) where the speaker has changed the address to second plural ('you') ("det enda sätt att vi kan bevara detta [...]"). The latter part of the exhortation has no pronoun in the Swedish version; instead, the Swedish has an agent construction ('*genom att agera aktivt'*, 'through active action', 'by acting in an active way'). The Finnish interpreter conveys the same person as the one used used by the speaker.

Thus, we can see that the SI versions can be unsystematic in conveying the original speech act. In the example above, the illocutionary point is embedded in the rather inconspicuous personal pronouns. Yet their role in (Anglo-Saxon) political rhetoric is far from insignificant, as has been convincingly argued by John Wilson. (1990: 76)[8] (See Chapter 3)

There are many examples, however, where the TTs convey the form and content of the original, as in the example below:

---

[8] On February 14, after the sitting had been opened, the first item on the agenda was 'approval of the minutes. Mr. Nordman asked for the floor and made the following comment: "Madame le Président, j'interviens sur le texte du procès-verbal que, pour ma part, j'ai trouvé dans mon casier, à propos de l'adoption du procès-verbal de lundi. Le procès-verbal de la séance d'hier indique que M. Dell' Alba a relevé une contradiction apparente entre mon intervention et les votes de mon groupe. (...) Mais je voudrais surtout insister wur le fait que, contrairement à ce qui est consigné au procès-verbal, à aucun moment je n'ai déclaré intervenir au nom du groupe libéral. Le mot à mot de mes propos le montre bien et j'ai même veillé à éviter d'utiliser un pluriel majesté, qui aurait pu prêter à confusion, me bornant à la première personne du singulier. (...)" (Kat./cat. AX-AB-96-009-IF-C)

Original : [But we cannot allow, as we've already said again and again, the American domination of our own culture, of our own cinemas.]
But if we want to turn that back it is us who have to do it. We cannot turn it back simply by constantly bad-mouthing them.
We have to take responsibility in all our countries.

Sv: Men om vi vill förändra detta så är det .. + måste vi förändra det /
[But if we want to change that then it is   +we must change that /
vi kan inte förändra detta genom att hela tiden skälla på dem
we cannot change   that   by constantly bad-mouthing them
utan **vi måste ta ansvar i alla våra egna länder**.
instead we must take responsibility in all our own countries]

De: Aber wenn wir da die Dinge <er> <er><mm> bekämpfen wollen / dann müssen wir das machen
und wir können nicht immer nur die anderen schmähen /
wir müssen Veranwortung zeigen in all unseren Ländern.
[We must   show responsibility   in all our   countries]

Su: Jos haluamme poistaa tämän ongelman / meidän täytyy tehdä tämä /
[If we want to eliminate this   problem   we   must   do   this
emme voi pystyä tähän pelkästään <..>haukkumalla amerikkalaisia
we cannot accomplish this simply   by bad-mouthing the Americans
meidän täytyy ottaa vastuuta kaikissa jäsenmaissa
we have to take responsibility in all the Member States]

The above segment is an example of a standard expression ('We have to take responsibility in all our countries'), for which there is an equivalent phrase in the four languages of the present study. Judging by the slight hesitation (marked with <..>), the Finnish interpreter focuses an added amount of attention to finding an appropriate lexical solution for 'bad-mouthing'; nevertheless, the rest of the message, i.e. the exhortation, has an equal content with the ST. One may conclude from examples like the above that the more predictable a phrase or lexical unit or segment is, the more likely it is that it will be translated accurately in the SI mode.

Request.   Requests can be part of the speech, expressed as an integral element of the main argument, as in debate No. 4 on Equal Pay (February 13, 1996):

(1) Original: *Parliament **is insisting** here on an analysis of cuts in public expenditure [...]*

(2) Original: *Kommission und Rat **müssen** ihre Verantwortung übernehmen [...]*
[Commission and Council must assume their responsibility]

(3) Original: *Här **återstår** alltså mycket **att göra**.*
[A lot remains to be done here]

(4) Original: *Mielestäni todelliset syyt naisten ja miesten palkkaeroihin **on selvitettävä**.*
[I think the real reasons behind the differences in the pay of men and women have to be clarified]

Sometimes these requests are presented as the final point at the end of the speech, as in the following examples (debate 1. on 'Second series of ERDF actions' January 18, 1996):

(1) Original: *Es muss also rasch ein angemessener Rechtsrahmen **geschaffen werden**.*
[An appropriate legal framework must be created soon]

(2) Original: *Mutta juuri tästä syystä minun mielestäni kaupunkialoitetta **on kehitettävä** sillä tavalla, että pienempien kaupunkien ongelmat otetaan huomioon.*
[But this is the very reason why I think the cities' initiative must be developed in such a way that the problems of smaller cities are taken into account]

(3) Original: *En sammanslagning av program **måste ske** för att underlätta ansökningsförfarandet och minska byrokratin. Interreg II bör också utvidgas så att fler länder utanför EU kan få del av strukturfonderna.*
[Programmes must be merged in order to facilitate the application procedure and to diminish bureaucracy. Interreg II should also be enlarged so that a larger number of countries outside the EU can get a share of structural funds]

A request which is formulated using a simple syntactic structure may be one of the few elements of a speech that interpreters manage to convey with all its propositional content and illocutionary force (e.g. example [2] above: *"Kommission und Rat müssen ihtre Verantwortung übernehmen"*). The material contains numerous examples, however, which show that speech acts like requests are not conveyed systematically by interpreters. Despite the fact that they are expressed in very simple terms, such as in the imperative mood ('must', 'should'), interpreters choose a different expression. This is illustrated below with a segment where two out of three interpreters formulate the request in a way which is not equal with the original:

◦ ***Example 10 (6.2)***

Original: We want a sound legal basis for jurisdiction *so that* **the citizen** knows where legitimacy in broadcasting lies and where the source of complaint can be.

De: <u>Aber es ist nötig</u> *das* klar zu umreißen damit <u>man</u> weiß was die rechtliche
[But it is necessary to define it in a clear way so that one knows - -]
Grundlage ist und damit man auch weiß wohin Beschwerden gehen können.

Sv: **Vi vill ha** en bra rättsgrund för jurisdiktionen så att *konsumenterna* vet
[We want to have a good legal basis for legislation so that consumers know
ø ø var man kan ställa klagomål
        where complaints can be placed]
Su: <u>Mitä tulee sitten</u> oikeudelliseen perustaan / **kansalaisten** täytyy tietää /
[As to   the legal   basis   citizens must know
mis..mikä *oikeutus* ohjelman harjoittajilla on ø ø [ja haluamme hienon ja - - -]
*wh<..>what *justification*the program practitioners have [and we want a fine and- -]]

Instead of conveying the clearly stated request "We want", the German and Finnish interpreters focus on what the speaker demands ('a sound legal basis'). The speaker's illocutionary point is not conveyed with an equivalent expression although it exists in the TT language code. The speaker states the grounds for wanting 'a sound legal basis'; the speech act is made on behalf of the citizens ('we want [...] so that the citizen knows'). The point is diluted in the German and Finnish versions, where the justification is expressed in the passive voice (the German TT) (*'aber es ist nötig* [...] *damit <u>man</u> weiss'*), without the reference to 'the citizen', or with a general cohesive phrase 'as to' (the Finnish TT). The request is further diluted through the ambiguous deixis which points to something that was said in the earlier segment (*'das'* [that] instead of the specific expression 'a legal basis' in the ST) .

The speaker continues by presenting a second demand beginning with the same phrase 'we want'. Again, the German interpreter substitutes the specific 'we want' with the passive voice and a modal verb. Examples of this kind might be an interesting topic for contrastive rhetorical studies.

Original: **We want** a sophisticated and flexible system of contributions to European programming from all for the benefit of all. [6.2]

De: Das europäische Programm <u>soll</u> von allem für alle sein.
[the European   program must be from all to all   ]

Sv: **Vi vill ha** ett sofistikerat och flexibelt system som [...]
[we want to have a sophisticated and flexible system that]

Su: [...] ja **haluamme** hienon ja joustavan järjestelmän joka [...]
[and we want a sophisticated and flexible system that]

The above example, together with many similar instances, strengthens the conclusion that speech acts are not conveyed systematically by interpreters. Where interpreters render the (modal) verbs of the original, they also convey the illocutionary point of the original message.

Appeal.   Appeals can be interpreted as a milder form of directive.[9] The research material contains different types of appeal. A typical appeal for support in parliamentary rhetoric is expressed with the verb 'to ask', as in the following example:

◇ **Example 11 (6.3)**

Original : Därför **ber jag parlamentet att stödja** mitt ändringsförslag
[Therefore I ask the Parliament to support my amendment proposal
nummer etthundratvå.
number one hundred and two]

En: So **I would ask the Parliament to support** my amendment number one-o-two.

Su: [...] joten **minä pyydän että parlamentti tukee** minun muutosesitystäni yksi-nolla-kaksi.
[so   I   ask   that the Parliament will support my amendment one-zero-two]

De: Und deswegen **bitte ich** meinen Änderungsvorschlag hundertzwei zu verabschieden.
[and that is why I ask you to accept my amendment proposal one hundred two]

Other instances of this sub-class of directives include utterances where speakers ask the MEPs to take a stand with regard to topical world affairs.

In the majority of cases observed in this corpus, verbs of appeal have the same semantic meaning in the four languages of the study. Judging by the many instances present in the corpus, interpreters tend to convey them with semantically equivalent verbs in their own language.

However, the illocutionary point of the appeal is not expressed by the verb alone, but with the whole propositional utterance. This is particularly evident in the debate on the Northern Ireland peace process (debate no. 7., February 14, 1996), where one appeal follows another in the emotional speeches. Below is an example of appeals of this kind, addressing everyone in the House, although in the passive voice:

But **our task now must be** to keep hope alive. [...] This appalling act of premeditated violence **must not be allowed to weaken our resolve** to secure a genuine and lasting peace in Northern Ireland. **The work** of our colleague, John Hume, **must not be lost; it has to be built upon**. [7.1]

A comparison of the STs with their three TTs reveals that such appeals are conveyed with equivalent form and content by the interpreters. However, when the speaker's rate of delivery is fast, and the ST syntax is complicated, consisting of agent constructions and several qualifiers, for

---

[9] Searle makes a clear propositional and syntactic differentiation between directives, commissives and expressives. According to him, expressives require a gerundive nominalization or some other nominal. (1979/1989: 14–15) Therefore I have not classified appeals as expressives, but rather a subdued form of directives.

example, interpreters are no longer able to convey all the lexical and illocutionary elements of the speech.

Implied criticism.   In a rapid flow of speech there are other speech acts that are more difficult to discern than exhortations, requests or appeals. One such class could be called 'implied criticism', exemplified by the following speech segment from the cross-border broadcasting debate:

◇ **Example 12 (6.4)**

Original: **The very people who** tell us that they want to support the European television and production industry **are the very people who** are at the same time denying a good deal of 🔊 money that is necessary for that industry.

De: *Und einige Leute* sagen und sie wollen das europäische Fernsehen und
[and some people say and they want to promote the European television and
die Produktionsindustrie fördern *aber* gleichzeitig versuchen <u>sie</u> da Geldkanäle
the production industry   but at the same time they try to stop the money channels
zu verschließen   die die Industrie braucht.
                        that the industry needs)   🔊

Sv: **Just de människor** som säger till oss att de vill stödja den europeiska
[The very people who say to us that they will support the European
tv-produktionsindustrin **är samma människor som**   samtidigt <.. > nekar
TV production industry   are the same people who at the same time deny
den industrin en stor del av   pengar som är nödvändigtvis.   🔊
the industry a large amount of money which is needed]

Su: *Jos ihmiset* haluavat tukea eurooppalaista televisiotuotantoa ja teollisuutta
[If   people   want   to support European television production and industry
nämä samat ihmiset sitten kieltävät suuret rahamäärät jota tämä teollisuus tarvitsee.
these same people   then deny the large sums of money that this industry needs.] 🔊

The clearly marked phrasing ("The very people who [...] are the very people who [...]") has helped the interpreters to anticipate a critical attitude. The TTs convey the tone of the argument with equal illocutionary force as the ST.

Throughout the debate, most speakers treat the concept 'European culture' as a given, like the following speaker:

For me the important question it has raised is: have we faith in European culture or are we afraid that it cannot stand on its own against American culture? [6. 4]

Yet there are others who point out that even this issue may acquire undesirable political flavors.

The following statement can be read as implied criticism to some participants of the debate:

◇ **_Example 13 (6.5)_**

Original: [Central to all the fuss and recriminations which have been part of this debate regrettably, there has been of course the cultural argument.] **I would not dare assume to tell anybody what was European culture.** And there has regrettably, Mr. President, been **a distinct whiff of cultural fascism** around at times.

De: [ø ø Hier sind auch gegenseitig viele Vorwürfe erhoben worden bedauerlicherweise, aber wir haben natürlich auch kulturelle Argumente ausgetauscht.] **Ich würde** <u>jetzt</u> **nicht wagen jemandem zu sagen was europäische Kultur ist** /
und leider hat sich hier <u>so ein gewisser gefährlicher Trend</u> auch gezeigt.
[and regrettably there has been a certain dangerous trend around as well]

Sv: [Vad som är avgörande för all den kritik som har ingått i denna debatt // det har väl varit kulturargumentet // jag skulle inte våga mig på att tala om för någon vad den europäiska kulturen är]
Och tyvärr   **så har vi sett rätt mycket av kulturfascism** då och då.
[And regrettably   we have seen a great deal of cultural fascism at times]

Su: [Kaikkien syytöksien keskellä, jotka ovat olleet osa tätä keskustelua valitettavasti on ollut tietystikin myöskin kulttuuriargumentteja // minä en uskaltaisi sanoa kenellekään mitä eurooppalainen kulttuuri on]
Valitettavasti herra puheenjohtaja on **ollut kulttuurifasismia myöskin välillä aina ilmoilla**
[Regrettably Mr. President   there has been cultural fascism also   at times always around]

The implied criticism is introduced, first, with the utterance "*I would not assume to tell anybody what was European culture*". The speaker strengthens her criticism with the claim "there has regrettably been a distinct whiff of cultural fascism around at times." It is interesting to compare the German TT version with the original. Does it convey the sense of the speaker's message, or its illocutionary point? The German TT *"Leider hat sich hier so ein gewisser gefährlicher Trend auch gezeigt"* ('regrettably there has also been <u>a certain dangerous trend</u> around') makes the analyst suspect that the German interpreter is trying to avoid the word 'fascism'. The speaker's critical stance is nevertheless conveyed, even if it is expressed in terms that are not equal with the original. This could be called the interpreter's interpretation of what the speaker intends to say.

The segment above (Example 13) has been selected to demonstrate some quality issues related to the interpreter's basic task which is to convey the sense of the original message. With a view to the purpose of argumentation in general, and political rhetoric in particular, we can elaborate this basic task by taking into account the listeners' expectations. Thus, the listener of SI should receive enough linguistic information to be able to create the same interpretation of the propositional content and illocutionary point of the speech as someone listening to the original speaker. The examples above show a number of careful lexical choices made by the speakers ('the cultural

argument', clarified by 'I would not assume to tell anybody what was European culture', followed by an enhancement of the criticism 'a distinct whiff of cultural fascism'). If the interpreter does not convey the equivalent rhetorical devices, or the same means of argumentation as the speaker, people listening to the TT will not receive the same message as the listener of the original.

6.1.4 Rhetorical devices

The new rhetoric of Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca is interested in the means of argumentation. The study of the numerous ways of forming arguments focuses on the interpretation of arguments. The form of the arguments is important for understanding their function and role in a text. Perelman considers the concept 'rhetorical device' to be pejorative. The citation in Chapter 3 demonstrates, however, the importance Perelman attaches to the linguistic form of argumentation. The concept 'rhetorical device' will be used here as a neutral term, referring to the linguistic or textual means used by a speaker to focus attention on his point.

Repetition. One rhetorical device that is used by numerous speakers in the present corpus is repetition. Repetition can be used to create presence for something that the speaker wishes to underline.

Speakers may repeat a phrase in order to alert their audience to an important claim, as in the example below. This can be combined with contrasting propositions to clarify the main point, as in the following speech segment:

> (1) **It is essential** that we understand
> that *we are* strengthening the directive, *we are not* trying to subvert or weaken it.
> (2) **It is essential** to understand
> that *we are* protecting wide and genuine choice for the consumer of broadcasting and *we are not* frustrating it.
> (3) **It is essential** to understand
> that *when we ask for a broad and comprehensive* definition of broadcasting *rather than the narrow one* of which Mr. Hoppenstedt spoke *we are* doing it because that is in the interest of the consumers of broadcasting and [...] [6. 2]

A comparison of the STs with their TTs suggests that interpreters may not have been sensitized to such rhetorical devices. Yet, if they render the surface structure of the input speech as faithfully as is possible in their target language, the resulting TT version will convey the sense of the original quite successfully, as can be seen in the Swedish and Finnish versions below.

◇ *Example 14 (6.2)*

Original: (1**) It is essential** *that we understand*
that we are strengthening the directive, we are not trying to subvert or weaken it.
   (2) **It is essential** *to understand*
that we are protecting wide and genuine choice for the consumer of broadcasting and we are not frustrating it.
   (3) **It is essential** *to understand*
that when we ask for a broad and comprehensive definition of broadcasting rather than the narrow one of which Mr. Hoppenstedt spoke we are doing it because that is in the interest of the consumers of broadcasting and [...]

De: (1) **Es ist nämlich sehr sehr wichtig** *ø ø ø*
dass wir die Richtlinie stärken und wir nicht versuchen / sie zu unterlaufen.
  (2**)Es ist wichtig** dass uns klar ist
dass wir eine wirckliche Auswahl für den Kunden bieten wollen
wir wollen das nicht einengen.
   (3) *ø ø ø*
Wenn wir eine weite Definition der s.s.Sendetätigkeit <er>verlangen ø ø ø dann deswegen weil das im Interesse der Verbraucher liegt.

Sv: (1) **Det är väsentligt** att vi inser
  [It is essential that we understand
att vi stärker direktivet / vi försöker inte försvaga det /
 that we are strengthening the directive we are not trying to weaken it]
   (2) **Det är väsentligt** att förstå
  [It is essential to understand
att vi skyddar +att vi stöder att tv-konsumenterna ska få tillgång till fler produkter /
that we protect +that we support that TV consumers shall have access to more products]
   (3) och **det är väsentligt** att förstå att [...]
  [It is essential to understand that]

Su: (1) että **on hyvin tärkeää** että me *ymmärtämme
  [that it is very important that we understand
että me vahvistamme tätä direktiiviä // me emme pyri heikentämään sitä millään tavalla
that we are strengthening this directive, we are not trying to weaken it in any way]
   (2) **On tärkeä** ymmärtää
  [It is important to understand
että me suojelemme todellista valinnanvaraa joka kuluttajilla on / me emme pyri
that we are protecting genuine choice that consumers have   we are not trying
supistamaan valinnanvaraa
to reduce the choice]
   (3) **On tärkeä** ymmärtää
  [It is important to understand
että kun me pyydämme [...]
  that when we ask [...]]

Here the speaker focuses attention on his arguments by repeating the phrase 'it is essential to understand'. Accuracy does not refer to lexical items only, it refers to the argumentative structure as a whole. By omitting the second unit of the first phrase ("It is essential **that we understand** that we are strengthening the directive [...]" – '*Es ist nämlich sehr, sehr wichtig øøø dass wir die Richtlinie stärken*') the German interpreter alters the logic of the argument ('It is important that we strengthen

the directive'). According to the propositional content of the German TT it is important to strengthen the directive. The illocutionary point and semantic content of the TT argument do not correspond with those of the original. The interpreter produces a request concerning what should be done instead of conveying the speaker's goal which is to focus the audience's attention on what his group is aiming at ('we are strengthening the directive'). Similar shifts in the propositional content can be found throughout the material. A suggestion or proposal, or like here, the expressed goal of a political group, is turned into a declarative statement of a general nature.

To analyze the sample segment further, the speaker makes his argumentation effective by presenting incompatibilities as discussed by Perelman. He first presents what he and his political group want to achieve with their proposed amendment, after which he states what they are not proposing.

(1) ***It is essential*** *that we understand that we are strengthening the directive, we are not trying to subvert or weaken it.*

He further enhances his argumentation by appealing to the real, to causality, by stating what will be achieved if their policy is accepted (i.e. the consumer will have wide and genuine choice):

(2) ***It is essential*** *to understand   that we are protecting wide and genuine choice for the consumer of broadcasting and we are not frustrating it.*

The qualifying terms 'wide and genuine choice' combined with the verb 'protect' are all part of the EP rhetoric, which is based on the shared values of democracy, on an open market economy and the supremacy of the interests of the citizens/consumers.

Interpreters process the text as they receive it aurally, and therefore it is not easy to observe such rhetoric devices as textual symmetry; it can be rendered to the listeners only by imitating closely the structures of the input text. This may not be a conscious method for most interpreters who have been instructed to convey the information, or the propositional content of the message. The Swedish version of the above segment (2) focuses on the propositional content without rendering the counter argument of the speaker:

(2) **Det är väsentligt** att förstå att vi skyddar +att vi stöder att tv-konsumenterna
[It is essential to understand that we protect +that we support that TV consumers
ska få tillgång till fler produkter.
     will have access to more products]

The Swedish interpreter may have missed the extension ('and we are not frustrating it') in the process of correcting himself by changing the verb; the self-correction may have diverted his

attention from listening to the input text.

Another speaker wishes to clarify for the fellow MEPs what the directive is about. She focuses attention on her main claims with the phrase 'It is about', repeating the phrase six times:

> **It is about building** a strong and competitive audiovisual industry in Europe which should offer 1 million new jobs before the year 2000 for Europeans.
> **It is about ensuring** Europeans benefit economically and culturally from an expanding industry.
> **It is about** our fifteen countries **joining** together, combining their strength and excellence to ensure ø our industry is a global player in a multichannel world.
> **It is about ensuring** that more than just a handful of people in the world decide what we shall all watch.
> **It is about ensuring** that one universal message from one place in the world does not dominate.
> **It is about creating** a space for Europe's voices to be heard and Europe's stories to be told, [6. 7]

This symmetrical structure was so obvious that all the three interpreters conveyed an equal structure in their target languages without major alterations.

Rhetorical questions. A popular rhetorical device is the use of question form. According to Perelman, a question is a purely rhetorical one if the speaker knows the answer. Politicians often resort to rhetorical questions in order to focus attention on an issue for which there are no ready-made answers.

MEPs in the present corpus frequently resort to what is generally labeled a 'rhetorical question', using it for many purposes. Firstly, they use this structure to introduce their topics, as in the following example from the debate on the application of Community law (debate No. 3, February 13, 1996):

> *Wie können wir Europa in die Köpfe der Menschen bringen wenn es so kompliziert ist ?*
> *Wie können wir Europa in die Herzen der Menschen bringen wenn es unzuver ..unzuverlässig ist?*
> *Frau Präsidentin, das sind zwei Fragen auf die ich gerne eingehen möchte .* [3. 2]

Secondly, they conclude their speech with rhetorical questions (speech 6. 3 on cross-border broadcasting):

> *Vilka etiska regler ska gälla för massmedia?*
> *Vilken roll ska public service företag spela gentemot de privata?*
> *Men först och främst: Vilken plats ska vi ge vår kulturella identitet?*
> *Parlamentet kan idag ge bra svar på dessa frågor.*
> *Tack.*
> [What ethical rules shall apply to the mass media?
> What role shall public service companies be playing against the private ones?
> But first and foremost: what status shall we give our cultural identity?
> The parliament can give good answers to these questions]

The rhetorical question as a syntactic structure may be such an obvious textual choice that interpreters automatically reproduce it. While it may be used to a different degree in the various European languages and cultures, it is nevertheless a device which is present at least in the four languages of the present study.

Figurative speech. Various forms of figurative speech can be found in the present corpus of short political speeches. However, the seven speeches on cross-border broadcasting contain only a few examples of metaphorical language. The most obvious ones can be found in the introductory presentation by Mr. Hoppensted (see Appendix, Speech 6. 1). He compares the drafting process of the final report to 'labor pains' (*'Geburtswehen'*) (6. 1: 2, 3). Later he compares the countries that have decided to allow the new services to develop freely as "traveling in the fast lane", while Europe would be "traveling in the slow lane" if it decided to adopt a wide interpretation of broadcasting (6. 1: 13).

The personification of Europe is a form of figurative language that is typical of the EU genre. One speaker emphasizes the final point of his speech by using this personification:

> **Europe can help** European culture, Mr. President, but it is by being
> positive rather than by being negative. [6. 4]

Such a personification may refer to all the Member States or to the European institutions as a whole, or to the individual institutions, particularly the Parliament, the Commission and the Council. Interpreters do not convey this personification of Europe in a systematic way. In this case, the German interpreter rendered the segment in the following words: "*Ich denke Europa hat eine eigene Kultur, aber wir sollten positiv sein und nicht negativ.*" 'I think Europe has a culture of its own but we should be positive and not negative'). The sense of the TT version is not equivalent with that of the ST message, which was expressed in simple terms. Had the interpreter reproduced the message following the linguistic form of the utterance, he would have conveyed the sense accurately and faithfully.

Political language also uses many words and expressions that can be labeled as 'dormant metaphors'. Speakers "are *strengthening* the directive", they want "a *flexible* system", laws have "*känsliga punkter*"' ('sensitive points'). Revision of the directive "*ställer oss inför ett vägval*" (~'places us at a crossroads', ~'makes us choose the road'). "A *rigid* quota system will *stifle* new development".

The following excerpt is an example of the large number of dormant metaphors that a short

text passage can contain (side by side with 'live' metaphors, marked with an asterisk [*]):

> If we do not unite it's simple
> the result will be **fragmentation, disintegration,** which will **leave us isolated** and ***the
> victims** of global interests who are simply **driven** by profit. ***The battle for the small screen** is
> to ensure we are not ***swamped by** cheap TV imports. [6. 7]

The research material shows that metaphorical language is often the reason for discontinuities in the TTs. This is clearly illustrated in the speech of Mr. Hoppenstedt, who uses a metaphor to enhance his point. After having presented his report at some length, he addresses his audience again (*"Meine sehr geehrte Damen und Herren"*). Next, he introduces a new theme by specifying the topic, which is the regulation of the new services by quotas:

> *Meine sehr geehrte Damen und Herren,*
> *ein weiteres Thema ist glaube ich wichtig: denn auch die neuen Dienste oder die*
> *Spartenkanäle, die sich entwickeln würden unter dem Artikel 1, unterfallen*
> *der Quotenregelung.* [6. 1: 11]
> [another theme is important to my mind: because also the new services, or the<xx>
> that would develop under Article 1 come within the scope of the quota regulation]

The speaker emphasizes the importance of this issue, pointing out that the Commission cannot have intended to include the new services in the quotas; this is an issue about which there is disagreement within the EP. In line with the policy of creating new job opportunities both in European TV programming and in the European film industry, the Committee was in favour of tighter quotas than what had been proposed by the Commission. The speaker illustrates his point by using figurative language:

◇ ***Example 15 (6. 1)***

 Original: [Das ist die Diskussion in dem Ausschuss, und ich kann mir nur vorstellen, dass die die auch sagen]
 die auch im Wirtschaftsausschuss gesagt haben, auch im Kulturausschuss, **dass Europa sich möglicherweise bei der Entscheidung für eine weite Auslegung auf die Kriechspur begibt** mit diesen neuen Diensten, mit neuen Medienangeboten, **und nicht auf der schnellen Bahn, auf der andere dann fahren, mitfahren kann.**
 [This is the discussion in the Committee, and I can only imagine that those who also say in<xx> they have also said in the Economic Committee also in the Cultural Committee that with the decision for a broad interpretation Europe will possibly get on the slow lane with these new services, the new media offers, and cannot drive on the fast lane that the others are driving]

En: [This was the debate / the controversy on the Committee / and there were some people who said] as the Economic and Monetary Affairs Committee said / as some parts of the Cultural Committee says that Europe might come out in favour of a broader interpretation of new services ø ø which makes new offers on the media market <..> and which would mean which would mean which would mean that some people would be prevented from taking the fast track as regards the development of these new services.

Sv: [<xx >diskussion som vi har haft i utskottet / jag kan mycket väl tänka mig att de som säger] och de som sade också i ekonomiutskottet och i kulturutskottet att Europa eventuellt måste ha en ny tolkning av de här bestämmelserna och kanske ge sig på krigs<..>stigen och man måste också beakta de nya +de nya anbud som finns och man ska inte bara kasta sig på första bästa tåg.
[discussion that we have had in the Committee I can imagine that those who say and those who also said in the Economic Committee and the Cultural Committee that Europe must have a new interpretation of these regulations and perhaps get on the war path and the new offering that is available should be taken into account and it is not advisable to just hop on the first and best train]

Su: [tämä on keskustelu jota valiokunnissa on käyty ja minä voin vain kuvitella että ne jotka sanovat] esimerkiksi talousvaliokunnassa jotkut ovat kulttuurivaliokunnassa sanoneet että Eurooppa mahdollisesti tulee joutumaan tällaiselle ryömimiskaistalle tulee menemään hitaasti jos se päättää tällä tavalla eikä pysty siis kulkemaan tätä nopeata tietä ø ø jota muut tulevat kulkemaan.
[(this debate that has been conducted in the Committees and I can only imagine that those who say) for example in the Economic Committee some have said in the Cultural Committee that Europe possibly will end up on such a slow lane will go slow if it decides like this and will not be able to go the fast way that others will be going]

The English interpreter clearly aims at conveying the propositional content in plain language. The quickly repeated phrase 'which would mean' may be an indication of the difficulty of comprehending and processing this unit. The key argument is not conveyed (i.e. Europe not being able to keep up with the development if a decision is taken for a broad definition of broadcasting). Instead, the TT refers to a small group of actors ("some people would be prevented from taking the fast track as regards development of these new services").

The Swedish interpreter does not convey the sense of the ST here (*"--att Europa eventuellt måste ha en ny tolkning av de här bestämmelserna och kanske ge sig på krigsstigen och man måste också beakta de nya +de nya anbud som finns och man ska inte bara kasta sig på första bästa tåg."* '[...] Europe must have a new interpretation of these regulations and perhaps get on the war path // and the new offering that is available should be taken into account / and it is not advisable to just hop on the first and best train'). Nor does the interpreter convey the connection between *'Anlegung'* ('interpretation') and what has been said previously. Furthermore, instead of referring to 'the slow lane' she refers to 'the war path'. Either she does not know the word *'Kriechspur'*, or she assumes that the speaker has said *'Kriegspur'* (the equivalent of the Swedish *'krigstig'*, 'war path'). The SI's hesitant delivery indicates that she is uncertain about the propositional content of the ST segment.

The Finnish interpreter conveys the main argument ('that Europe possibly will end up on such a slow lane will go slow if it decides like this and will not be able to go the fast way that others will be going'), complete with the metaphor. However, the modifying phrases specifying the main argument are omitted. Instead of using the specifying utterance, '[the decision] for a broad interpretation',the interpreter uses deixis ('if it decides this way'). Thus, whereas the speaker gives all the necessary information in saying "the decision for a broad interpretation", those listening to the Finnish SI are expected to remember what is being referred to with the deixis 'if it decides this way' .

6.1.5 Summary of the results

The debate on cross-border television broadcasting was selected to represent a topic which concerns something of which interpreters can be assumed to have a frame (in the sense used by Fillmore, as discussed by Setton 1999: 175), or declarative world knowledge. Furthermore, it is representative of a debate based on a report. Thus, interpreters have the opportunity to become familiar with the topic and the key concepts of the meeting. They can therefore be expected to have at least some degree of shared knowledge with the speakers. When the recording was made it was not possible to know who would take the floor. Eventually, the recording of the joint debate contained two German speeches, one Swedish speech and four English speeches interpreted by six interpreters into the four target languages.

Judging by these 21 TTs on the topic of cross-border TV broadcasting, it can be said that the interpreter's knowledge of the topic of the meeting does, in fact, have a positive effect on the quality of interpreting, which confirms the theoretical premise of the analysis. As a rule, terms and concepts are conveyed by equal or corresponding lexical units by the interpreters. The less experienced Finnish and Swedish interpreters[10] working from German made mistakes with EU concepts such as *'Artikel 1', 'Quotenregelung', 'Garantiefond', 'Strukturfond'* and *'Öffentlichkeit'* ('Article 1', 'quota regulation', 'Guarantee Fund', 'Structural Fund', 'openness'). The Finnish interpreter could not find an equivalent for the key concept 'Rundfunk' ('broadcasting'). Instead of referring to TV broadcasting, she kept referring to 'radio', which may have been confusing for the Finnish listeners.

The hypothesis based on the theoretical premise was thus confirmed. The topic of the debate did not create either comprehension problems or major speech production problems for interpreters. Instead, the accuracy and faithfulness of the TTs is to a great extent determined by the

---

[10] As has been indicated earlier, by the time of the recording, Finnish and Swedish interpreters had only worked for one year for the EP.

overall characteristics of the ST, i.e. whether it is a written text or a freely presented text.

The research question was formulated in the following way: Do the TTs convey the ST argumentation in such a way that the listener will receive the speaker's main claims, their rationale as well as the speech act in the same way as someone listening to the original speech? This question was supplemented with a sub-question: Do the TTs convey the speakers' rhetorical devices, as well as terms and concepts?

In order to answer these questions, the ST speeches have been analyzed following Perelman's new rhetoric. Besides the propositional content, which should be conveyed to the listeners of SI, speeches also contain elements that have the following aims:

1) to make the audience adhere to the argumentation;
2) to make the argumentation more effective;
3) to make the argumentation more persuasive.

The speeches analyzed here show that, in a political context, the sense of the message consists not only of the factual information but also of the elements that have been listed above. The rhetoric features of the speeches can be summarized as follows:

- the speeches are characterized by traditional structure of argumentation: the speakers introduce their topic, discuss it, and conclude by presenting their final point;
- the main arguments are based on values shared by EU;
  – the MEPs are acting as guardians of democracy;
  – MEPs as spokesmen of the citizens;
  – they emphasize the role of the European Parliament;
- they indicate the speakers' stance towards the topic of the meeting.

An accurate and faithful rendering of these features conveys the elements that speakers use in order to make the audience adhere to the argumentation. Since these features have an important role in rendering the argumentation more effective, as well as persuasive, a faithful SI version conveys these elements, too. Besides having the function of persuading and convincing the listeners of the speaker's views with their *logos* and *pathos*, these elements also convey the *ethos* of the speaker. The *ethos* is an important element of the impression that the audience receives of the speaker and the weight of his speech.

Rhetorical devices further enforce to the argumentation. These include:

- textual symmetry;
- rhetorical questions, as well as
- figurative language.

Speech acts are an integral element of the EP political genre. A considerable part of the illocutionary force of the speeches is embedded in speech acts, the most frequent ones in the debate on cross-border TV being the following:

- directives, with the subcategories of
    - exhortation
    - request
    - appeal; and
- implied criticism.

In order for the speech acts to be accurately conveyed by SI, attention has to be paid to the intended/expressed addressee of the speaker, the modal auxiliary used, as well as the voice (active/passive).

Based on the previous analysis, the above items are considered to be essential elements of 'the sense of the message'. Thus, they have been used as the basis of comparison in assessing the accuracy of the TTs in relation to the STs. The significance of the individual items has been evaluated in the speech context. If at least two out of three interpreters omitted the same textual material, or conveyed an erroneous rendition of the ST segment, the speech as a whole was analyzed together with the segment creating problems. The next step was to find the possible cause of the problems.

The TTs of speech 6. 6 contained the largest number of various types of non-correspondences with the original. The speech is clearly a carefully prepared written text. The speaker simply read it out loud from the manuscript and most of the argumentation was lost in all the three TT versions. This shows clearly that even professional interpreters experience difficulties with the processing demands set by such source texts. The material confirms what Setton has observed in his study: "Even in professional SI, serious breakdowns may occur when concentrated written text is read as it stands with no warning or documentary support, [...]" (1999: 256).

In contrast to that German speech, the English speeches delivered during the TV debate can

all be characterized as more spoken-like in their rhetoric formulation and their argumentation. There are very few instances where all three interpreters omit relevant items of argumentation, or distort the meaning altogether. What tends to be omitted, however, are certain single elements of the argumentation. Typically, the speakers' line of reasoning is based on specific arguments. In many cases, SI versions lose much of this specificity whereby the line of reasoning is altered.

The speaker's commitment is a significant component of the faithfulness of SI. Elements that reflect the stance of the speaker and his political group tend to be lost in the SI versions. In particular, this is the case with speech acts which are not systematically conveyed by interpreters. Furthermore, from the point of view of SI accuracy, the illocutionary point of the ST can be just as important as the propositional content. Therefore, definitions of SI accuracy should also include the illocutionary aspect.

Another element which has a key role in determining SI accuracy is the interpreter's knowledge of the languages concerned. The Swedish speech and its SI versions were given as an example to underline the importance of a solid language base. In the ST, the syntax is not complicated, the topic is familiar, and the manner of presentation is both calm and clear. Yet a lot of argumentative material is omitted in the SI versions. A comparison of this speech as well as other speeches in Swedish with their interpreted versions leads one to the conclusion that interpreters should have a wide command of the language that they are recruited to interpret from in the EP plenary sitting if they are expected to interpret accurately and faithfully (cf. texts by the EP Interpreting Directorate concerning the command of languages in Chapter 4.3, Interpreting Arrangements).

The TTs confirm the hypothesis of the study, according to which interpreters aim at rendering the STs accurately and faithfully. They clearly aim at capturing the gist of the message under circumstances that are not always amenable to the SI method. Failures in TTs are to a large extent linked with the characteristics of the ST. Whenever a speech is planned and delivered in a manner which follows the norms of spontaneous spoken language, this is reflected in an increased level of accuracy in interpreters' performances.

How do these results and conclusions enrich the content of the quality criterion 'accuracy'? The material analyzed here indicates that SI accuracy can be assessed on the basis of the overall argumentative structure of the ST. The more completely it is conveyed in the TT, the more accurately the sense of the message is rendered in the TT.

6.2 Debates displaying features of EU institutional rhetoric

Introduction.   According to the research plan of the present study, three different types of debate have been selected for closer analysis. The first group of speeches that are analyzed in the previous chapter (Chapter 6.1) discuss a topic that does not require a great deal of specialized knowledge from the interpreter's point of view. The second group of speeches that are analyzed in this chapter concern EU-related topics, which interpreters can be expected to be familiar with in professional terms (See Chapter 4.3, *Selection criteria of interpreters*).

The debate constituting the first set of EU-related speeches is titled *"IGC – Preparations for the Turin summit"*[1]. The speeches deal with EU institutional issues, involving a number of EU terms and concepts. The second set of speeches originates from sessions titled 'Oral questions to the Council', 'Written questions to the Council', and 'Oral questions to the Commission'.

6.2.1 Speeches on the role of the European Parliament

The assumption underlying the inclusion of the IGC debate in the corpus is twofold. From a practical point of view, it is assumed that the main themes as well as the terms and concepts are familiar to interpreters, since they are tested for EU terminology before they are accredited to work for the European Parliament. From a theoretical point of view, with reference to the cognitive aspects of SI, it is assumed here that the interpreters' performances are based on more or less the same set of background knowledge of the topic under discussion. This assumption is based on the fact that interpreters work for the EP on a regular basis, whereby they have acquired knowledge of the institutions and the substance of the issues under debate. They also study EU documents and terminology lists. Thus, the knowledge of the topic that interpreters share with the speakers, while not at the same level as that of the MEPs, can be expected to be at a considerably higher level than what is frequently the case when interpreters work for international conferences in the so- called 'free market' (i.e. outside the institutional context). Consequently, it is hypothesized that

---

[1] The Turin summit was held 29–30 March, 1996. The Intergovernmental Conference is an on-going process reviewing the roles of the European institutions.

interpreters will not face problems comprehending the content of the speeches or the terms and concepts.

A second working hypothesis follows from the first one: if the propositional content of the TTs deviates from that of the STs, it is assumed that at least some of these deviations may be due to some features in the STs rather than lack of EU knowledge or general professional competence. One of the tasks of the analysis is therefore to pinpoint such ST features.

The main interest of the analysis below is in the overall argumentation of the ST speeches. Special emphasis is paid to arguments expressed in figurative language. Attention is also paid to other linguistic features, such as the speakers' use of EU terms and concepts, as well as the syntax of the speeches.

The design of the analysis of the speeches on the Intergovernmental Conference (IGC) could thus be formulated as follows:

> *Theoretical premise*: The interpreter's knowledge of the topic of the meeting, as well as of the related vocabulary, facilitates the processing of the input text, thereby contributing to an adequate SI performance.

The predictive force of this premise will be assessed by testing the following two hypotheses on the empirical material.

> *Hypothesis 1*: Interpreters' familiarity of the topic and vocabulary enables them to convey the sense of the ST, leading to a semantically and/or functionally equivalent TT.

This hypothesis, which is derived from the theoretical premise of the study, will be tested by analyzing the source texts and comparing the results of the analysis with the target texts. The sense is considered to be primarily composed of the argumentation of the speeches, their speech acts and the EU-related terms and concepts.

> *Hypothesis 2*: Shortcomings in the sense consistency of TTs compared with STs may be due to some ST features that prevent a full rendering of the original speech.

The hypothesis led to the research question behind the analysis of the research material:

Research question: Do the TTs convey the ST argumentation in such a way that the listener will be able to constitute a representation of the ST message which is equivalent to the one he would have constituted had he been listening to the original speech?

Sub-question 1: Given that the sense of a ST lies in the argumentation, in the speech act, as well as in the terms and concepts used by the speaker, to what extent are these elements rendered by interpreters?

Sub-question 2: If the argumentation, the speech act, and the relevant vocabulary are not rendered in the TT, what are the features in the ST that explain the shortcomings in equivalence?

If a comparison of the STs with their TTs shows that at least two of the three interpreters have failed to render the sense of a segment in the ST, a text analysis of this segment will be conducted, paying attention to both the syntax and lexical features of the text segment.

IGC – Preparations for the Turin summit.   The debate on the IGC, the eighth in chronological order in the corpus, was based on the report by Raymonde Dury and Johanna Maij-Weggen.[2] It took place on March 13, 1996, beginning as early as eight o'clock on Wednesday morning and continuing until 12:25. Voting took place at the usual time at 12:30. Altogether 77 speeches were given, including the speeches by the President of the EP, the President of the Council and the President of the Commission as well as the presentations by the rapporteurs.

The corpus contains the 14 speeches (by the same number of speakers) that were delivered in the languages of the study: six in English, one in Finnish, five in German and two in Swedish. Because of the length of the session, there were two teams of interpreters, altogether fifteen working from and into the languages of the study. The TTs are rendered by four English, four Finnish, three German and four Swedish interpreters, several of them working from at least two languages into their TT language. (See list of speakers below.)

---

[2] Report by Mrs. Dury and Mrs. Maij-Weggen on behalf of the Committee on Institutional Affairs (A4–0068/96) on Parliament's opinion on the convening of the Intergovernmental Conference; and evaluation of the work of the Reflection Group and definition of the political priorities of the European Parliament with a view to the Intergovernmental Conference on the proposal for amendment of the Treaties on which the European Union is founded. (Final Draft Agenda for the part-session in March 1996. PE 165.826/FD)

Table 4. List of speakers

Report on Parliament's opinion on the convening of the Intergovernmental Conference; and evaluation of the work of the Reflection Group and definition of the political priorities of the European Parliament with a view to the Intergovernmental Conference on the proposal for amendment of the Treaties on which the European Union is founded
Statements by the Council and Commission on the preparations for the European Council (Turin, 29/30 March 1996)
Rapporteurs Mrs. Dury and Mrs. Maij-Weggen

Speech No.	Speaker	Source language	Target languages
1.	Green	English	Finnish, German, Swedish
2.	Poettering	German	English, Finnish, Swedish
3.	Roth	German	English, Finnish, Swedish
4.	Voggenhuber	German	English, Finnish, Swedish
5.	Hyland	English	Finnish, German, Swedish
6.	Cox	English	Finnish, German, Swedish
7.	Sjöstedt	Swedish	English, Finnish, German
8.	Ullman	German	English, Finnish, Swedish
9.	Riess-Passer	German	English, Finnish, Swedish
10.	Lööw	Swedish	English, Finnish, German
11.	Donnelly	English	Finnish, German, Swedish
12.	Iivari	Finnish	*German, English, Swedish
13.	Malone	English	Finnish, German, Swedish
14.	David	English	Finnish, German, Swedish

* Refers to 'retour' into German.

The subject of the debate. At the beginning of the debate, the president of the EP, *Klaus Hänsch*, introduces the topic of the debate. Next, he highlights some issues that are discussed in the report. They concern the principles according to which the Turin meeting of the IGC will be organized, some of the key words being 'openness' and 'transparency'. Another important issue is the role of the EP and how it can participate in the IGC in such a way that the results of the IGC conference would be acceptable to the citizens of Europe. Furthermore, Hänsch makes an appeal to the President of the Council to make visible the request of the EP to be represented in the IGC through two observers.[3]

6.2.2 Argumentative features of the Source Texts

Typically, MEPs structure their speeches by stating whether they (and their political group) are for or against the report; they expand their position by providing the rationale for their commitment. They further elaborate their speech by stating their demands, appeals and criticism relating to the

---

[3] According to the final draft agenda, the Joint Debate also covered statements by the Council and Commission on the preparations for the European Council in Turin, 29-30 March, 1996.

issues that are taken up in the report. The main arguments are frequently presented in the form of speech acts or metaphoric utterances. The reasons for demands or criticism are often supported by facts and figures relating to an area known to the speaker. These various elements of the speeches will be discussed in more detail below.

Speech acts.   In the light of the present corpus, a few speech acts stand out as typical of political rhetoric in the European parliament. Chapter 6.1 contains examples of *directives*, exhortations, requests and appeals in particular. In addition to directives, the IGC debate contains other types of speech acts than the ones discussed in 6.1, including *approvals,* as well as expressions of *opposition*. The speech segments that can be characterized as speech acts are often distributed throughout the speech.

Within the EP genre, a speech may start with a speech act indicating the speaker's *approval*. The first taxonomy of speech acts by Austen includes a group of verbs, which, according to him, "pass all [his] tests of the pure explicit performative" (1962/1990: 88), one of them being 'endorse'. This performative is exemplified by the following opening:

> Mister President,
> *I want to* **endorse** most of this report. *I* particularly **welcome** the fact that there is no challenge to the principle of one Commissioner per Member State. [8.13]

EP rhetoric also makes abundant use of speech acts that Searle (1979/1989) classifies as *assertives*. He defines this class as follows: "the point or purpose of the members of the assertive class is to commit the speaker (in varying degrees) to something's being the case, to the truth of the expressed proposition" (1979/1989: 12). According to the semantic analysis of Leech, predicates indicating a propositional attitude like 'believe' and 'assume' correspond to assertive predicates. He has called this category, defined by psychological predicates, the 'creditive' category (1983: 211). Stubbs discusses such forms as commitments. Referring to Lyons (1981: 240) he calls them self-expression, that is, how speakers report their own beliefs, attitudes, and so on (1996: 205).

In the present corpus, 'believe' is one of the most frequent predicates in this class; it is used in the same semantic sense across the four languages included in this study. The following utterance is a typical example of this speech act:

> Socialists **believe** that the last year has seen the development in particular of the priority of employment generation, and **the clear belief** that *this IGC not only must, but can, present a new approach to Europe's role in creating jobs*. [8. 1]

The segment above combines two types of speech act; first, assertives (in bold), followed by an exhortation (in italics). The exhortations tend to be indirect imperatives, as discussed by Searle (1979/1989), and later modified by Stubbs, who criticizes Austen and Searle for studying invented data instead of actual language behavior (1996: 200–224). Austin proposed that "an 'imperative' may be an order, a permission, a demand, a request, an entreaty, a suggestion, a recommendation, a warning [...], or may express a condition or concession or a definition [...], &c." (1962/1990: 76–77) Political rhetoric, as exemplified in the present material, contains such modalities, which is the reason for using the ideas of speech act theory for describing and analyzing the material.

Speakers frequently state in explicit terms what they are *opposed* to. In the example below the speaker expresses his group's opposition to 'majority voting' (in bold), one of the crucial issues of the IGC debate:

◇ **Example 16 (8. 11)**

Original: Finally, ***we oppose the generalization, and I stress the generalization of majority voting***.

De: Zum Schluss noch **sind wir gegen die Generalisierung ø ø die**
[Finally   still   we are against   the generalization   the
Generalisierung der Mehrheitsabstimmung. [...]
generalization   of   majority voting]

Sv: <u>Vi< .. >vill ha</u> en generalisering och jag trycker på det ordet ø av
[We want to have a generalization and I stress the word   of
majoritetsomröstning [...]
majority voting]

Su: *sen vuoksi mielestämme ei myöskään voida laajentaa< .. >*enemmistöpäätöksen
[that is why we do not think either   that the extension of majority voting can be
laajentamista, [...]
extended]

The above example demonstrates the way in which a politician makes clear to his audience the stance that he and his political group represent. His choice of words is deliberate: "We *oppose* the generalization [...] of majority voting". The German TT version conveys the same illocutionary point ('*wir sind gegen [...]*' - 'we are against [...]'). However, the other TT versions show that even a rather straightforward speech act will not always be rendered with an equivalent illocutionary force. Although the Finnish version conveys some of the propositional content of the ST, it does not render the illocutionary force of the speech act in saying: "[...] *mielestämme ei myöskään voida laajentaa enemmistöpäätöksen laajentamista*" ('*we do not think* that majority voting should be extended'). The Swedish TT fails to convey the sense of the original altogether; it would appear as

if the interpreter had not heard the main verb 'oppose' at all ("*vi vill ha*" – 'we want to have [a generalization of majority voting]').

The *directive* is by far the most frequent kind of speech act occurring in the debate on the IGC report, too, indicating the stand of the political group and what the group demands. In this study, a directive concerns a problem and a suggestion of how it should be solved, performed by a politician in an institutional setting. This is a particularly frequent type of element characterizing the argumentation of the EP genre. The following two utterances are examples of such directives containing special illocutionary force:

Es muss daher eine klare und nachvollziehbare Festlegung der Kompetenzen der
[That's why the competencies of the Union must be fixed in a clear and transparent way
Union **geben**, die sich nur und ausschließlich am Prinzip des Erfordernisses orientiert.
that is   only and exclusively   oriented on the principle of necessity] (8.9)

Die Beweislast **muss** im Streitfall bei den Zentralisierern **liegen** und nicht umgekehrt.
(In cases of dispute, the burden of proof must be vested with those in favor of centralization, not the other way round.) (I8.9)

The concluding remarks frequently end in a directive which has the tone of a *commitment*, as in the following proposition by a German MEP:

[*Meine Damen und Herren, Die Fraktion der Europäischen Volkspartei wendet sich mit Entschiedenheit gegen eine Renationalisierung der europäischen Politik. Eine Renationalisierung würde zu neuem Nationalismus führen. Und Nationalismus is der Krieg, wie Francoise Mitterrand hier vor dem Europäischen Parlament gesagt hat. Für uns, die FVP, ist die Einigung Europas, wie Bundeskanzler Helmut Kohl es immer wieder formuliert, eine Frage von Krieg und Frieden im 21. Jahrhundert.*]
Deswegen muss die Regierungskonferenz ein Erfolg werden, und **wir als**
[therefore   the IGC   must be   a   success   and we as
FVP werden auch in der Zusammenarbeit mit den Regierungen und dem Parlament
PPE shall   also contribute to the cooperation with the governments and the Parliament
unseren Beitrag **dazu leisten**. [8.2]

Expressions of commitment.   The speaker's commitment to the issue at hand is a characteristic of political language that is frequently present in speeches at the European Parliament. Speakers tend to specify whether they are speaking on their own behalf, or on behalf of their political group, or on behalf of the citizens. As Wilson (1990: 76) argues, politicians are particularly conscious of their commitment; this is reflected in their use of personal pronouns or other referents.

Speech 8.14 (see end of chapter) serves as an example of how speakers indicate their commitment (in bold). Because of their marked character they can be considered an integral constituent of the sense of the message. It is therefore not irrelevant how the speaker's commitment

is rendered by interpreters.

The sample shows that three interpreters leave out the unit that expresses the speaker's commitment, in this case, the reference to the political group ('Labour', 'Labour Members', 'the Labour Party'). On one occasion the Swedish interpreter says *'vi'* ('we') instead of 'Labour'. From the listener's point of view this reference might be ambiguous; it may refer to all the MEPs that are present, or the listener may be able to infer from the context that the speaker is speaking on behalf of his political group.

Figurative speech. The corpus contains numerous speeches where the main arguments are expressed in figurative language. Like many other textual features, figurative speech, too, could be classified in different categories. Here, figurative speech is first discussed as a rhetorical element, followed by a discussion of metaphors that are used as part of EU genre in a less rhetorical manner.

Speakers may have many reasons for the use of figurative expressions in their interventions.[4] Politicians may expect their audience to be familiar with classical mythology as well as historical events and personalities, and the meanings and connotations that they carry. By referring to them a speaker may condense or enhance his message. Figurative language, such as analogy and metaphors, can also be used to imply the speaker's attitude, leaving it to the listeners to infer the meaning of the message.

The following is one of the most obvious examples of an analogy based on a familiar figure from Greek mythology – the Trojan horse – which is used to highlight the argument (in bold):

> *For all of these reasons we will oppose vigorously any attempt to insert these amendments and the public service charter. We support the idea of universal access to such services. That is already provided for in the resolution.*
>
> ***If these amendments were adopted,*** *they would be the antithesis of a dynamic economy and offend the very employment objectives which so many here preach so loudly and which my group shares.* ***They would in fact be a regressive form of creeping protectionism, an ideological Trojan horse.***
>
> ***Amendment 207 would offend the fundamental principles of the Single Act and fail to complete the internal market in energy, telecoms, and postal services. It offends long-standing principles of competition.***
>
> *We are emphatically opposed to this and we will vote against. [8.6]*

The speaker may safely expect that the metaphoric meaning of 'the Trojan horse' is known to his audience: something evil is disguised as something quite innocent. The speaker is referring to the amendments arguing that they are 'an ideological Trojan horse'. Should they be passed, what will be

---

[4] See e.g. Perelman 1969/1971: 371–411.

under threat is a dynamic economy as well as the objectives that have been set for employment.

The structure of the above argumentation can be traced back to Aristotle, who lists a number of persuasive techniques, one of them being that of warning (*Rhetoric,* Book II, 23, 1399a). The speaker predicts according to the formula 'if you do this, the consequences will be ...'. Perelman calls this the pragmatic argument. Such an argument "permits the evaluation of an act or an event in terms of its favorable or unfavorable consequences" (1969/1971: 266–270).

In most cases, figurative speech is not conveyed successfully in the TTs. Such textual elegance as demonstrated in the original phrasing is difficult to achieve in simultaneous interpreting, even if the interpreter tried to follow the speaker as closely as possible. In this case, the interpreters produce the basic proposition of the claim with the result that those listening to interpreting may be confused rather than impressed by the reasoning. (See below) In the case of the Swedish TT, for example, the profusion of words has resulted in mistranslations where protectionism is modified with the word '*progressiv*' ('progressive') instead of 'a *regressive* form of creeping [protectionism]'.

◇ **Example 17 (8. 6)**

Original: *They would in fact be **a regressive form of creeping protectionism, an ideological Trojan horse**.*

De: *Das wäre mehr ein Rückschritt, und man würde Protektionismus schaffen und die*
[That would be more like a step backwards, and it would create protectionism, and
Idiole<.. >Ideologie <xx> als ein< xx> trojanisches Pferd wieder einführen.
introduce ideology as a Trojan horse]

Sv: Det är en form av progressiv protektionism och en trojansk häst.
[That is a form of progressive protectionism and a Trojan horse]

Su: *Se olisi askel <..>l<. >takaisinpäin ja <ö.. >se merkitsisi protektionismia ja <.. >*
[It would be a step backwards and   it would mean protectionism and
ikäänkuin se olisi protektionismin troijalainen hevonen.
as if it were   a Trojan horse of protectionism]

In his discussion of how metaphors work Searle (1979/1989: 77–78) makes the following point: "In order that the speaker can communicate making metaphorical utterances [...] there must be some principles according to which he is able to mean more than, or something different from, what he says – principles known to the hearer, who, using this knowledge, can understand what the speaker means."

Interpreters, too, have to try to understand what the speakers mean. MEPs may pick their metaphoric expressions from classical literature or classical philosophy. The following two examples serve to illustrate that these units (in bold) are not easily rendered in the simultaneous

mode with the intended effect.

Original*: But, in any case, it is inconceivable that intergovernmentalism will be entirely abandoned by the governments at this Intergovernmental Conference.* **To expect that they should abandon intergovernmentalism is, as we say in English, to tilt at windmills.** 🔊

De: Aber es ist unvorstellbar dass< ..>man< .. >die< .. >dass die Regierungen bei der
[But it is inconceivable that [passive form] that governments would
Regierungskonferenz die Regierungen völlig ausschliessen würden
shut out governments altogether in the Intergovernmental Conference]   🔊
ø ø ø ø ø ø   ø

Sv: Men det är svårt att tänka sig att det <xx>samarbetet helt ska överges av IGC /
att förvänta sig att de överger *de möten* <xx> **är faktiskt att kämpa mot väderkvarnar**.
[to expect   that they abandon those meetings [xx] is in fact to fight against windmills.]   🔊

Su: *Ei voida ajatella että hallitusten välistä yhteistyötä <.. >ei <.. >enää< .. >käytettäisi< ..> työvälineenä* / tämä on mielestäni aivan absurdia [- - -]
                 [this   I think is   quite   absurd]   🔊

The transcription and the hesitant speech production in the above segment can be seen as reflections of the interpreters' on-going SI processing. While the German interpreter omits the analogy between abandoning intergovernmentalism to tilting at windmills, the Finnish interpreter 'interprets' the expression to mean that the whole idea is 'quite absurd'. Judging by the TTs, the play with words ("that intergovernmentalism will be [...]by governments at this intergovernmental Conference") is taxing on the interpreters' speech comprehension and speech production faculties. A coined compound like 'intergovernmentalism' may not be easy to render quickly into other languages. Interpreters' prosody reveals that they are looking for ways to render the first part of the argument in their respective languages. Their information handling system is subjected to overload, to use Gerver's (1969/2002) formulation.

One of the most sophisticated analogies of the whole corpus can be found in the same speech, immediately after the previous segment:

Original: *Finally,we oppose the generalization, and I stress the generalization of majority voting. Some extension of majority voting may well have its merits but such extensions as occur can only take place on a piecemeal basis* **rather than in pursuit of a platonic ideal where the continuation of national vetoes is regarded as disturbing the harmonious music of the celestial spheres**. 🔊

De: Zum Schluss noch sind wir gegen die Generalisierung ø ø die Generalisierung der Mehrheitsabstimmung / natürlich könnte man manchmal Mehrheitsabstimmung unterstützen aber die können nur entstehen <..> bei bestimmten Themen / **man sollte nicht das ø Ideal verfolgen wo die weiterführung der nationalen Vetos ø** *die harmonische Musik ø ø stören würden*

[Finally we are against the generalization the generalization of majority voting. One could obviously sometimes support majority voting but that could only take place concerning certain themes. One should not follow the ideal where national vetoes would disturb the harmonious music]

Sv: Vi .. vill ha en generalisering och jag trycker på det ordet ø av majoritetsomröstning / en andel av majoritetsomröstningar har sina fördelar / men de kan bara ske .. <ö> litet spritt emot en bakgrund av en ø ide<..> där<..>mm<..>ø vetot stör den himmelska musiken

[we want to have a generalization and I stress the word of majority voting, some majority voting has its merits, but that can only take place /on a piecemeal basis/ background of an *ide where the veto disturbs the heavenly music]

Su: sen vuoksi mielestämme ei myöskään voida laajentaa< .. >enemmistöpäätöksen laajentamista / sitä voidaan käyttää pelkästään sirpaleittain / *koska pitää ottaa huomioon kansallisen veto-oikeuden <.. > merkitys.*

[therefore we do not think that the extension of majority voting can be extended / it can only be used *as pieces because the significance of the right to national veto has to be taken into account]

The speaker is referring to one of the central issues on the IGC agenda, which was the revision of the decision-making process by adopting the principle of majority voting. He presents his opposing view with a sarcastic analogy, seeing those in favor of majority voting as 'pursuing a platonic ideal' and its 'harmonious music of the celestial spheres', which is disturbed by the existing decision-making process. One may wonder how many MEPs were persuaded not to vote for the amendments as a result of the allusion to Plato.

The rhetoric intentions of the speaker are not fully realized in the interpreters' versions. The main claim of the ST is that majority voting should not be the rule; however, if it is applied, then on a piecemeal basis, and the right to national vetoes should be maintained. While the Swedish version contains lexical elements of the analogy, it does not capture the actual argumentation; on the contrary, the propositional content is the exact opposite of what the speaker says ('We want to have a generalization [...] of majority voting [...] the veto disturbs the heavenly music'). By picking one term of the analogy ('[the veto disturbs] the heavenly music') the Swedish interpreter produces an argument which may have sounded truly odd to the listeners. The Finnish version is vague ('Therefore we think one cannot extend the extension of majority voting [...] because the significance of the right to national vetoes has to be taken into account.'). Again, as in the previous segment, the interpreter attempts to infer the sense of the utterance, omitting the metaphorical elements altogether. This is not a paraphrase; rather, it is an effort to retrieve the informational content of the message, which is what interpreters are instructed to do.

Another example is provided here to illustrate how a witty rhetoric device of adapting a

familiar figure of speech may be lost in the simultaneous mode of translation. Below is an example of two solutions to the translation of figurative language. (Debate on 'Second series of ERDF actions', January 18, 1996) Either the interpreter may decide to play safe and infer the meaning of the incoming segment rather than to try to translate the analogy faithfully (the Swedish version), or he makes the effort but gets all confused, whereby the sense of the message is altogether obscured (the Finnish version).

◇ ***Example 20 (1.1)***

Original: There's no point in **offering** them **the carrot of European funding** in new areas 🔊 while **beating them with the stick of European bureaucracy.**

Sv: Det finns ingen vits med att erbjuda nya områden finansiering från EU/ *om man fastnar*
  [There's no point in offering new areas funding from EU if one gets stuck in
i den europeiska byråkratin [...] 🔊
the European bureaucracy]

Su: <öö> Euroopan rahoituksen <öö> rrah +<u>Euroopan rahoituksen porkkanan päässä </u>on
  [At the end of the carrot of European funding there is
<u>keppi joka <aaa> identifioituu eurooppalaiseen byrokratiaan</u> / no niin.
a stick which   gets identified with European bureaucracy oh well.] 🔊

The syntax of the above claim is rather complicated for simultaneous translation where the spoken text is received aurally, maintained in the working memory and produced as an oral translation. The first unit is in the negative ('There's no point'), the main verbs are in the gerund form ('in offering', 'while beating') and the objectives are genitive constructions based on a familiar proverb which is split in a novel way ('*the carrot* of European funding', '*the stick* of European bureaucracy'). The Swedish interpreter clearly aims at conveying the sense and not the form of the message. His version is literally an interpretation of what the speaker says: in other words, it is pragmatic inferencing of the meaning on the basis of the linguistic form of the message.

Humor, irony, sarcasm.   The last example in the above chapter could be called 'humorous' regarding the way the familiar figure of speech ('to offer a carrot while beating with a stick') has been exploited to highlight the speaker's point. The effectiveness of political rhetoric can be enhanced by the use of humor, irony and sarcasm. These devices are particularly effective in conveying the attitude of the speaker, Winston Churchill being one of the most famous masters of the art.

These rhetoric devices may not be easy to identify in a rapid flow of speech, nor to translate and produce at the pace set by the speaker. The debate on IGC contained some examples of the use of sarcasm, like the following argument:

*Dieses Europa des Dialoges und des Friedens ist wahrlich nicht dort, wo **diese sogenannte Säule d**er gemeinsamen **Außen-** und Sicherheitspolitik **steht, wenn sie denn überhaupt steht**. Wir sehen es, und Hans Koschnick, unser Administrator, hat es zu spüren bekommen, dass diese Politik **in Wirklichkeit** eine Politik der unsicheren Selbstverteidigung **ohne ein Außen** ist.[5]* [8.8]

The speech as a whole focuses on the ultimate aim of the EU, which is the maintenance of peace. It criticizes the idea of a common foreign and security policy, and the concept of 'pillar' that is used in this context. The speaker underlines his skepticism by using the word "*sogenannte" [Säule]* ('so-called' [pillar]). In Stubbs's words, "some of the normal commitment to the word 'pillar' is suspended , in order to convey a moral point of view" (1996: 210). According to the speaker, instead of 'pillars' there should be a new kind of union of nations which cannot wage wars against each other. The metaphor of the pillar (of foreign and security policy) standing somewhere, combined with the sarcastic question 'if it stands at all', represents a rather complicated play with words. Two of the interpreters omit the skeptical utterance, whereby the speaker's sarcasm is not conveyed to the audience.

The speaker continues in the same mood by saying that this policy "is in reality a policy without the foreign" ("*ohne ein Außen*"). Such wordplay is possible in German where word combinations are common, and they can be shortened by leaving out the second unit, which is the same in adjacent word combinations (*'ein gemeinsamer Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik',* instead of *'Außenpolitik und Sicherheitspolitik'*). The verbal humor exploited by the speaker in isolating the concept *'Außen'* ('foreign') without the second element *'Politik'* ('policy') is rather literary, or at least understandable to the listeners of German only. In such instances, interpreters would have to fill in some additional words in order to make the syntax acceptable. Yet there is usually no time for such editing, as this would prevent the interpreters from attending to the next incoming unit. None of the three interpreters conveyed this unit of the argument.

Metaphors as an integral element of EU genre. A specific category of EP genre is the multitude of metaphorical concepts and expressions that refer to specific political entities. The example above is a case in point. The 'three pillars' refer to the structure of EU policies created in the Maastricht Treaty[6]. Speakers need not elaborate what they mean by 'pillars'. Perelman classifies metaphors

---

[5] 'This Europe of dialogue and peace is certainly not where this so-called pillar of the common foreign and security policy stands, if it stands at all. We can see, and Hans Koschnick, our administrator, has experienced it that this policy is in reality a policy of insecure self-defense without the [element of] foreign /without being actual foreign policy.'

[6] The three 'pillars' are, first, EC Policy, second, Common Foreign and Security Policy, and third, Cooperation in Home and Justice Affairs.

that are eroded or no longer active as 'dormant'. He has seen stereotyped metaphorical expressions come to life again in the mouth of certain speakers (1969/1971: 407); this can be seen in the example above, where the speaker revives the dormant metaphor 'pillar' by turning it into a tangible element:

*Dieses Europa des Dialoges und des Friedens ist wahrlich nicht dort, wo **diese** sogenannte **Säule der gemeinsamen Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik** steht, wenn sie denn überhaupt steht.*

The expression above may also serve as an example of variations between languages, as discussed by Perelman. He stresses the fact that "a metaphor in one language may be more or less 'dormant' than the same metaphor in another language," which means that "translation will always somewhat alter the original text" (op.cit.: 407).

Politicians may also invent *ad hoc* metaphors to describe their attitude toward the issues at hand. Such rhetorical elements are often lost in interpreting. This may be due to the fact that interpreters do not always know or recognize the references. In the example below, the speaker demands more rights for the EP in the name of democracy. She starts by using metaphoric expressions to designate something which has not been mentioned by previous speakers (*'Zeichen des Rates', 'dieses Aussperrungszeichen aus Palermo'*). During the long debate, the only speaker to refer to 'Palermo' is Mrs. Agnelli, speaking on behalf of the Council (as the 18th speaker), who refers to the fact that President Santer was present in Palermo. The city referred to during the rest of the debate is Turin, where the IGC Conference was going to take place.

The metaphor (*'Zeichen des Rates', 'dieses Aussperrungszeichen aus Palermo'*) is an integral part of the argument as can be seen from the transcription below:

◇ *Example 21 (8.3)*

Original: *Frau Präsidentin,*
*pünktlich zu unserer Debatte kommt das unmissverständliche **Zeichen des Rates,***
 [punctually to our   debate comes   the unmistakable   sign of the Council
wie er sich die Regierungskonferenz vorstellt.
the way it views the intergovernmental conference]
***Dieses Aussperrungszeichen aus Palermo** ist skandalös, bitter, und sehr*
this   closing sign   from Palermo is scandalous, bitter, and very
gefährlich für die europäische Integration, denn es macht klar, dass nicht daran gedacht
dangerous for   European integration   because it makes it clear that no one is thinking
wird die Debatte wirklich demokratisch zu führen und die Bürger miteinzubeziehen.

about conducting the debate in a really democratic way and about involving the citizens in the debate]

En: Thank you very much Madame President.
        ø
Well / we can see how the Council views the IGC and our role / **we've been closed out** / and it's
dangerous for <xxxxx> because it makes it very clear that no one's thinking about a really
democratic debate involving ordinary people.

Sv: Fru Talman,
ø
det kommer **ett tecken** att rådet ser på   regeringskonferensen   på det ena sättet
[there is   a sign   that the Council views the Intergovernmental Conference in one way
så att det här visar att man utespärrar oss från <u>Palermo</u>**.**
so that this   shows that we are being closed out from Palermo.]
Det är väldigt farligt för den europeiska integrationen för det är klart+visar klart att man inte har
tänkt sig att debatten verkligen ska föras demokratiskt och att medborgarna ska också kopplas in.

Su: Rouva puhemies,
<u>aivan täsmällisesti</u> *tässä keskustelussamme tulee ilmi se miten neuvosto tämän konferenssin näkee.*
Tämä Palermon sulkuaika - sitä emme ymmärrä.
[This closing-out time of Palermo - that we do not understand.]
Ja jos ajatellaan Euroopan integraatiota niin on aivan selvää että ei ajatella sitä että keskustelua
käytäisiin demokraattisesti ja että kansalaiset otettaisiin mukaan keskusteluun.

The speaker uses the concept *'Aussperrungszeichen'* ('closing sign') in a figurative way, explaining it later with the claim 'for it makes clear that no one is thinking about conducting the debate in a really democratic manner and involving the citizens [in the debate].' The TTs above demonstrate again the difference between experienced and novice interpreters in the EP. The experienced English interpreter focuses on the meaning of the segment producing an intelligent TT[7] ("We've been closed out") while omitting the specifying reference ('Palermo') and the qualifiers ('scandalous' and 'bitter'); instead, he adds the modifier 'very' [dangerous]. The Finnish and Swedish EP novice interpreters do not recognize the reference to 'Palermo'; they nevertheless convey it, although with the wrong sense, as the Swedish version ('we've been closed out from Palermo'); or with no real sense, as the Finnish version ('this closing-out time of Palermo [...]'). The way the speaker refers to 'Palermo' as something that the audience will recognize is typical of the short speeches of the EP plenary session. Speakers expect the names of the various EU or other international conferences to be shared knowledge.

A second example of the figurative use of EU-related concepts can be found in the following speech segment, where the speaker focuses on the EP's role as a spokesperson of the citizens of Europe as well as the guardian of democracy. The metaphor coined by the speaker is a personification where the role of the EP is equated with that of an advocate.

---

[7] In the sense used by Lederer, see Chapter 2.

◇ *Example 22 (8.4)*

Original: *Frau Präsidentin, die Frage, die wir heute zu entscheiden haben, ist, ob das Parlament mit diesem Bericht in den zentralen Auseinandersetzungen der europäischen Integration eine Haltung einnimmt, die es* **zum Anwalt** *der Nöte und der Hoffnungen der Menschen in Europa* **macht**.
[Madame President, the question that we must decide on today is whether the Parliament is adopting a stand with this report regarding the central conflicting issues of European integration that will make it the advocate of the needs and hopes of the people of Europe]
[...]

Sie ... **Das Parlament macht sich nicht zum Anwalt** *der Behebung des Demokratiedefizits. Nach der Devise, für jedes Problem eine europäische Kompetenz,*
macht man sich im Gegenteil zum Anwalt *einer blinden Zentralisierung.* 🔊
[She ... the Parliament does not make herself the advocate /speaking on behalf of/ doing away with the democratic deficit. On the contrary, according to the slogan, for every problem a European competency /the European Parliament/ makes herself the advocate of blind centralization]

En: Madame President / The question we are addressing today< ..> is< .. .. >does the Parliament with this report< ... >take an attitude in central decisions of the European Union *which is commensurate with the expectations of the peoples of Europe.* 🔊
It is< .. >*the Parliament is not <.. >***speaking on behalf** *<.. >of doing away with the democratic deficit / Under the slogan of European powers we are defending blind centralization.*

Sv: Fru Talman// den frågan som vi skall fatta beslut om i dag< .. >gäller om parlamentet<..> med det här betänkandet<.. >ska kunna <.. >ta en ställning< .. >om <..> integrationen <.. >som <..> *sätter människans intresse i centrum <.. ..>*
Parlamentet gör inte s.. är inte försvarare för att man ska upphäva demokratiunderskottet /
man ska ha en europeisk befogenhet för varje problem // säger man // *men det betyder att* man är
blind centralist egentligen. 🔊
[Madame President, the question that we shall be deciding on today concerns whether the parliament with this report will be able to take a stand on the integration that puts people's interests in the focus The parliament does not make itself is not defender for the upheaval of the democratic deficit. It has been said that there should be a European competence for every problem but that means that /the Parliament/ is actually a blind centralist]

Su: Rouva Puhemies// Kysymys josta meidän pitää tänään päättää on se josko parlamentti <.. öö ..>voi tämän<.. öö > mietinnön <.. öö .. > joka koskee Euroopan integraatiota ottaa sellaisen kannan <..öö.. >*että se ottaa huomioon kaikki toiveet <.. > e..eurooppalaisten ihmisten toiveet <.. >ja vakaumukset*
Ja parlamentti ei <..ö.. ö ..> tai tässä mietinnössä ei keskitytä demokratiavajeeseen <u>vaan</u> siinä
puhutaan eurooppalaisista kompetensseista *vaan* siinä sokeasti *puolustetaan* keskittymistä . 🔊
[Madame Chairman, The issue that we should decide on today is whether the Parliament can with this report that deals with European integration take a stand whereby it will take into account all the wishes the wishes of European people and the beliefs
And the Parliament does not or this report does not focus on the democratic deficit instead it deals with European competencies, instead it blindly defends centralization]

In the example above, the speaker draws the analogy between the European Parliament as the representative of citizens and an advocate or spokesperson (*'Anwalt'*) speaking on behalf of his client. Initially, this reiterated personification is not conveyed. The speaker uses the same metaphor three times, always in the same form (*'das EP macht sich / macht sich nicht zum Anwalt'*); the interpreters produce something vague or general to begin with, and later find the semantically

equivalent expression of 'to speak on behalf of', 'to defend'. It can be seen from the interpreters' versions that these linguistic inventions distract the interpreters in their effort to render the sense of the message as accurately and faithfully as possible. Instead of conveying what the speaker may have thought of as an interesting way of expressing his ideas, the TTs tend to turn figurative language, such as personifications, into more 'standard' language.

EU-related concepts and vocabulary.   There are many lexical items which constitute the core of the EU genre and which carry important political meanings for the MEPs. These include some key concepts of parliamentarism such as 'democracy' or 'citizens', as well as issues which are known by the metaphoric concepts 'transparency' and 'openness'. In her introduction, one speaker actually refers to the fact that these concepts are reiterated speech after speech:

◇ ***Example 23 (8.9)***

Original: [Danke Frau Präsidentin!]
Die Forderungen nach Demokratie, Transparenz und Bürgernähe stehen am Beginn
[The demands for democracy transparency and closeness to citizens can be found at the
jeder Debatte über die Regierungskonferenz und die Revision des Vertrages von
start of every debate on the Intergovernmental conference and the revision of the
Maastricht.
Maastrich Treaty.]

En: Thank you, Madame President
The call for transparency, democracy and closeness to citizens are the forefront of *all our debates*
ø ø ø ,

Sv: Ja, tack fru talman
[Yes thank you Madame Chairman
Kraven på demokrati och öppenhet ø stå bakom varje diskussion inför
The demands for democracy and openness underlie every discussion before the
regeringskonferensen   ø ø
Intergovernmental Conference]

Su: Kiitokset, rouva puhemies
Vaatimukset demokratiaa *transaventia ja kansalaisten <ömömöm> oikeuksia vastaan
[The demands for democracy, trans*aventia and against   the rights of the citizens
ovat erittäin tärkeitä
 are very important]

The present study set out from the hypothesis that interpreters are familiar with EU terms and concepts. A comparison of the STs and TTs has revealed numerous examples of EU-related concepts as well as legal terms and expressions that are not conveyed in equivalent terms by the interpreters. The example above shows that some of the most familiar key words may be omitted, or they are not conveyed very clearly. *'Bürgernähe'* (closeness to citizens) is a concept with

significant political weight, yet it is not conveyed by the Swedish interpreter. In the Finnish version, even if the lexical item is vaguely conveyed ('citizens' rights'), the sense of the message is totally distorted ('the demands [...] against citizens' rights are very important').

With reference to the accuracy of interpreting, it can be seen here that the speaker defines the context in very specific terms (*"jeder Debatte über die Regierungskonferenz und die Revision des Vertrages von Maastricht", '*every debate on the Intergovernmental conference and the revision of the Maastrich Treaty'*)*, the interpreters are not equally specific. On the contrary, they generalize (En, Sv) or leave out this unit altogether (Su). Such solutions may be due to the fast rate at which the speaker reads out her speech from notes.

The example below (8.9) is typical of EU genre, where EU terminology and legal terminology are used in a manner which makes the information content of the speech extremely dense. As a result, much of the content of the argumentation is lost in the SI. The same speaker as above (Example 23) continues her speech by criticizing the EU, firstly, for not having involved the citizens in the decision-making process, and secondly, for having taken on too many tasks instead of applying the principle of subsidiarity. The speaker presents the following demand:

*Es muss daher eine **klare** und **nachvollziehbare** Festlegung der **Kompetenzen***
[That's why the competencies of the Union must be fixed in a clear and transparent way
*der **Union** geben, die sich nur und ausschließlich am **Prinzip** des **Erfordernisses** orientiert.* [8.9]
/so that they are/ only and exclusively   oriented on the principle of necessity]

None of the three interpreters has conveyed the lexical unit *'nachvollziehbar'* ('transparent'), although it is one of the core concepts of EU rhetoric that is based on the basic texts of the European Union. It was introduced by President Hänsch in his introductory comment as one of the key issues of the debate. Furthermore, this concept was brought up by a number of subsequent speakers.

The speaker continues by using legal terminology (*'die Beweislast'; 'die vertragliche Festschreibung'*) together with EU concepts (*'die Zentralisierern'; 'der Luxemburger Kompromiss'; 'Transparenz'; 'Recht der Bürger'*):

◇ ***Example 24 (8. 9)***

Original: *Die Beweislast muss im Streitfall bei den Zentralisierern liegen und nicht umgekehrt. Dazu gehört auch **die vertragliche Festschreibung des Luxemburger Kompromisses**, ebenso wie die Grundsätze der Information und Transparenz +ebenso wie die Tatsache, dass die Grundsätze der Information und Transparenz ein Recht der Bürger sein müssen, und nicht nur eine Gnade.*
[In cases of dispute, the burden of proof must be vested with those in favor of centralization, not the other way round. This also includes the * of the Luxembourg compromise with a treaty, [and] similarly the principles of information and transparency +as well as the fact that the principles of information and transparency must be a right of the citizens and not just a favor]

En: <u>There is</u> <u>a</u> <u>need</u> <u>for</u> <u>decentralization</u> / <u>and</u> <u>that</u> <u>of</u> <u>course</u> <u>means</u> <u>a</u> <u>Luxembourg</u> <u>compra</u> <u>+promise as well</u> / <u>As fo</u>r information and transparency <..>being a right of citizens that is obvious too it shouldn't just be a handout.

Sv: <u>Centraliseringen får inte bli avgörande och där har vi Luxembourg- kompromissen</u>
[Centralization must not be the decisive thing and we have the Luxembourg compromise
<u>att bygga på de grundläggande kraven på öppenhet</u> och ø.. <ö> detta är något
 to build on there/ those basic demands for openness and   this is something
som måste vara en rättighet för medborgarna och inte en nåd.
that must be   a right of the citizens   and not a favor.]

Su: ø ø ø <u>ja siksi esimerkiksi</u> Luxembourgin kompromissi pitää sopimuksellisesti
[and that is why for example the Luxemburg compromise must be ratified with a treaty
vahvistaa <u>jos me puhumme informaatiosta ja transparenssista niin meidän täytyy lähteä</u>
if we talk   about information and transparency then we must start from the fact that
<u>siitä että kansalaisilla pitää olla oikeuksia eikä vain</u> <öö> <u>että heidän sallittaisiin tehdä jotain</u>
the citizens must have rights and not just   that they are allowed to do something]

The English and Swedish interpreters do not render the legal expression used by the speaker (*'die Beweislast',* 'the burden of proof'), nor do they convey the essential sense of the propositional content of this segment ('concerning a matter in dispute, the burden of proof is vested with those favoring centralization, and not the other way round'). Instead, they seem to be making inferences of what the speaker intends to say on the basis of what she has said in the previous unit. In that unit she presents a demand on the need to clarify the competencies within the EU. The English interpreter continues by saying "There is a need for decentralization of decision ", while the Swedish interpreter says "Centralization must not be the decisive thing..."; the Finnish interpreter omits this unit altogether.

While lack of knowledge of legal terms and concepts may result in non-correspondencies with the ST, they may also be due to textual features in the original speech. This is what the present study aims to demonstrate by showing text segments that have not been rendered successfully by the three interpreters processing the same text at the same time, under the same conditions. It may be difficult to create a representation of the sense of the message if the speaker refers to isolated issues (*'im Streitfall',* 'in case of conflict'), and actors (*'die Zentralisierern',* 'those for centralization') as well as political items (*'der Luxemburger Kompromiss',* 'the Luxembourg compromise'), which have no metatextual links to previous utterances. As the interpreters have obviously not comprehended the speaker's reasoning, they link their TT versions of the rest of this segment to the preceding unit in a way which distorts the logic of the original argumentation.

 Despite of what was said above, an analysis of the interpreters' versions leads one to the conclusion that mastering EU concepts requires time and exposure to the EU genre. Moreover, the material shows that most (of the newcomer) interpreters experience problems with legal terms,

having a tendency to translate them incorrectly, or not to comprehend the semantic content of legal terms.

This conclusion is further corroborated by an analysis of the other debates that deal with EU issues. One of them is entitled 'Second series of ERDF actions'. The following is a typical utterance, referring to the European Regional Development Fund:

*It is also important in allowing areas which are not **zoned as Objective areas, like 1 or 5b or** whatever, to escape from that straightjacket and put forward their own proposals.* (1.5)

The Finnish and Swedish newly-recruited interpreters are not familiar with EU regional policy, nor with the labels attached to the various funds and subsidies. Consequently, interpreters do not convey them in their TTs.

It should be emphasized here that the material was recorded in spring 1996, only one year after Finland and Sweden had joined the EU. Practically all interpreters in these countries were needed to service the numerous meetings of both the Parliament and the Commission. While they had to pass the recruitment criteria and tests, only a number of them had received training in working for the institutions. Today, the situation is quite different. Interpreters are trained to work in the EU, not only in Finland and Sweden but also in the accession countries. Furthermore, they receive training on-the-job before they commence their work as full-fledged interpreters.

Interpreting into B-languages. As discussed in Chapter 4, 'retour interpreting' was resorted to for the first time in the case of the new official language, Finnish. A different directionality in interpreting brings up phenomena associated with the interpreter's need to quickly retrieve the required terms and concepts. The research material contains instances where EU terms may be familiar even to newcomers, but they are omitted or conveyed in an incomplete form because of problems in speech production. The following is an example of a Finnish ST segment which is not conveyed accurately into the non-mother-tongue 'pivot' language:

Original: Budjettivaliokunta, sosiaali- ja työllisyysasiain valiokunta sekä maataloutta ja maaseudun kehittämistä käsittelevä valiokunta antoivat mietintöön erittäin hyvän lisäpanoksen. [2.1]
[The Committee on Budgetary Control the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment and the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development supplied the report with significant additional substance]

In presenting her report the speaker refers to a number of Community initiatives (which is mentioned in the title of the report) such as Konver, Rechar and RETEX as well as TACIS, PHARE and the Interreg Programmes. Either the acronyms or the reasons for referring to them are only

vaguely conveyed, or not conveyed at all.

Below is an example of the speech by a Finnish politician who was particularly concerned with foreign policy. She was a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Security and Defense Policy. Political rhetoric has the role of persuading and convincing the audience of the integrity of the speaker's stance. In order to achieve this effect, speakers employ political concepts that have specified denotations ('non-alignment'). Furthermore, they refer to cases that are critical for their party group or for their member state (the Baltic Sea). The essential aim for the interpreter, however, is to convey the speaker's point, particularly in cases where an interpreter has to act as a 'pivot' for the rest of the interpreter team.

Sample 6.2.1 (8. 12)

Finnish original	'retour' into German
Olen tyytyväinen siitä	Wir müssen auch
että mietinnössä otetaan huomioon	die besondere Stellung
sotilaallisesti liittoutumattomien	der neutralen Staaten berücksichtigen
maiden erityisasema	
mutta myös niiden mahdollisuus osallistua	und auch ihre M ..ihnen auch
ulko- ja turvallisuuspolitiikan	die Möglichkeit gewähren
muotoiluun	an der <öö> Aussenpolitik
ja täytäntöönpanoon.	mitzuwirken
Liittoutumattomuus	Es ist besonders wichtig
voi palvella Euroopan vakautta.	dass wir de.. <öö> den Ostseeraum
Näin on tällä hetkellä	berücksichtigen
erityisesti Itämeren alueella	denn <er> es ist sehr wichtig
joka on yksi herkimmistä	
ja tärkeimmistä alueista	
yhteisen Euroopan rakentamisen kannalta.	für die zukünftige Entwicklung

Su: [I am pleased about the fact that the report takes into consideration the special position of countries with no military alliances, as well as the opportunity granted to them to participate in the formulation and implementation of foreign and security policy. Non-alliance can serve European stability. At the moment this is particularly the case in the Baltic Sea area which is one of the most sensitive and important areas from the point of view of building a common Europe.]

De: [We must also take into account the special situation of the neutral states and to provide them with the possibility to cooperate in foreign policy. It is particularly important that we take the Baltic Sea area into consideration, because it is very important for future development.]

The English and Swedish TTs, based on the German 'retour', do not convey the speakers message, as can be seen from the transcribed versions (cf. the rough translation above):

En: There is also a need for citizens to have a possibility of having a say in foreign policy // it is particularly important for us to consider the Baltic Sea Area because it is crucial for development in those countries /

Sv: och vi måste också ge möjlighet att medverka till utrikespolitiska åtgärder / det är speciellt viktigt att vi tar hänsyn till Östersjöområdet / det är mycket viktigt för den framtida utväcklingen /
[and we must also give the possibility to cooperate in foreign policy affairs / it is particularly important for us to consider the Baltic Sea Area / it is very important for future development]

The above example has been selected here as representative of the non-correspondences that characterize most of the 'retour' TTs in the research material. It has to be borne in mind, again, that the STs were written and read from scripts without pauses or marked emphasis on individual terms, concepts or other keywords.[8]

Acronyms.   Reference has been made above to acronyms. They are typical for most institutions and organizations, and the EP is no exception to this rule. In the segment below, in addition to using a political term ('a *neutral* country') the speaker refers to the WEU (the Western European Union) and the UN (United Nations) Charter.

> **Original** : *By voting for these, a **neutral** country like Ireland will be able, in a constructive way, to make available its expertise for peace-keeping and humanitarian operations undertaken by **the WEU** in conformity with **the UN Charter** without commitments to any other type of military activity.*
> [8.13]

Interpreters equip themselves with lists of acronyms, but, as the following example shows, this may not always guarantee that they are recognized and produced with an equivalent acronym in the target language. The speaker below has been discussing the role of Ireland in peace-keeping and humanitarian operations. She then moves on to discuss the Common Foreign and Security Policy, CFSP.

> ◇ **Example 25 (8. 13)**
>
> **Original**: *In my view, `CFSP must be about` strengthening peace and security, recognizing `the broader contribution  to security` that can be made `by` economic progress, the removal `of` the causes `of` conflict `through` the fight `against` crime and drugs, and the protection of the environment.*

---

[8] As has been mentioned elsewhere, Finnish MEPs tended to make sure that interpreters had a text of their written speech.

De: Meines Erachtens muss **die GASPE** dazu führen, Sicherheit und Frieden zu 🔊
[In my view CFSP must lead to the the strengthening of security and peace
stärken indem hier auch der größere Beitrag ø ø für den Frieden berücksichtigt wird /
while here a major contribution to piece is taken into account, too
dies kann zum wesentlichen Fortschritt führen / Konfliktherde können ausgeräumt
this can lead to considerable progress causes of conflict can be removed
werden / Verbrechen /Drogenhandel können bekämpft werden und die Umwelt kann
there can be fight against crime drug trafficking   and environment can be protected]
geschützt werden.

Sv: ø Och det måste här handla om att stärka fred och säkerhet // man måste också inse
[And here we must deal with strengthening peace and security / we must also see that
att ekonomiska framsteg kan stärka säkerheten //att konflikthärdar undandröjs // kampen
economic progress can strengthen security causes of conflikt are removed fight
mot narkotika brottslighet och skyddet av miljön //   🔊
 against drugs criminality and protection of the environment]

Su: [ja tässä mielessä <öö ..öö> me emme halua osallistua laajoihin sotilaallisiin
[and in this sense   we do not want to take part in extensive military   🔊
toimenpiteisiin] *vaan haluamme ainoastaan vaan lujittaa ja vahvistaa rauhaa* ja <öö> tämä

activities what we want instead is simply only to enforce and solidify peace]
<..ö..>_ tottakai aiheuttaa myöskin tai johtaa myöskin taloudelliseen kehitykseen // *meidän täytyy*

myöskin vastustaa rikollisuutta ja huumeita ja <öö> säilyttää ympäristömme terveenä.

The German interpreter recognizes the acronym 'CFSP' (*'die GASPE'*), whereas the Swedish interpreter does not. By referring to 'here' (*'här'*) the interpreter creates a deixis with the preceding segment which also deals with securing peace. The Finnish interpreter's version seems like guessing and inferencing, based on the previous segment, without having any semantic equivalence with the ST segment. The acronym 'CFSP' was at the time – and still is – one of the acronyms that are an integral part of the EU Treaties, and one that all interpreters working for the EP could be expected to know.

Even the most frequent abbreviations may not be accurately rendered by the interpreters, as in the following example, where the speaker refers to the Common Agricultural Program of the EU, the CAP:

◇ **Example 26 (8. 5)**

Original: *However,to go down the route suggested in this report opens the possibility of* **tinkering with funding for individual CAP programs on a yearly basis,** *thereby provoking greater instability for European agriculture, for farms throughout the European Union, for our food industry and for rural communities across the European Union.* 🔊

De: <u>Wenn man aber noch weiter geht in dem Bericht</u> dann erkennt man dass es die
[If one goes still further in the report then one will recognize that there is the
Möglichkeit gibt <u>dass auch einzelne ø Programme <mm..> finanziert werden können</u>
possibility   that also   individual   programs   can be financed   on a
<u>auf täglicher Basis</u> / *das wäre Instabilität für die Agrarpolitik in der Gemeinschaft* für unsere
daily basis   That would /mean/ instability for the agricultural policy in the Union for our
Bauern für unsere Nahrungsindustrie ø ø in der ganzen Union, -
farmers for our food industry   across the Union]

Sv: Men om man går<..>slår i på den vägen som betänkandet föreslår då öppnas
[But to go down the route suggested by the report   opens the
möjlighet **att man kan manipulera med finansiering inom** <u>olika</u> ø program ø och
possibility of manipulating with funding   within the different programs and
därmed skapar man ytterligare instabilitet för det europeiska jordbruket / för bondgårdar i
thereby creating   added   instability for   European   agriculture / for farms
 hela EU för livsmedelsindustrin och för landsbygdssamhällen i hela unionen.
across the EU for the food industry and for rural communities across the Union]

Su: <u>mutta jos me ajattelemme pidemmälle niin meidän täytyy tunnustaa se</u> että on
[but   if we think   further   then we have to confess that there is
olemassa mahdollisuus että <u>voidaan luoda myöskin yksitt<.. > voidaan rahoittaa yksittäisiä</u>
the possibility that individual programs can also be created ... funded
ø ohjelmia. *Se johtaa kuitenkin epätasapainoiseen tilanteeseen < öö.. >*
        That will lead to an unbalanced situation however
maatalouspolitiikassa maataloudessa / elintarviketeollisuudessa ø ø koko unionin alueella [- - -]
in agricultural policy   in agriculture /   in the food industry   across all of the Union area]

Interpreters may concentrate on rendering 'the sense of the message' to such a degree that they decide to skip such qualifiers as the acronym 'CAP' ('Common Agricultural Program'). They may even expect that, because of the context, listeners automatically associate the EU-related concept 'programme' with 'CAP', as agriculture is the topic of this speech segment. This example shows that translation accuracy tends to suffer in a rapid stream of ST speech, complicated by a relatively dense syntax (the unit in bold), as well as colorful expressions ('*tinkering* with funding') in collocation with EU terminology (CAP programs).

This example takes us to certain syntactic features which, according to SI literature, make SI more difficult.

6.2.3 Source Text linguistic structure: Syntax

Beginning with the earliest studies of SI cited here,[9] a complex syntactic structure has been regarded as one decisive factor that makes SI more difficult. The speech segment below illustrates the difficulty of rendering a speech in the SI mode if it is delivered with the syntax of literary language (indicated by underlining). The segment reads as follows:

---

[9] Oléron and Nanpon (1965/2002)

◇ *Example 27 (8.2)*

Original : *Dieses wollen und müssen wir ändern.*

Notwendig ist es, die Methode von Robert Schumann und Jean Monnet anzuwenden.
Nicht die Aufrechterhaltung des Gleichgewichts der Interessen der europäischen Nationen, sondern die Vereinigung der Interessen der europäischen Völker `ist in der Lage, den großen Herausforderungen gerecht zu werden.`
[Not the maintenance of the balance of the interests of the European nations but the unification of the interests of the European peoples will make it possible to live up to the great challenges]
En: ⌀⌀⌀⌀⌀
We .. have to respect the interests of the Member States certainly,
but we must see them as being more than a sum of their constituent parts.
This is something we must strive for to see the big picture.

Sv: Och det vill och måste vi ändra på / det är nödvändigt att man använder<xx> Robert
 [And that we want and must change. It is necessary that the methods of Robert
Schumans och Jean Monnets metoder / man ska inte bibehålla genom jämnvikten för
Schumann and Jean Monnet are applied. /We/ must not maintain through the balance for
nationernas intressen man ska ena de europeiska folkens intressen /det är det som är
national interests /we/ must unite the European peoples' interests. That is the great
den stora utmaningen för oss.
challenge for us]

Su: Meidän täytyy estää se
[We must prevent that
Meidän täytyy käyttää Schumannin ja Jean Monet'n <.. ö.. > sanoja
we must use Schumann's and Jean Monnet's words
se että pidetään tasapaino yllä Euroopan tasolla ei ole pelkästään tavoite vaan meidän
 that balance is maintained on the European level is not only a goal but we
täytyy myöskin pysty.. pyrkiä yhdistämään Euroopan kansat.
must also be abl.. aim at uniting the peoples of Europe]

The speaker uses various devices which have the purpose of creating textual cohesion primarily in written style. First, he uses much deixis, referring back to something which he has said earlier (*"Dieses wollen und müssen wir ändern."* 'This is something that we want and must change.'). He refers to the great challenges he has discussed previously ("[...], *den grossen Herausforderungen gerecht zu werden.*" '[makes it possible] to do justice to the great challenges'). A second element creating text-internal cohesion is the reiteration of the word *'Interesse'* ('interest'). A further device typical of literary style is the use of marked syntactic constructions like (*nicht* + noun – *sondern* + noun) in order to highlight the main argument.

Judging by the TTs in the research corpus, these cohesive devices often lead to problems in SI. Since the segment above does not contain difficult terms or concepts, it must be the complicated syntax that has prevented the interpreters from getting a clear representation of the main points. The clause beginning with the negative (*'nicht'*) has a head word which is a nominalized verb (*'die Aufrechterhaltung'*) with an object in the genitive form (*'des Gleichgewichts'*); the object is modified

by a double genitive (*'der Interessen der europäischen Nationen'*). The parallel clause beginning with the word *'sondern'* has the same structure. This construction is followed by the predicate group *'ist in der Lage, den grossen Herausforderungen gerecht zu werden'.*

The complexity of the syntactic structure may explain why the English interpreter does not convey the names of Schumann and Monnet. After all, their role as the founding fathers of the EU is one of the first things people have to learn if they apply for a job at the EU. However, his version of the segment can be seen as a perfect example of an attempt to retrieve the sense of the message without trying to reproduce the original syntax of lexicon.

Attention has been paid to the omission of the names of the two authorities because their use serves as an example of a traditional rhetorical technique. By referring to authorities who are appreciated by everyone in the audience the speaker gives weight to his claims. This method is also used to win the audience's adherence to the speaker's message as discussed by Perelman (e.g. 1969/1971: 305–310). Therefore it is not insignificant whether the names are conveyed in the SI or not.

German segments have been provided here as examples of complicated syntax. English arguments may have a dense syntax as well, as in the following example:

◇ *Example 28 (8.6)*

Original: *Amendment 207 would offend the fundamental principles of the Single Act and fail to complete the internal market **in energy, telecoms, and postal services.** It offends long-standing principles of competition.*

De: ø ø Und dann<..>wenn man den Wettbewerb nicht<..>schützt dann würde man den
[And then if /we/ do not protect competition then
Binnenmarkt in Gefahr bringen / den ganzen Wettbewerb
the Internal Market would be brought under threat / all competition]

Sv: 207 skulle ... ändra på de grundläggande principerna o..och det skulle helt
[207 would   alter   the fundamental   principles   and it would totally
 snedvrida ø ø **telekommunikationsmarknaden** // **posttjänstmarknaden** till
distort   the telecommunications market, the postal services market
exempel.
for example]

Su: ø ø Jos me<ö.. emme ö.> suojaa kilpailua niin silloin me vaarannamme sisämarkkinat *ja koko kilpailun*
[If we do not protect competition then we will put the internal market and the whole competition at risk]

Original*: We are emphatically opposed to this and we will vote against.*

De: Wir sind dagegen deswegen werden wir auch dagegen stimmen / Danke.
[We are against it therefore we are going to   vote against it.   Thank you.]

Sv: Vi är mot sådana förvridningar / vi kommer att rösta mot detta förändringsförslag.
[We are against such distortions we shall vote against this amendment proposal]

Su: ja siksi me olemme tätä vastaan ø ø.
[and that is why we are against this]

This segment as a whole contains eight elements that need to be processed by the speech comprehension and production systems with the added translation task: 1) a term ('Amendment'); 2) a figure (207); 3) a modal verb ('would') + the predicate verb ('offend'); 4) a genitive construction with a premodifier and an EU term ('the fundamental principles *of the Single Act*'); 5) parataxis ('and'); 6) an elliptic infinitive construction ('fail to complete'); 7) the object, again an EU term ('the internal market'); 8) a list of terms ('energy, telecoms, and postal services') linked to the previous element with the preposition 'in'. Some of these items do not have a direct equivalent in the other languages ('fail to complete', 'telecoms').

Some elements enhancing the argumentation are missing in the TTs above. From the point of view of the purpose of the argumentation, the omission of the reference to Amendment 207 in the German and Finnish versions can be considered a failure in accuracy. The listeners of the German TT may not have had a clear idea of what the speaker is against and what he will vote against. The Swedish TT does not have the headword of the genitive construction ("the fundamental principles *of the Single Act*" – "de grundläggande principerna" *ø ø*) so that it is up to the listener to infer what principles are being referred to. The Finnish TT is an example of how the interpreter may choose to concentrate on the main points of the speech ('If we do not protect competition we will endanger the Internal Market and competition as a whole – and therefore I am against this.') The specifying elements of the segment are omitted ('energy, telecoms, and postal services') as well as the reference to the Amendment and its number.

6.2.4 Summary of the results

The analysis of the debate on the IGC report has shown that the SI target texts do not convey consistently the various elements of the ST argumentation consisting of:

    a. a clearly planned argumentative structure, which contains

    b. claims supported by specifying examples and references; as well as

    c. terms and concepts; as well as

    d. speech acts.

Furthermore, the rhetoric devices used by the speakers, such as figurative speech, is frequently not conveyed, or it is conveyed in such a manner that the effect of the device is lost. Syntactic elements having pragmatic relevance such as logical connectors are either omitted or added.

The study set out from the hypotheses that interpreters would be familiar with both the topic of the debate and the terms and concepts typically used in discussing EU institutional issues. The results of the analysis therefore raise sub-question 2: If the argumentation, the speech act, and the relevant vocabulary are not rendered in the TT, are there some ST features that explain the lack of equivalence between the ST and TT?

Factors influencing the accuracy of interpreting. Various potential reasons for failures to convey the full sense of the original message have been discussed in this chapter. They relate to the theoretical premise of the study: If professional interpreters are familiar with the topic of the meeting as well as with the related vocabulary, they should not be hampered by comprehension problems; consequently, they should be able to create a representation of the incoming message and convey its sense in a coherent way in the target language.

One important factor determining the degree of equivalence between the ST argumentation and the TT versions seems to be **the amount of exposure to the EU genre**. Interpreters with less experience of the EU genre may not have accumulated mental models of the themes and topics of the on-going debates. What they also lack is a (mental) store of EU terms and concepts that has been corroborated through frequent use and that could be activated during the SI task, as modeled by Setton (see Chapter 2). The TT versions of the Nordic interpreters show that, although they have passed the tests accrediting them to work for the EP, the information-handling system of a newly recruited interpreter is not yet ready to cope with the cognitive load of the speeches, or with the rate at which they are presented.

While interpreters' competence is an integral component constituting SI quality, a key factor explaining the lack of equivalence concerning the elements listed above is the fact that the **speeches are read from manuscripts**. This is linked with syntactic structures as well as stylistic features which are typical of written language. A case in point are metaphors and other types of figurative speech, which do not lend themselves easily to the SI mode of translation. Rather than making the claim more effective, the metaphor, as it appears in the TTs, may confuse the listener, making him wonder what the speaker is trying to say. Sometimes interpreters opt at omitting complicated metaphors altogether; instead of attempting to render them, interpreters decide to infer the propositional content of the segment containing figurative language.

The material shows that shortcomings in the sense consistency of TTs, compared with STs, are to a large extent due to the above ST features. The following elements reduce the degree of equivalence between STs and TTs:

1. Speeches are read from manuscripts;

2. Speeches are presented at a fast rate, where there are fewer pauses than in impromptu speech; furthermore, the pauses are short.

3. Speeches that have been written in advance tend to be formulated in language that is typical of written texts, i.e.:

   - ideas are expressed in long and complicated sentences;

   - the syntax is dense, including extended genitive constructions, agent structures and groups of qualifiers with a high information load.

The negative effects of these factors on the interpreter's performance have been discussed in SI literature (e.g. Gerver 1969, Seleskovitch 1982, Lederer 1978/2002), yet the practice of reading out written speeches from manuscripts continues.

The research question relating to SI quality has been formulated as follows: Do the TTs convey the ST argumentation in such a way that the listener will be able to constitute a representation of the ST message which is equivalent to the one he would have constituted had he been listening to the original speech? On the basis of the above analysis and the results, the answer is: yes and no. This answer will be further elaborated in the Conclusions of Chapter 6.

6.2.5 Questions to the Council and the Commission

Introduction.   Oral and written questions to the Council and the Commission are an integral part of the plenary sitting agenda. Examples of these debates have been included in the study, firstly, in order to see whether the speeches display different characteristics from the debates based on reports. Secondly, they have been studied with a view of analyzing whether they bring forth different aspects relating to SI quality criteria.

In his Ph.D. dissertation *Party group behavior in the European Parliament* (1996), Tapio Raunio discusses at length the institution of parliamentary questions in the EP and the usage of it by the MEPs (1996: 162–226). According to Raunio, theoretical literature on the function of parliamentary questions lists the following reasons as the most important ones[10]:

---

[10] Raunio (1996: 168); reference is made to Franklin and Norton (eds.) 1993, *Parliamentary Questions*, Wiberg 1991, *Analysis and Politics*; and Wiberg and Koura 1994)

a) tabling questions is something the MPs are supposed to be doing;

[the function of the questions is that of]

b) asking for information;

c) getting the executive to make a formal statement and pressing it for action;

d) defending or promoting constituency or sectorial interests; and

e) informing the policy makers of problems they might be unfamiliar with.

Raunio refers to the Maastricht Treaty, which obliges the Commission to answer Parliament's questions (Article 140). The Council is under no such obligation. It has only agreed to answer questions. (ibid.: 173) Raunio quotes Martin Westlake, who makes the following comment about the nature of the question time in the EP:

Question-time was bound to be a pale imitation of the lively debates in the British House of Commons in a culturally diverse Parliament *where debates had to be interpreted through earphones*, where there was no government and opposition and, above all, where there was no prime minister. (ibid.: 174) (my italics)

According to Westlake, lack of liveliness of the question-time debates is partly due to the fact that debates "have to be interpreted through earphones". In many interpreters' experience, this is a common view of SI; machines do the job rather than people with a limited processing capacity.

Another reason for the different quality of the EP question-times is the fact that Commissioners take turns in answering the questions, which means that the answers to the MEPs' follow-up questions may be rather general. This is particularly common when the member of the institution is not an expert on the specific issue. Consequently, the procedure of written questions has been more popular. (ibid.)

Raunio focuses on written questions which are answered in writing. However, the EP plenary agenda also has an item called 'written questions', which are answered orally in the meeting and which can be complemented by a short follow-up question. These are presented spontaneously, which means that the syntax may be more simple than that of planned speeches.

The design for analyzing the sessions on oral and written questions is the following:

Theoretical premise: The interpreter's knowledge of the topic of the meeting and of the relevant vocabulary will facilitate the cognitive task of simultaneous interpretation.

This theoretical premise is tested on the basis of empirical material produced in the same setting and under the same conditions as the material discussed earlier.

Hypothesis: Because of the large number of diverse topics interpreters may not share the background knowledge underlying the speeches of the MEPs and the representatives of the Council/Commission. Therefore, the interpreters' versions of the STs may contain more omissions, discontinuities and errors than have been observed in the TTs of topics known to interpreters.

The documents distributed to interpreters contain the written versions of the questions. In 1996, interpreters received them in their booths prior to the beginning of the session. This provided interpreters with an opportunity to glance at the questions before they were discussed.

Research question: Do interpreters convey the sense of the speakers' questions with sufficient accuracy for the addressee(s) to understand their point?

The question can be at least partly answered by the responses provided by the representatives of the two institutions.

The analysis below focuses on ST argumentation. Attention is first paid to issues relating to the Council and its role in the EU (a. Oral questions to the Council). Elements enhancing the argumentation are also studied. Cohesive elements supporting the logic of the argumentation are also analyzed. Source texts are then compared with the interpreters' versions in order to study to what extent these elements are conveyed by the interpreters.

The remaining part of this chapter (b. Written questions to the Council; c. Questions to the Commission) discusses the issue of interpreters' language proficiency in the light of the hypothesis and the research question.

a. Oral questions to the Council

The research corpus contains four oral questions to the Council concerning the United Nations Human Rights Commission meeting that was forthcoming in Geneva. Three speeches are in German and one in English. The recording was made March 13, 1996.[11] The questions are submitted to the Council in written form; they are also distributed as meeting documents. In 1996 they were formulated as follows:

---

[11] Verbatim report of the proceedings, March 1996, Tuesday II – Wednesday I.

ORAL QUESTION 0-0058/96 Pursuant to Rule 40 of the Rules of Procedure
by Ariel Oostlander, James Moorehouse and Marlene Lenz, on behalf of the PPE Group to the Council

Subject: Human rights issues to be raised at the UN Commission on Human Rights in Geneva in March–April 1996

"At the spring session of the UN Commission on Human Rights, what will be the Council's priorities and in what way will the Council take into account Parliament's resolutions? Will we see a renewed attempt to achieve a resolution on China (a resolution which failed by one vote in 1995), given Parliament's resolutions on human rights abuses in that country?

Will the case of Iran be raised, given that the 'critical dialogue' between the Troika and Iran has yielded no visible result so far and the Teheran Government continues to persecute citizens belonging to religious and other minorities, while waging an assassination campaign against political opponents inside and outside the country? Will the Council take an active part in the debate to identify effective ways and means to promote respect for human rights all over the world?"

An understanding of the function and purpose of the question-time speeches is an essential angle for analyzing their argumentation. Raunio provides the following statement as a motivation for the MEPs to present questions: "Parliamentary questions, one of the freest forms of activity in modern legislatures, gives the individual representative an excellent chance of promoting and defending those issues which he or she regards important." (ibid.: 166)

This statement is confirmed by the speeches of the present corpus. *Democracy* and *human rights* are two of the core values which are defended by MEPs. The oral questions relating to the Human Rights Commission aim at reminding the Council of the importance that the EP, the Member States, the citizens and the rest of the world attach to human rights.

Main elements of argumentation: A close analysis of one speech.   The speeches analyzed in Chapter 6.1 are part of joint debates based on reports. The analysis focused on the argumentation of the speeches in order to retrieve the 'gist' of the message. If two or all three interpreters failed to convey the point of an argument or a segment which is relevant from the point of view of the overall reasoning, the segment was selected for closer analysis. It has been assumed here that failures in parallel TTs in the same segment of the same ST will provide empirical data about textual features that hamper or obstruct an accurate rendering of the ST. The sample speech on the opposite page has been analyzed in full, the aim being to have a detailed look at one speech and its interpreted versions. This procedure was chosen, because in the case of oral questions there is no 'joint debate'. The question is presented, after which the Member of the Council answers the question (or in the case of 'Questions to Commission', a Member of the Commission).

The first speech of the debate is transcribed in full below (Sample 6.2.2). It is included here in order to highlight the constraints involved in the simultaneous mode of translation. The TTs contained omissions as well as various types of shifts in the form and content of the original message. Lexical items and segments which were not conveyed successfully by at least two interpreters have been printed in bold.

◇ **Sample 6.2.2 (Speech 9. 1)** 🔊

Frau Präsidentin, Wir haben gestern Kommisionspräsident Santer zu dem Verlauf und den Ergebnissen des Asiengipfeltreffens gehört, **obwohl** und obwohl auch da die Menschenrechte angesprochen wurden, so sagte er war es ein Gipfel der Harmonie. **Aber** – so sagte er auch, **und so habe ich es auch verstanden** – hätten wir, das heisst die anwesenden Europäer, auf Lösungen bestanden, wäre es ein Fiasko geworden.

Und um dieses noch zu verdeutlichen: **jetzt schon droht uns China wenn die Europäische Union** in Genf die Verurteilung Chinas wegen Menschenrechtsverletzungen vom letzten Jahr wiederholt. Besser könnte man die Zwiespältigkeit, vor der die Europäische Union angesichts der Menschenrechtssituation steht, kaum ausdrücken: Auf der einen Seite die Notwendigkeit, die auch bejaht wird, der Zusammenarbeit aus wirtschaftlichen, sondern auch aus sicherheitspolitischen Gründen, andererseits die harte Realität dessen, was wirklich geschieht. Diese seltsame Zwiespältigkeit beherrscht unsere Politik.

Es gibt zu den Menschenrechten hervorragende Erklärungen **des Rates**, der Kommission, die sehr gute Dokumente vorgelegt hat. Es gibt den Vertrag von Maastricht. Es gibt die Vorlagen zur Regierungskonferenz, über die wir heute auch im Europäischen Parlament abgestimmt haben. Sie alle sprechen von der Beachtung der Menschenrechte, von Grundrechten, von Menschenrechtsklauseln für Drittstaaten.

Andererseits, was macht China? **Es gibt eklatante Menschenrechtsverletzungen, wie Verhaftung** und Ausweisung für solche, **die die Informations- und Meinungsfreiheit ernst nehmen. Von Misshandlungen** und Beschneidigungen der Persöhnlichkeitsrechte von Frauen und behinderten Kindern und von Kindern, die das falsche Geschlecht haben, nämlich Mädchen.

Der tibetanische Professor Renposche hat uns eine beeindruckende Schilderung der Unterdrückung des tibetanischen Volkes **vor zwei Tagen gegeben** aber er hat auch bestätigt, dass asiatische Religionen sehr wohl die Beachtung der Persönlichkeitsrechte kennen. Ein agressives China wiederum schießt mit scharfen Raketen bei Übungen, die die demokratische Wahl in Taiwan behindern sollen.

Was wird das Schicksal HongKongs sein?

Iran sucht den Dialog, die Europäische Union sagt "kritischen Dialog" Iran wünscht aber keine Kritik und zeigt Verständnis für Hamas, **die die furchtbaren Attentate in Israel verursachte. Gleichzeitig wendet sich aber Iran "sanft" gegen Terrorismus, natürlich bei Erhaltung der Fatwa. Was ist mit Irak**? Was ist mit Syrien?Wie geht es in Tschetschenien? **Hier gibt es Krieg durch** ein Land, Russland, das gerade dem Europarat beigetreten ist.

Es gibt Sklavenarbeit, Menschenhandel – die Liste wurde jetzt schon von anderen ergänzt. Für mich gehört auch Kuba dazu, auch Ex-Jugoslawien, vor allen Dingen Bosnien.

Wir wollen die EU nach Osten erweitern. Wir sollten wissen, dass wir am eigenen Maßstab gemessen werden; und daher auch unsere Sorge und Frage an den Rat: Wie wird der Rat in Genf auftreten? Welche Prioritäten wird er setzen? Wird er den Mut haben, seine Haltung vom letzten Jahr beizubehalten?

Unsere Mitgliedstaaten haben **über den Rat** nicht nur die Verantwortung für ihre eigenen Interessen, sondern immer stärker auch für die Europäische Union, wenn sie glaubwürdig bleiben wollen.

Vierzehn Tage vor der Regierungskonferenz über die Fortentwicklung der Europäischen Union wird die Öffentlichkeit sie auch an dieser Frage messen. Wer Vertrauen verlangt von den Menschen, muss auch Vertrauen durch die eigene Handlungen und nicht durch Zwiespältigkeit schaffen. Deswegen erwarten wir eine Antwort des Rates. Vielen Dank.

The sample speech 9.1 is representative of the oral questions which are delivered in the EP. The MEP is addressing the Council, which will represent European views in the UN meeting. The European representatives demonstrate their awareness of violations of human rights in different parts of the world. The speaker first refers to the Asian summit that the President of the Commission had reported on the previous day. In the main body of her speech she raises many examples. These serve to enhance her main argument, according to which the EU institutions should adopt a firm stance against human rights' violations. The speaker criticizes the EU Council for having a double standard in this issue. She also accuses the Council representatives for not having presented their criticism of the human rights' violations clearly enough at the Asian summit. She adds more weight to her argument by pointing at countries where the problem is present: first, China, second, Iran, third, Irak, fourth, Syria, and fifth, Chechnya and Russia.

The speaker lists a number of examples of violations of human rights. Since this segment gave rise to many omissions, discontinuities and errors in the interpreters' versions, it has been studied more carefully by transcribing the interpreters' TTs as well. The original ST meaning units and the corresponding elements of the TTs are transcribed in the form of a propositional table.

The speaker reads from her notes, though at a moderate rate. TT versions do not convey the sense of the original ST in a consistent way. The factual information is either vaguely conveyed or mistranslated. A close analysis of the various non-correspondences can be found in Tables i. and ii. at the end of Chapter 6.

There are some basic rhetoric devices that constitute the essence of the message. The speaker makes use of various devices in order to add weight to her claims. She provides examples of violations of human rights, beginning the segment with "*wie*" ('such as') (4 – 11), introducing them in groups of two ([4] "*Verhaftung und Ausweisung*", 'arrest and deportation' ; [6] "*Informations- und Meinungsfreiheit*" 'freedom of speech and of thought'). The English interpreter does not convey the cohesive device '*wie*', nor the specific lexical items ([4] omitted, [6] 'human rights'). The Finnish interpreter omits the main claim ([3]'there are flagrant violations of human rights'), conveying one concept of each of the noun groups ([4]'deportation of people [6] who take freedom of thought seriously').

The speaker enhances her argumentation with further examples: 'assaults and restriction of the human rights of women and handicapped children, as well as of children who are of the wrong

gender, that is, of girls'. The English interpreter omits this example ([7–8] 'assaults and restrictions of human rights'), introducing 'being imprisoned for human rights' at this point instead. The Finnish interpreter turns the example into a vague reference ([9–10] 'and if we think of the weak position of women and handicapped children'). The Swedish interpreter mistranslates this segment ([1–11] 'But regarding China, [3] nothing is done. Chinese [6] applying for asylum are being deported, and it is accepted how women and handicapped children are being treated, as well as children who are of the wrong gender'). The passive form utterance contains strange deixes, first in [3], which could refer to the Parliament or to the international community in general, and second in [7] "*man accepterar*", 'it is accepted', where it is difficult to know who or what body is being referred to.

The speaker further enhances her argumentation by referring to an authority and expert on the issue who had given a talk on the repression of Tibetan people in the Parliament a few days earlier (12–18). The English interpreter omits this, conveying only an isolated reference ([14] "And violations of human rights in Tibet."). The interpreter renders the utterance as an addition to the previous statement ("Flagrant violations of human rights [...]"). The Finnish interpreter refers to this authority, although not very accurately ([12] 'and if we think of the professor of Tibet'), omitting the name. The Swedish interpreter mistranslates again. Instead of referring to the speaker as 'professor' she calls him the 'ambassador' [16]. And the qualifier 'impressive' ([13] '*beeindruckend*') is rendered as 'awful' ([13] '*fruktansvärd'*) in the Swedish SI.

The speaker next moves to the theme that is high up on the EP agenda, i.e. democracy. The claim of the argument (19–21) is that China is launching rockets/missiles in order to hinder democratic elections in Taiwan. This claim is not conveyed by the interpreters. An MEP listening to the Swedish TT would have raised his eyebrows at the Swedish TT claiming that [19–20]*"Kina det aggressiva Kina skjuter ju omkring Taiwan"* ('China, the aggressive China is, of course, shooting around in Taiwan'). The speaker then asks: [22] 'What will happen to Hong Kong?' The question is omitted by the English interpreter. The Swedish interpreter says: [22] 'The same thing is going to happen to Hong Kong', linking this claim to the previous one [19–20] on Taiwan. The Finnish interpreter conveys a question in Finnish that can be considered almost equivalent with the original ([22] 'What will be Hong Kong's future'). What detracts from complete equivalence is the use of the word 'future' instead of 'fate', which does not change the sense of the utterance in any relevant way from the point of view of the overall argumentation.

The speaker introduces her next claim by saying [23] 'Iran is seeking dialogue', adding that [24] 'European Union says "critical dialogue"'. The Swedish interpreter's rendering distorts the roles of the actors in stating [23–24] 'The EU says that we should have a critical dialogue (but Iran for example does not want to have any critical dialogue'). Where the speaker says [26] '[Iran] sympathizes with Hamas', the English interpreter says [26] "and they have their views [...]". The

Swedish interpreter says something which does not correspond with the sense of the original: [26] 'money continues to be given to Hamas'. The speaker goes on to refer to Iran and its stance toward terrorism, claiming that [29–30] Iran has adopted a soft approach toward terrorism by keeping the Fatwa. The Swedish interpreter produces something quite nonsensical in saying [30] *"Iran har fortfarande en fatwa mot Kina."* ('Iran continues to have a fatwa against China'). The English SI is rather obscure ([29–30] "Quite apart from the continued existence of Fatwa"). The Finnish SI captures the gist of the claim in saying [29–30] '*Irani does not fight against terrorism; instead, it accepts Fatwa'. (For some reason the interpreter says 'Irani' instead of Iran which is the Finnish form of the name, too.)

Next, the speaker introduces three questions (31–33) referring to three different countries ('What about Iraq? What about Syria? What about Chechnya?). The English and Finnish interpreters omit the first one (31), Iraq. The final claim of the sample states [34–35] 'Here there is war through one country, Russia, Russia that has just entered the Council of Europe'. The accusation against Russia as the originator of the war is not conveyed by the interpreters. The Swedish SI comes closest to conveying the speaker's point in saying [34] 'What is Russia doing in Chechnya?'. The Finnish version says [34] 'There is war in /some part of/ Russia'. The English version omits reference to war altogether [34] "This is a country, Russia which has [...]"

Apart from being dense with references to various proper names and concepts relating to the theme of her intervention, the speech lacks metatextual elements for linking the various items, or for foregrounding them. The speech is an impressive list of issues that the speaker perhaps expects the addressees to have the required background information for, and therefore it is not necessary to elaborate on them.

From the point of view of SI method, such a list of claims, surrounded by some additional informative material, requires an excellent command of the source language. The interpreter must be able to find the corresponding expressions and lexical items immediately in the TL in order to be able to convey the original accurately. Accuracy is the result of a fast translation and speech production process. If the interpreter's command of the language is not sufficient, the resulting TT may abound in omissions and errors. The number of errors increases if the interpreter does not know the terms and concepts of international politics or world affairs.

Besides the factual information, the speech also contains linguistic information for the recipients. The discussion above deals with TT errors relating to the informational content of the speech. Shlesinger (1995) and Setton (1999) have attracted attention to shifts in cohesion in SI. Shlesinger observed that shifts[12] occur particularly in cohesive devices that are perceived as not

---

[12] Shlesinger uses the term 'shift' to refer to cases where a cohesive device appearing in the source text is omitted or replaced by one from a different category. (1995:196)

essential to the informational content of the text. Conjunctions are a case in point. She discusses the difference between formal equivalence (a matching of surface forms) and functional equivalence (a matching of the ways in which the text will be used and understood) (ibid.: 195).

Conjunctions like the ones in the speech above (9.1), *'obwohl'* ('[al]though') and *'aber'* ('but') have functional equivalents in the four languages concerned, yet they are not rendered consistently by the interpreters. The fact that the speaker repeats the conjunction *'obwohl'* provides the listener with the cue that the point the speaker is aiming at will follow in the statement to come. 'But' is often used in the same sense as 'however' to indicate something which is contrary to what has been said before. Therefore this conjunction, too, helps the listener to follow the speaker's reasoning, and to expect an argument that expresses the speaker's point.'

The speaker concludes her speech by reminding the audience of the Council's role:

Original: *Unsere Mitgliedstaaten haben **über den Rat** nicht nur die Verantwortung für ihre eigenen Intressen, sondern immer stärker auch für die Europäische Union, wenn sie glaubwürdig bleiben wollen.* [9.1]
[Our Member States have not only the responsibility for their own interests via the Council but also a growing /responsibility/ for the European Union if they want to retain their credibility]

This is a key point of the question to the Council. In what follows, the speaker also refers to the general public. As discussed by Raunio, one of the motivations to present parliamentary questions, and one of their main functions, is to alert the media and the general public – the voters – to issues that an M(E)P considers important. The speaker stresses the point that it is the Council on which the Member States can rely. The recurring themes of trust and credibility are taken up in this context. Therefore, from the point of view of sense consistency with the original message, it would have been crucial to include the reference to the Council in the SI version of the ST. Yet none of the interpreters has done that.

An analysis of the remaining three speeches confirms the above observations. On the one hand, speakers may not realize what mental agility it takes to convey densely packed arguments on-line into another language; on the other hand, interpreters may not always have the required training and experience to analyze political language and the motives and goals underlying it. A couple of examples will corroborate this conclusion.

The oral questions to the Council concerned the UN conference on Human Rights, a forum that meets on a regular basis in Geneva. The argument of the question below refers to the basic purpose of the conference:

◇ *Example 29 (9.2)*

Original*:* Der Einsatz der Menschenrechte und für die Rechte ist keine **politische Rückendeckung** für Regime auf anderer Ebene, sondern ein Korrektiv für Fehlentscheidungen in der **politische Seilschaften** keinen, aber auch gar keinen Einfluss haben dürften.
[An input in human rights and in rights does not mean political backing for governments at another level // instead it means changing wrong decisions in which political factions should have no influence whatsoever]

En: *We don't simply want back-up and support for individual countries / I think the Old Boy network should be banished from <.. > from Geneva.*

Sv: *Det krävs en <.. >ett annorlunda typ av arbete som man verkligen kan påverka också. Tack.*
(A different kind of work is required which one can also have a real influence on. Thank you]

Su: Ihmisoikeuksien suojeleminen ei vaadi <..> selustatukea vaan pitää olla myöskin poliittista tahtoa ja poliitiko..poliitikoilla pitää olla myös vaikutusta tähän ihmisoikeustilanteeseen. Kiitoksia.
(Protection of human rights does not require backing; instead, what is required is political will and politicians must also exercise their influence in this human rights situation. Thank you]

The speech is read from script at a fast rate. From the point of view of translation equivalence, the analysis shows a number of non-correspondences between the original and the TTs. The English TT is very much an 'interpretation' of the original in the literary sense of the word. This applies to the last segment in particular ('I think the Old Boy network should be banished from Geneva'). One may ask to what extent this speech act (of the kind 'directive') conveys the illocutionary point of the original German utterance *"[...], in der politische Seilschaften keinen, aber auch gar keinen Einfluss haben dürften"* ('where political factions should have no influence whatsoever'). The interpreter clearly tries to capture the sense of the utterance, rendering one metaphoric expression (*'politische Seilschaften'*[13] *;* 'political factions') with another one ('Old Boy network').

Non-correspondences can be observed in the way the tone of the argumentation is conveyed. Instead of rendering the criticism toward political coalitions ("*ein Korrektiv für Fehlentscheidungen in der politische Seilschaften keinen, aber auch gar keinen Einfluss haben dürften*"), the Swedish TT conveys a vague demand ('A different kind of work is required which one can also have a real influence on'). It does not convey the imperative mood of the original, demanding that political networks must not interfere with the aims of the conference, nor the reference to the effort invested in human rights ('*Der Einsatz für Menschenrechte';* SI version: 'A different kind of work'). The Finnish TT conveys the imperative mood of the original; it also contains the same lexical items as the original ('human rights', 'politicians'). However, the speaker demands that *political networks*

---

[13] The expression has its roots in mountain climbing. *'Seil'* refers to the rope that is used by mountain climbers; *'Seilschaft'* is the group of climbers who hold on to the same rope.

must not have any influence whatsoever, whereas the Finnish TT insists that *politicians* should have an influence on the human rights situation.

The analysis of the original ST and the three TTs demonstrates the complexities of political rhetoric. The English interpreter is clearly accustomed to interpreting political language in the widest sense of the word 'to interpret', whereas the Swedish interpreter, a novice[14] , is trying to cope on the surface level of the text, producing propositions that may sound quite logical. Yet, the Swedish version is extremely vague in its propositional content; a listener would have to make a real effort to infer what the speaker is trying to say. The Finnish version, on the other hand, while not a hundred percent consistent with the original, provides a tangible claim ('Protection of human rights does not require backing; instead, what is required is political will, and politicians must also exercise their influence in this human rights' situation').

The research material contains speeches that serve as examples of the way in which the same issues are discussed using structures that follow the syntax of non-scripted language while containing the same terminology and the same concepts and proper names as speech 9. 1 (speech 9.3, in English, and 9. 4, in German). Both speeches are presented freely. The English speaker holds on to sheets of paper that seem to contain the main points of his speech as well as the proper names he refers to. It can be classified as a prepared speech. The German speaker has certainly planned his speech beforehand, but he presents it without any notes. The analysis shows that the sense of the message is conveyed consistently in the TTs by the same interpreters whose TTs of the first speech (9. 1) contained omissions, which indicates that sense consistency with the original message is not a language-specific issue. As soon as the syntax requires increased concentration and attention while the substance, too, requires an extra amount of attention and prior knowledge, interpreting gets less accurate, as in speech 9. 1.

The conclusions by Gerver (see Chapter 2) are thus corroborated by the findings of the present study: the interpreter's information-handling system has been subjected to overload; in attempting to cope with this overload the quality of the interpreter's output suffers, showing an increase in the number of errors and omissions.

Below are extracts from the German speech (9.4) referred to above. The first sample (6.2.4 [a]) is a segment that deals with the same topic as 9.1, but with a syntax that is easy to process, judging by the TTs. The first segment is immediately followed by another segment (6.2.4 [b]) with a more complicated syntax. The terms and concepts of the second segment are typical of the EU genre, yet the TTs contain a number of omissions or vague renderings of the original. Therefore one is led to conclude that it is the syntax which is creating problems for the interpreters and not the substance or the vocabulary.

---

[14] See Chapter 4 for interpreting arrangements in the EP.

The segment below is relevant from the point of view of argumentation. The core element of the segment is that the question is directed at the Council by a Member of the European Parliament. Previous speakers had made the same point (e.g. 9. 1). MEPs require of the Council to have the courage to table a resolution concerning the human rights situation in China. Since the function of the questions is to make the Council, and everyone else, aware of what the EP considers to be an important human rights' issue, as well as what it demands of the Council, these elements of the MEPs' rhetoric are essential from the point of view of SI accuracy.

◇ **Sample 6.2.3 (9.4)**

(a) Original

	En	Sv	Su
denn es ist ja klar geworden	+	+	+
dass hier in diesem Parlament	+	+	+
eine klare Haltung Übereinstimmung	+	+	+
bei allen Fraktionen	+	+	+
zum Thema China	+	+	+
und zum Thema Iran	-	+	+
vorhanden ist.	+	+	+

Legend:
+ lexical sense unit included
– lexical sense omitted

(a) Example of a text segment which has been conveyed accurately by the interpreters (with the exception of one omission in the English TT).

(b) Original

	En	Sv	Su
Und wollen wir auch	+	+	+
wenn es eine Übereinstimmung	+	-	+
der unterschiedlichen Organe geben muss	+	-	+
wissen	+	-	+
ob der Rat	~	-	-
die Haltung	~	-	+
die dieses Parlament nacher beschliesst	~	-	-
so auch vertreten wird	~	-	-
und ob andere Organe unserer Union	+	-	-
gleiches zukünftig tun werden.	+	-	-

Legend:
+ lexical sense unit included
– lexical sense unit omitted
~ lexical sense unit vaguely conveyed

(b)Example of a text segment (see translation below[15]) directly following the previous one where interpreters who are new to the EP have not managed to convey the speech accurately.

---

[15] 'And we also want to know if there has to be a consensus of the various bodies whether the Council will represent the stance that this Parliament later adopts and whether the other bodies of our Union do the same in the future.'

The same speaker employs interesting rhetoric devices to make his point. The speech is highly coherent in the way it deals with the concept 'human rights'. The speaker even adds a little bit of sarcasm and humor to his argumentation.

Original: Das aber gerade weist darauf hin, dass eine überwältigende Mehrheit von Staaten auf der Welt gibt, **die sich um das was wir als Menschenrechte bezeichnen et ... hätte ich ein schlimmes Wort gesagt ... einen Kehricht kümmern**, die das nicht interessiert. [9.4]

[But that in fact shows that there is a vast majority of states in the world that do not give a / I almost used a naughty word / could not care less of what we call human rights they do not find them interesting]

The speaker enhances his point as well as the coherence of his speech by repeating words and phrases (highlighted by different styles):

(c) Original (Legend: + lexical sense unit included; – lexical sense omitted; ~ vague rendering of original)

Und gerade deshalb ist unsere Chance	+	+	+
und auch unsere Pflicht	-	+	+
uns als eine Grossmacht der Menschenrechte zu bezeichnen.	+	~	+
Und die Chance auch zu Nutzen,	+	-	-
gerade bei der Globalisierung der Wirtschaft	+	-	+
bei ihrer Vielseitigkeit	+	+	-
und Vielteiligkeit ind der Welt,	-	+	-
unsere Chance zu nutzen,	+	+	+
das die die mit uns zusammenarbeiten wollen,	+	+	-
zu akzeptieren haben,	+	+	+
dass wir einen Anspruch an sie stellen,	+	+	+
nämlich den des Respektes von den Menschenrechten.	+	+	-
Und lassen Sie mich einen Satz sagen, den ich für ganz wichtig halte.	+	+	+
Wenn wir unter uns diskutieren	+	+	+
dann muss eines klar sein:	+	+	+
es gibt in diesem Hause	+	+	+
keine rechten und keine linken Menschenrechte.	+	+	+
Die Universalität der Menschenrechte	+	+	+
muss von allen gewahrt werden.	+	+	-
Und deshalb sage ich für mich persönlich	+	-	+
Ob die Menschenrechte in einem Land wie Kuba	+	+	+
mit Füssen getreten werden,	+	~	~
oder ob in einem Land wie China	+	+	+
mit Füssen getreten werden,	-	-	~
oder ob sie in einem anderen Land	~	+	+
mit Füssen getreten werden,	~	+	+
das der eine oder andere glaubt,	~	+	+
näher bei sich zu sein,	+	+	+
die Universalität und die Unteilbarkeit der Rechte	+	-	+
jedes einzelnen Menschen	+	-	+
müssen im Mittelpunkt unseres /Handelns/ stehen!	+	-	/-/
Vielen Dank.	+	-	+

With the exception of the question addressed directly to the Council and some of the rhetorical expressions, the English interpreter conveys the content of the speech accurately, whereas the less experienced Nordic interpreters, the Swedish one in particular, do not reach the same level of accuracy. Yet they, too, manage to convey the main arguments in their TLs. It can therefore be assumed that this is due to the coherence of the speech which focuses on one point (i.e. the various EU institutions must be unanimous when they appear in international conferences, and the EU should be seen as a staunch supporter of human rights). Furthermore, what he says is expressed using uncomplicated structures. These are clearly some of the key criteria that make it possible to translate a speech in the simultaneous mode. The results of the analysis will be discussed in greater detail together with the analysis of the subsequent material (written questions to the Council).

b. Written questions to the Council

'Written questions to the Council' refers to the procedure whereby MEPs may send their questions to the Council in writing and receive the answer orally, after which they can present a complementary or specifying question. The corpus contains three questions to the Council in the languages of the present study, two in English on 'arms trade' and 'death sentences for ideological reasons', and one in Swedish on 'EU integration'. The analysis is based on the same theoretical premise as before. Taking into account the spontaneity of the specifying questions it is hypothesized that the syntax of the STs will be more simple than that of the (planned) oral questions, which should facilitate the interpreters' task.

Question time was included in the research material and in the analysis for the following reasons:

a) it is representative of the EP discourse as a permanent element of the plenary session;
b) the discourse is based on a different meeting procedure from the 'joint debates' which may affect the (1) presentation rate; (2) the syntax; and (3) the information density.

Table 5. List of speakers

Speech No.	Speaker	Source language	Target languages
1	Watson	English	Finnish, German, Swedish
2	Lindqvist	Swedish	English, Finnish, German
3	Jackson	English	Finnish, German, Swedish
4	Lindqvist	Swedish	English, Finnish, Swedish

The role of interpreter's knowledge of languages. An important prerequisite for a successful SI performance is a thorough knowledge of the languages. A detailed analysis of a speech in Swedish has been included here to demonstrate the importance of a sufficient knowledge of the interpreters' working languages. While there were several interpreters who had learned Swedish, they had not had much exposure to speeches by Swedish MEPs (oral communication by an EP auxiliary session interpreter).

The following example serves to demonstrate not only the difficulty of rendering the sense of a message, if the interpreter does not have a solid command of the language, but also what the consequences are if the message is not fully conveyed.

◇ **Speech Written Questions to Council (10. 2)** 🔊

Original: Tack, herr ordförandeTack, herr rådsordförande, för svaret.
≈Just som många tror och jag håller med om≈ är kanske den allvarligaste bristen idag **i förhållandet mellan EU och medborgarna** just avsaknaden av förtroende och legitimitet mellan EU:s ledning och medborgarna. **Det finns många exempel på detta**.
Det sker för många saker samtidigt, i varje fall enligt den relation jag har bakåt i mitt land.
EMU, IGC **har vi pratat om idag**, regeringskonferenssen, utvidning till flera länder - det sker mycket av beslut - som många medborgare hinner inte med att smälta. **För många är det allvarligt nog att precis ha gått med i en stor union och knapp hunnit passera en folkomröstning. Därför är frågan viktig och den är viktig också för er som rådspresident, eftersom det är rådet som har det yttersta, politiska ansvaret för att relationen mellan medborgarna och EU:s ledning är sån att medborgarna inte uppfattar sig som överkörda.**
Och min ytterligare fråga är – –

President: (hitting the table with his club) *Quale se asunto? What is the question?*
Swedish interpreter: *Vad är frågan, herr Lindqvist?*
Original: Herr rådspresident,
vad har rådet att ge för att EU skall gå med – –
President*: sorry*
Swedish interpreter*: jag kunde inte upptäcka någon fråga i det här, herr Lindqvist,*
och jag bad er ställa fråga och inte ägna åt debatt och så därför tar vi frågan nummer 15 från fru Caroline Jackson.
[Lindqvist shouting from his seat]
President*: But you have .. you have...you were out of time it's only one minute only one minute to put a question.*
[Lindqvist shouting ...]

President: *Sorry! Signora Jackson.*
After the speech by Caroline Jackson:

Lindqvist:

Herr ordförande!

Jag vill bara tala om att jag reagerar kraftigt mot att inte få svar på min fråga tidigare. **Jag drog över tio sekunder när ordföranden avbröt mig med en fråga**. Andra har dragit över mer än en halv minut **utan att ställa någon fråga. Reglerna skall vara lika för alla och jag ber att få legga detta till protokollet**.

President: Eso es lo que tratamos de hacer, senor Lindqvist.

Speech 10. 2 above[16] can be divided into three parts in terms of the internal structure of the argumentation. First, the speaker presents his main claim: (I) The most serious problem in the relationship between the EU and the citizens is lack of trust and legitimacy between the EU leaders and the citizens. In the second part he gives examples of this: (II) (a) too many things happening at the same time (1. EMU, 2. IGC, 3. enlargement); (b) the referendum on whether to join the EU has just been concluded; people have not had enough time to digest everything. This leads to the third part of the speech which also contains the main point leading to the question: (III) These are the reasons why the question is important, and why the question is also important for the President of the Council, as it is the Council that has the ultimate political responsibility for the relationship between the citizens and the EU leaders.

The Swedish speaker delivers his oral question alternating between reading from his notes and speaking freely. The style of delivery may have caused comprehension problems for the interpreters.

The speaker is interrupted by the President at the point where he begins his question (*"Herr rådspresident, min ytterligare fråga är, vad har rådet att ge för att EU skall gå med – –"*; 'Mr. President of the Council, my further question is, what does the Council have to give in order that the EU would go [along – –]'). The President insists that he did not detect any question in what the speaker was saying. According to the President, the speaker should have presented a question instead of entering into a debate. Yet, looking at the Finnish interpreter's version and comparing it with the other two TTs one can see that the Finnish TT is the only one conveying the beginning of the speaker's question (as well as the only one conveying the propositional content and the argumentation more or less consistently with the original speech) (See spread sheet analysis at the end of this chapter). Thus it is possible to conclude that the Spanish interpreters were probably using the English or German interpreter as their pivot, and consequently the President (who was Spanish) did not get the sense of the speaker's message, nor did he get the word 'question' (line 29), or the beginning of the question proper (lines 38–40). The English interpreter can be heard laughing

---

[16] The original with the interpreters' TTs can be found at the end of this chapter. The units in bold refer to utterances where the sense consistency with the original was not achieved by interpreters.

here.

Besides the question not being conveyed to the President, the sense of the argumentation leading to the question is not conveyed consistently with the original, either. The speaker introduces his point by using the superlative form in order to enhance his main claim (*"[...] den alvarligaste bristen idag i förhållandet mellan EU och medborgarna [är] just avsaknaden av förtroende och legitimitet mellan EU:s ledning och medborgarna."* '**today, the most serious deficiency** in the relationship between the EU and the citizens [**is] precisely lack of trust and legitimacy**.') His claim is diluted into a simple statement by the interpreters, as can be seen below:

◇ ***Example 30 (10. 2)***

Original: Tack, herr ordförande, tack herr rådsordförande, för svaret.

Mr. President of the Council, Thank you for the answer

≈Just som många tror och jag håller med om ≈ är kanske **den allvarligaste bristen i dag i**
As I think there are many people who agree with me that today perhaps the most serious

förhållandet mellan EU och medborgarna just avsaknaden av förtroende och
shortcoming in the relationship between the EU and the citizens is the very lack of trust
legitimitet mellan EU:s ledning och medborgarna. Det finns många exempel på detta.
and legitimacy between EU's leaders and citizens. There are many examples of this]

En: Thank you President
Thank you President-in-Office for that reply / I believe <..> that there are many people who'd agree
with me *when it comes to the lack of contact <..>between citizens and the European institutions and*
lack of confidence / lack of legitimacy <..> between the management of the European Union and the
citizens.

De: Vielen Dank Herr Präsident
[Thank you Mr. President

Ich danke Ihnen für die Antwort< .. >ich glaube es werden mir viele zustimmen wenn ich
I thank you for the answer I think many people would agree with me when I

sage *dass es einen Mangel an Kontakten zwischen den Bürgern und den Institutionen*
say   that there is   lack of contact   between the citizens and the Institutions

gibt / ein Mangel an Vertrauen   an Legitimität<.. >zwischen der<..er..>also ein Mang.
gibt   a shortage of   trust   of legitimacy   between   that is shortage of
Mangel an Verbindung zwischen der Leitung der ganzen Gemeinschaft und den Bürgern.
contact between the leaders of the whole Union and the citizens]

Su: Kiitoksia herra puhemies
kiitos neuvoston puheenjohtaja
Kuten monet muutkin ovat olleet samaa mieltä niin < xx >minä olen myöskin sitä mieltä että
[as has been agreed to by many others   I   too agree   that
ø on olemassa erittäin suuria puutteita EU:n ja kansalaisten välillä   koska   meiltä
there are extremely great deficiencies between the EU and the citizens because we are
puuttuu luo<..>keskinäinen luottamus ja legitimiteetti / laillisuus<..öö..> nimenomaan
lacking   mutual   trust   and legitimacy legality   particularly between
EU:n johdon ja kansalaisten väliltä.
 the EU leaders and the citizens]

The point of the main claim, presented in the superlative form ('*the most serious problem* **in the relationship between the EU and the citizens** is the very lack of trust and legitimacy'') is not rendered by the interpreters. Where the speaker aims at prioritizing a problem, interpreters make a statement without the priorization. With respect to the EU discourse this is not irrelevant. First, the relationship between the EU and its citizens is a theme that the MEPs take up continuously. Furthermore, separate debates have been devoted to this issue. Secondly, at the time of the recording, Sweden was a new Member State with MEPs who were overtly critical of the EU, including the speaker cited here. Therefore, it was to be expected that they would highlight their critical views using marked expressions.

The speaker enhances his main claim (see above) by giving examples of what he means ([15] 'there are many examples of this'). This introduction to the examples is omitted by the English and German versions. The speaker continues [16–18] 'Too many things happen at the same time, at least according to the <xx> I have back in my country.' The English interpreter links this statement in a vague manner to the main claim [16] "many factors are contributory", after which the TT deviates completely from the ST [17–18] "not only what happens in my own country".

The speaker continues his example by enumerating the many things happening at the same time [19–22] and pointing at the citizens' reactions [23] 'We have talked about the EMU, IGC today, the Intergovernmental Conference, enlargement into several countries – a lot of decision-making is taking place – many citizens do not have enough time to digest /it all/'. The German SI does not refer to the EMU; reference is made to the enlargement where the English SI says [19–21] "[...] the Economic and Monetary Union which may involve a number of countries".

Next, the speaker refers to his written question:

[26–37] 'For many it is serious enough to just have joined a large Union and barely have had time to pass the referendum. Therefore the question is important, and it is also important for you as the President of the Council, because it is the Council that has the final political responsibility for making sure that the relations between the citizens and the EU leadership remain such that the citizens do not feel that they have been ignored'.[17]

As can be seen from the transcription of the English and German versions, they do not convey the sense of the above message. The Finnish version, on the other hand, does convey the full sense of the message. However, segment [26–28] contains an interesting deviation from the original, a kind of subjective interpretation which may be based on the interpreter's knowledge of the results of the referendum in Sweden. Where the Swedish ST says "För många är det allvarligt nog att precis ha gått med i en stor union och knapp hunnit passera en folkomröstning" ('for may it is serious enough to just have entered a big union and barely have passed a national referendum'), the Finnish

---

[17] My (rough) translation of the Swedish.

version can be translated as follows [26–28] 'and quite a few people have said no to the Union in the referendum'.

From the speaker's point of view, the biggest problem arises from the fact that the beginning of his question is not conveyed. Consequently, he is interrupted by the President for not putting a question.

The speaker asks for the floor again, objecting to the fact that he has been interrupted. He also points out that others have exceeded their speaking time without putting a question; yet they were allowed to finish their speech whereas he was not [61–62]. This argument, too, is rendered inaccurately by the English interpreter ([61] "Others spoke beyond their time"), as the key claim 'without putting forth a question' is not conveyed in the English TT.

Another explanation for the President's decision to cut the speaker in midstream may lie in the fact that to him the speaker's 'question' sounded like an intervention in a debate. This is what the President says in his comment ('I asked you to put a question and not to indulge in a debate'). Scholars on the topic of parliamentary questions have come to the conclusion that 'politicians pretend to be asking questions, and ministers pretend to be answering them'. The motivation behind the question may not be to ask for information; instead, the M[E]P may present his question in order to provide information, or indicate that he has important knowledge of the topic at hand. The institution of parliamentary questions is used for political signaling. In many cases, parliamentary questions can be characterized as speech acts. (Wiberg 1998: 197–219) The ultimate purpose of the above speech may have been to signal a critical stance to the general public in Sweden.

c. Questions to the Commission

The theme of the questions to the Commission is *Objective 2 of the Structural Funds*; the Commissioner answering the questions is Monika Wulf-Mathies. The corpus contains 11 speeches on the theme, two by the Commissioner (in German), four in English, three in Finnish, and two by German speaking MEPs.

The topic has been selected for closer analysis as representative of EU discourse. The term 'Structural Funds' refers to the system of allocating EU money under different programs. In terms of shared background knowledge it can be assumed that MEPs as well as interpreters with experience at the EP know what is meant by the various Objectives and how the Structural Funds are governed and administered. In 1996, however, the newcomer interpreters from Finland and Sweden were only superficially versed in the various EU programs and Funds and the relevant vocabulary.

Table 6. List of speakers

Oral Questions to Commission Structural Funds – Objective 2 Presented by Speciale

Speech No.	Speaker	Source language	Target languages
1.	Wulf-Mathies	German	English, Finnish, Swedish
2.	McCarthy	English	Finnish, German, Swedish
3.	Stenius-Kaukonen	Finnish	*German, English, Swedish
4.	Schroedter	German	English, Finnish, Swedish
5.	Macartney	English	Finnish, German, Swedish
6.	Walter	German	English, Finnish, Swedish
7.	Rusanen	Finnish	*German, English, Swedish
8.	Myller	Finnish	*German, English, Swedish
9.	David	English	Finnish, German, Swedish
10.	Evans	English	Finnish, German, Swedish
11.	Wulf-Mathies	German	English, Finnish, Swedish

* Indicates that German is the 'retour' language

Retour interpreting. The analysis of this Question time of the plenary sitting will take another angle of SI in the EP by discussing the role of *relay* in the EP context. The fact that relay is a normal element of the multilingual EP meetings has been explained in Chapter 4. This variable must be taken into account when discussing SI accuracy in the multilanguage context of EP. (See the above example of a misunderstanding between the President and the Swedish MEP.)

'Relay interpreting' based on 'retour' interpreting complicates the issue of SI accuracy even more. The issue of the interpreters' command of their working languages is highlighted by the constant need of the interpreters to 'take relay' when no one in the booth has a command of the language that is used by the speaker. The situation is further complicated when the interpreter acting as *'pivot'* has to work into a language that is not his mother-tongue. The demands set by this directionality of interpreting (A-language into B-language) can be highlighted by comparing Finnish originals and their SI versions that are based on the German TT by a Finnish *'pivot'*. Attention will also be paid to the differences in SI quality depending on whether the ST is spoken freely or recited from scripted texts. (See also the example in 6.1.)

The debate analyzed here contains three speeches in Finnish, interpreted into German, the 'retour language' of the meeting. At the time, German had been selected as the relay language for the Finnish booth for the simple reason that there were more Finnish interpreters willing to work from Finnish into German in the plenary session than there were for other languages (e.g. English, French, Italian, Spanish). The Finnish interpreter is acting as the *'pivot'* for the other interpreters who do not have Finnish as their working language. In 1996 this meant practically all the remaining 'booths',

with the exception of the Swedish one, which had a small number of Finnish interpreters with Swedish as their mother-tongue. They were able to work directly from Finnish into Swedish, and colleagues with Swedish as a C-language could take relay from them.

Thus, in the meeting discussed here, the Finnish interpreter translating from Finnish into German was a non-native speaker of German.

In the light of the very modest amount of propositional content of the Finnish speeches that is conveyed into German, and via this relay language into English and Swedish, one is faced with all the key components and constraints of the SI mode of translation. The simultaneous mode is particularly ill suited for the translation of a written speech which is read from notes at a fast rate. The analyses above have demonstrated SI quality problems that may be related to the manner in which speeches are read. If non-correspondences can be observed in professional interpreting from C or B-languages into A-languages, what can be expected of a different directionality (ST A into TT B, or even C)? A sample of one of the three Finnish questions to the Commission is transcribed below to illustrate the points made above.

Sample 6.2.4
◇ **Oral question to Commission**

Tehokkainta työllisyyden hoitoa on hyvä aluepolitiikka, jolla parannetaan
[the most efficient way of taking care of employment is good regional policy which is used to facilitate
työllistävien yritysten toimintamahdollisuuksia. Tehtyjen selvitysten mukaan
the functioning potential of companies providing employment. According to studies conducted
uusia työpaikkoja syntyy ennen muuta maakuntakeskuksissa ja vahvoilla keskusalueilla.
new jobs are created first and foremost in provincial centers and in strong central regions.
Tavoite 2 -ohjelma, jonka tavoitteena on työpaikkojen lisääminen tuotantorakennetta
Objective 2 Programme which aims at increasing the number of jobs by modernizing the production
uudistamalla, kilpailukykyä parantamalla ja kansainvälistymistä lisäämällä yhdistettynä
structure, by improving competitiveness and by increasing internationalization combined with
kansallisiin rakennemuutosohjelmiin, on ehdottomasti tehokkain työllisyyttä edistävä unionin
national restructuring programs is by far the most efficient Union Programme in Finland
ohjelma Suomessa.
with the aim of promoting employment]

The sample is part of a speech (10.7) which has all the properties that have been discussed in SI literature as factors complicating the SI process: the lexicon consists mainly of highly informative words, the syntax is dense, and the rhetoric structure consists of a list of items that have the

purpose of describing the severity of the Finnish unemployment situation. The speech is a typical written text which is read quickly from the script. The resulting TT is inaccurate in terms of the propositional content and the line of reasoning. Keywords containing relevant information about the substance of the message are omitted.

In the case of another Finnish speech dealing with the same topic, the interpreter manages to convey most of the ST into German, and the Swedish interpreter manages to pick up most of the speech from the Finnish *pivot*. Yet the English interpreter is not able to render the speech via relay into English. The next step is to look for possible reasons for this difference between the TTs. One explanation may be the fact that the English interpreter is not used to listening to a non-native colleague speaking German, whereas the Swedish interpreter may be more used to the Scandinavian way of formulating ideas.

The TTs of all the 11 Finnish speeches in the material (one by the Finnish rapporteur) show the same tendency: most of the argumentation, including the propositional content of the speeches, is not conveyed into the other languages. The same is true for Swedish speeches.

However, there are segments that are rendered quite successfully, as can be seen from the sample below which constitutes the final point of a speech relating to the Objective 2 Programme. The speech act is an appeal for the fellow MEPs to support the amendment which, according to the speaker, aims at rectifying an unjust decision made by the Finnish government. The appeal was formulated as follows:

◇ *Example 31 (10.3)*

Original: Finnish
Retour: German by a Finnish interpreter, a non-native speaker of German

Original: [...] *Siksi pyydän, että tuette muutosehdotusta, joka mahdollistaa tavoite kakkosen kriteerien kunnioittamisen ja siten listan tarkistuksen Suomen osalta.*
[Therefore I ask you to support the proposed amendment which makes it possible to
 respect the criteria of Objective 2 and thereby a review of the list concerning Finland.]
De: Ich bitte um ihre Unterstützung für den diesbezüglichen Änderungsantrag / der die Einhaltung der Ziel Zwei Kriterien durchaus ermöglicht /und damit die Änderung der Förderungsliste für Finnland.

Original: *Rouva Wulf-Mathies sanoi, että voidaan tehdä marginaalisia muutoksia.*
[Mrs. Wulf-Mathies said that marginal changes can be made]
De: Frau Wulf-Mathies <xxx> marginale Änderungen *macht könnte

Original: *Haluaisin tietää, mitä rouva Wulf-Mathies tarkoittaa sanalla marginaalinen.*

[I should like to know what Mrs. Wulf-Mathies means by the word marginal]

De: Ich möchte wissen < ö ö >was Sie damit meinen

Original: *Rouva Wulf-Mathies sanoi myös, että emme voi lähteä muuttamaan alueita suhdannepoliittisten vaihteluiden vuoksi.*

[Mrs. Wulf-Mathies also said that we cannot start reviewing regions because of cyclical changes]

De: Frau Wulf-Mathies hat auch gesagt / wir können also die Liste nicht ändern < ö >je nach Konjunkturschwankungen

Original: *Euroopan unioinin jäsenmaista ei löydy tällä hetkellä kuin yksi kokonaan EU:n tukialueiden ulkopuolelle jätetty alue, jossa työttömyys on yli kolmen vuoden ajan yhtä mittaa ylittänyt 21 prosenttia.*
Se alue on Tampereen seutukunta.

[At the moment there is only one region amongst the Member States of the European Union which has been left outside the subsidized regions altogether, [in this region] unemployment has continuously exceeded 21 per cent for more than three years.
That region is the Tampere region.]

De: aber es gibt in der EU zur Zeit nur eine Region / die auch +ganz ausserhalb der Zielgebiete ist / in der die Arbeitslosigkeit seit drei Jahren kontinuierlich über einundzwanzig Prozent beträgt. Diese Region heisst< .. >Tampere.

In spite of the mostly incomplete rendering of the Finnish speeches into German, the Commissioner's reply indicates that she has captured the main gist of these interventions. The Commissioner first clarifies what she means by 'marginal changes' and explains the criteria that make a region eligible for changes. The segment containing her direct reply to the intervention quoted above reads as follows:

Original: *Die Frage ist Tampere - eine marginale .. wäre Tampere eine marginale Veränderung - ja oder nein kann ich nach meinen bisherigen Kenntnissen der Lage nur so beantworten, dass es wohl keine marginale Veränderung wäre, und ich will das aufnehmen was Frau Rusanen eben auch gesagt hat – oder Frau Myller – ich weiß nicht, wer es war – nämlich dass in Finnland alle Regionen eine Arbeitslosenquote über dem EU-Durchschnitt haben* [...]

[The question whether Tampere would be /eligible for/ a marginal change yes or no I can answer that on the basis of my present knowledge only in such a way that it would not be a marginal change and I will take up what Mrs. Rusanen has just said – or Mrs. Myller – I don't know who it was – that is, all regions in Finland have an unemployment rate /that is/ above the EU average [...]]

The above answer indicates that focusing on key issues promotes mutual understanding. Furthermore, when the speaker presents his ideas or questions in a straightforward manner (for example, the appeal above), the addressees will be able to pick the points that are interesting for

them. One aspect that is relevant here is the fact that the Commissioner was able to listen to 'retour interpreting' which was delivered in her mother-tongue. If the message is received through relay, it may be more difficult to obtain the main points of the argumentation (cf. the Swedish Question to Council).

Freely spoken vs. scripted Source Text   Regarding the difference in SI quality depending on whether the ST is a recited scripted text or one that is delivered freely, the result is fairly unambiguous. The material contains the introductory and concluding speeches by the German Commissioner that are relatively long and full of factual data, yet they are conveyed successfully by all three interpreters. The Commissioner is not reciting from a scripted text. Furthermore, a Commissioner is not restricted by any overly tight speaking time limitations; therefore they can speak freely without having to pack and condense what they want to say in the tightest and most compact form possible.

Compared to the TTs based on the STs by Commissioner Wulf-Mathies, the TTs of the English and German speeches by MEPs contain considerable amounts of inaccuracies. First, with regard to the main arguments: they are either omitted or linked together in a way that changes the logic of the original. Second, specifying data on which the orator builds his arguments (facts, figures, dates, terms) are omitted or rendered incorrectly. What is also relevant from the point of view of sense consistency with the original message, rhetoric elements are omitted (such as metatextual phrases, and references to proper names or to people who are present).

6.2.6 Summary of the results

The significance of the interpreter's background knowledge is further emphasized by the results of the analysis of Chapter 6.2. The incomplete SI renderings of the speeches confirm the hypothesis, according to which shortcomings in the TTs are at least partly due to the fact that interpreters do not share enough background knowledge with the speakers. The less experienced Nordic interpreters' TTs contain more omissions and errors than those by staff interpreters or freelance interpreters with a long experience at the EU who have accumulated a store of EU knowledge during their careers. This is clearly reflected in interpreters' command of EU-related terms and concepts, EU acronyms in particular.

However, an even more important factor underlying the number of errors and omissions is

the mode of delivery of the speeches. TTs based on written texts that are read out contain omissions and errors, regardless of whether the interpreter is new to the EP or a more experienced longtime freelance or staff interpreter. The syntax of written speeches deviates from that of spoken language. The following syntactic elements seem to be unsuited for the oral translation of aurally received texts:

- linguistic devices creating cohesion and coherence in a written text;
- negative constructions;
- genitive constructions with several modifiers;
- elliptic infinite constructions that contain several objects.

The list above is far from exhaustive; however, it is an indication of the fact that similar elements tend to create inaccuracies in TTs regardless of the source language. Examples of carefully formulated argumentation getting diluted in the interpreters' versions abound in the corpus, demonstrating that it is often an extremely demanding – if not an impossible – task to catch the nuances and finesses of the argumentative techniques of prepared speeches in the simultaneous mode of translation.

STs containing figurative speech, such as metaphors, create obvious problems for interpreters. *Ad hoc* metaphors and metaphors that are part of EU genre seem to require more mental processing than is needed for standard expressions. Legal terms and concepts are another source of omissions and mistranslations. In the present material, humor, irony and sarcasm are used in a way which is typical of a more literary style. More often than not, these are also language-specific devices.

Speech acts are an integral element of the EU genre. Depending on the verb and/or the illocutionary point, they can be classified as follows:

- assertives ('believe')
- exhortations (modal auxiliaries like 'should')
- opposition ('we are against', 'we oppose')
- directives
- commitment (e.g. to a political group).

Accuracy of interpreting would be greatly enhanced if the speech acts were conveyed faithfully. The party addressed, or the person used by the speaker, as well as the political group the

speaker commits himself to, should be rendered faithfully.

An element which cannot be overlooked is the interpreter's command of languages. This is evident particularly in the case of the new languages in 1996 such as Swedish or Finnish, and it is accentuated when interpreters are expected to work into a language which is not the interpreter's mother-tongue (A to B). The quality of the *pivot* TT is crucial when a large number of interpreters depend on the relay of one or two colleagues. This issue is more than topical at the time of enlargement when EU is going to include a large number of new Member States with national languages of limited diffusion.

Sample 6.2.1 Speech 8. 14

Original	De	Sv	Su
Foremost amongst our concerns	+	+	+
are the report's proposals	+	+	+
to merge the common foreign and security pillar	+	+	+
into the Community pillar.	+	+	~
Labour believes that	-	*vi*	-
the second and third pillar	~	-	+
should remain intergovernmental	~	+	-
but with greater involvement of the European Parliament.	+	+	+
Equally,	-	+	-
British Labour Members	-	+	-
do not accept the desirability	-	+	-
of giving the European Union a military competence,	+	+	+
although we support the strengthening of the WEU.	+	+	+
Mr. President,	+	-	-
the Labour Party supports	+	-	+
an extension of qualified majority voting	+	+	-
but believes there is a need	+	+	-
to retain unaniminity in areas such as	+	+	-
Treaty changes,	-	+	-
budgetary policy,	-	+	-
taxation,	+	+	+
external border controls,	+	+	+
and foreign and security issues.	-	+	-
It should be noted that	+	-	~
Labour supports	-	+	-
co-decision	+	+	+
for the European Parliament	+	+	-
in all policy areas	+	+	+
where there is qualified majority voting at Council.	+	+	+

Legend: + lexical sense unit included
   - lexical sense unit not conveyed
   ~ lexical sense unit vaguely conveyed

   vi Swedish for 'we'

Table i.

Speech 9.1 with English and Swedish TTs

#	Original	English	Swedish
1	Andererseits	And yet	Men
2	was macht China?	what does China do?	vad beträffar Kina
3	Es gibt eklatante Menschenrechtsverletzungen.	Flagrant violations of human rights	så gör man ingenting
4	wie Verhaftung und Ausweisung		Man utvisar kineser
5	für solche,	with people	
6	die die Informations- und Meinungsfreiheit ernst nehmen,	who defend human rights	som söker asyl
7	von Mißhandlungen	xx not	och man accepterar
8	und Beschneidigungen der Persöhnlichkeitsrechte	for human rights being imprisoned	hur man behandlar
9	von Frauen und behinderten Kindern	mm .. the rights of women and handicapped people	kvinner och ..ö.. handikappade barn
10	und von Kindern, die das falsche Geschlecht haben,	and also little girls whose only mistake is	och barn som är av fel kön
11	nämlich Mädchen.	that they are of the wrong gender	
12	Der tibetanische Professor Renposche		Vi har hört
13	hat uns eine beeindruckende Schilderung		den fruktansvärda skildringen
14	der Unterdrückung des tibetanischen Volkes	And also violations of human rights in Tibet	om hur man förtrycker det tibetanska folket
15	vor zwei Tagen gegeben,		
16	aber er hat auch bestätigt,	We . are . assured	och ambassadören har .. understrykit också
17	dass asiatische Religionen	that under .. Asiatic .. religion	att man i Asien väl känner till
18	sehr wohl die Beachtung der Persönlichkeitsrechte kennen.	human . rights . are ..	hur man behandlar Kina.
19	Ein agressives China wiederum	+protection thereof is a very important thing	Kina det aggressiva Kina
20	schießt mit scharfen Raketen bei Übungen,		skjuter ju skarpt omkring Taiwan
21	die die demokratische Wahl in Taiwan behindern sollen.	There are other countries as well	inför dom almänna val som kommer att äga rum
22	Was wird das Schicksal Hongkongs sein?		xx på samma sätt kommer att gå för Hong Kong
23	Iran sucht den Dialog,	Iran is seeking dialogue with the Union	EU säger
24	die Europäische Union sagt "kritischen Dialog",	we say yes critical dialogue	att vi skall ha en kritisk dialog men
25	Iran wünscht aber keine Kritik	but Iran doesn't want criticism	Iran till exempel vill inte ha någon kritiskt dialog
26	und zeigt Verständnis für die Hamas,	.. and they .. have their views	utan man fortsätter att ge pengar till Hamas
27	die die furchtbaren Attentate in Israel verursachte.	about the recent .. dreadful terrorist	och våldsdåden i Ki.. i Mellan-Östen
28	Gleichzeitig	outrageous ..ehm .. in Israel	
29	wendet sich aber Iran "sanft" gegen Terrorismus,	Quite apart from	
30	natürlich bei Erhaltung der Fatwa.	the continued es.ex..existance of the Fatwa	Och Iran har fortfarande en fatwa mot Kina

Table ii.

Speech 9.1 with Finnish TT

#	German	Finnish
1	Andererseits	
2	was macht China?	Mutta / kun puhutaan Kiinasta
3	Es gibt eklatante Menschenrechtsverletzungen,	
4	wie Verhaftung und Ausweisung	niin sellaisten ihmisten karkottamiset
5	für solche,	
6	die die Informations- und Meinungsfreiheit ernst nehmen,	jotka .. ottavat mielipiteenvapauden todesta
7	von Mißhandlungen	
8	und Beschneidigungen der Persöhnlichkeitsrechte	
9	von Frauen und behinderten Kindern	ja jos ajatellaan naisten ja vammaisten lasten
10	und von Kindern, die das falsche Geschlecht haben,	..ö..heikkoa asemaa
11	nämlich Mädchen.	
12	Der tibetanische Professor Renposche	ja jos ajatellaan ..er .. Tiibetin professoria ..professoria
13	hat uns eine beeindruckende Schilderung	
14	der Unterdrückung des tibetanischen Volkes	joka puhui Tiibetin kansan alistamisesta
15	vor zwei Tagen gegeben,	
16	aber er hat auch bestätigt,	niin hän vahvisti sen
17	dass asiatische Religionen	että aasialaiset uskonnot
18	sehr wohl die Beachtung der Persönlichkeitsrechte kennen.	tunnustavat ihmisoikeudet erittäin hyvin
19	Ein agressives China wiederum	mutta Kiina
20	schießt mit schargen Raketen bei Übungen,	ampuu raketteja
21	die die demokratische Wahl in Taiwan behindern sollen.	kun Taiwanissa on tarkoitus järjes+järjestää demokraattiset vaalit
22	Was wird das Schicksal Hong Kongs sein?	Mikä tulee olemaan Hongkongin tulevaisuus?
23	Iran sucht den Dialog.	
24	die Europäische Union sagt "kritischen Dialog",	Euroopan unioni puhuu kriittisestä vuoropuhelusta Iranin kanssa
25	Iran wünscht aber keine Kritik	mutta Iranissa ei ole minkäänkään näköistä ymmärtämystä tälle
26	und zeigt Verständnis für die Hamas,	vaan se ymmärtää Hamasia
27	die die furchtbaren Attentate in Israel verursagte.	joka tekee terroritekoja
28	Gleichzeitig	ja samaan aikaan
29	wendet sich aber Iran "sanft" gegen Terrorismus,	*Irani ei suinkaan .. taistele terrorismia vastaan
30	natürlich bei Erhaltung der Fatwa.	vaan hyväksyy fatwan

Speech 10.2 Original with English and German TTs

#	Original	English	German
1	Tack herr ordförande,	Thank you, President	Vielen Dank Herr Präsident.
2	Tack, herr rådsordförande,	Thank you President-in-Office	Ich danke ihnen
3	för svaret.	for that reply.	für die Antwort ..
4	Som [jag tror] många	I believe.. that there are many people	ich glaube es werden mir viele
5	som jag håller med om	who'd agree with me	zustimmen wenn ich sage
6	är kanske den allvarligaste bristen idag	when it comes to the lack of contact ..	dass es einen Mangel an
7	i förhållandet mellan EU och medborgarna	between citizens and the European	Kontakten zwischen den Bürgern
8	just avsaknaden av	institutions/ the lack of	und den Institutionen gibt.
9	förtroende	confidence	Ein Mangel an Vertrauen
10	och legitimitet	lack of legitimacy ..	an Legitimitet ..
11	mellan EU:s ledning och medborgarna.	between the management of	zwischen der .. er.. also
12		the European Union and the citizens.	ein Mang. Mangel an Verbindung
13			zwischen der Leitung der ganzen
14			Gemeinschaft und den Bürgern.
15	Det finns många exempel på detta.	ø ø ø	ø ø ø
16	Det sker för många saker samtidigt.	Many factors are contributory	Viele Faktoren tragen dazu bei
17	i varje fall enligt den relation	not only	es geht nicht nur um mein Land
18	jag har bakåt i mitt land.	what happens in my own country	es geht nicht nur um mein Land .
19	EMU, IGC har vi pratat om idag,	the IGC, the Economic and Monetary	xx
20	regeringskonferenssen,	Union .. which may involve	die Regierungskonferenz
21	utvidning till flera länder	a number of countries	oder .. er .. Erweiterung
22	det sker mycket av beslut som	many of thxxx ..the decisions	all solche Entscheidungen
23	många medborgare hinner inte med att smälta.	are not understood and are not digested	die werden gar nicht begriffen
24		by our citizens.	gar nicht verdaut
25			von unseren Bürgern.

Original	English	German
26 För många är det allvarligt nog		
27 att precis ha gått med i en stor union		
28 och knapp hunnit passera en folkomröstning.	Even if there were referenda	
29 Därför är frågan viktig	I dare say it would be the same	
30 och den är viktig också för er		Und ... auch wenn ... ..
31 som rådspresident		wenn es um die Verantwortung geht
32 eftersom det är rådet	the same would apply	
33 som har det yttersta, politiska ansvaret	as regards political responsibility .	die politische Verantwortung
34 för att relationen mellan medborgarna		die Bürger
35 och EU:s ledning	or our ability in this domain.	die können gar nicht richtig folgen
36 är sån att medborgarna	Citizens cannot comprehend	welche Entscheidungen da
37 inte uppfattar sig som överkörda.		getroffen werden auf Ebene
38 *Herr rådspresident*		.. auf der leitenden Ebene ..
39 *min ytterligare fråga är*		
40 *vad har rådet att ge för att EU skall gå med...*		
55 Herr ordförande!	Thank you, President	Herr Präsident,
56 Jag vill bara tala om	Just to say that I would like to ..	ich möchte dazu bemerken ..
57 att jag reagerar kraftigt mot	respond and .. object	dass ich es sehr sehr schade finde
58 att inte få svar på min fråga tidigare	to the fact that I can't have a reply	dass meine Frage hier
59 Jag drog över tio sekunder	even though I only arrived	nicht beantwortet werde
60 när ordföranden avbröt mig med en fråga.	ten seconds late	Ich war nur zehn Minute .. zehn
61 Andra har dragit över mer än en halv minut	Others spoke beyond their time	Sekunden verspätet
62 utan att ställa någon fråga.		– Entschuldigung –
63 Reglerna skall vara lika för alla	I think that the rules should apply	und andere haben oft mehr als
64 och jag ber att få legga detta till protokollet.	equally to all.	eine Minute minutelang gesprochen
		und haben sprechen minutelang dürfen
		ohne eine Frage zu stellen.

Speech 10.2. Original and the Finnish interpreter's version

#	Original	Finnish
1	Tack herr ordförande,	Kiitoksia herra puhemies
2	Tack, herr rådsordförande,	kiitos neuvoston puheenjohtaja
3	för svaret.	
4	Som [jag tror] många	Kuten monet muutkin
5	som jag håller med om	ovat olleet samaa mieltä niin xx
6	är kanske den allvarligaste bristen idag	minä olen myöskin sitä mieltä
7	i förhållandet mellan EU och medborgarna	että on olemassa erittäin suuria puutteita
8	just avsaknaden av	EU:n ja kansalaisten välillä koska meiltä
9	förtroende	puuttuu luo+keskinäinen luottamus
10	och legitimitet	ja legitimiteetti +laillisuus .. öö ..
11	mellan EU:s ledning och medborgarna.	nimenomaan EU:n johdon ja kansalaisten
12		väliltä.
13		
14		
15	Det finns många exempel på detta.	Tästä on monia esimerkkejä.
16	Det sker för många saker samtidigt,	Täällä tapahtuu hyvin paljon samanaikaisesti
17	i varje fall enligt den relation	asioita
18	jag har bakåt i mitt land.	jos minä ajattelen vain
19	EMU, IGC har vi pratat om idag,	omia suhteitani omassa maassani
20	regeringskonferenssen,	me olemme puheneet ö HVK:sta ja ö
21	utvidning till flera länder	EU:n laajentumisesta
22	det sker mycket av beslut som	öö tehdään paljon päätöksiä
23	många medborgare hinner inte med att smälta.	joihin ö +joita kansalaiset
24		eivät ehdi sulattamaan
25		
26	För många är det allvarligt nog	ja ö hyvin ö monet ihmiset
27	att precis ha gått med i en stor union	ovat sanoneet ei
28	och knapp hunnit passera en folkomröstning.	koko e.. unionille kansanäänestyksessä
29	Därför är frågan viktig	ja siksi minusta on tää ..tärkeää kysyä
30	och den är viktig också för er	eee ja miettiä neuvostonkin kannalta sitä
31	som rådspresident	
32	eftersom det är rådet	että meillä pitää öö
33	som har det yttersta, politiska ansvaret	joka on siis poliittisesti vastuussa
34	för att relationen mellan medborgarna	että suhteet EU:n ja kansalaisten välillä
35	och EU:s ledning	ovat sellaisia
36	är sån att medborgarna	että he .. heidän yli .. ylitseen ei
37	inte uppfattar sig som överkörda.	käsi..kävellä
38	*Herr rådspresident*	
39	*min ytterligare fråga är*	*Minun kysymykseni on,*
40	*vad har rådet att ge för att EU skall gå med...*	*mitä neuvoja neuvoston puheenjohtaja*
41		*haluaa antaa meille.*
42		Ja puheenjohtaja keskeyttää.

6.3 Debate illustrating the unshared knowledge constraint

Introduction.   The last section of this chapter focuses on speeches that are assumed to contain a high degree of unfamiliar or unshared information from the interpreter's point of view. The theoretical basis for the choice of the topic is prevalent in SI literature: the availability – or unavailability – of shared information may affect the interpreter's reconstruction of the speaker's message (Shlesinger 1995b: 195).

The session to be analyzed is called 'debates on topical and urgent subjects of major importance'. The EP Rules of Procedure (Rule 47) define the session as follows: "A political group or at least twenty-nine Members may ask the President in writing for a debate to be held on a topical and urgent subject of major importance [...]. Such a request must be linked with a motion for a resolution. The President shall notify Parliament immediately of any such request." The debate is immediately followed by voting on the resolutions.

The selection of this debate to illustrate the unshared knowledge constraint is based on my own experience. I had a chance to observe the various meeting types when I was working as a freelance interpreter for the EU. My conclusion was that this session taxes the interpreter's world knowledge even more than either the debates on the reports dealing with draft legislation or the debates dealing with EU institutional issues. Normally, it is possible to familiarize oneself with the content and vocabulary of the reports prior to the debate, whereas the session on topical and urgent subjects deals with issues that are very recent, as the title indicates. The documents containing the MEPs' draft resolutions only reach the interpreters' booths shortly before they are discussed. Consequently, interpreters have only a limited time to have a look at them before the debate begins. Yet, all kinds of phenomena may be raised, human rights being the theme that was discussed most frequently during my two years of observation on site. High demands are set on the interpreter's world knowledge when reference is made to various specific – often remote – issues and proper names related to them.

The agenda item known as 'Topical and urgent debate' has been included in the research material as an example of the many and varied topics that are debated in the EP. The analysis will be based on the following notions:

SI task: According to the definitions of SI, interpreters are expected to convey the sense of the

message. Furthermore, according to the EP definition of interpreting, interpreters are expected to convey the sense of the message accurately and faithfully.

Theoretical premise 1: SI is a complex cognitive process involving speech comprehension and speech production. Knowledge of the topic of the incoming speech should facilitate the SI task.

Hypothesis: Non-correspondences between the original speeches and their interpreted versions are due to the fact that speakers read their texts, referring to issues and names that are not known to the interpreters.

Research question 1: Do interpreters convey the sense of the original STs (where 'sense' is considered to consist of the argumentation, including the speech acts, the rhetoric as well as the terms and concepts enhancing the arguments)? If they do not, to what extent does this depend on the interpreters' background knowledge?

Topics of the debate   At the time of recording the material (March 14, 1996), the time slot for this debate was Thursday afternoon, immediately after the lunch break. The debate can last up to three hours. (Rules of Procedure, Rule 47) The topics covered on March 14 were the following: antipersonnel mines[1], Cuba (the Helms-Burton Law), human rights, Chechnya, and Taiwan. The corpus contains seven speeches on antipersonnel mines, five on Cuba, 18 on human rights, four on Chechnya and two on Taiwan. This amounts to 36 speeches that were delivered by 20 speakers (a number of MEPs spoke on more than one topic).

Table 7. List of speakers

Topical and urgent subjects of major importance (Rule 47) 14.3.

3 p.m. - 5.30 p.m. debates; 5.30 p.m. to 6 p.m. votes

Speech No.	Speaker	Source language	Target languages
1.	Gredler	German	English, Finnish, Swedish
2.	Günther	German	English, Finnish, Swedish
3.	Telkämper	German	English, Finnish, Swedish
4.	Truscott	English	Finnish, German, Swedish

---

[1] Anti-personnel mines are a type of land mine.

Speech No.	Speaker	Source language	Target languages
5.	Hyland	English	Finnish, German, Swedish
6.	Hautala	Finnish	*German, English, Swedish
7.	Telkämper	German	English, Finnish, Swedish
8.	Kreissl-Dörfler	German	English, Finnish, Swedish
9.	Newens	English	Finnish, German, Swedish
10.	Telkämper	German	English, Finnish, Swedish
11.	Gredler	German	English, Finnish, Swedish
12.	Telkämper	German	English, Finnish, Swedish
13.	Gredler	German	English, Finnish, Swedish
14.	Moorhouse	English	Finnish, German, Swedish
15.	Gahrton	Swedish	English, Finnish, German
16.	Hallam	English	Finnish, German, Swedish
17.	Moorhouse	English	Finnish, German, Swedish
18.	Gredler	German	English, Finnish, Swedish
19.	Evans	English	Finnish, German, Swedish
20.	Gredler	German	English, Finnish, Swedish
21.	Lenz	German	English, Finnish, Swedish
22.	Cars	Swedish	English, Finnish, German
23.	Hoff	German	English, Finnish, Swedish
24.	Kreissl-Dörfler	German	English, Finnish, Swedish
25.	Morgan	English	Finnish, German, Swedish
26.	McKenna	English	Finnish, German, Swedish
27.	Mann, Thomas	German	English, Finnish, Swedish
28.	Hyland	English	Finnish, German, Swedish
29.	Gredler	German	English, Finnish, Swedish
30.	von Habsburg	German	English, Finnish, Swedish
31.	von Habsburg	German	English, Finnish, Swedish
32.	Schroedter	German	English, Finnish, Swedish
33.	Hoff	German	English, Finnish, Swedish
34.	Cars	Swedish	English, Finnish, German
35.	Watson	English	Finnish, German, Swedish
36.	Laurila	Finnish	*German, English, Swedish

Anti-personnel mines (APMs) had not been in the headlines at the time of the debate, and therefore the features of that weapon were discussed at great detail. Other types of weapons were referred to as well; similarly, the arms industry, and treaties on arms and armament, were dealt with. The political situation between Cuba and the USA was not a front-page item at the time, whereas Chechnya and Taiwan were constantly in the news. Human rights' issues referring to cases in such countries as Western-Papua, Colombia, and Bhutan concerned issues that could be described as exotic or remote from the point of view of a rank-and-file interpreter.

An analysis according to the method described in Chapter 5 demonstrates that the TTs

conveyed considerably less information of the ST than the TTs discussed in sections 6.1 and 6.2. The more specific the speaker is, the less of the content of the speech is conveyed in the TT. This is even more so when the speech is read at a fast rate.

The following analysis will attempt to find answers to the research question by describing the STs and comparing them to the TTs. A detailed analysis of one speech is conducted in order to determine the nature of the inaccuracies. The design and layout of the original and its SI versions illustrate the method of analyzing the two sets of texts. (See opposite page). This method could be compared to a laboratory analysis where the STs and TTs have been placed under a microscope in order to allow the analyst to look at the textual details and the propositional content as carefully as possible.

The VCR and sound recordings provide a further opportunity, first, to see whether the speaker is reading from notes and second, to listen to the prosody of the original speech as well as that of the SI versions. The recordings also allow the analyst to formulate a subjective impression of the original speaker's message. Recordings also make it possible to assess the SI as it was delivered in the authentic situation.

6.3.1 Sample speech

The speech below (11.4) is an example of rhetoric typical of the topic. It has been selected as an example of a prepared speech containing a number of features which illustrate the constraints of the SI mode of translation (see Spread sheet analysis at the end of Chapter 6.3). The speaker has been assigned 3 minutes' speaking time. He has a written speech which he recites in a manner typical of a classroom reading exercise. The following analysis of the speech and the TTs will look at (1) the argumentation from the point of view of new rhetoric; (2) the speech act as an important element of political argumentation, and (3) the textual level from the point of view of text linguistics.

Speech 11.4 Original 🔊

Thank you, Mr. President,
to date the result of the UN Convention on certain conventional weapons has been disappointing. Little progress has been made on measures to further restrict the production and use of land-mines. Although agreement has been reached on the use and transfer of blinding lasers a loophole remains whereby the lasers can still be developed and manufactured. There is massive public support across the European Union to outlaw such vicious and indiscriminate weapons.

The UN review conference this April provides an opportunity for further progress on banning both antipersonnel mines and blinding lasers. The European Union should ensure that it leads the way in revising the CCW.
Belgium is to be congratulated, as has been mentioned, for already agreeing a total ban on the production transfer and use of APMs. All Member States have agreed bans or moratoria on APM

exports. The EU should go further and take action itself to ban the production, stockpiling transfer and use of APMs.

The Council should adopt a new joint action before the April review conference. The CCW Convention should include provision for regular, automatic review conferences, a ban on the production and export of APMs and advertising. The existing stocks should be destroyed.

When it comes to Protocol 2 on land mines a statement should be inserted aiming at the complete elimination of APMs as soon as is feasible. Verification procedures should be tightened and all anti-handling devices should be banned. Anti-tank mines must also be made detectable.

Mr. President, EU Member States must sign and ratify Protocol 4 on blinding weapons as soon as possible. They should ban the development and production of blinding lasers as a matter of urgency. Whatever the outcome of the review conference, EU Member States should ban APMs forthwith. Existing stocks of APMs and blinding laser weapons should be eradicated.

Mr. President, it is tragic ... but a well-known fact that that land-mines kill seventy people every day of every week - two thousand people a month. It is time to call a halt to this madness. Women and children are the main victims but often Member States' own troops are killed and injured by land mines made in the EU as we have witnessed both in the Gulf and in the former Yugoslavia. The EU should increase its de-mining efforts and its assistance to the victims of land mines but this only fully makes sense if the EU backs a total land-mine ban.

However, the EU should go further and develop a binding code of conduct to regulate the entire arms trade
so that EU Member States cease to supply dictators who then go on to repress their own people and attack their neighbors. The EU should develop its defense diversification programmes to help the defense sector
adjust to the end of the Cold War without massive job losses. It is time for the EU Member States to take the initiative and give a lead. The citizens of Europe and the developing world are crying out for change. We should not disappoint them.

Sample speech argumentation. The sample speech (11. 4) contains a number of directives to the Council, specifying what the MEP and his political group expect the Council to put forward in the UN CCW[2] review conference in April 1996. According to the speaker's first claim the result of the Convention has been disappointing so far (1: 1–10[3]). He justifies his claim by stating that in spite of the Convention, it is a fact that land mines and blinding lasers are still being developed, manufactured and used (1: 11–19). He enhances this claim by referring to public opinion: "There is massive public support across the European Union to outlaw such vicious and indiscriminate weapons" (1: 20–24). Thus the UN conference has an important role in providing "an opportunity for further progress on banning both antipersonnel mines and blinding lasers" (1: 25–29). The speaker specifies his topic by referring to the Convention (1: 3–4) and its substance (1: 7–10; 12–15). He does this by enumerating the content of the Convention ('measures to restrict the production and use of land mines; use and transfer of blinding lasers').

Throughout the corpus it is possible to observe the interpreters' tendency to omit

---

[2] CCW is the acronym for Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons.
[3] The numbers refer, first, to the page of the sample text, and second, to the rows where the segment concerned is transcribed.

semantically close lexical items. Lines 1: 7–9 show the German TT rendering both the 'production' and 'use' [of land mines]; the Finnish and Swedish TTs omit 'production', conveying only the 'use' [of land mines]. In the next segment (1: 11–19) the specificity of the ST rationale is lost in the German and Swedish TTs; the Finnish TT omits one of the enumerated items ('transfer' [of blinding lasers]). While these omissions do not always distort the main point of the argumentation, this does happen in segment 1: 20–29 in the German and Swedish TTs. The non-correspondence of the German TT argumentation is due to mistranslation. The German interpreter may not have heard the original properly ("There is massive public support across the European Union **to outlaw** such vicious and indiscriminate weapons") judging by the translation *"Es ist notwendig, dass solche Waffen auch grenzüberschreitend aus dem Verkehr gezogen werden"* ('It is necessary that such weapons are also taken out of traffic across the borders'). All three interpreters omit the qualifying elements 'vicious' and 'indiscriminate' which give the statement illocutionary force appealing to the listeners' emotions. Segment 25–29 is omitted altogether by the Swedish interpreter.

A later segment of the speech (2: 44–52) focuses the argumentation on the EU, exhorting the EU to *"go further and take action itself* to ban the production, stockpiling transfer and use of APMs"*, following a statement that functions as its rationale ("All Member States have agreed on bans or moratoria on APM exports") (2: 41–43). The argumentation is not conveyed fully by the German and Swedish interpreters. Instead of addressing the EU, the German SI uses the passive form *"und alle Mitgliedsstaaten haben bereits beschlossen Moratorien durchzuführen und der Verbote auszusprechen und es muss hier eine generelle Regelung getroffen werden"* ; (2: 41–45) ('and all the Member States have already decided to implement moratoria and to be in favor of the ban, and a general act/directive must be agreed on this matter.')

In terms of political rhetoric, the Swedish SI is typical of much of the TTs in the corpus in not rendering the deixis or the addressee of the original. Instead of conveying the party addressed by the speaker ("The EU should [...]), the Swedish interpreter has first person plural: *"[...] vi måste gå vidare [...]"* (2: 44–45); ('*we* must go further'). In fact, the Swedish interpreter is very systematic in the use of the grammatical subject 'we' when the speaker is addressing a specified body, as in segments 3: 9, 3: 12, 4: 4, 4: 6 and 4: 13. First, the speaker utters the following directive: *"**EU Member States** must sign and ratify Protocol 4"*; the Swedish interpreter says *"Vi måste underskriva ø det fjärde protokollet [...]"* ('*We* must sign the fourth Protocol"). The speaker continues by saying "**They** should ban [...]"; the Swedish interpreter continues to address the directive to first person plural (*"Vi måste se till at [...] förbjuds"* ('We must make sure that [...] are banned'). In the final segments of the speech the speaker refers to the EU; there, too, the Swedish interpreter systematically refers to 'we'.

If the interpreter has not devoted his attention to listening to which party is being addressed,

the resulting TT may distort the rhetoric intent of the speaker, as can be seen even more clearly in the next segment of the speech and its Swedish TT. Where the speaker addresses his directive to the Council ("**The Council** should adopt a new joint action"), the Swedish interpreter continues with the first person plural: *"Vi borde komma fram till ett beslut"* ('We ought to arrive at a decision") (3: 53–54). In the next segment the speaker refers to the CCW Convention ("The CCW Convention should include [...]"); the Swedish interpreter uses the passive form (*"Om man förbjuder [...]"*; 'If [...] is banned') (3: 58).

A speaker creates the basis of agreement by providing specific facts relating to the topic at hand, such as the enumeration of the core issues of the CCW Convention. An important rhetoric device is to refer to the consequences and implications of the phenomenon that the speaker is against, such as weapons. A speaker's argument may aim at establishing the real, in the sense discussed in Perelman (see Chapter 3) by illustrating these consequences and implications. In the present example, the speaker stresses his point by providing the numbers of people killed or injured. Furthermore, he establishes the real, adding presence to the problem with arguments by example or illustration. He does this stating who these people are ("Women and children are the main victims but often Member States' own troops are killed and injured by land mines made in the EU"). These quantitative and qualitative arguments will appeal to both the rational and the emotional side of the listener.

Literature on interpreting points to the fact that figures and numbers are easily confused in SI. The present corpus confirms this observation almost in every case where speakers give numbers and figures. In the following example the ST argument aims at persuading the audience with quantitative data, yet the data is not conveyed correctly in the TTs (segment 3: 87–92). The speaker gives weight to his argument by providing impressive facts and figures: "[...] land-mines kill **seventy** people **every day** of every week - **two thousand** people **a month**." The Swedish interpreter makes an error in the number of people killed every day; the German TT is vague in rendering the number of people killed every month:

◇ *Example 32 (11.4)*

Original: *[Mr. President, it is a tragic ... but a well-known fact] that that land-mines kill* **seventy** *people every day of every week - two thousand people a month.*

De: [...] dass **jeden Tag**<..>**siebzig** Menschen getötet werden durch solche Minen
[that every day   seventy people   are killed   through   such mines
das sind *mehrere tausend* **pro Monat**"
that is   several   thousand per month]

Sv: landminor dödar <u>sjuttiotusen</u> människor per dag och **två tusen per månad** 🔊
[land mines kill   seventy thousand people per day and two thousand per month]

Su: maamiinat tappavat **seitsemänkymmentä** ihmistä **joka päivä // kaksituhatta**
[land mines kill   seventy   people   every day two thousand ihmistä **joka**
kuukausi. 🔊
people every month]

The informational content of the German and Swedish TTs above deviates from the original numeric information. The quantitative expression '*mehrere tausend*' ('several thousand') in the German version is not equal with 'two thousand' in terms of information or rhetoric intent. Yet it is not misleading like the Swedish version according to which land mines kill seventy thousand people per day. The listeners will have been able to realize that the figure cannot be correct (70,000 pro 70), but such misinformation in the TT may have been rather distracting to the listeners. A further distraction may have been caused by the consequent figure 'two thousand per month', as the previous figure is '70,000 per day'. Experienced interpreters may resort to vague expressions like 'several thousand' instead of exact numbers if they are not sure of what the exact figure was. Yet, the Finnish TT shows that it is possible to get all the facts right.

Typically for the EP genre, the final argument of the speech refers to the citizens of Europe.

◇ **_Example 33 (11. 4)_**

Original: *The citizens of Europe* and *the developing world* *are crying out for change. We should not disappoint them.* 🔊

De: Bürger Europas und **die Entwicklungsländer** <u>brauchen</u> einen Wandel und wir müssen sie nicht enttäuschen.
[The citizens of Europe and the developing countries need a change and we must not 🔊
disappoint them]

Sv: ø ø **Utvecklingsvärlden** kräver nu förändringar och vi bör inte svika *våra befolkningar*. 🔊
[the developing world demands changes now and we should not disappoint our populations]

Su: <u>EU ø</u> ja **kehi**<..>**tysmaat** huutavat muutosta / me emme saa pettää heitä. Kiitos 🔊
[The EU and the devel oping countries are crying our for change / we must not disappoint them. Thank you.]

The German TT conveys the basic propositional content of the final speech act which includes a directive and an exhortation (4: 119–121; 125) . The TT predicate does not correspond with the original, however. The ST has an active attitude ('the citizens and the developing world **are crying out** for change', whereas the German TT views the situation from a different point of

view: 'citizens and the developing countries **need** a change'). The Swedish and Finnish TTs lose some of the core arguments of the EU genre in not referring specifically to the citizens. In terms of political rhetoric, the speaker is not only speaking for himself but he is representing the citizens of Europe. His appeal is supported by the ethos derived from the reference to the expectations of the citizens of Europe. The exhortation gains still more weight through the reference to the developing world.

Speech acts   The discussion above refers to speech acts as an essential component of the rhetorical form of the EP speeches. The speech (11. 4) contains directives to the EU institutions, the EU Council in particular. These are expressed with the modal verbs should and must, or a phrase like 'it is time to [...]' which underline the tone of the speech.

> The European Union ***should ensure*** that it leads the way in revising the CCW.
> All Member States have agreed on bans or moratoria on APM exports. *The EU* ***should***
> ***go further and take action itself to ban ...***
> The Council ***should adopt*** *a new joint action ...*
> The CCW Convention ***should include*** provision for ...
> *Existing stocks* ***should be destroyed.***
> When it comes to Protocol 2 on land mines *a statement* ***should be inserted ...***
> Mr. President, *EU Member States* ***must sign and ratify*** Protocol 4 on ...
> *They* ***should ban*** the development and ...
> *The EU* ***should increase*** its de-mining efforts and ...
> However, *the EU* ***should go further*** **and develop** a binding code of conduct ...
> *The EU* ***should develop*** its defense diversification programmes ...
> ***It is time for the EU Member States to*** **take the initiative and give a lead.**

A comparison of the SI versions with the original shows that the Finnish interpreter is the only one who systematically renders the predicates indicating the sense and mood of the speech acts. The German and Swedish interpreters tend to use the modal verb 'must' where the speaker uses the conditional, or the polite form 'should'. The corpus contains numerous examples of similar slight non-correspondences in the tone of the original ST. A comparison of the STs with the TTs indicates that interpreters are not very systematic in selecting lexical expressions to convey the speaker's speech act. In the speech concerned (11. 4), the speaker uses the modal verb 'must', and the German interpreter uses the conditional of the modal verb *'sollen'* (e.g. "Der *Europäische Union* ***sollte** eine führende Rolle einnehmen [...]"*; 'the EU should adopt a leading role [...]'); the Swedish interpreter uses 'bör' (*"Vi **borde** komma fram till [...]"*; 'we should arrive at [...]'). However, the degree of imperativeness seems to change between the ST and the TT. The use of modal verbs

belongs to the field of contrastive rhetoric. In the light of these examples it would appear that different Indo-European languages use modal verbs differently, although the same lexical items exist in all these languages, even in Finnish, which is a non-Indo-European language.

Towards the end of his speech the speaker presents a directive and a rationale: "**The EU should develop** its defense diversification programmes to help the defense sector adjust to the end of the Cold War without massive job losses." The German version substitutes the directive with a statement (*"Wichtig ist es, dass die Verteidigungsindustrie dabei unterstüzt wird sich zu konvertieren am Ende des kalten Krieges."* 'It is important that the defense industry gets support in order to adjust itself at the end of the cold war.') Thus, instead of rendering the exhortation "The EU should develop [...]", the interpreter produces a neutral statement 'it is important that [...]'. While not distorting the basic message, the TT fails to convey the illocutionary point of the original.

Text linguistics.   A rhetoric analysis has been applied for the basic task of comparing the form and content of the STs with the TTs. Consequently, comparisons have been carried out on a level which is not bound to features that are an integral element of the individual languages (such as language-specific syntax). However, STs have been compared with their TTs from the point of view of text linguistics focusing on lexical items that carry relevant propositional/semantic information. Text linguistic analysis is also considered useful where it is appropriate to point out items that have an important role in organizing the argumentation.

Textual structure.   The introductory segment of the sample speech (11. 4) contains the main argument (in italics) and the key vocabulary (in bold) of the speech:

> (1)To date *the result of* **the UN Convention on certain conventional weapons** *has been disappointing. Little progress has been made on measures to further* **restrict the production and use of land mines**. Although *agreement has been reached on* the **use and transfer of blinding lasers** *a loophole remains* whereby the lasers can still be **developed and manufactured**. *There is* massive *public support across the European Union to outlaw such* vicious and indiscriminate *weapons*.

The speaker introduces his first claim by the marked theme 'to date'. This is characteristic of the EP rhetoric. Speakers actively point out areas where achievements are unsatisfactory in spite of existing legislation or agreements. The next segment completes the introduction, beginning with the theme 'The UN review conference this April' which is the topic of the debate:

> (2) The UN review conference this April provides *an opportunity for further progress on banning* both anti-personnel mines and blinding lasers.

In segment (1) the speaker laments: "little progress has been made on measures to further restrict [...]"; in segment (2) he states that "the UN conference provides an opportunity for further progress [...]". The rest of the speech contains directives for the EU, the Member States and the Council on how they should act and what should be achieved. On the textual level the speech has a clear cohesive structure as to the view of its topic and its presentation. It focuses on the ideas presented in the introduction, retaining its lexical coherence throughout the text. There is marked coherence also in the linking of the claims to each other. This coherence is reflected in the Finnish and German interpreters' versions. While lacking in much of the specific substance, the Swedish version, too, conveys the structure of the argumentation of the original speech.

The speaker announces his theme explicitly (see Halliday 1985: 40) by means of the expression 'when it comes to':

Original: ***When it comes to*** Protocol 2 on land mines a statement should be inserted (...)

De: **Was** das Protokoll 2 zu Landminen **betrifft** so muss ein Protokoll verabschiedet werden (...)
[concerning Protocol 2 on land mines / a protocol must be accepted]

Sv: **Vad gäller** landminor så måste man (...)
[concerning land mines one must [...]]

Su: **Ja sitten** maamiinojen kakkosprotokollan **mukaan** <xxn pitäisi (...)
[And then according to protocol two on land mines xx should (...)]

As can be seen in the example above, regardless of their language, interpreters recognize this element and produce an utterance with an equivalent function (the German and Swedish TTs) or convey the thematic marking (the Finnish TT). The corpus demonstrates a clear tendency for the more clearly marked themes to be conveyed more faithfully by the interpreters.

Literal vs. written style Throughout the corpus it can be observed that where the speeches have been prepared and written in advance they tend to follow the cohesive devices that are characteristic of literary style. While the speech 11.4 is a typical prepared speech, with carefully formulated argumentation focusing on clearly defined topics, it is evident that the speech has been adjusted for oral presentation. This is reflected in the structure of hypotactic statements following each other. The majority of them can be classified as requests or exhortations to relevant parties (for example, "The European Union should ensure that it leads the way in revising the CCW."). This statement is a typical example of a clause complex, where the primary clause ('The European Union should ensure') initiates the secondary clause ('that it leads the way in revising the CCW').

Simple as they may seem on paper, such basic syntactic structures do not guarantee successful SI performances if the interpreter does not know or recognize the key lexical items constituting the point of the argument (like the acronym 'CCW', cf. the Swedish TT 2: 30–32).

Out of the 25 sentences of the speech only seven have other than S–V–O syntax. Four of them are passive constructions starting with the object (2: 35; 3: 69–71). All three interpreters render their TTs in the passive voice. A further three clause complexes have a different structure. The first of them begins with a concessive ('although') (1: 11); the second one is a hypotactic clause complex, beginning with the indefinite relative 'whatever' (4: 81); the third begins with an adversative ('however') (5: 106). According to Halliday, they are inherently thematic, although "they do not take up the the whole of the thematic potential of the clause" (ibid.: 51). The conjunctions have the function of creating cohesion indicating causal relations between clause complexes (ibid.: 302–308). Of these three syntactic structures, the second one ("Whatever the outcome of the review conference, EU Member States should ban APMs forthwith") has not been captured by the Swedish and Finnish interpreters, who seem to focus on the propositional content of the main argument. Looking at the previous segment in the Finnish TT, it is obvious that, in his effort to produce all the nominalized verbs and having corrected himself, the interpreter is lagging behind the speaker and accelerates his speech production. Focusing his attention on these components of the SI process the interpreter may not have been able to listen to the incoming sequence beginning with 'whatever [...]'.

Since the relationship between the clause complexes is significant from the point of view of the sense of the message, this aspect of Halliday's functional grammar is useful for the analysis of STs as well as their TTs. The following example demonstrates the way in which such elements as conjunctive adjuncts guide the listener to the relevant point of the text.

◇ *Example 34 (11.4)*

Original: ***Although*** *agreement has been reached on the use and transfer of blinding lasers a loophole remains whereby the lasers can still be developed and manufactured.*

De: Im Bezug auf Blendlaser ist etwas **zwar** getan worden **aber** es gibt immer noch Lücken die eine Herstellung weiter möglich machen <nach einer Anwendung>
[Regarding blinding lasers xx something has been done but there still are loopholes that make further production possible <according to/after an application>]

Sv: Vi har< .. ö ..> en lagstiftning mot laservapen som förorsakar blindhet **men** dessa produceras och säljs fortfarande.
[We have legislation against laser weapons that cause blindness but these are still produced and sold]

Su: **Vaikka** sopimus on aikaansaatu koskien tiettyjen sokeuttavien laseraseiden käyttöä 🔊

[Although agreement has been reached concerning the use of certain blinding laser weapons

niin **silti** on olemassa porsaanreikä, jonka <xx> laseraseita voidaan edelleen kehittää ja valmistaa.

yet there still exists a loophole which xx laser weapons can still be developed and manufactured]

When a speaker begins his argumentation with the conjunctive adjunct 'although', the listener is prepared to expect a claim expressing the speaker's critical stance. The German and Swedish interpreters render the consecutive claims above by starting the latter claim with 'but', which does convey at least some of the propositional logic of the original ST; the German 'zwar' is another way of indicating the concessive tone.[4]

The corpus shows that interpreters have a tendency to use addition as a cohesive device in places where the speaker has finished one statement (marked in a written text by a full stop), and proceeds to a new one. ST hypotactic relationships between clauses are frequently turned into paratactic ones by interpreters. Thus the internal logic of the ST clause complex either becomes rather weak or disappears altogether, as observed by Shlesinger (1995 b). This means that the listener may not detect the speaker's point as easily as he could have done if the original syntax had been conveyed. As far as the four languages are concerned, they share most of the syntactic devices that convey the speaker's line of reasoning, such as coordinating and subordinating conjunctions.

Lists   One trend which can be observed throughout the corpus is the tendency for interpreters to omit one or several items in ST segments characterized as 'lists' by researchers in the field of interpreting. The EP rhetoric abounds in arguments which are supported by lists of examples. These are frequently presented as groups of nouns, proper names or nominalized verbs. A typical case in point is a syntactic structure in which one predicate has two (1), three (2) or even four complements (3). See below (11. 4: 1 – 4):

(1) *measures to further restrict* **the production and use of land mines** (1: 6-10)

De: **die Produktion und** <u>Verbreitung</u> **von Landminen** einzuschränken
[to restrict the production and distribution of land mines   ]

Sv: men nu <u>vill man</u> begränsa   ø **användningen av minor**
[but now they want to restrict the use of mines]   [passive voice]

Su: [...] koskien **maamiinojen ø käytön** rajoittamista
[concerning the restriction of the use of land mines]

---

[4] According to Halliday, too, the meaning of such adversatives as 'although' is 'but'. (1985: 50)

(2) *[for.. agreeing on]* a total ban on **the production, transfer and use of APMs** (2:8–11

De: [Belgien] hat <u>hier </u>eine Vorreiterrolle gespielt
[/Belgium/ has acted here as]

Sv: [för att man infört] *totalförbud ø ø ø*
[/for introducing/   a total ban]

Su: että **maamiinojen** ø ø **käyttö** *kielletään kokonaan*
[that the use of land mines is banned altogether]

(3) *to ban* **the production, stockpiling transfer and use of APMs** (2: 18-23)

D e : ø ø ø

Sv: [och] införa ett ø ø ø **användar**förbud.
[/and/ introduce a ban on the use]

Su: jotta *tällaisten aseitten* **ø käyttö** ja *voi <... >***varastointi** ø ø voitaisiin kieltää.
[in order to make it possible to ban the use and stockpiling of such weapons]

(4) *The CCW Convention should include (a)* **provision for** *regular, automatic review conferences,*
(b) *a ban on* **the production and export of APMs** *and* **advertising**. (2: 27–33)

De: Das CWW .. +CCW Einkommen muss (a) *Entsprechendes vorsehen* / (b) ein Verbot **von Produktion und Export** *dieser Waffen* und auch **die Werbung** dafür muss verhindert werden.

[The CCW Convention must include provision for something similar, the production and export of these weapons and also advertising must be banned]

Sv: Om man (a) ø ø (b) förbjuder **export och produktion och reklam** så vore det ett stort steg framåt.
[If export and production and advertising are banned that would be a great step forward]

Su: [..] ja tässä kokouksessa pitäisi myöskin sisällyttää (a) automaattinen tällainen sisältökokousten sarja (b) niin että *tällaisten aseitten* ø **vienti- ja mainonta**kielto saataisiin aikaan
[and in this meeting an automatic series of such substance meetings should be included
so that a ban on the export and advertising of such weapons would be achieved]

(5) *They should ban* **the development and production of blinding lasers** (3: 12–15)

D e : ø ø ø

Sv: <u>Vi </u>måste se till, att ø ø **laservapen som förorsakar blindhet** förbjuds
[we must see to it that laser weapons that cause blindness are banned]

Su: **Sokeuttavien laserien** käyttöön <.. >käyttö **tai tuottaminen valmistus** pitäisi <xxx>
[the use or production manufacturing of blinding lasers should xxx]

When out of context, the vocabulary contained in the excerpts above looks rather identical, yet the versions produced by the interpreters of these or similar segments of text do not systematically render an equivalent translation compared with the original.

Several non-correspondences can be observed in the examples above. In segment (1) the German TT is the only one conveying two verbs. However, the second verb deviates semantically from the one in the ST (instead of 'use' the German has *'Verbreitung'*, 'distribution'). The other two interpreters omit 'production'.

In segment (2) the speaker congratulates Belgium on having agreed on a total ban on the a) production b) transfer and c) use of APMs. The German TT compresses this statement into 'Belgium has played the role of a pioneer'. The Swedish version compresses the statement to mean 'Belgium should be congratulated for having introduced a total ban'. Of the three nominalized verbs the Finnish TT conveys the 'use' [of APMs]. The Finnish TT is the only one to convey the head of the genitive construction (APMs) specifying which weapon is being discussed here.

Unit (3) has four items, of which the Swedish TT conveys only one ('the use'), the Finnish TT conveys two ('use', 'stockpiling') together with the reference to 'such weapons', whereas the German interpreter omits this segment altogether. Unit (4) contains two directives for the CCW Convention. The Finnish interpreter is the only one of the three who manages to render the content of the first directive (a), although vaguely and without reference to the specific acronym 'CCW'. The speaker uses an epithet ('regular') together with a classifier ('automatic') to specify what kind of review conferences should be organized. Of these specifying elements the Finnish interpreter leaves out the first ('regular'). The second part of the Finnish TT directive (b) omits the nominal verb 'production'. While the German TT for directive (a) is very vague (*'Das CWW Einkommen muss Entsprechendes vorsehen'*), directive (b) is more verbose than the original ("*ein Verbot von Produktion und Export dieser Waffen und auch die Werbung dafür muss verhindert werden*", 'a ban on the production and export of these weapons and also the advertising of them must be banned'). Furthermore, where the speaker has a specific reference, the TTs tend to use deixis, as the German TT, which renders the head of the genitive construction of the original by using deixis ('the production and export *of these weapons*' instead of 'the production and export *of APMs*). Yet the same interpreter has used the German equivalent '*Anti-Personenminen*' earlier on (2: 28), which shows that the term is not unknown to the interpreter.

In the last excerpt ((5) They should ban **the development and production of blinding lasers**), the German interpreter omits the segment altogether, while the Swedish interpreter omits

the complements ('the development and production'). The Finnish interpreter produces three nominalized verb complements, one of which is not semantically equivalent with the ST lexical item (instead of 'development' the TT has 'use').

A similar tendency as described above in relation to complements can be seen in the tendency of interpreters to leave out one element of a predicate group if it contains two or more verbs which are semantically close, as in the segment below:

Original: *EU Member States must **sign and ratify** Protocol 4 on blinding weapons* (...)

De: *ø ø ø*

Sv: Vi måste ***underskriva*** *ø* det fjärde protokollet av förblindande vapen (...)
[we must sign the fourth protocol on blinding weapons]

Su: EU:n pitäisi myöskin *ø **ratifioida*** sokeuttavien laserxx koskeva sopimus (...)
[EU should also ratify the protocol on blinding lasers]

The German interpreter omits this segment altogether, whereas the Swedish and Finnish interpreters convey one of the two verbs; the Swedish TT has the verb 'sign' and the Finnish has 'ratify'.

6.3.2 Summary of the results.

A detailed analysis of the debate on topical and urgent subjects confirmed the hypothesis of this chapter ("Non-correspondences between the original speeches and their interpreted versions are due to the fact that speakers read their texts, referring to issues and names that are not known to the interpreters"). As pointed out by various authors (for example Gile, Setton), material is omitted or mistranslated in the TT if a written ST is presented orally.

The present study confirms the fact by providing examples of the textual elements that tend to be omitted, such as idiosyncratic or figurative expressions as well as proper names, including the names and acronyms of groups and organizations. However, when interpreting accuracy is assessed, the function of these elements from the point of view of the overall argumentation has to be taken into account. For example, the significance of the omission or error in numbers and figures depends on whether they are used to enhance the argument, or to refer to an item in draft legislation at hand (such as the number of an Article or of a paragraph). In the same way, the omission of a name has more significance if the speaker is addressing someone in the House, or referring to someone who is not present. In the latter case the speaker may use names to make his argument more specific, or he

may refer to authorities to give more weight to his argumentation.

According to SI theory, interpreter's background knowledge is important in order to achieve an SI performance that is satisfactory from the listener's point of view. An observation that has not been discussed at length in previous empirical studies is the fact that ST argumentation, including speech acts, tends to lose its point or focus in the TTs.

Even less attention has been devoted to the fact that, in many cases, various ST features explain why the TTs do not convey arguments or speech acts in a way which could be considered equivalent with their ST. In the light of the present analysis, the speaker's manner of presentation may have a crucial role for the outcome of SI quality. Of the 34 speeches included in the analysis, 12 are delivered freely, sometimes supported by notes. A total of 21 speakers read their speech from notes. Three of these speakers have succeeded in making their written speech sound like a spoken one. A further three speakers read at a fast rate and in a classroom fashion. One speaker has no written text, but speaks at an extremely fast rate, with hardly any pauses between the meaning units.

Where non-correspondences occur, they can in many cases be related to the dense syntax of the written ST, which is presented at a fast rate. The TT shortcomings are further aggravated when the STs are short, and different speakers follow each other in rapid succession. (In the case of the debate that has been analyzed here, 'Topical and urgent subjects of major importance', most speakers had been allotted one minute of speaking time.) The interpreters' task is further complicated by the constant change of angles and presentation styles, even though the topic remains the same (e.g. 'Anti-personnel mines').

6.4 Concluding remarks

To conclude Chapter 6, the research question and the method will be discussed in the light of the results.

From the point of view of SI quality, the key research question is the following:

How can the interpreter's performance provide the listener with the same conditions for comprehending the speech, or for creating one's own interpretation of the content of the speech and of the speaker's intentions as another listener who is attending to the original speech?

This question has been addressed to one speech context, the plenary session of the European Parliament. The analysis of the different debates highlighted the characteristics of

political rhetoric. Consequently, a method was chosen which is adapted to texts that aim at persuading and convincing the audience. Furthermore, the method was designed in such a way that it can be applied to analyze a large number of speeches by an even larger number of speakers (original speakers as well as three interpreters for every speaker). A linguistic approach, such as a Hallidayan approach, would have been too detailed for the analysis of a relatively large corpus. A propositional analysis would have been too cumbersome; and, what is more relevant regarding the present material, it would not have provided the means for analyzing the illocutionary force of the speeches. The best approach for analyzing the political speeches appeared to be new rhetoric, or argumentation theory, combined with textual analysis.

The material has been analyzed from three main angles:

(1) rhetoric elements of argumentation;
(2) speech acts as an integral element of political argumentation;
(3) the semantic and syntactic aspects of the speeches.

The analysis foregrounded several characteristics as essential elements of the sense of the message. The following elements constitute much of the EP plenary genre, regardless of language:

i. Argumentative techniques
- stating the main argument;
- rationale and justification of the argument;
- rhetorical devices enhancing the argumentation.

ii. Speech acts
- expressing the speaker's illocutionary point;
- expressing the speaker's commitment.

Interpreting quality: accuracy of interpreting

The analysis of the corpus was based on the premise that essential elements of the sense of the message are contained in argumentation. The question following this premise is: To what extent do interpreters convey the speakers' argumentation? And if something is omitted, what is it?

In order to assess whether the sense of the message is conveyed in simultaneous

interpreting, the analysis focuses on the speakers' argumentation. Interestingly enough, the more closely interpreters conveyed elements related to argumentation, the more accurately they managed to convey the sense of the message. These elements are not strictly language-specific; instead, they are used to express a speaker's line of reasoning in a way which is common to all men. What is significant from the point of view of the listeners, they also help them in the process of speech reception. In this way, ST analysis can help determine certain quality criteria from the listener's point of view.

The following tendency can be seen in the rhetorical structure of the STs and the TTs, as shown in the debates that have been selected for the report and in the research material as a whole:

- the more marked the rhetorical structure, the more clearly it is rendered in the TT;
- however, interpreters do not convey structural markers in a systematic way.

Introductory statements tend to be conveyed faithfully. However, non-standard openings, which may contain unexpected references, or which employ humor, may be lost in interpreting. Specific marking, such as enumeration of points, is often omitted, or rendered in an unsystematic manner. Speakers' final points are often omitted, or rendered in a haphazard way. This may be due to the time-pressure caused by the short speaking-times, leading to a rapid succession of speakers, with the intermittent introductions by the President of the meeting.

The conditions for understanding the content of the speech are largely set by the form and content of the arguments. The analysis of the TTs highlighted the following problems relating to the manner in which ST arguments were conveyed:

- claims are not conveyed accurately;
- the rationale or justification of the claims is not conveyed accurately; specific facts supporting the claims, or examples and analogies enhancing the claims, are omitted or mistranslated;
- figurative speech is either omitted or rendered in a clumsy manner.

From the point of view of SI accuracy relating to political rhetoric, it is important to identify elements in the speech that constitute the basis of agreement on which the speaker builds his argumentation. This can be expressed through single concepts like 'democracy', 'European culture', or 'the citizens'. They have the function of making the audience adhere to the argumentation. Tangible examples, figures and names have the function of making the argumentation more effective and more persuasive. Omissions or mistranslations of these elements have the opposite effect.

Arguments convey a great deal of information about the speaker's intentions. Figurative speech, humor, or irony all serve the same purpose. If they are not faithfully conveyed, the effect on the listener may not be what the speaker intended. Speakers' intentions become even more obvious in the speech acts. They are frequently addressed to specified addressees, who may be referred to by name. Thus, a great deal of the original intention can be lost if proper names are omitted in this context.

Concerning speech acts, the following general observation could be made on the basis of a comparison between STs and TTs:

- speech acts are omitted or mistranslated, whereby the illocutionary point of the speech is not conveyed to the listeners.

It is possible to give at least a partial answer to the original question 'how can the interpreter's performance provide the listener with the same conditions for creating one's own interpretation of *the speaker's intentions* as another listener who is attending to the original speech?

Modality and lexis. Greater SI accuracy will be achieved if the TT conveys the verbs and the mood of the original. Furthermore, SI accuracy can be greatly enhanced by paying attention to the speaker's commitment to a political group for example. Attention should also be paid to the grammatical person used in the speech act, i.e. whether it is first person singular or plural. This is significant when the speaker expresses a stance toward the issue at hand, indicating with the grammatical person whether the stance is his own or that of his group. Similarly, politicians are careful in their choice of voice. The passive voice can be a conscious choice in order to avoid commitment.

Semantic and syntactic aspects of the original speeches were also examined as variables that determine SI quality to a considerable degree. Semantic inaccuracy is a frequent phenomenon in the TTs. It seems to be directly related, firstly, to the manner in which speeches are presented, and secondly, to the interpreter's experience of the EP genre. If a written text is read out at a fast rate, it is more likely that interpreters produce semantically inaccurate TT versions.

Throughout the corpus it is possible to observe the interpreters' tendency to omit semantically close items, which are presented in pairs or as lists. Such inaccuracies at word level do not significantly distort the sense of the message; however, the primary quality expectation of those listening to SI is not met if a whole utterance or proposition is mistranslated. As far as syntax is concerned, it can be observed that SI accuracy is enhanced if the relationship between clause complexes is conveyed with equivalent TT means.

All in all, SI accuracy is influenced both by the interpreter's knowledge of the subject and the related vocabulary, and the manner of ST presentation. The material shows that an increase in presentation rate, and a decrease in the length and number of pauses separating meaning units, correlate positively with the number of omissions and errors. Furthermore, a clear correlation can be observed between an increasing textual density of the ST and the number of argumentative features and devices being lost in the TTs. If the speech is written, using written-like syntax, and read out at a fast rate, it can be expected that the TT contains a high number of omissions, and even errors. If the topic is unfamiliar to the interpreter, this number is even higher. If it is in the speaker's interest that his speech is conveyed accurately and faithfully by the interpreters, he could collaborate with interpreters by avoiding the ST features enumerated in this paragraph.

There are other factors influencing SI quality, however, which are not related to ST features. One of the most crucial ones is the interpreters' knowledge and command of the languages in question. The material shows the importance of a solid competence in the oral comprehension of ST languages. If that is not reliable, the TT will not succeed in conveying the speaker's message accurately. This aspect is closely linked with the interpreter's experience of working for the EP.

A final,and even more important, conclusion based on the analysis of the original speeches and the TTs relates to the speaker's *ethos*. What is the impression of the speaker that is created by the SI version by the interpreter? In a setting like the European Parliament, Members learn to know each other in the different meetings that lead to the plenary sitting. One speaker is interpreted by different interpreters in different meetings, so that the speakers' *ethos* does not depend on one speech or one meeting. Yet, if they want to persuade other MEPs to vote for their proposal, it is not irrelevant in what manner and to what degree of accuracy the SI conveys their argumentation.

The basic philosophy of the method of analysis has been to describe simultaneous interpreting in a real-life setting. The segments that were selected for close scrutiny in this chapter represent topics and linguistic features that at least two out of three interpreters did not render correctly. Linguistics has always been interested in problems because they bring out the contrast between what is 'normal' or 'standard' and what requires further study. In the present investigation, the problem segments were selected in order to highlight the factors which make simultaneous interpreting difficult. Demonstrative power was sought by having a large number of instances that could be classified in certain categories.

The method was devised for the purposes of the present study. This has been only a first attempt to apply it to the analysis of natural language. There is ample room to fine-tune the method and make it more systematic. The units of comparison can be selected in different ways, depending on the research question. The tools of analysis can be selected to classify material into broader or

more narrow categories.

As the primary aim was to approach the research material in a holistic way, there are many elements that have only been touched on. These include the speakers' use of cohesive devices, and the way interpreters render them in their TTs. It is a topic that would deserve a study in its own right. Speech act theory is another large field of study which could be used as the primary approach in studying material of the kind that is presented here. Recent literature on speech acts has not been discussed here; instead, the aim has been to draw attention to its applicability for Interpreting Studies.

The prosodic features of STs and TTs are an integral element of spoken language. They, too, have been and should be studied on a serious theoretical basis, using the latest methodology. Because prosody is such an essential element of the listening experience, it was deemed practical to offer the reader the opportunity to listen to those segments of the speeches that are discussed in the study.

At the start I asked 'how can the interpreter's performance provide the listener with the same conditions for comprehending the speech, or for creating one's own interpretation of the content of the speech and of the speaker's intentions, as another member of the audience who is listening to the original speech? The answer should be limited to what can be learned on the basis of the present material, which consists of argumentative speeches. Their purpose is not only to inform the audience but also to persuade and convince the audience of the validity of the speaker's point of view. Therefore, the answer that this study can give to the question is the following: the interpreter should be loyal to the speaker. By respecting the speaker's way of expressing his ideas and by conveying his rhetoric as faithfully as possible, the interpreter will not only convey the speaker's logos but also his ethos. The logos and pathos together will allow the listener to create his pathos of the speech he has listened to.

page 1

	Original	German	🔊
1	Thank you, Mr President,	Vielen Dank Herr Präsident	
2	to date	Das Ergebnis der VN Konvention	
3	the result of the UN Convention	über bestimmte konvenzionelle Waffen	
4	on certain conventional weapons	war bisher	
5	has been disappointing.	nicht sehr erfolgreich.	
6	Little progress has been made on	Es sind nur wenige Massnahmen getroffen worden	
7	measures to further restrict	um die Produktion	
8	the production and	und Verbreitung	
9	use	von Landminen	
10	of landmines.	einzuschränken	
11	Although agreement has been reached		
12	on the use		
13	and transfer		
14	of blinding	im Bezug auf Blendlaser	
15	lasers	ist etwas getan worden	
16	a loophole remains	aber es gibt immer noch Lücken	
17	whereby the lasers can still be		
18	developed	die eine Herstellung	
19	and manufactured.	weiter möglich machen nach einer Anwandung	
20	There is massive public support	Es ist notwendig	
21	across the European Union // to outlaw such	dass solche Waffen	
22	vicious		
23	and indiscriminate	auch grenzenüberschreitend	
24	weapons.	aus dem Verkehr gezogen werden	
25			
26			
27			
28			

page 2

	Original	German
25	The UN review conference this April	es geht hier
26	provides an opportunity for further progress	sowohl um Blendlaser
27	on banning	als auch um Anti-Personenminen.
28	both anti-personnel mines	Der Europäische Union sollte
29	and blinding lasers.	eine führende Rolle einnehmen
30	The European Union should ensure	im hinblick auf die Revision des
31	that it leads the way	Übereinkommen über konvenzionelle Waffen
32	in revising the CCW.	der Vereinigten Nationen, CCW.
33	– –	Belgien hat hier eine Vorraterrolle gespielt
34	– –	ø
35	Belgium is to be congratulated,	ø
36	as has been mentioned,	ø
37	for already agreeing a total ban on	ø
38	the production	ø
39	transfer	und alle Mitgliedsstaaten haben bereits beschlossen
40	and use of APMs.	Moratorien durchzuführen ø
41	All Member States have agreed bans	und der Verbote auszusprechen
42	or moratoria	und es muss hier
43	on APM exports.	eine generelle Regelung getroffen werden
44	The EU	ø
45	should go further	ø
46	and take action itself	ø
47	to ban	ø
48	the production	ø
49	stockpiling	ø
50	transfer	ø
51	and use of	
52	APMs	

	Original	German
53	The Council should adopt	Der Rat muss
54	a new joint action	eine neue gemeinsame Aktion beschliessen
55	before the April review conference.	vor der ûberprüfungskonferenz vom April
56	The CCW Convention should	das CWW .. CCW Übereinkommen muss
57	include provision for regular	entsprechendes vorsehen
58	automatic	ø
59	review conferences	ø
60	a ban on the production	ein Verbot von Produktion
61	and export of APMs	und Export dieser Waffen
62	and advertising.	und auch die Werbung dafür muss verhindert werden.
63	Existing stocks should be destroyed.	die vorhandene Lagern müssen zerstört werden.
64	When it comes to Protocol 2 on landmines	Was das Protokoll 2 zu Landminen betrifft
65	a statement should be inserted	so muss ein Protokoll verabschiedet werden
66	aiming at the complete elimination of APMs	das die <xx> völlige Verbot von Landminen beinhaltet
67	as soon as is feasible.	ø
68	Verification procedures should be tightened	es sollten die verhandenen Massnahmen verscharft werden
69	and all anti-handling devices should be banned.	und zum Beispiel müssen auch
70	Anti-tank mines must also be made detectable.	anti..Panzerminen auffindbar gemacht werden
71	– – –	und entsprichendes Material muss entwickelt werden.
72	Mr President,	ø
73	EU Member States must sign	ø
74	and ratify	ø
75	Protocol 4 on blinding weapons as soon as possil	ø
76	They should ban the development	ø
77	and production	ø
78	of blinding lasers	ø
79	as a matter of urgency.	Es handelt sich um eine dringliche Anbelegenheit

	Original	German
80	Whatever the outcome of the review conference,	Was immer bei der Überprüfungskonferenz herauskommt
81	EU Member States should ban APMs forthwith.	so sollten die Mitgliedsstaaten diese Waffen
82	– – –	<xxx> verbieten
83	Existing stocks of APMs	ø Landminen
84	and blinding laser weapons	und Blendlasern und Anti-personenminen
85	should be eradicated.	müssen vollkommen ausgeschaltet werden.
86	Mr President,	ø
87	it is tragic ...	Es ist tragisch
88	but well-known fact	aber eine bekannte Sache,
89	that that land-mines kill	dass jeden Tag .. siebzig Menschen getötet werden
90	seventy (70) people every day of every week -	durch solche Minen
91	two thousand (2000) people a month.	das sind mehrere tausend pro Monat
92	It is time to call a halt to this madness.	ø
93	Women and	Frauen
94	children are the main victims	und Kinder sind die Hauptopfer
95	but often Member States' own troops are	Oft ist aber auch das Militär aus unseren Ländern
96	killed and injured by	die anderswo eingesetzt werden getötet werden
97	landmines made in the EU	durch Minen die in unseren eigenen Ländern hergestellt worde
98	as we have witnessed both	ø
99	in the Gulf	ø
100	and in the former Yugoslavia.	ø
101	The EU should increase its de-mining efforts	Die Minenräumbemühungen müssen ausgebaut werden
102	and its assistance to the victims of landmines	das Verbot muss ausgebaut werden
103	but this only fully makes sense	und nur das ist ein Weg dazu,
104	if the EU backs a total landmine ban.	dieses Grauen zu verhindern.

	Original	German
105	However,	ø
106	the EU should go further	Es muss
107	and develop a binding code of conduct	ein verbindlicher Verhaltungskodex entwickelt werden
108	to regulate the entire arms trade	ø
109	so that EU Member States cease to supply	damit die EU Mitgliedsstaaten nicht mehr hingehen
110	dictators	Diktatoren zu unterstützen
11	who then go on to repress their own people	die dann anschliessend das eigene Volk
112	and attack their neighbours.	und ihre Nachbaren mit diesen Waffen bekriegen.
113	The EU should develop	Wichtig ist es
114	its defence diversification programmes	ø
115	to help the defence sector	dass die Verteidigungsindustrie dabei unterstützt wird
116	adjust to the end of the Cold War	sich zu konvertieren am Ende des Kalten Krieges
117	without massive job losses.	ø
118	It is time for the EU Member States	ø
119	to take the initiative	ø
120	and give a lead.	ø
121	The citizens of Europe	Die Bürger Europas
122	and the developing world	und die Entwicklungsländer
123	are crying out for change.	brauchen ein Wandel
124	We should not disappoint them.	und wir müssen sie nicht entäuschen.

	Original	Swedish	Finnish
1	Thank you, Mr President,	Tack herr talman	Kiitokset puhemies
2	to date		
3	the result of the UN Convention	resultatet av FN konventionen	YK:n tiettyjä aseita koskeva
4	on certain conventional weapons	ø ø ø	rajoitussopimuksen tulos
5	has been disappointing.	har hittils varit en besvikelse	on ollut *hyvin pettynyt
6	Little progress has been made on	ø ø	on hyvin vähän aikaansaatu
7	measures to further restrict	men nu .. vill man .. begränsa	koskien maamiinojen
8	the production and	ø	
9	use	användningen	käytön rajoittamista
10	of landmines.	av minor.	
11	Although agreement has been reached	ø Vi har	Vaikka sopimus on saavutettu
12	on the use	.. ö	koskien tiettyjen
13	and transfer	en lagstiftning mot laservapen	sokeuttavien
14	of blinding	som förursakar blindhet	laseraseiden
15	lasers		käyttöä
16	a loophole remains	men	niin silti on olemassa porsaanreikä
17	whereby the lasers can still be	dessa	jonka ## laseraseita voidaan edelleen
18	developed	produceras	kehittää
19	and manufactured.	och säljs fortfarande.	ja valmistaa.
20	There is massive public support	Det finns nu starka rörelser ø	On olemassa valtava tuki Euroopassa
21	across the European Union//to outlaw such	för att förbjuda dessa	tällaisten
22	vicious	er	
23	and indiscriminate		
24	weapons.	vapen	aseiden kieltämiseksi.

Close analysis Speech 11.4 continued
Page 2

Original	Swedish	Finnish
2 5 The UN review conference this April	och översynen av konventionen	YK:n tarkastelukonferenssi huhtikuussa
2 6 provides an opportunity for further progress	gör det möjligt	tarjoaa tilaisuuden
2 7 on banning	att kräva ett totalt förbud	jonka avulla voidaan uudestaan saada et##
2 8 both anti-personnel mines	för dessa laservapen	sekä laseraseiden
2 9 and blinding lasers.	och minor.	että maamiinojen
3 0 The European Union should ensure	Det är	käytön kieltämisessä.
3 1 that it leads the way	CCW komissionen	Euroopan unionin pitäisi pitää huolta siitä
3 2 in revising the CCW.	FN komissionen	että Euroopan unioni on johtavassa asemassa
3 3		tässä myöskin WEU:ssa
3 4		
3 5 Belgium is to be congratulated,	och Belgien borde gratuleras	Belgiaa tulisi onnitella siitä
3 6 as has been mentioned,	ø	kuten on jo todettu
3 7 for already agreeing a total ban on	för att man infört ett totalförbud	että Belgia on jo suostunut siihen
3 8 the production	ø	että .. että maamiinojen
3 9 transfer	ø	käyttö ø ø
4 0 and use of A PMs.	ø	kielletään kokonaan.
4 1 All Member States have agreed bans	Alla har .. alla ø länder har beslutat	Kaikki jäsenmaat ovat ## pitäisi
4 2 or moratoria	om ett exportförbud	hyväksyä kaikkien tällaisten aseitten
4 3 on APM / exports.	ø	viennin estäminen
4 4 The EU	men vi	ja EU:n
4 5 should go further	måste gå vidare	pitäisi mennä vielä pitemmälle
4 6 and take action itself		ja ryhtyä itse toimenpiteisiin
4 7 to ban	och införa	jotta
4 8 the production	ett användarförbud.	tällaisten aseitten
4 9 stockpiling	ø	käyttö
5 0 transfer	ø	ja voi.. varastointi
5 1 and use of	ø	ø
5 2 APMs.	Vi borde komma fram	voitaisiin kieltää.

244

	Original	Swedish	Finnish
5 3	The Council should adopt	till ett beslut	Neuvoston pitäisi ryhtyä
5 4	a new joint action	innan kommissionen återkallas i April.	uudelleen yhteis##n toimenpiteisiin
5 5	before the April review conference.	ø	ennen tätä huhtikuun kokousta
5 6	The CCW Convention should	ø	..ja tässä kokouksessa pitäisi myöskin
5 7	include provision for regular		sisällyttää
5 8	automatic	Om man förbjuder	automaattinen
5 9	review conferences	export	tällainen sisältökokousten sarja
6 0	a ban on the production	och produktion	niin että tällaisten aseiden
6 1	and export of APMs	och reklam	vienti-
6 2	and advertising.	så vore det ett stort steg framåt	ja mainontakielto saataisiin aikaan.
6 3	Existing stocks should be destroyed.	och dom lager som finns måste förstöras.	Olemassa olevat varastot tulisi hävittää
6 4	When it comes to Protocol 2 on landmines	Vad gäller landminor	ja sitten maamiinojen kakkosprotokollan mukaan
6 5	a statement should be inserted	så måste man	
6 6	aiming at the complete elimination of APMs	förbjuda APM	##n pitäisi poistaa tällaiset
6 7	as soon as is feasible.	så fort som möjligt	niin nopeasti kuin mahdollista
6 8	Verification procedures should be tightened	vill säga personminor.	ja jonkinlainen varmennusmenetelmä
6 9	and all anti-handling devices should be banned.	ø	pitäi.. sitä pitäisi tiukentaa
7 0	Anti-tank mines must also be made detectable.	Anti-tankminor måste också uppgrävas	niin että kaikki tällaiset aseet
7 1	—	och förstöras	ja myöskin panssarintorjuntamiinat
7 2	Mr President,	ø	pitäisi saada selvästi havaittaviksi.
7 3	EU Member States must sign	Vi	ø EU:n ø pitäisi myöskin ø
7 4	and ratify	måste underskriva det fjärde protokollet	ratifioida
7 5	Protocol 4 on blinding weapons as soon as possible	av förblindande vapen så fort som möjligt	sokeuttavien laser## koskeva sopimus nopeasti
7 6	They should ban the development	Vi måste se till	Sokeuttavien laserien
7 7	and production	att laservapen som förorsakar blindhet	käyttöön .. käyttö
7 8	of blinding lasers	förbjuds	tai tuottaminen valmistus
7 9	as a matter of urgency.	so fort som möjligt	pitäisi ### ##sti
8 0			

	Original	Swedish	Finnish
81	Whatever the outcome of the review conference,	ø	ø
82	EU Member States should ban APMs forthwith.	ø	ja EU:n jäsenmaiden tulisi kieltää tällaiset aseet
83	– –	– –	myöskin välittömästi
84	Existing stocks of APMs	och existerande lager av personminor	ja myöskin tällaisten aseiden varastot
85	and blinding laser weapons	och laservapen	
86	should be eradicated.	måste förstöras.	pitäisi hävittää kaikkialla EUn alueella
87	Mr President,	ø	Puhemies
88	it is tragic …	Det är ju tragiskt	on todella traagista
89	but well-known fact	ø	mutta hyvin tiedettyä
90	that that land-mines kill	men landminor dödar	että maamiinat tappavat
91	seventy (70) people every day of every week	sjuttiotusen (70 000) människor per dag	seitsemänkymmentä ihmistä joka päivä
92	two thousand (2000) people a month.	och två tusen per månad	kaksituhatta ihmistä joka kuukausi
93	It is time to call a halt to this madness.	Vi måste få stopp på denna galenskap	Tämä hulluus on saatava loppumaan
94	Women and	Oskyldiga människor	Naiset ja
95	children are the main victims		lapset ovat suurin uhriryhmä
96	but often Member States' own troops are		mutta usein myöskin omat sotilaat
97	killed and injured by	mördas av landminor	kuolevat
98	landmines made in the EU	som tilverkats inom EU	EUssa valmistettujen maamiinojen seurauksena
99	as we have witnessed both		kuten olemme jo huomanneet
100	in the Gulf		Persianlahdella
101	and in the former Yugoslavia.	EU måste trappa upp sin röjningsaktivitet	Jugoslaviassa
102	The EU should increase its de-mining efforts	ø	M##si. EUn pitäisi myöskin
103	and its assistance to the victims of landmines	Men detta fungerar enbart	tukea näitä uhreja
104	but this only fully makes sense	om vi ställer oss bakom ett totalt förbud ø	mutta tässä on järkeä vain siinä mielessä,
105	if the EU backs a total landmine ban.		että EU tukee maamiinojen täydellistä kieltämistä

Close analysis Speech 11.4 continued

Page 5

Original	Swedish	Finnish
106 However,		EUn pitäisi kuitenkin
107 the EU should go further	Vi måste också försöka	mennä myöskin pidemmälle
108 and develop a binding code of conduct	införa en ø uppförandekodex	ja kehittää sitova käyttäytymissääntö
109 to regulate the entire arms trade.	inom vapenindustrin	koko asekauppaan
110 so that EU Member States cease to supply	så att ..	niin että EUn jäsenmaat eivät enää toimittaisi
111 dictators	totalitära regeringar	diktaattoreille
112 who then go on to repress their own people	inte kan få tillgång	jotka näin sortavat omia kansojaan
113 and attack their neighbours.	till dessa vapen.	ja hyökkäävät naapureittensa kimppuun
114 The EU should develop	Vi måste samtidigt	EUn pitäisi myöskin kehittää
115 its defence diversification programmes	ø	omat ohjelmansa
116 to help the defence sector	försöka hjälpa vapenindustrin	joiden avulla voitaisiin auttaa puolustusteollisuutta
117 adjust to the end of the Cold War	att klara sig	sopeutumaan kylmän sodan päättymisen jälkeiseen aikaan
118 without massive job losses.	utan att behöva massavskäda.	ø
119 It is time for the EU Member States	ø	EU-maiden on aika
120 to take the initiative	ø	ottaa tässä johtajan asema
121 and give a lead.	ø	
122 The citizens of Europe		EU
123 and the developing world	Utväcklingsvärlden	ja kehi..tysmaat
124 are crying out for change.	kräver nu förändringar	huutavat muutosta
125 We should not disappoint them.	och vi bör inte besvika våra befolkningen.	me emme saa petää heitä
126		Kiitos

7. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

What is meaning? Where is the meaning in a text? For thousands of years philosophers have tried to answer that question, but they have not been able to answer it in a way that would satisfy the practical needs of language users. Translation studies have approached the question in a pragmatic way, because translators and interpreters need to know what is expected of them. Thus, they have asked: What is the sense of a message?

According to existing definitions of interpreting, the interpreter's basic task is to facilitate bilingual or multilingual communication by conveying the *sense* of the speaker's source language message in the target language. These definitions also describe the manner in which the message should be rendered. However, what is meant by 'sense' has not been specified in an exhaustive way. Thus, one of the aims of the present study has been to operationalize the concept of 'sense' for the purpose of defining and assessing SI quality.

The terms employed in the existing definitions of interpreting refer to elements that are considered to describe what constitutes the sense of the message. Interpreters are expected to convey *the propositional, cognitive and semantic substance* of the message. They are expected to *identify propositions*, and to *reformulate them* into propositions that have *the same interlocutory effect* as the original. They are expected to convey the *semantic, connotative and aesthetic content* of the original message, using the lexical, syntactic and stylistic resources of the target language. In other words, they are expected to *understand the intended message perfectly*. Moreover, they are expected to express themselves *with equal clarity and precision* as the original speaker, so that the interpreters' versions have *the same effect on the listeners* as the original has on the original speaker's audience.

All of these explanations have the ideal interpreting performance as their goal. Another question is: to what extent is it possible to meet these expectations? There is a relatively limited

amount of information about what interpreters do in practice to reach the ideal level of performance.

The description and modeling of the simultaneous interpreting (SI) process are satisfactory and adequate at the theoretical level, which views SI holistically. There is general theoretical agreement, according to which interpreting requires the parallel operation of various cognitive tasks, namely the listening to, comprehension and translation/reformulation of input speech, and the production of output speech. Furthermore, the inherent constraints involved in this complex cognitive task are not normally recognized in theoretical definitions of SI.

This study is a contribution to the practical, performance level. It tries to explain what the 'sense of the message' is by analyzing authentic original speeches and their interpreted versions. In other words, it is yet another attempt to investigate the nature of 'sense' in real-life communication situations. If we are able to reach an adequate description of the critical components of the 'sense', we can also specify such quality criteria as 'accuracy' and 'faithfulness' of interpreting.

The focus of this study has been on the speaker's role in constituting SI quality in the multilingual speech situation of the European Parliament. It is important to be aware of the close link between the speaker's output and the interpreter's input/output. Interpreters receive the speaker's message aurally, on-line, segment by segment, paced by the speaker. The speakers' way of structuring their ideas and their manner of presenting them is thus crucial for the interpreters' ability to comprehend the utterances and reformulate them in the target languages. In many cases, speakers have prepared their presentations carefully in written form, in order to be able to deliver them fluently within the time limits set for them. Yet even when interpreters have access to a manuscript, they nevertheless have to rely primarily on the aural channel. So, even in this latter case, the speaker's presentation rate and prosody have an impact on the SI quality.

In this study, interpreting has been viewed as oral translation. Both the research question, and the definitions given in the Introduction, presuppose that original speeches (STs) and interpreters' versions (TTs) need to be analyzed and compared with each other. Thus, a theoretical framework was developed which takes into account the characteristics of the research material. An essential element of this framework of analysis has been the recognition that the interpreters' (oral) text production conditions differ from those of written translation. Therefore, the method of comparison is based on parameters that are suited for this mode of translation. Arguments (the main claim and its rationale), and rhetorical devices (such as example, analogy, humour, and figurative language), have been used as the primary units of comparison. The results of this comparison have been used as the basis for determining the constituents of SI quality in real-life situations.

Argumentation theory proved to be a flexible tool for analyzing the sense of the STs and

their TTs. It is an approach which can be combined with other analytical tools. Its strength and applicability lies in the fact that it transcends the semantic and grammatical constraints of individual languages. As a neutral, language-independent tool, it helps the analyst to capture 'the gist' of the message. Thus, it is suited for analyzing the continuous flow of words that are produced in conferences.

The research material was recorded in the European Parliament, where the speeches belong to the register of political rhetoric. From the point of view of Interpreting Studies, the sense of political rhetoric is composed of both the *semantic content* of the arguments and the *linguistic form* in which they are delivered. In this study, 'the content' refers to what is contained in the arguments. 'The form' refers to ways of expressing ideas that are typical of a specific genre. This study highlights the important role of speech acts in political rhetoric. The formulation of speech acts is an essential element of the sense of the message. Furthermore, speech acts are expressed by using more or less similar linguistic means across languages. Thus, speech acts are an example of speech units that provide a natural basis for assessing equivalence between STs and TTs at the pragmatic level. Arguments are an example of speech segments that provide a basis of comparison at the ideational level. At the semantic level, the evaluation of the accuracy of the TT versions of individual lexical items or utterances is based on their 'dictionary meaning' in the context. Syntactic elements, such as conjuncts and disjuncts, are an integral constituent of meaning as landmarks of the speaker's line of reasoning.

Karla Déjean Le Féal defined interpreting quality from the listener's point of view in an eloquent manner (see Introduction). In the light of the present study her definition may be reformulated as follows :

> What the listeners receive through interpreters should convey the same arguments as expressed by the speaker. The genre, register, and illocutionary point should remain the same. In other words, the speaker's *logos, pathos* and *ethos* should be conveyed to the listeners.

The speaker initiates the interpreting process and has the primary role in determining the level of SI quality. If it is in the speakers' interest that the whole multilingual audience receives the relevant elements of the speech in a processable way, speakers should remember that the speech also has to be processed by interpreters. Speakers should collaborate with interpreters so that this mutual goal can be reached. In other words, speakers should make sure that they speak in such a way which allows the interpreters to render their message so that that listeners comprehend them, and are able to create their own interpretation of the speaker's message.

The above statement does not mean that interpreters are not accountable for SI quality. They divide their attention between the speaker and the listener, and their primary task is to take the listener's needs into account. Terminological accuracy is naturally important for listeners, but other speech elements require accuracy as well. Procedural encoding devices, such as connectives, modals and markers of coordination, have an important role for the audience, as they help the listener to process the communicative intentions of the speaker. Therefore, interpreters should not focus solely on the propositional content, or the factual data. They should also convey the linguistic devices, referred to above, that provide clues to the listener on how to process the speaker's text.

The analysis of the research material shows that an interpreter's knowledge of the topic has a major impact on SI quality. Therefore, collaboration between the speaker/organizer/administration and the interpreter is of vital importance if the quality of SI is to be improved. Familiarity of the topic and genre of the meeting is also reflected in the level of accuracy and faithfulness of the SI.

An interpreter's command of the source language(s) is a further factor that clearly affects the quality of SI. The results of the present study, based on authentic material, show a clear correlation between an interpreter's command of languages and the number of omissions and errors in the TT. This is evident in the case of languages of limited diffusion included in this study (Finnish, Swedish). Interpreters whose native language is English or German had not, at the time of the recordings in 1996, had enough practice in understanding spoken Swedish. In addition, accuracy may suffer if interpreters are expected to master more than three languages. The same is true if interpreters are required to interpret written speeches into languages which are not their mother tongue or their language of education. This is clearly demonstrated in the case when Finnish speeches are interpreted into German by Finnish interpreters who are not native speakers of German.

The method applied in this study provides a systematic approach to analyzing SI material. Specific tool can be used in a reliable manner to assess whether an interpreter's target text conveys the sense of the message. The method is not limited to political rhetoric alone. Argumentative rhetoric is an integral element of public speaking in general. The approach also highlights those ST textual features which are not amenable to simultaneous interpreting, such as a literary style which is characterized by a high lexical and syntactic density, and written speeches that are read from script.

The focus in this study has been on the definition of SI quality, and consequently, the method of analysis has centered around the comparison of STs with TTs. A different focus would probably lead to different methods. Should the researcher be interested in analyzing interpreters' performances as textual entities, he or she would probably not pay too much attention to the ST.

However, it is important to remember that any analysis of natural language is bound to be subjective. Arguments, rhetoric means, or speech acts may be interpreted differently by different recipients. The significance of certain textual features also varies from one listener to the next. One member of the audience may focus on terminological accuracy, or correctness of factual data, whereas another listener in the same audience gives higher priority to oratory skills and elegance. Interpreter colleagues, as well as teachers and scholars of interpreting, would form yet another audience, who might view the SI performances differently from the actual end-users of SI.

The crucial question, however, remains the same whatever the audience:

How can the interpreter's performance provide the listener with the same conditions for comprehending the speech, or for creating one's own interpretation of the content of the speech and of the speaker's intentions, as the speaker's performance provides to another listener who is listening to the original speech?

This was the research question of this study, and it needs to be answered before this study is over. A satisfactory answer is vital for a multi-lingual institution such as the European Parliament, which will soon house twenty-five Member States with their national languages. Will it remain a voice of its citizens, or will it become a modern tower of Babel?

This study gives a simple answer: *Speakers should take into account the fact that their speeches are being or are to be interpreted.*

This sounds basic, but the authentic material shows that speakers often forget this fact. In addition, speakers are not often aware of the factors that are at play in the oral mode of translation. A better awareness of features that either facilitate or complicate the interpreter's performance will make communication effective. Effectiveness deteriorates in a multilingual speech situation if interpreting does not work adequately. Naturally, effectiveness of communication depends on interpreter skills which can be upgraded by well-targeted further training. But to an even greater degree effectiveness depends on speakers and the way they take their listeners and interpreters into account. It should also be remembered that what facilitates interpreters' work also benefits the multilingual audience. The listener's role is greatly facilitated if speakers speak their text instead of reading them aloud, i.e. express themselves in a manner which is as close to the spoken norm as possible. This is true irrespective of whether the member of the audience listens to the original or the interpreted version. By taking into account the fact that speeches are interpreted, speakers prioritize the needs of the audience. In this way they will act true to their role in giving a voice to the citizens of Europe.

TIIVISTELMÄ

KANSALAISTEN ÄÄNI VAI NYKYAJAN BAABELIN TORNI?

Tulkkauksen laatu Euroopan parlamentin poliittisen retoriikan valossa

Tutkimus käsittelee simultaanitulkkausta yhtenä kääntämisen alalajina. Tutkimuksen kannalta simultaanitulkkauksessa on useita kiinnostavia tekijöitä, jotka erottavat sen muun tyyppisistä kielellisistä tehtävistä. Näitä ovat samanaikainen kuunteleminen ja puhuminen sekä ulkopuolelta määräytyvä puheen sisältö ja puhenopeus. Kääntämiseen toiminnan liittää se, että tulkki vastaanottaa puheen yhdellä kielellä ja tuottaa sen toisella kielellä. Tämä puheen merkityksen ja kielellisen muodon prosessointi on kiinnostanut neurologeja, psykologeja, psykolingvistejä ja kognitiotieteilijöitä. Käsillä olevassa tutkimuksessa näiden tutkimusten tuottamaa tietoa käytetään analyysin taustana.

Kirjallinen ja suullinen kääntäminen ovat prosesseina siinä määrin erilaisia, että tulkkaukselle on luotu oma teoreettinen tarkastelukehys. Teorianmuodostuksessa on kuitenkin vielä tarkentamisen varaa. Omalta osaltani olen halunnut tehdä tutkimuksen, joka autenttisen tekstiaineiston pohjalta saaduin tuloksin ja johtopäätöksin täydentää olemassa olevaa kuvaa siitä, millaisia tekstejä simultaanitulkkauksessa työstetään.

Aikaisempi tulkkauksen tutkimus on tarkastellut tulkkausta suhteellisen pienten aineistojen pohjalta, jotka joissakin tapauksissa ovat autenttista kokousmateriaalia, mutta aineistoa on täydennetty tutkimusta varten järjestetyissä tilanteissa. Yleensäkin aineiston saanti tulkkauksen tutkimukseen on todettu vaikeaksi. Aineistoon liittyvänä ongelmana on ollut myös se, että yleistävien johtopäätösten tekeminen edellyttää paitsi edustavaa aineistoa myös usean tulkin versioita samoista lähtöteksteistä samoille kohdeyleisöille samoissa puhetilanteissa. Näiltä osin tutkimukseni aineisto täyttää empiiriselle tutkimukselle asetetut edustavuutta koskevat vaatimukset. Aineisto - 120 puhetta (englanniksi, ruotsiksi, saksaksi ja suomeksi) sekä tulkkaukset samoilla kielillä - on nauhoitettu Euroopan parlamentin täysistunnossa keväällä 1996.

Euroopan parlamentin tulkkiosaston mukaan "tulkkien tehtävänä on tulkata yhdellä Euroopan unionin virallisella kielellä pidetyt puheet täsmällisesti muille virallisille kielille." Tutkimuksessa tarkastellaan, miten tämä toteutuu käytännössä. Painopiste on tulkkauksen laadussa, jota analysoidaan autenttisen kokousaineiston pohjalta.

Määritelmien mukaan tulkin tehtävä on vastaanottaa ja tuottaa uudelleen toisen henkilön puheen sisältö ja tarkoitus säyvineen ja asenteineen, täsmällisesti ja uskollisesti. Tutkimukseni pyrkii operationalisoimaan nämä laatukriteerit, jotka yleiskielisinä voivat tarkoittaa eri asioita eri arvioitsijoille. Kyseiset kriteerit liittyvät myös tulkkauksen kuulijoiden odotuksia kartoittaneiden tutkimusten tuloksiin, joiden mukaan kuulijat pitävät tärkeimpänä laatukriteerinä lähtötekstin ja kohdetekstin välistä merkitysvastaavuutta. Niinpä olen asettanut tutkimuksen tehtäväksi kuvata EP:n puheiden sisällön välittymistä tulkkauksessa sekä pohtia, mitkä tekijät edistävät tai haittaavat tulkkaukselle asetettujen tavoitteiden toteutumista.

Tutkimuksen lähtöoletuksen mukaan alkuperäinen puhe ja tulkin versio poikkeavat usein toisistaan. Tehtävänä on ollut verrata lähtötekstejä ja kohdetekstejä toisiinsa teoreettisten kriteerien pohjalta sekä ryhmitellä vertailun perusteella poikkeavuuksia sen mukaan, miten ne muuttavat lähtötekstin viestiä. Argumentoinnin teorian, erityisesti Perelmanin uuden retoriikan (1982), sekä tekstilingvistiikan (Adam 1999, Halliday 1985) avulla on analysoitu EP:ssä pidettyjen puheitten sisältöä ja tavoitteita. Puheita voidaan tarkastella omana genrenään (poliittinen retoriikka), jossa on selvästi erottuvia puheakteja (vetoaminen, ohjeitten antaminen, vaatimusten esittäminen). Puhujat perustelevat väitteitään retorisin keinoin. Näiden kokonaisuuksien tunnistaminen auttaa määrittämään viestin sisältöä, jonka tulisi välittyä tulkkauksessa.

Lähtöoletuksen mukaan simultaanitulkkauksen onnistuminen määritelmissä asetettujen tavoitteiden ja laatuvaatimusten mukaisesti ei riipu yksin tulkin taidoista. Tätä on pyritty demonstroimaan siten, että vertaillaan kolmen eri tulkin versioita samasta lähtötekstistä. Tulkit toimivat normaaleissa työolosuhteissa viikkotyölistan mukaisesti. Aineistona on eri istuntotyyppejä, jotka asettavat erilaisia vaatimuksia tulkkien yleistiedoille ja EU-tietämykselle. Suuri osa lähtöteksteistä on etukäteen valmisteltuja, monet kirjoitettuja ja sisältä luettuja.

Vertailun tuloksena nähdään, että tulkkaukset poikkeavat lähtöteksteistä suorassa suhteessa niiden muotoiluun ja esitystapaan. Mitä kirjallisempi tekstin muotoilu ja mitä nopeammin se luetaan/puhutaan, sitä enemmän tulkkien kohdeteksteissä on virheitä ja poisjättöjä. Tulos vahvistaa ensimmäisten empiiristen tutkimusten tuloksia (esim Oléron ja

Nanpon 1965, Gerver 1969) samoin kuin ensimmäisten teoreetikkojen väittämiä (esim. Lederer 1981, Seleskovitch 1982), joiden mukaan simultaanitulkkaus on tarkoitettu vapaasti esitetyn puheen kääntämiseen.

Lähtötekstien ja kohdetekstien vertailu korostaa kielitaidon merkitystä simultaanitulkkauksessa. Tulkin asiantuntemus korreloi myös suorassa suhteessa tulkkauksen tarkkuuteen. Tulos vahvistaa teorioissa ja oppikirjoissa esitettyjä näkemyksiä tulkin tarpeesta saada perehtyä käsiteltävään aiheeseen etukäteen.

Tutkimukseni on pyrkinyt löytämään uuden näkökulman sen määrittämiseen, mikä on 'viestin sisältö' täydentämään aiempia lähestymistapoja ('semanttinen ja propositionaalinen merkitys'). Koska simultaanitulkkaus ei saa eikä voikaan olla pelkkää kielellistä transkoodausta, on tavoitteena ollut löytää lähestymistapa, joka pureutuu sisältöön sivuuttamatta kuitenkaan kielellistä ilmaisua. Argumentoinnin teoria tarjoaa lähestymistavan, jota voi soveltaa joustavasti luonnollisen puheen analysointiin.

REFERENCES

Adam, Jean-Michel (1999) *Linguistic textuelle. Des genres de discours aux textes,* Paris: Nathan.

Ahrens, Barbara (2002) 'The correlation between verbal and nonverbal elements in simultaneous interpretation', *In*: G. Garzone, P. Mead and M. Viezzi, 37–46.

Alexieva, Bistra (1994) 'Types of texts and intertextuality in simultaneous interpreting.' *In*:M. Snell-Hornby, F. Pöchhacker and K. Kaindl, 179–187.

Antola, Esko et al. (1996) *Mitä EU:sta?* Sitran julkaisusarja no. 150, Atena kustannus.

Aristoteles *IX Retoriikka (Rhetorica) Runousoppi (Poetica)* Tampere: Gaudeamus.

Austin, J.L. (1962/1990) *How to do things with words,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baker, Mona, ed. (1998/2001) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies,* London and New York: Routledge

Barik, Henri C. (1969/2002) 'Simultaneous interpretation. Qualitative and linguistic data.' *In*: F. Pöchhacker and M. Shlesinger, 78–91.

Bowker, L. et al. eds. (1998) *Unity in Diversity? Current Trends in Translation Studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Bühler, Hildegund (1986) 'Linguistic (semantic) and extra-linguistic (pragmatic) criteria for the evaluation of conference interpretation and interpreters.' *Multilingua* 5 (4), 231-235.

Chernov, Ghelly V. (1979/2002) 'Semantic aspects of psycholinguistic research in simultaneous interpretation.' *In*: F. Pöchhacker and M. Shlesinger, 98–109.

Collados Aís, Angela (1998/2002) Quality Assessment in Simultaneous Interpreting: The Importance of Non-verbal Communication. *In*: F. Pöchhacker and M. Shlesinger, 326–336.

Cutler, A., Dahan, D. & van Donselaar (1997) 'Prosody in the comprehension of spoken language': A literature review. *In*: *Language & Speech*, (40(2), 141–201.

de Bot, Kees (2000) 'Simultaneous interpreting as language production.' *In*: B. Englund Dimitrova and K. Hyltenstam, 65–88.

Déjean Le Féal (1990) 'Some thoughts on the evaluation of simultaneous interpretation.' *In*: D. and M. Bowen, eds. *Interpreting – Yesterday, today and tomorrow*, Binghamton, NY: SUNY, pp. 154–60.

Englund Dimitrova, B. and Hyltenstam K. eds. (2000) *Language processing and simultaneous interpreting*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Enqvist, Nils Erik (ed.) (1982) *Impromptu Speech: A symposium,* Åbo: Åbo Akademi.

Evans, Ruth (1998/2001) 'Metaphor of Translation', *In*: M. Baker, 149–153.

Gambier, Y. and Tommola J. eds. (1993) *Translation & Knowledge. SSOT IV Scandinavian symposium on translation theory, Turku, 4–61992.* Turku: Centre for Translation and Interpreting.

- - - - - , D. Gile, C. Taylor, eds. (1997) *Conference Interpreting: Current trends in esearch..Proceedings of the International Conference on Interpreting: What do we know and how? Turku, August 25–27, 1994,* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins

Garzone, G., Mead, P., Viezzi, M. eds. (2002) *Perspectives on interpreting*, Bologna: CLUEB

- - - - - amd Viezzi, M. eds. (2002) *Interpreting in the 21st Century. Challenges and Opportunities*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Gile, Daniel (1990a) 'L'évaluation de la qualité de l'interpretation par les délégues: une étude de cas', *The Interpreters' Newsletter*, 3, 66–71.

- - - - - (1990b) 'Scientific research vs. personal theories in the investigation of interpretation', *In*: L. Gran and C. Taylor, 28–41.

- - - - (1991) 'Methodological aspects of interpretation (and translation) research', *Target* 3 (2), 153–174.

- - - - (1994) 'Opening up in interpretation studies.' *In*: M. Snell-Hornby et al., pp. 149-158.

- - - - (1995) 'Mirror Mirror on the Wall: An Introduction', *Target* 7(1) Special Issue Interpreting Research, 1–6.

- - - - (1997a). 'Postscript', In: Y. Gambier, D. Gile, C. Taylor, 207–211.

- - - - - (2000) 'Issues in Interdisciplinary Research into Conference Interpreting.' *In*: B. Englund Dimitrova and K. Hyltenstam, 89–106.

- - - - et. al. (1997b) 'Methodology', *In*: Y. Gambier, D. Gile, C. Taylor, 109–122.

Gerver, David (1969/2002) 'The effects of source language presentation rate on the performance of simultaneous conference interpreters.' *In*: F. Pöchhacker and M. Shlesinger, 53–66.

Gran, L. and Taylor, C. eds. (1990) *Aspects of applied and experimental research on conference interpretation*, Udine: Campanotto

- - - - - and Dodds J. eds. (1989) *The Theoretical and Practical Aspects of Teaching Interpretation. Proceedings of the Trieste Symposium, 1986,* Udine: Campanotto

Halliday, M.A.K. (1985/1990) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar.* London: Arnold.

Halverson, Sandra (1998) *Concepts and Categories in Translation Studies*. Ph.D. Thesis (published) Department of English, University of Bergen, Norway.

Hatim, B. and Mason, I. (1990) *Discourse and the Translator*. London/New York: Longman.

Herbert, J. (1952/1968) *The Interpreter's Handbook: How to Become a Conference Interpreter*, Genève: Librairie de l'Université Georg.

Isham, William P. (2000) 'Phonological Interference in Interpreters of Spoken-Languages: An Issue of Storage or Process?' *In*: B. Englund Dimitrova, K. Hyltenstam, 133–149.

Kakkuri-Knuuttila, Marja-Liisa, ed. (1999) *Argumentti ja kritiikki. Lukemisen, keskustelun ja vakuuttamisen taidot*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus

Kalina, Sylvia (1998) *Strategische Prozesse beim Dolmetschen,* Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

- - - - - (2002) 'Quality in Interpreting and its Prerequisites – A Framework for a Comprehensive View.' *In*:: G. Garzone, M. Viezzi, 121–130.

Kurz, Ingrid (1989) 'Conference Interpreting: User Expectations.' *In*: D.L. Hammond (ed.) *Coming of Age: Proceedings of the 30th Annual Conference of the American Translators Association*, Medford, New Jersey: Learned Information, 143–148.

- - - - - (1993/ 2002) 'Conference Interpretation: Expectations of Different User Groups.' *In*: F. Pöchhacker and M. Shlesinger, 313–324.

Kopczynski, Andrej (1980) *Conference Interpreting: Some linguistic and communicative problems.* Poznan: Institute of Applied Linguistics, Warsaw University.

Lamberger-Felber, Heike (1998) *Der Einfluß kontextueller Faktoren auf das Simultandolmetschen. Eine Fallstudie am Beispiel gelesener Reden*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Graz Universität

Lederer, Marianne (1978/2002) 'Simultaneous Interpretation – Units of Meaning and Other

Features.' *In*: F. Pöchhacker and M. Shlesinger, 131–146.

- - - - - (1981) *La traduction simultanée – Expérience et théorie*, Paris: Minard Lettres Modernes.

Leech, Geoffrey (1983/1991) *Principles of Pragmatics*, London/New York: Longman.

Leiwo, Matti (1992) *Pragmatiikan ja retoriikan oerusteita*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto.

Levelt, Willem (1989) *Speaking: from Intention to Articulation*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT.

Mack, Gabriele (2002) 'Die beurteilung professioneller Dolmetschleistungen.' *In*: J. Best and S. Kalina, eds. *Übersetzen und Dolmetschen*, Tübingen und Basel: A. Francke Verlag, 110–119.

- - - - - and Lorella Cattaruzza (1995) 'User surveys in SI: a means of learning about quality and/or raising some reasonable doubts.' *In*: Tommola, Jorma (ed.) *Topics in interpreting research*, University of Turku, Centre for Translation and Interpreting, 37–49.

Mackintosh, Jennifer (1995) 'A Review of Conference Interpretation: Practice and Training', *Target* Special Issue on Interpreting Research 7(1), 119–133.

Malmkjær, Kirsten (2001) 'Unit of translation', In: M. Baker, 286–288.

Massaro, Dominique and Shlesinger, Miriam (1997) 'Information Processing and a Computational Approach to Simultaneous Interpretation', *Interpreting* 1 (2), 12–53.

Marzocci, Carlo &Giancarlo Zucchetto (1997) 'Some Considerations on Interpreting in an Institutional Context: the Case of the European Parliament'. *Terminologie et Traduction* 3. 1997, Luxembourg: Commission européenne, 70–85.

Meyer, Michel (1986) *De la problématologie*, Bruxelles: Mardaga.

Messina, Alessandro (2002) 'Quality research and quality standards in interpreting: the state of the art.' *In*: G. Garzone, P. Mead, M. Viezzi, 103–109.

Moser, Peter (1995) *Survey on expectations of users of conference interpretation*, commissioned by AIIC (International Association of Conference Interpreters).

Nida. Eugene and Charles Taber (1969) *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Leiden: Brill.

Noël, Emile (1993) *Working together – the institutions of the European Community*, Brussels/Luxembourg: Directorate General for Information, Communication, Culture and Audiovisual, Publications Unit.

Oléron, Pierre and Hubert Nanpon (1963/2002) 'Research into Simultaneous Translation', *In*: F. Pöchhacker and M. Shlesinger, 43–50.

Palonen, Kari (1998) 'Retorinen käänne poliittisen ajattelun tutkimuksessa', *In*: K. Palonen, H. Summa, 137–159.

- - - - - & Summa H. eds. (1998) *Pelkkää retoriikkaa*. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Paradis, Michel (2000) 'Prerequisites to a Study of Neurolinguistic Processes involved in Simultaneous Interpreteting. A Synopsis', *In*: B. Englund Dimitrova, K. Hyltenstam, 17–24.

Perelman, Chaïm (1982) *The realm of Rhetoric*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Perelman, Chaïm (1979) *The New Rhetoric and the Humanities*. Dordrecht:Holland / London: D. Reidel Publishing Company.

Perelman, Chaïm and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca (1958/1968) *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on argumentation*, Trans. by J. Wilkinson and P. Weaver, Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Posner, Michael I. and Stanislas Dehaene (1994) 'Attentional networks', TINS, 17 (2), 75–79.

Pöchhacker, Franz (2002) 'Researching Interpreting Quality: Models and Methods.' In: G. Garzone, M. Viezzi, 95–106.

- - - - - (2001) 'Researching Interpreting Quality', *Meta*, XLVI (2).

- - - - (1994) *Simultandolmetschen als komplexes Handeln,* Tübingen: Gunter Narr

- - - - (1993) 'From knowledge to text: coherence in simultaneous interpreting', *In*: Y. Gambier, J. Tommola, 87–100.

Pöchhacker, F. and Shlesinger M. eds. (2002) *The Interpreting Studies Reader.* London/New York: Routledge.

Ramos-Ruano, Germán-Luis (1991) *In*: D. Staquet & K. Zeyringer, 61–65.

Raunio, Tapio (1996) *Party group behaviour in the European Parliament.* Acta Universitatis Tamperensis. ser A vol 521, Tampere: Tampereen yliopisto

Robinson, Douglas (1998/2001) 'Free translation*', In*: M. Baker, Mona, 87–90.

Rules of Procedure (February 1995) 10th edition, European Parliament.

Searle, John R. (1979/1989) *Expression and Meaning. Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Segui, Juan & Ferrand, Ludovic (2000) *Leçons de parole*. Paris: Odile Jacob

Seleskovitch, Danica (1978) *Interpreting for International Conferences. Problems of Language and Communication.* Translation and adaptation of *L'interprète dans les conférences internationales – problèmes de langage et de communication* by Stephanie Dailey and E. Norman McMillan. Washington: Pen and Booth.

- - - - - (1982) 'Impromptu speech and oral translation', *In*: N-E. Enkvist, 245–253.

Selkirk, E. (1984) *Phonology and syntax: The relation between sound and structure*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Setton, Robin (1999) *Simultaneous Interpretation: A Cognitive-Pragmatic Analysis* Amsterdam /Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- - - - - (2002) 'Meaning assembly in simultaneous interpretation.' *In*: F. Pöchhacker and M. Shlesinger, 179–202.

Sharwood Smith, Michael (2000) 'Attention Mechanisms and the Language Acquisition Device. Reflections on Communication and Developmental Processes'*, In*: B. Englund Dimitrova, K. Hyltenstam, 25–44.

Shlesinger, Miriam (1989) *Simultaneous Interpretation as a Factor in Effecting Shifts in the Position of Texts on the Oral-literate Continuum*, unpublished M.A. Thesis, Tel Aviv University.

- - - - (1995a) 'Stranger in Paradigms: What Lies Ahead for Simultaneous Interpreting Research?' *Target* Special Issue Interpreting Research 7 (1), 7–28.

- - - - - (1995b)'Shifts in Cohesion in Simultaneous Interpreting', *The Translator* 1 (2), 193–214.

- - - - - (1997) 'Quality in Simultaneous Interpreting.' *In*: Gambier Y., Gile, D., Taylor, C., 123–131.

Snell-Hornby, Mary (1988) *Translation Studies. An Integrated Approach*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins

- - - - - Pöchhacker, F., Kaindl, K. eds. (1994) *Translation Studies. An Interdiscipline. Selected Papers from the Translation Studies Congress, Vienna, 9-12 September 1992,* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins

Staquet, D. and Zeyringer, K. eds. (1991) *Les Langues: Pivot du Nouvel Espace Economique Europeen. 17ème Colloque annuel Angers, I.P.V.L. 10.11.10.1991.* Association Internationale Langues et Economie. Nottingham: Praetorius Limited

Stenzl, Catherine (1989) 'From Theory to Practice and from Practice to Theory.' *In*: Gran and Dodds, 23–26.

Stubbs, Michael (1988) *Discourse Analysis. The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language,* Oxford: Basil Blackwell

- - - - (1996) *Text and Corpus Analysis. Computer-assisted Studies of Language and Culture*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Summa, Hilkka (1998) 'Kolme näkökulmaa uuteen retoriikkaan', *In*: K. Palonen, H. Summa, 51–83.

Tommola, Jorma (1999) 'New Trends in Interpreting Research: Going Psycho – or Neuro?' *In*: A. Álvarez Lugris, A. Fernández Ocampo, (eds.) *Anovar/Anosar estudios de tradución e interpretación,* Vigo, vol. 1, pp. 321–330.

- - - - (2003) 'Estimating the transfer of semantic information in interpreting', in Collados Aís, A., Fernándes Sánchez, M. & Gile, D. (eds.) *La evaluación de la calidad en interpretación*. Granada: Editorial Comares, 125–146.

- - - - and Laakso, T. (1997) 'Source text segmentation, speech rate and language direction: effects on traIn:ee simultaneous interpreting', *In*: Klaudy, K. and Kohn, J. (eds.) *Transferre necesse est,* Budapest: Scholastica, pp. 186–191.

- - - - and Helevä, M. (1998) 'Language direction and wource text complexity: effects on trainee performance in simultaneous interpreting', *In*: Bowker et al., 177–186.

Toury, Gideon (1995) *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins

Varantola, Krista (1980) *On Simultaneous Interpretation.* Publications of Turku Language Institute No. 1.

Vermeer, Hans J. (1989) *Skopos und Translationsauftrag*. (th - translatorisches handeln, Band 2) Heidelberg: Selbstverlag.

Vuorikoski, Anna-Riitta (1997) 'User Responses to Simultaneous Interpreting.' *In*: L. Bowker et al (eds.) *Unity in Diversity? Current Trends in Translation Studies*, Manchester: St. Jerome, 187–194.

- - - - - (1995b) 'Simultaneous Interpreting as Experienced by the Audience.' *In*: P. Krawutschke (ed.) *Connections. Proceedings of the 36th Annual Conference of the American Translators Association*, Medford, N.J.: Information Today, Inc., 165–174.

- - - - - (1995a) *Simultaneous Interpreting – User Experience and Expectations*. Unpublished Licentiate Thesis. Department of Translation Studies, University of Tampere.

- - - - - (1993) 'Simultaneous Interpretation – User Experience and Expectation.' *In*: C. Picken, ed. *Translation –The Vital Link: Proceedings of the XIIIth World Congress of   FIT,* vol. 1, London: Institute of Translation and Interpreting, 317–327.

Wagner, Emma et al. (eds.) (2002) *Translating for the European Union Institutions.* Manchester: St. Jerome.

Williams, Malcolm (2001)'The Application of Argumentation Theory to Translation Quality Assessment', *Meta*, XLVI (2), 326–344.

Wilson, John (1990) *Politicaqlly Speaking. The Pragmatic Analysis of Political Lanuage.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell Limited.

EU information sources:

Euroopan parlamentin jäsenet 1994–1999. Neljäs vaalikausi. Toimittanut Euroopan parlamentin pääsihteeristö. Parlamentin puheenjohtajiston pääosasto. Jäsenistä vastaava jaosto, helmikuu 1996, Luxemburg: Euroopan yhteisöjen virallisten julkaisujen toimisto.

'Interpretation in the European Parliament'. Report by Mrs Pery. PE 194.642/BUR

Official Journal of the European Communities, No. 4-473, Report of proceedings from 15 to 19 January 1996

Rules of Procedure 1995

(See also list of research material)

Electronic sources:
  http://www.europa.eu.int/inst
  http://www.europa.eu.in/institutions/parliament
  http://www.europarl.eu.int/

APPENDIX 1

LIST OF THE RESEARCH MATERIAL

Interviews:
Ulpu Iivari
Saara-Maria Paakkinen
Stenius-Kaukonen
Mikko Rönnholm
Kyösti Toivonen

Video recordings and printed documents from the European Parliament:

Ennakkokatsaus 11.-15.12.1995/ PE 191.607 (in Finnish)
Briefing (as at 4.12.1995)
Final Draft Agenda PE 165.614/FD
Esityslista istuntojakso 11-15.12.1995 PE 165.614/OJ (In Finnish)
Esityslista tiistai 12.12.1995 (In Finnish)
Suulliset kysymykset työjärjestyksen 41 artiklan mukaisesti KYSELYTUNNILLE
12. joulukuuta 1995/ PE 194.931 (In Finnish)
ORAL QUESTIONS pursuant to Rule 41 of Rules of Procedure for QUESTION TIME on 12
December 1995/ PE 194.931

14.12.1995
ESITYSLISTA Istunto Torstai 14. joulukuuta 1995/ PE 195.293 (In Finnish)
AGENDA for the sitting of Thursday 14 December 1995 /PE 195.293
ESITYSLISTA Istunto Torstai 14. joulukuuta 1995/ PE 195.293 (In Finnish)
Päätöslauselmaesitykset (In Finnish)
11.45-12.15 Votes
15.00-15.30 Topical and Urgent Debate
Minutes Sitting of Wednesday 13 December 1995 /PE 195.288
Pöytäkirja Istunto 13.12.1995 (In Finnish)

JANUARY
Briefing (as at 9.1.1996)
Lopullinen esityslistaluonnos PE 165.707/PDOJ (In Finnish)

18.1.1996
video recording: **Howitt report** (53 mins)
REPORT on the Europen Commission's information document on Structural Funds Innovatory
Measures 1995-1999: Guidelines for the second series of actions under Article 10 of the ERDF
Regulation Committee on Regional Policy
Rapporteur: Mr. Richard Howitt A4-0257/95
[MIETINTÖ Euroopan komission tiedotusasiakirja rakennerahastojen uutta luovista toimenpiteistä
vuosina 1994-1999 ja suuntaviivoista EAKR:n asetuksen 10 artiklan mukaisille toimille (C4-
0453/95)]

video recording: Myller report (30 mins)

MIETINTÖ Komission tiedonanto varojen jakamisesta ja yhtisöalotteiden toteuttamisesta Itävallassa, Ruotsissa ja Suomessa (KOM (95)0123 - C4-0282/95)

Alueellinen komitea

Esittelijä: Riitta Myller

REPORT on the Communication from the Commission on the allocation of funds and the implementation of Community Initiatives in Austria, Finland and Sweden

Rapporteur: Mrs. Riitta Myller A4-0328/95

Official Journal of the European Communities No. 4-473

Debats of the European Parliament, English edition

FEBRUARY 1996

Ennakkokatsaus PE 196.294 (In Finnish)

Briefing (as at 1.2.1996) PE 196.294

Esityslista, istuntojakso helmikuu 1996/ PE 165.756/OJ (In Finnish)

13.2.96

Video recording: Joint debate Application of community law (3h 27min)

REPORT (A4-0001/96) on the Commission's Twelfth Annual Report to Parliament on monitoring the application of Community law - 1994 (COM (95) 0500 - C4 - 0233/95)

Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights

Rapporteur: Mr Georgios Anastassopoulos

MIETINTÖ (A4-0001/96) Komission kahdestoista vuosikertomus parlamentille yhteisön oikeuden soveltamisen valvonnasta - 1994

Oikeusasioita ja kansalaisten oikeuksia käsittelevä valiokunta

Video recording: Joint debate Equal pay

REPORT (A4 0338/95) on the Memorandum on equal pay for work of equal value (COM (94) 0006 - C4-00084/94)

Committee on Women's Rights

Rapporteur: Mrs Maria Paola Colombo Svevo

MIETINTÖ (A4 0338/95) Muistio samapalkkaisuudesta samanarvoisissa työtehtävissä (KOM (94) 0006 - C4-00084/94)

Naisten oikeuksien valiokunta

Verbatim report of proceedings 13.2.1996

PÖYTÄKIRJA Istunto Tiistai 13. helmikuuta 1996 / PE 196.582

14.2.1996

Video recording: **Joint debate Hoppenstedt report** (186 mins)

MIETINTÖ (A4-0018/95) Ehdotus Euroopan parlamentin ja neuvoston direktiiviksi televisiotoimintaa koskevien jäsenvaltioiden lakien, asetusten ja hallinnollisten määräysten yhteensovittamisesta annetun direktiivin 89/552/ETY muuttamisesta (KOM(95) 0086 - C4-0200/95 - 95/0074 (COD))
kulttuuri-, nuoriso- ja koulutusasioita sekä tiedotusvälineitä käsittelevä valiokunta
Esittelijä: Gerardo Galeote Quecedo
         Karsten Friedrich Hoppenstedt

Verbatim report of the proceedings

II Northern Ireland peace process

MARCH

Ennakkokatsaus PE 196.306 (In Finnish)
Final Draft Agenda PE 165.826/FD
LOPULLINEN ESITYSLISTALUONNOS istuntojakso MAALISKUU 1996/
PE 165.826/PDOJ (In Finnish)

13.3.96
video: **Joint debate Dury & Maj-Weggen** (2 h 21 min)
Report (A4–0068/96) on Parliament's opinion on the convening of the Intergovernmental Conference; and evaluation of the work of the Reflection Group and definition of the political priorities of European Parliament with a view to the Intergovernmental Conference on the proposal for amendment of the Treaties on which the European Union is founded
Statements by Council and Commission on the preparations
for the European Council (Turin, 29/30 March 1996)
Rapporteurs Ms. Raymonde Dury and Ms. Johanna Maij-Weggen
REPORT (A4-0068/96)

Oral questions:	**B4-0282/96 - 0-0031/96**
	B4-0283/96 - 0-0034/96
	B4-0284/96 - 0-0052/96
	B4-0286/96 - 0-0058/96
	B4-0289/96 - 0-0067/96
Questions to the Council (2h10min)	
	B4-0278/96

Verbatim report of the proceedings 12.3. - 13.3.1996

14.3.96
Topical and urgent subjects (2h 23 min)
Verbatim report of the proceedings 13.3. - 14.3.1999

European Parliament, Directorate General for Research: Working papers: THE POWERS OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT IN THE EUROPEAN UNION. Political Series E-1. December 1993

Appendix 2

6.1   Debate on a familiar topic
Wednesday 14th February 1996 Joint debate 9.15 – 12.00
Report: Galeote Quecedo and Hoppenstedt Television broadcasting (A4-18/96)

No. of Speech / Speaker	SL	Target languages	Comments
1/33 Hoppenstedt, Karsten	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	1st speaker
06-04-1937			
Veterinarian			
Germany/CDU			
MEP 07.1989 /PPE			
2/33 Whitehead, Phillip	English	Finnish, German, Swedish	5th speaker
30-05-1937			
Writer and television producer			
United Kingdom /Lab.			
MEP 07.1994 /PSE			
3/33 Ahlqvist, Birgitta	Swedish	English, Finnish, German	7th speaker
16-05-1948			
Headmistress			
Sweden /SAP			
MEP 01.1995 /PSE			
4/33 Perry, Roy James	English	Finnish, German, Swedish	24th speaker
12-02-1943			
Lecturer			
United Kingdom /Cons.			
MEP 07.1994 /PPE			
5/33 Banotti, Mary	English	Finnish, German, Swedish	28th speaker
29-05-1939			
MEP			
Ireland /FG			
MEP 07.1984 /PPE			
6/33 Junker, Karin	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	29th speaker
24–12–1940			
Journalist			
Germany /SPD			
MEP 07.1989			
7/33 Tongue, Carol	English	Finnish, German, Swedish	31st speaker
14–10–1955			
Administrator, researcher			
United Kingdom /Lab.			
MEP 07.1984 /PSE			

Annex 2. ii

6.2 Debates displaying features of EU institutional rhetoric

6.2.1 Speeches on the role of the EU Parliament
Wednesday 13th March 1996 Joint debate 8.15 a.m. –12.30 p.m.
Report Mrs Dury and Mrs Maij-Weggen
on behalf of the Committee on Institutional Affairs (A4-0068/96)
on Parliament's opinion on the convening of the Intergovernmental Conference; and evaluation of the Reflection Group and definition of the political priorities of the European Parliament with a view to the Intergovernmental Conference on the proposal of the amendment of the Treaties on which the European Union is founded
IGC – Preparations for the Turin summit

No. of speech / Speaker	SL	Target languages	Comments
1/77 Green, Pauline	English	Finnish, German, Swedish	21st speaker
08–12–1948			
Parliamentary Officer for Co-operative Union			
United Kingdom /Lab.			
MEP 07.1989 / PSE			
2/77 Poettering, Hans-Gert	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	22nd speaker
15–09–1945			
Lawyer			
Germany /CDU			
MEP 07.1979 /PPE			
3/77 Roth, Claudia	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	26th speaker
15–05–1955			
Dramatist			
Germany / Grüne			
MEP 07.1989 / V			
4/33 Voggenhuber, Johannes	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	35th speaker
06–05–1950			
MEP			
Austria /Grüne			
MEP 01.1995 / V			
5/77 Hyland, Liam	English	Finnish, German, Swedish	41st speaker
23–04–1933			
Politician			
Ireland / FF			
MEP 07.1994 /UPE			
6/77 Cox, Patrick	English	Finnish, German, Swedish	42nd speaker
28–11–1952			
Public representative			
Ireland /Non Party			
MEP 07.1989 /ELDR			

No. of speech / Speaker	S L	Target languages	Comments
8/77 Ullman, Wolfgang	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	44th speaker
Theologian			
Germany /Grüne			
MEP 07.1994 /V			
9/77 Riess-Passer, Susanne	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	46th speaker
03–01–1961			
Lawyer			
Austria /FPÖ			
MEP 01.1995-04.1996/ NI			
10/77 Lööw, Maj-Lis	Swedish	English, Finnish, German	65th speaker
13–08–1936			
Labour exchange officer			
Sweden /SAP			
MEP 01.1995 /PSE			
11/77 Donnelly, Brendan	English	Finnish, German, Swedish	66th speaker
25–08–1950			
Political consultant			
United Kingdom /Cons.			
MEP 07.1994 /PPE			
12/77 Iivari, Ulpu	Finnish	*German, English, Swedish	67th speaker
20–03–1948			
Journalist			
Finland /SDP			
MEP 01.1995 / PSE			
13/77 Malone, Bernie	English	Finnish, German, Swedish	69th speaker
26–03–1948			
Public representative			
Ireland /Lab.			
MEP 08.1994 /PSE			
14/77 David, Wayne	English	Finnish, German, Swedish	70th speaker
01–07–1957			
MEP			
United Kingdom /Lab.			
MEP 07.1989 /PSE			

Appendix 2.iii

5.2 Debates displaying features of EU institutional rhetoric

5.2.2 Questions to the Council and the Commission
Wednesday 13th March 1996 Joint debate 3 p.m. – 5.30 p.m.
Oral questions to the Council
on human issues to be raised at the UN Commission on Human Rights in Geneva in March-April 1996

No. of speech / Speaker	S L	Target languages	Comments
1/16 Lenz, Marlene	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	4th speaker
04–07–1932			on behalf of the P
MEP			(together with
Germany/ CDU			Oostlander and
MEP 07.1979 /PPE			Moorhouse)
2/16 Kreissl-Dörfler, Wolfgang	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	6th speaker
01–12–1950			
farmer /diploma in social			
pedagogy			
Germany / Grüne			
MEP 07.1994 /V			
3/16 Moorhouse, James	English	Finnish, German, Swedish	9th speaker
01–01–1924			
MEP			
United Kingdom /Cons.			
MEP 07.1979 /PPE			
4/16 Schulz, Martin	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	12th speaker
20–12–1955			
Bookseller			
Germany /SPD			
MEP 07.1994 /PSE			

5.2 Debates displaying features of EU institutional rhetoric

5.2.2 Questions to the Council and the Commission
5.2.2.2 Question Time to the Council
Wednesday 13 March 1996 5.30 p.m. – 7 p.m.

19 written questions were answered orally by Mr. Ferraris (in Italian) on behalf of the Council

Speaker	Source language	Target languages	comments
1/57 Watson, Graham R.	English	Finnish, German, Swedish	Question no. 12
23–03–1956			on the export of arms
MEP			44th speaker
United Kingdom /LD			
MEP 07.1994 /ELDR			
2/57 Lindqvist, Hans	Swedish	English, Finnish, German	Question no. 13
09–01–1942			on 'more or less
Lawyer			union'
Sweden / C P			47th speaker
MEP 10.1995 /ELDR			
3/57 Jackson, Caroline F.	English	Finnish, German, Swedish	Question no. 15
05–11–1946			(Question no. 14 was
MEP			cancelled)
United Kingdom /Cons.			on persecution in Iran
MEP 07.1984 /PPE			49th speaker
4/57 Lindqvist, Hans	Swedish	English, Finnish, German	52nd speaker
(see above)			Reaction to the President's interruption

Appendix 2.v.

5.2 Debates displaying features of EU institutional rhetoric
5.2.2 Questions to the Council and the Commission

5.2.2.3 Oral question to the Commission
Tuesday 13th February 1996 9.15 a.m. – 12 and 3 p.m. – 5.30 p.m.)

Oral question by Mr Speciale on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy to the Commission (B4-0011/96 – 0-0009/96/corr. 1) on the second planning period (1997-1999) of activities according to Objective 2 of the Structural Funds

Speaker	Source langua	Target languages	comments
1/23 Wulf-Mathies, Monika	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	2nd speaker
Member of the Commission			
2/23 McCarthy, Arlene	English	Finnish, German, Swedish	3rd speaker
10–10–1960			
Academic			
United Kingdom /Lab.			
MEP 07.1994 /PSE			
3/23 Stenius-Kaukonen, Marjatt	Finnish	English, German, Swedish	7th speaker
19–07–1947			
M P			
Finland /Vas			
MEP 01.1995–11.1996/GUE/NGL			
4/23 Schroedter, Elisabeth	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	8th speaker
11–03–1959			
Environment advisor			
Germany /Grüne			
MEP 07.1994 /V			
5/23 Macartney, Allan	English	Finnish, German, Swedish	9th speaker
17–02–1941			
United Kingdom /SNP			
MEP 07.1994 /ARE			
6/23 Walter, Ralf	German	Finnish, English, Swedish	11th speaker
15–03–1958			
Social worker			
Germany /SPD			
MEP 07.1994 /PSE			
7/23 Rusanen, Pirjo	Finnish	*German, English, Swedis	12th speaker
18–12–1940			
M P			
Finland /KOK			
MEP 01.1995-11.1996/ PPE			

Appendix 2.v. continued

13/23 Myller, Riitta	Finnish	*German, English, Swedish	13th speaker
12–07–1956			
Journalist			
Finland /SDP			
MEP 01.1995 /PSE			
9/23 David, Wayne	English	Finnish, German, Swedish	15th speaker
01–07–1957			
MEP /United Kingdom /Lab.			
			Comments
10/23 Evans, Robert J. E.	English	Finnish, German, Swedish	17th speaker
23–10–1956			point of order
Teacher			
United Kingdom /Lab.			
MEP 07.1994 /PSE			
11/23 Wulf-Mathies, Monika	Geerman	English, Finnish, Swedish	20th speaker
Member of the Commission			
12/23 Wulf-Mathies, Monika	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	22nd speaker
Member of the Commission			response to a
			question
			freely spoken
			(5 short clauses)

5.3 Debate illustrating the unshared knowledge constraint
Thursday 14 March 1996 3p.m.–5.30 p.m.: debates

Topical and urgent subjects of major importance (Rule 47)

I Anti-personnel landmines			
No of speech / Speaker	**S L**	**Target languages**	**Comments**
1/11 Gredler, Martina	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	1st speaker
29–12–1958			
Medical doctor			
Austria /LF			
MEP 01.1995-11.1996 /ELDR			
2/11 Günther, Maren	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	3rd speaker
18–06–1931			
Headmistress			
Germany /CSU			
MEP 08.1993 /PPE			
3/11 Telkämper, Wilfried	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	4th speaker
16–01–1953			
Historian			
Germany /Grüne			
MEP 02.1987 /V			
4/11 Truscott, Peter	English	Finnish, German, Swedish	5th speaker
20–03–1959			
MEP			
United Kingdom /Lab.			
MEP 07.1994 /PSE			
5/11 Hyland, Liam	English	Finnish, German, Swedish	6th speaker
23–04–1933			
Politician			
Ireland / FF			
MEP 07.1994 /UPE			
6/11 Hautala, Heidi Anneli	Finnish	*German, English, Swedish	7th speaker
14–11–1955			
Journalist		'retour' into German	speaks freely
Finland / Vihr			from notes
7/11 Telkämper, Wilfried	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	
see above			

Appendix 2.vi. continued

II Cuba			
No of speech / Speaker	SL	Target languages	Comments
1/12 Kreissl-Dörfler, Wolfgang 01–12–1950	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	14th speaker
Farmer, Social pedagogue Germany /Greens			
MEP 07.1994 / V			
2/12 Newens, Arthur Stanley 04–02–1930	English	Finnish, German, Swedish	15th speaker
MEP			
United Kingdom / Lab.			
07.1984 /PSE			
3/12 Telkämper, Wilfried 16–01–1953	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	19th speaker
Historian			
Germany /Grüne			
MEP 02.1987 /V			
4/12 Gredler, Martina	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	20th speaker
29–12–1958			Comment on
Medical doctor			Telkämper's
Austria /LF			intervention
MEP 01.1995-11.1996 /ELDR			(5 short clauses)
5/12 Telkämper, Wilfried	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	23rd speaker
(see above)			Reply to Ms. Gredler
III Human Rights			
1/27 Gredler, Martina 29–12–1958 Medical doctor Austria /LF MEP 01.1995 /ELDR	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	24th speaker on human rights violations in Iran
2/27 Moorhouse, James 01–01–1924 MEP United Kingdom /Cons. MEP 07.1979 /PPE	English	Finnish, German, Swedish	25th speaker on Iran

3/27 Gahrton, Per	Swedish	English, Finnish, German	26th speaker
02–02–1943			on Iran
Writer			
Sweden /MP			
MEP 01.1995 /V			
4/27 Hallam, David	English	Finnish, German, Swedish	26th speaker
13–06–1948			on Iran (Baha'i)
–			
United Kingdom /Lab.			
MEP 07.1994 /PSE			
5/27 Moorhouse, James	English	Finnish, German, Swedish	28th speaker
01–01–1924			on Bhutan
MEP			
United Kingdom /Cons.			
MEP 07.1979 /PPE			
6/27 Gredler, Martina	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	29th speaker
29–12–1958			on Bhutan (refugees)
Medical doctor			
Austria /LF			
MEP 01.1995 /ELDR			
7/27 Evans, Robert J. E.	English	Finnish, German, Swedish	30th speaker
23–10–1956			on Bhutan
Teacher			
United Kingdom /Lab.			
MEP 07.1994 /PSE			
8/27 Gredler, Martina	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	31st speaker
(see above)			on Algeria
9/27 Lenz, Marlene	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	
04–07–1932			33rd speaker
MEP			on Algeria
Germany /CDU			
MEP 07.1979 /PPE			
10/27 Cars, Hadar	Swedish	English, Finnish, German	
14–06–1933			35th speaker
Director			on ex-Yugoslavia
Sweden /FP			
MEP 01.1995 /ELDR			

No of speech / Speaker	S L	Target languages	Comments
11/27 Hoff, Magdalene	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	38th speaker
29–12–1940			on Bosnia-
Construction engineer			Herzegovina
Germany /SPD			
MEP 07.1979 /PSE			
12/27 Kreissl-Dörfler, Wolfgang	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	39th speaker
01–12–1950			on Colombia
Farmer, social pedagogue			
Germany /Grüne			
MEP 07.1994 /V			
13/27 Morgan, Mair Eluned	English	Finnish, German, Swedish	40th speaker
16–02–1967			on Colombia
Television researcher			
United Kingdom /Lab.			
MEP 07.1994 /PSE			
14/27 McKenna, Patricia	English	Finnish, German, Swedish	42nd speaker
13–03–1957			on West Papua
Artist, teacher			
Ireland /GP			
MEP 07.1994 /V			
15/27 Mann, Thomas	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	43rd speaker
28–01–1946			on Nepal and Bhutan
Copywriter			
Germany /CDU			
MEP 07.1994 /PPE			
16/27 Hyland, Liam	English	Finnish, German, Swedish	44th speaker
23–04–1933			on West Papua
Politician			
Ireland /FF			
MEP 07.1994 /UPE			
17/27 Gredler, Martina	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	45th speaker
29–12–1958			on West Papua
Medical doctor			
Austria /LF			
MEP 01.1995 /ELDR			
18/27 von Habsburg, Otto	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	46th speaker
20–11–1912			on Croatia and Serbia
Writer			
Germany /CSU			
MEP 07.1979 /PPE			

Appendix 2.vi. continued

IV Chechnya			
No of speech / Speaker	SL	Target languages	
1/8 von Habsburg, Otto	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	51st speaker
20–11–1912			
Writer			
Germany /CSU			
MEP 07.1979 /PPE			
2/8 Schroedter, Elisabeth	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	53rd speaker
11–03–1959			
Environment advisor			
Germany /Grüne			
MEP 07.1994 /V			
3/8 Hoff, Magdalene	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	54th speaker
29–12–1940			
Construction engineer			
Germany /SPD			
MEP 07.1979 /PSE			
4/8 Cars, Hadar	Swedish	English, Finnish, German	55th speaker
14–06–1933			
Director			
Sweden /FP			
MEP 01.1995 /ELDR			
7/8 Schroedter, Elisabeth	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	57th speaker
11–03–1959			Follow-up question
Environment advisor			to the
Germany /Grüne			Commissioner
MEP 07.1994 /V			

V Taiwan

1/11 Watson, Graham R.	English	Finnish, German, Swedish	59th speaker
23–03–1956			
MEP			
United Kingdom / LD			
MEP 07.1994 /ELDR			
2/11 Laurila, Ritva Tellervo	Finnish	*German, English, Swedish	61st speaker
13–04–1932			
MA, editor-in-chief		'retour' into German	
Finland /Kok			
MEP 01.1995 /PPE			

Appendix 2.vi. continued

No of speech / Speaker	SL	Target languages	Comments
3/11 Sakellariou, Jannis	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	68th speaker
12–11–1939			Makes a point about
Research director			the text ("no
Germany /SPD			translation")
MEP 07.1984 /PSE			
4/11 Hoff, Magdalene	German	English, Finnish, Swedish	69th speaker
29–12–1940			Corrects the
Construction engineer			translation:
Germany /SPD			*Soros-Institut*
MEP 07.1979 /PSE			(instead of
			'Foundation')

Appendix 3

○ Speech 6.1 🔊

1. Presentation by the rapporteur, Karsten Hoppensted (February 14,1996)

1.a The full speech:

AUSÜBUNG DER FERNSEHTÄTIGKEIT

Rapporteur: Karsten Hoppenstedt (PPE)

I Address

Frau Präsidentin,
meine sehr verehrten Damen und Herren!

1. Medien und Fernsehen gehen alle an. Deswegen hat offenbar auch ein grosser Teil der Abgeordneten dieses Plenum verlassen. Vielleicht nutzen sie ja die Möglichkeit, die Diskussion auf ihren Bildschirmen zu verfolgen.

II Introduction

2. Die Kommission hat uns einen Vorschlag gemacht - vor einem Jahr - und dieser Vorschlag ist ja erst nach vielen Geburtswehen auf den Weg gebracht worden. 3. Geburtswehen deshalb, weil es im Artikel 1 um die Definition des Rundfunks geht und ging und im Artikel 4 wo es um die Quotenregelung ging. 4. Und hier hat es innerhalb der Kommission eine Abstimmung gegeben, die dahin gehend lautet, der Rundfunkbegriff bleibt so eng gefasst, wie im Kommissionsvorschlag für uns heute sichtbar, und die Quoten werden verstärkt und klargestellt im Verhältnis zu der 89er Richtlinie.

III Discussion of the report

5. Meine Damen und Herren,
hier ist glaube ich auch die Diskussion innerhalb des Ausschusses von einer besonderen Bedeutung, aber auch in den anderen Ausschüssen, die sich damit befasst haben. 6. Im Artikel 1 geht es eben darum, ob all das – so hat es zumindest der Ausschuss, der Kulturausschuss beschlossen – was als Bild auf dem Fernsehschirm zu sehen ist, Rundfunk ist und damit den weiteren..öö.. Massnahmen dieser Richtlinie unterliegt. Und hier gibt es natürlich die Frage, ob all das, ob Spartenkanäle, ob andere Darstellungen auf dem Bildschirm auch den Rundfunkordnungen unterliegen müssen. 7. Das hat ja auch zur folge, dass in den einzelnen Nationalstaaten, die ganz andere Genehmigungspraxen dann auch für diese Dienste, die man ja als neue Dienste ansieht und anspricht, dann gemacht werden müssen.

8. Meine Damen und Herren,

Die Meinung diejenigen, die nicht diesem Vorschlag des Kulturausschusses zugestimmt haben, ging eben dahingehend, dass man gesagt hat, wir wollen einen engen Rundfunkbegriff, um sich die neuen Dienste entwickeln zu lassen, um sich die neuen Dienste

entwickeln zu lassen, von denen wir gar nicht genau wissen, wie sich denn einiges entwickelt, und nicht mit Regelungen vorsehen im Vorfeld, die möglicherweise diese Entwicklung hemmen.

9. Meine Damen und Herren,

ich glaube, die Kommission war sehr schlau und klug, dass sie gesagt hat: Wir untersuchen das in Grünbüchern, die wir Mitte dieses Jahres dann vorlegen, und dann beurteilen, was möglicherweise neuer Dienst auf der einen Seite ist, möglicherweise auch einer Regelung unterworfen werden soll. 10. Und ich halte es gerade im Hinblick auf die Diskussion Wachstum und Beschäftigung, die wir ja in diesem Parlament

nach dem Delors-Papier gemacht haben, wo wir gerade fokusiert auf die neuen Dienste uns konzentrieren,

dass wir hier nicht im Vorfeld frühzeitig Regelungen treffen, die dann diese neuen Dienste und damit auch die Entwicklung von Arbeitsplätzen möglicherweise behindern. Das wird sicherlich auch Herr Barzanti und Herr Caudron auf ihrer Ausschüsse sagen.

11. Meine sehr geehrte Damen und Herren,

ein weiteres Thema ist glaube ich wichtig: denn auch die neuen Dienste oder die Spartenkanäle, die sich entwickeln würden unter dem Artikel 1, unterfallen der Quotenregelung. 12. Und ich glaube wenn dann auch diese ganzen neuen Dienste der Quotenregelung unterworfen werden, was sicherlich nicht so gemeint ist, aber letztendlich rechtlich dann entstehen würde, ist nicht akzeptabel für einige, für einige akzeptabel. 13. Das ist die Diskussion in dem Ausschuss, und ich kann mir nur vorstellen, dass *[die in sagen.]..* im Wirtschaftausschuss gesagt haben, auch im Kulturausschuss, dass Europa sich möglicherweise bei der Entscheidung für eine weite Auslegung auf die Kriechspur begibt mit diesen neuen Diensten, mit neuen Medienangeboten, und nicht auf der schnellen Bahn, auf die andere fahren, mitfahren kann.

14. Die Quotenregelung, wie sie wissen, ist bei Ihnen in der Kommission, bei uns im Ausschuss so diskutiert worden, dass im Ausschuss die Quotenregelung noch verschärft worden ist. Es ist auch das, was die Kommission vorgeschlagen hat, noch verstärkt worden. Und das im Sinne natürlich und in guter Absicht,

die europäischen Werke zu stützen. Europäische Werke – aber nicht nur Filmwerke, sondern auch Programme – sich entwickeln zu lassen. 15. Und ich glaube hier muss man unterscheiden. Wir haben hier gestern grosse ...nicht Demonstrationen aber grosse Öffentlichkeit in diesem Parlament gehabt: die Filmschaffenden Franreichs [...] waren ja hier versammelt und haben nochmal den Finger in das Thema Film gelegt und haben beschworen, die Filmförderung in Europa nicht fallenzulassen.

16. Ich glaube, das will auch keiner. Wir alle im Kulturauschuss wollen, dass die europäische kulturelle Dimension, was die Filme und Programme anbelangt, sich entwickelt. 17. Hier gibt es natürlich Leute, die sagen, es gibt auch andere Wege. Und die anderen Wege sind ja Media-2-Programm, das Aktionsprogramm, möglicherweise Garantiefond, möglicherweise 1% der Strukturfonds, die eingesetzt werden, um die europäische Filmindustrie und

Programmindustrie insgesamt zu unterstützen. 18. Diese beiden Wege muss man natürlich vergleichen. Und das ist auch im Kulturausschuss gemacht worden. Die Mehrheit hat sich für eine Verschärfung der Quotenregelung natürlich auch im Blick auf diese Fördermittel dann entschieden.

19. Meine Damen und Herren,

ich glaube dass wir im Auge haben müssen, wenn es um die reine Filmförderung geht – so wie wir das auch im Bericht von Frau Junker über die Entwicklung der audiovisuellen Industrie gehört haben – dass wir hier eine eigene Filmrichtlinie eigentlich fordern müssten, um das Thema getrennt von der Programmindustrie zu betrachten, denn die Programmindustrie – die europäische – hat ja enorm aufgeholt. 20. Wenn sie wissen, dass immerhin fast 12 Milliarden investiert worden sind in die europäischen Programme, dann sind das ja die Arbeitsplätze vor Ort in Europa, die hier dann unterstützt worden sind: die Künstler und die Programmacher und diejenigen, die sich da mitbefasst haben die ganze Industrie.

21. Weitere Punkte sind natürlich im Ausschuss gewesen die Frage des Teleshoppings die Frage der Werbung. Alles sehr gewichtige, und jedes für sich ein gewichtiges Thema, denn die private Rundfunk- und Medienindustrie lebt natürlich nur von der Werbung. Sie kann sich nur entwickeln, wenn es Werbung gibt. Also wurde dieses Thema hinreichend diskutiert, und wir haben ja auch einen Weg gefunden, der sicherlich nicht die zustimmung aller gefunden hat und auch findet aber immerhin einen Weg gefunden.

22. Für mich ist ein ganz besonderer und wichtiger Punkt und auch für den Ausschuss natürlich , dass die Standortdiskussion - wo ist denn die Verantwortlichkeit für einen Sender, für das, was da passiert, wie ist der Staat oder wie ist die staatliche Verantwortlichkeit einzugrenzen, ist in dem Ausschuss gelöst worden,
so glaube ich, und mit der grossen Mehrheit des Ausschusses auch auf eine richtige Bahn angelenkt worden. Möglicherweise gibt es hier noch kleinere Variationen wenn man die Änderungsanträge sieht.

23.Für uns und für mich und für den Ausschuss eine ganz wichtige ... ein wichtiger Punkt ist natürlich der Jugendschutz. Und ich glaube, dass die Diskussion des Jugendschutzes der ja von der Kommission schon in einer hervorragender Weise in der alten Richtlinie eingebracht worden ist und auch in der neuen Richtlinie auch wieder eingebracht worden ist hat die Dimension der technischen Möglichkeiten erhalten,
die wir eingebracht haben, nämlich diese berühmte Diskussion um eine technische Abschaltmöglichkeit, genannt wie in USA V-chip. 24. Und ich glaube, dass wir hier einig sind, dass die letzt Verantwortung die letzt Verantwortung bei den Erziehungsberehtigten, bei den Erziehungsorganisationen, bei den Eltern liegen soll und dass man hier die Letztverantwortung die keinem ... keiner jemand abnehmen kann dann hier noch ein Bereich hat, wo man möglicherweise dann eingreifen kann.

25. Und ich glaube dass die Diskussion darüber erst beginnt, wie das funktioniert, wie wir das

gemeinsam gestalten können und wie wir dann zu einem Ergebnis kommen, das sowohl vom Rat als auch vom Parlament und natürlich auch von der Kommission, aber den Medienanbietern insgesamt dann behandelt wird, und akzeptiert wird. 26. Ich glaube schon, dass wir hier auf einem guten Weg sind. Und die Diskussion in Europa... im Europarat bei aller Unterschiedlichkeit der kulturellen und religiösen Dimensionen hier etwas zu finden was auch eine gewisse solide Basis hat, um Kinder vor Pornographie vor Gewalt zu beschützen, hat glaube ich einen guten Weg genommen. 27. Ich glaube auch, dass die Diskussion in den USA für uns ja nicht unbedingt Massstab unserer Diskussion sein soll, aber auch mit einem kleinen Seitenblick dahin ist es schon wichtig, denn wir werden in Zukunft über die neuen technischen Möglichkeiten – ob Internet über oder andere Massnahmen – auch hier direkt Zugriff haben auf solche Bereiche, und dann wäre schon gut... dann wäre schon gut, wenn wir hier nicht nur europäische Standards haben der Union ... nicht nur europäische Standards haben des Europarates, sondern auch Standards haben, die weltweit, weltweit eine Bedeutung haben. Und ich glaube, darauf müssen wir hinarbeiten.

IV Conclusion

28. In diesem Sinne darf ich mich auf [...] bedanken und die Abstimmung wird nachher wie abgesprochen so laufen wie besprochen. Die Präsidentin hat einen Weg gefunden, die wir nicht immer nach dem Berichterstattern fragen, sondern eben nach unseren Abstimmungslisten verfahren.

29. Die Diskussionen, das darf ich abschliessend sagen, im Ausschuss aber auch in den Anhörungen war eine faire, saubere Diskussion in dem Bemühen, eine Richtlinie auf den Weg zu bringen, mit der die Europäer in Zukunft Medienthemen behandeln können und auch für die europäische Dimension der Medienwirtschaft insgesamt einen machbaren Weg zu gehen.

30. Danke sehr das zu hören.