Linguistica Silesiana 38, 2017
ISSN 0208-4228

EWA GUMUL
ewa.gumul@us.edu.pl
University of Silesia

EXPLICITATION AND DIRECTIONALITY IN SIMULTANEOUS INTERPRETING

The aim of the present study is to investigate the relationship between explicitation and directionality in simultaneous interpreting. Given that explicitation in this mode of interpretation is often triggered by the constraints inherent in the process of interpreting, it has been hypothesized that explicitating shifts might be more frequent in retour, which is considered to be more demanding. The study is both product- and process-oriented, relying on recordings and transcripts of interpreting outputs as well as retrospective protocols. The participants in the study were 36 advanced interpreting students. The analysed forms of explicitation range from cohesive explicitation (e.g. adding connectives, reiteration, etc.), through substituting nominalisations with verb phrases and disambiguating lexical metaphors, to inserting explanatory remarks. The present paper is aimed to be a pilot study for a larger project in progress.

1. Introduction

Explicitation has sparked unprecedented interes in the Translation Studies community in the last 60 years. Hailed by many to be a translation universal, it has been investigated in relation to translational norms, strategic behaviour, translator's style and many other aspects. Relatively few studies, however, have undertaken research into the relationship between explicitation and directionality, and all of those few focus exclusively on written translation (e.g. Klaudy and Károly 2005; Hopkinson 2008). Thus, investigating how the direction of interpreting may influence the scope and types of explicitating shifts seems to be a promising path of research. Given that each of the two directions of interpreting – into an interpreter's mother tongue (B into A) and into a foreign language (A into B) – entails different difficulties, it might be expected that the constraints inherent in each direction will influence the rendition of the source text, and consequently will have an impact on the phenomena that are universal to the translation process, like explicitation.

2. Directionality in interpreting

The problem of directionality in interpreting has been one of the most contentious issues in the translation and interpreting studies community since the beginning of the profession. However, it is only recently that we can observe a surge in the number of empirical studies and discussions based on firm theoretical foundations from other fields.

Despite the fact that pioneer simultaneous interpreters worked both into their native and a variety of non-native languages (Baigorri Jalón 2000), the first four decades of the existence of the profession were marked by two contrasting policies regarding the direction into which simultaneous interpreting should be performed. Whereas Western Europe rejected interpreting into B, Eastern Europe claimed the supremacy of this direction. In contrast to the two prevailing dogmas of the past, recent research provides a wealth of evidence indicating that this issue, for various reasons, certainly cannot be perceived in terms of a clear-cut dichotomy. Before presenting the results of these studies, let us have a brief look at the arguments behind the two conflicting views on directionality, as they reflect to some extent the specificity of each direction.

The views favouring into-A interpreting range from highly critical standpoints, opting even for excluding into-B interpreting from curricula of interpreter training institutions (Seleskovitch 1968; Seleskovitch & Lederer 1989), to those slightly more liberal recognizing the needs of the market although at the same time emphasising its inferior quality (Seleskovitch 1999; Déjean Le Féal 2002; Donovan 2004, 2005). The above-mentioned proponents of the Paris school claim that interpreting into a foreign language is more cognitively demanding, more stressful, far more prone to errors and interpreters working into a B language are unable to demonstrate the same level of confidence and flexibility of expression as in their mother tongue. According to Seleskovitch (1968: 43), "only in the A language will the speech production be spontaneous and idiomatic". As observed by Bartłomiejczyk (2015: 109), the very term "retour", a widely-used synonym of into-B interpreting, implies that into-A interpreting is a default option.

This standpoint is reflected in the policy of many international organizations. In European Union, until very recently, the only direction of interpreting was into-A interpreting. It was only with the most recent accessions that retour interpreting from relatively rare languages has been accepted (Bartłomiejczyk 2015: 109), while into-A interpreting remains the dominant direction of interpreting.

The conflicting view of directionality was voiced by the Eastern European camp led by the Soviet Union, where priority was given to into-B interpreting. This direction was believed to be superior mostly due to the ease of comprehension of a text delivered in one's native tongue. Denissenko (1989: 157) argued that "a full o near full message gotten across even if in a somewhat stiff, less idiomatic or slightly accented language serves the purpose much better than an

elegantly-worded and an impeccably pronounced half message or less". Another argument was that of a "cognitive economy". Given that while speaking in a foreign language one usually has fewer ways of conveying the message and consequently is able to come up with fewer possible target language renditions, the effort of re-encoding the message is considerably lesser, which paradoxically facilitates the interpreting task (Iglesias Fernández 2005). Taking about the preference for into-B interpreting in the former Eastern bloc, we have to take into account the political and social context. Due to ideological reasons, only local interpreters were considered as reliable and trustworthy (Brander de la Iglesia & Opdenhoff 2014: 9-10).

Currently, there are many voices in the translation and interpreting studies community advocating the need to adopt a more balanced view on directionality (e.g. Gile 2005; Martin 2005; Padilla 2005; Brander de la Iglesia & Opdenhoff 2014). The traditional dichotomy loses its ground in the light of the results of the recent empirical studies which reveal far less obvious disparities between the retour and the native (e.g. Tommola & Helevä 1998; Al-Salman & Al-Khanji 2002; Bartłomiejczyk 2004; Donovan 2004; Seel 2005; Opdenhoff 2011, 2012; Nicodemus & Emmorey 2013). In the last two decades directionality has become one of the most popular research lines in the interpreting studies. We can witness a proliferation of empirical studies addressing different aspects of the direction of interpreting.

The studies that aim at testing interpreters' preferences through surveys provide seemingly conflicting evidence of both into-A (Donovan 2004; Nicodemus & Emmorey 2013) and into-B preferences (Al-Salman & Al-Khanji 2002; Nicodemus & Emmorey 2013), which might be obviously attributable to some related aspects, like, for instance, a language pair involved or a mode of interpreting as in the case of research by Nicodemus & Emmorey (2013), who investigated both spoken-language interpreters and signed language interpreters. The results of this study indicate that the latter group reports a clear preference for retour, whereas spoken-language interpreters find it easier to work into their native. In contrast, analysis of questionnaire responses conducted by Al-Salman and Al-Khanji (2002), who investigated directionality in terms of strategic processing, reveals that the majority of respondents (professional interpreters) find it more comfortable to perform retour interpreting. Their declared preferences coincide with the results of the analysis of the recordings of their outputs in terms of linguistic adequacy, strategic competence and communication strategies, in which they score more when interpreting into their B language.

The issue of strategic processing in relation to directionality is discussed at length in the works of Bartłomiejczyk (2004, 2006), whose results indicate that the strategies adopted by interpreters differ substantially depending on the direction of interpreting, at least in the case of trainee interpreters who were the subjects in her study. The strategies used with more frequency in into-A interpreting (into Polish in this case) were inferencing, parallel reformulation, transcoding, addition, personal involvement and resorting to world knowledge,

whereas those favoured in retour were approximation, syntactic transformation, paraphrase and visualisation. Bartłomiejczyk also emphasises that in some cases the differences in strategic processing between the retour and the native are attributable to language-pair specificity, which confirms a frequently voiced opinion in the interpreting studies community (e.g. Kalina 2005) that it is impossible to consider the issue of directionality without taking into account the conditions imposed by a language pair involved.

As far as propositional accuracy is concerned, the existing empirical studies, like in the case of interpreters' preferences, also provide evidence in favour of either direction. Whereas the above-mentioned Al-Salman and Al-Khanji (2002) report higher scores for retour, Chang and Schallert (2007) detected higher propositional accuracy in the outputs of interpreters working into their A language. This study, like the one of Bartłomiejczyk, investigates directionality in the context of interpreting strategies. Their results indicate that professional interpreters regularly working in both directions develop strategic behaviours that help them cope with the difficulties inherent in each direction of interpreting, which is consistent with the findings of Bartłomiejczyk (2004, 2006), although the subjects in her study were trainee interpreters, so she detected this tendency at an earlier phase of developing interpreting competence. Chang and Schallert (2007) attribute the asymmetry between into-A and into-B interpreting to differences in the level of proficiency between A and B languages, metacognitive awareness of interpreters of the limits of their language abilities, and finally to language-specific differences between the languages involved.

Another aspect of directionality that has inspired numerous studies recently is its position in the curricula of interpreter training institutions. In contrast to the policy that until fairly recently allowed only into-A interpreting in Western European institutions and interpreting schools, there is also a growing tendency among interpreter trainers to recognise the need to incorporate *retour* into training curricula (e.g. Adams 2002; Donovan 2005; Iglesias Fernández 2005; Opdenhoff 2011; Brander de la Iglesia & Opdenhoff 2014). In fact, as emphasised by Brander de la Iglesia and Opdenhoff (2014), "for the past two decades interpreter trainers have been wondering not whether retour interpreting should be taught, but how it can be taught" in order to cater for the needs of the market.

Incorporating retour in training curricula has become a fact in many countries in which it has not been taught until recently. It is, for instance, the case of Spain due to the needs of the market and the influence of some empirical studies (Stévaux 2003; Brander de la Iglesia and Opdenhoff 2014). The study of Brander de la Iglesia & Opdenhoff (2014) reports on a project within The European Higher Education Area (EHEA) which aims at fostering the skills inherent in into-B interpreting by elaborating and circulating materials for teaching retour from Spanish into English and German. By contrast, in Poland teaching this direction of interpreting has always been a standard practice at all conference interpreting courses at graduate and post-graduate level, which is reflected in

the syllabi, elaborated within Polish Qualifications Framework, of each university offering translation and interpreting programme. The practice of routinely teaching retour in Poland is, apart from the influences of the Soviet school, mostly due the necessity – the limited scope of Polish on the international arena and the fact that in the private market interpreters have always been expected to work in both directions.

The presence of both native and retour in simultaneous interpreting in most language combinations with Polish is one of the reasons of undertaking the study investigating the relationship between explicitation and directionality presented in this paper. Testing translation universals in interpreting appears to be one of the promising research areas, as none of the previously mentioned works on directionality undertakes the analysis of this aspect of simultaneous interpreting.

3. Explicitation

The phenomenon of explicitation is currently one of the central issues in the Translation Studies research. This most serious candidate for the status of a translation universal has generated over one hundred empirical studies and theoretical reflections pondering over different aspects of this notion. However, although it is one of the most frequently researched phenomena, the concept remains elusive, beginning with its very definition and scope. The first attempt at defining explicitation appears in the classic work of Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/1995), who describe it very aptly as "making explicit in the target language what remains implicit in the source language because it is apparent from either the context or the situation" (Vinay & Darbelnet 1958/1995: 342). Nevertheless, their perception has its limitations as they refer to explicitation merely as "a stylistic translation technique", whereas the current state of research into this topic proves it is a much broader phenomenon.

Firstly, seeing it in terms of a translation technique implies that it is always a conscious and deliberate shift, which, as demonstrated by a number of studies, is not always true. Secondly, translators resort to techniques in order to reach equivalence between source and target texts when confronted with translational problems, and implicitness of the original can by no means be invariably treated as a translation problem. Taking into account one of the conditions for identifying explicitation, as opposed to other shifts, which states that a given modification can be perceived as explicitation only if there is a possibility of equally implicit rendition in the target-language version (Séguinot 1988), explicitation can hardly be perceived as a solution undertaken by a translator to obtain equivalence. Assuming that there also exists a possibility of an implicit translation, both explicit and implicit renditions would be considered as equivalent to the source text. Perceiving explicitation as a technique is perhaps only valid in the case of certain forms, especially those pragmatically conditioned, like adding

explanatory remarks, that are supposed to cater for the culture-specific knowledge deficiency of the target audience. In such cases, explicitation might be seen as aiming at pragmatic or functional equivalence. However, adding connectors as well as many other forms of optional cohesive explicitating shifts can hardly be perceived as resulting from translational problems. Thus, Vinay and Darbelnet's definition covers only a fraction of the function and potential of explicitation.

Another shortcoming of this classic definition is the assumption that for an explicitation to occur the corresponding deep structure element of meaning must be implicit in the source text. As pointed out by Murtisari (2013, 2016), the traditional inferred/encoded distinction has limited validity in translation research, as it does not account for all manifestations of explicitation. Certainly, all forms that involve physical addition, like, for instance, adding connectives, filling out ellipsis, reiteration of lexical items, inserting hedges and discourse organizing items, etc., are accountable for within Vinay and Darbelnet's implicit/explicit dichotomy. However, shifts that entail specification rather than physical addition of an extra element do not conform to this model, as the element that generates explicitation is already present in the surface structure of a source text. In the case of intensifying cohesive ties, lexicalisation of proforms, disambiguating lexical metaphors, or lexical specification, which are all widely recognized forms of explicitation, the item is not implied in the source text, it is explicit, and the shift leading to explicitation only makes it more explicit compared with the source-language version. The resulting modification is thus a shift within explicature involving a more transparent and specific form of encoding the meaning in the target text. Taking into account these factors, Murtisari redefines the concept of explicitation as "shifts of meaning from the implicit to the explicit or simply to a higher degree of explicitness" (Murtisari 2013:332) that has more explanatory power than the original definition of the notion. The need to reconsider the boundaries of explicitation and perceive it as resulting not only from the implicit but also less explicit variant in the source text had been also voiced previously by Baumgarten et al. (2008). Explicitation should therefore be "understood as increased explicitness of a target text as compared to a source text" (Gumul 2015:156).

Most studies focus on one form of explicitation, adding connectives being the most popular one (e.g. Blum-Kulka 1986; Shlesinger 1995; Niska 1999; Olohan & Baker 2000; Whittaker 2004; Puurtinen 2004; Fabricius-Hansen 2005; Englund Dimitrova 2005, etc.). However, as indicated above, explicitation might take many different forms. Its surface manifestations range from diverse types of cohesive explicitation, through adding modifiers, qualifiers and hedges, opting for verbal constructions instead of nominalisations, and disambiguating metaphors, to inserting explanatory remarks. Such multiple surface manifestations of explicitation have been investigated in a relatively few studies (Weissbrod 1992; Øverås 1998; Pápai 2004; Gumul 2006, 2007; Mesa-Lao 2011; Vahedi Kia & Ouliaeinia 2016, etc.), as such a broad view of explicitation

is not essential to test certain hypothesis and focusing just on a single form lends itself to a more precise analysis. However, investigating certain aspects of explicitation requires a comprehensive view of a wide spectrum of surface manifestations in order to trace many possible dependencies, as we believe might be the case with the relationship of explicitation and directionality – the object of analysis in the present paper.

Explicitation has been investigated adopting diverse research methods, ranging from manual comparison of source and target texts, through analysis of parallel translational corpora, to juxtaposing the levels of explicitness in monolingual and comparable corpora. Studies adopting any of these three methods are essentially product-oriented as they are dealing with existing texts. There also some process-oriented, experimental or semi-experimental studies, usually combining analysis of the process, through think-aloud protocols or retrospective comments, with product analysis (Englund Dimitrova 2005; Gumul 2006, 2008). Each of these research methods has its weaknesses. Manual comparison, although it allows a thorough analysis of the relationship between a source and target texts along with the impact of co-text and usually the extra-textual context as well, is very time-consuming and the analysed corpus is usually of a relatively small size, which makes it difficult to separate universal tendencies from text-specific features. By contrast, corpus studies, since they operate on large samples of texts, allow for the generalisation of the results to a much larger extent. However, corpus-based approach is only suitable for certain forms of explicitation that can be annotated and tagged in the corpus, and therefore such studies usually focus on adding connectives (e.g. Fabricius-Hansen 2005), shifts to finite clauses (e.g. Øverås 1998) or few other forms of explicitation. Moreover, in purely comparable-corpora studies, which aim at comparing translated texts with parallel texts that have been originally written in that language, it is impossible to distinguish between legitimate cases of explicitation and unjustified addition, as no source text is used for reference. Likewise, it is difficult to filter all instances of obligatory shifts leading to higher explicitness, required by language-specific differences, from explicitation proper which is by nature optional. Finally, process-oriented research also has some inherent deficiencies. Firstly, because translator's comments are not always fully reliable. A translator may also verbalize, to a certain extent, what he or she wants the process to appear, apart from the actual decisions. Secondly, think-aloud protocols may influence the process of the translation and the resulting product due to its invasive nature and retrospective comments are liable to be influenced by short-term memory problems of a translator, who is likely to forget certain decisions or reach some conclusions post factum.

Most of the existing studies on explicitation aim at investigating this phenomenon in written translation. The scale of research in Interpreting Studies is relatively narrow and the studies began to emerge relatively recently. Before the first empirical studies appeared, there were even some initial claims (e.g. Schjoldager 1995) that explicitation in simultaneous interpreting is unlikely to

occur mostly due to the broadly understood time constraint, i.e. both the speed of simultaneous processing and the lack of any post-editing. Nevertheless, the existing empirical studies in the field of interpreting (Shlesinger 1995; Ishikawa 1999; Niska 1999; Gumul 2006, 2007, 2008; Baumgarten et al. 2008; Kajzer-Wietrzny 2012) supply evidence that explicitation in interpreting is by no means a marginal occurrence.

Shlesinger's study, aiming to investigate the changes in cohesive patterns, confirmed that interpreters tend to explicitate implicit links by inserting additional cohesive devices. The same tendency was observed in Niska's study. Ishikawa's research concentrated on explicitation without an apparent textual motivation. Her main objective was to investigate cognitive factors triggering explicitation. Kajzer-Wietrzny's (2012) doctoral dissertation is a corpus-based study investigating the relationship between the interpreting style and translation universals, among them explicitation. The aim of Gumul's (2007) research was to identify and analyse various forms of explicitation in interpreting, ranging from syntactic and lexical levels to the pragmatic stratum. This product-based study also focused on comparison of simultaneous interpreting with consecutive as regards the extent and type of explicitating shifts. The two remaining studies combined product- and process-oriented research focusing on the causes of explicitation. The present study undertakes further analysis of this phenomenon in simultaneous interpreting, relating it to an aspect that has not been investigated so far in relation to explicitation, namely directionality.

4. The study

4.1. The aim and the hypothesis

Results of previous research into explicitation in SI (Gumul 2006, 2007, 2008) indicate that explicitation in this mode of interpreting is mainly cohesion-based (apart from substituting nominalizations with verb phrases which also has been found to occur with a substantial frequency). The six most common changes included adding connectives – 40%, shifts from referential cohesion to lexical cohesion, i.e. lexicalization of pro-forms – 20%, replacing nominalizations with verb phrases – 13%, reiterating lexical items, filling out elliptical constructions, and shifts from reiteration in the form of paraphrase to reiteration in the form of identical/partial repetition – 6% each. The other 7 types of explicitating shifts constitute 9% of all instances of explicitation identified in target texts (Gumul 2007). The results of another study (Gumul 2006) show that explicitation in interpreting is in most cases a subconscious, involuntary procedure. The analysis of both interpreting outputs and the retrospective remarks indicates that subconscious explicitation accounts for almost 94% of all cases of explicitating shifts detected in the outputs, while strategic explicitation only for slightly over 6%. The vast majority of subconscious shifts are cohesion-based, whereas

a large proportion of meaning specification, disambiguating metaphors, and explanatory phrases are fully conscious strategic choices of the interpreters. Previous research on explicitation in interpreting into an A language showed that a certain amount of shifts are clearly attributable to the constraints inherent in the interpreting process. Thus the initial hypothesis might be formulated assuming that such shifts might be more frequent in the other direction, since processing capacity management in retour is believed to be a more demanding task.

The principal aim of this study is the attempt to determine whether explicitation is dependent on the direction of interpreting. Since the participants in the study are advanced interpreting students, the present research is also hoped to provide some additional evidence on directionality in trainees.

4.2. Research design

The analysis is based on both product and process data, i.e. interpreting outputs and the subjects' retrospective remarks. The research has been conducted on the English – Polish language pair, in both directions of interpreting. The participants in the study were 36 advanced interpreting students. All participants were native speakers of Polish, with English as language B. Prior to the experiment, about half of the subjects had received 180 hours of training in simultaneous interpreting (which amounts to 6 semesters) and the other half – 120 hours (i.e. 4 semesters). The classes in SI provided practice in both native and retour, in almost equal proportion, in an attempt to cater for the needs of the Polish interpreting market and the situation of the Polish language on the international scene, owing to which interpreters are regularly required to work into a B language.

The corpus of source texts consists of 5 fragments of authentic speeches, constituting 4 sets of equal length (in order to ensure the uniform length of the source texts, two of the speeches were used together during one experimental session). The source texts were comparable in terms of the subject matter – all of them were political speeches delivered following the terrorist attack on the 11th of September. The original speeches were slightly modified to make them comparable also in terms of explicitating potential, i.e. as far as lexical choice and the levels of morphosyntactic complexity and redundancy are concerned.

Each of the analysed sets has been interpreted by 18 subjects, which amounts to 72 interpreting outputs. The two directions of interpreting were recorded during separate sessions in order to prevent the fatigue effect. The average rate of delivery was about 120 words per minute. In order to eliminate the variable of the speed of delivery, which is likely to influence the number and type of explicitating shifts, the rate of delivery was controlled, i.e. all the texts were recorded by lectors. Each set was followed by a retrospective remarks session.

Immediately after the interpretation, the subjects were asked to listen to their outputs and make comments whenever they felt they expressed something more explicitly than it was articulated in the source text, or added any words or

expressions that did not appear in the input. They were specifically asked not to make any comments regarding the quality of their outputs, but rather talk about the decisions taken and the reasons behind them. It was also emphasised that their remarks should only reflect what they thought during the task of interpreting, and must not be made on the basis of their outputs. In order to determine whether potential scarcity of comments stemmed from the subjects' lack of verbosity, their unwillingness to make remarks or the subconscious, involuntary nature of explicitation in interpreting, the subjects were also asked to make comments regarding the topic of the interpreted speech, its form and vocabulary employed by the speaker. Both interpreting outputs and retrospective remarks were recorded and transcribed.

5. Results and discussion

The results of the analysis reveal that explicitation is more frequent in interpreting into a B language. The number of explicitating shifts detected in interpreting outputs into an A language, i.e. Polish is 875, while in the other direction (into B) as many as 1108 such shifts have been identified. T-test analysis indicates that the difference is statistically significant. Quite predictably, the difference is not uniform for all categories of explicitating shifts. The four categories which show markedly higher proportion of explicitations in retour interpreting are: adding connectives, reiteration, meaning specification, and disambiguating metaphors:

Table 1. Types and number of explicitating shifts

	TYPES OF EXPLICITATING SHIFTS:	B ⇨ A Native		A ⇨ B Retour	
		Number of occurrences	%	Number of occurrences	%
1	adding connectives	338	38.62	432	38.98
2	categorial shifts of conjunctive cohesive devices (i.e. from vaguely cohesive to more explicitly cohesive)	13	1.48	16	1.44
3	reiterating lexical items	93	10.62	148	13.35
4	shifts from reiteration in the form of paraphrase to reiteration in the form of identical/partial repetition	79	9.02	89	8.03
5	shifts from referential cohesion to lexical cohesion (i.e. lexicalization of pro-forms)	56	6.4	49	4.42

	TYPES OF EXPLICITATING SHIFTS:	B ⇨ A Native		A ⇨ B Retour	
		Number of occurrences	%	Number of occurrences	%
6	filling out elliptical constructions	38	4.34	45	4.06
7	replacing nominalizations with verb phrases	89	10.17	79	7.12
8	adding modifiers and qualifiers	40	4.57	52	4.69
9	inserting hedges	16	1.82	18	1.62
10	inserting discourse organizing items	7	0.8	10	0.9
11	disambiguating metaphors	32	3.65	59	5.32
12	including additional explanatory remarks	10	1.14	12	1.08
13	substituting generic names with proper names or adding a proper name to a generic name	5	0.57	8	0.72
14	lexical specification	12	1.37	16	1.44
15	meaning specification (i.e. articulating ideas retrievable or inferable from the preceding part of the text or the cognitive context)	47	5.37	75	6.76
	TOTAL	**875**		1108	

Closer analysis of the outputs and retrospective remarks reveals that a substantial proportion of these types of explicitating shifts is apparently due to adopting repair or preventive strategies.

Although adding connectives appears to be a largely subconscious or highly automated procedure, as none of the subjects verbalised this type of operation in their retrospective comments, the analysis of two overlapping lines of discourse suggests that explicitating the implicit logical relations might in some cases be due to adopting the strategy of padding, i.e. uttering a non-committal material. Usually it allows the interpreters to avoid excessively large pauses, as in the following example:

(1)
ST: (...) nasza część Europy była niejeden raz w swej historii / także tej całkiem niedawnej / dotknięta chorobą nienawiści i ksenofobii / umieliśmy jednak często

płacąc wysoką cenę przezwyciężyć tę chorobę / to nasze bolesne doświadczenie powinno umacniać naszą determinację w walce z fanatycznym terroryzmem / może również stać się okazją do umacniania łączących nas więzi / do przezwyciężania historycznych zaszłości w naszej części Europy / do rozwiązania problemów odziedziczonych po ostatnim dziesięcioleciu / odpowiedzią na zagrożenia / i chcę to tu bardzo głośno w Warszawie powiedzieć / odpowiedzią na zagrożenia powinno być przyspieszenie integracji europejskiej oraz rozszerzenie NATO o aspirujące państwa / integracja wymaga akceptacji tych samych wartości zasad i procedur / a to znaczy iż Europa rzeczywiście staje się wspólnym kontynentem gdzie wszyscy korzystamy z bezpieczeństwa i rozwoju / ale także ponosimy współodpowiedzialność za nasz los i dzielimy ryzyko walki z każdym niebezpieczeństwem / dotyczącym czy to jednej społeczności / państwa regionu / czy też całej Europy i świata / dziś mamy okazję aby postarać się więc dramat i nieszczęście zamienić w mądrą siłę! / dziękuję Państwu że przybyliście prowadzić wspólny dialog / jestem przekonany że stąd z naszego spotkania popłynie wielkie przesłanie solidarności / solidarności w batalii z terroryzmem i w walce ze złem / (...)
TT: (...) ***and therefore*** *many times in history / our country suffered because of xenophobia / and terror and hatred / but we managed to overcome this disease of our nation /* ***and that's why*** *we should be even more determined to fight terrorism / and it should be also the oppo opportunity to yy solve some problems which we inherited / in // in yy in history /* ***and therefore*** *our response to dangers should be broadening NATO / of some countries /* ***and*** *we have to introduce accept some procedures / new procedures / and that that now we have to think if Europe is becoming a common continent / but also we have to think / that we take responsibility for out fate /* ***and*** *it doesn't matter whether it concerns only one region or the whole world /* ***and*** *today we have the opportunity to convert this / yy unhappy moment to to ee a to to a better thing by finding some resolutions /* ***and*** *I'm convinced / that in the fight of terrorism and the fight against evil / we are united and ready to fight it (...)*

The above extract from one of the interpreting outputs clearly demonstrates that the addition of connectors is caused by the constraints inherent in this mode of interpreting. The interpreter apparently struggles to maintain text cohesion and coherence despite a considerably high omission rate. Firstly he or she tries to fill the gaps to avoid excessive pauses. The lengths of the EVS suggest that some of the items might be inserted while waiting to obtain sufficient information in order to be able to translate a given segment correctly. Secondly, they apparently serve to give a semblance of a cohesive and coherent discourse to a rather disjointed fragmentary rendition. It has to be emphasised that although the implicit logical relations are explicitated, due to a high omission rate the target-text segment on the whole is not more explicit than the corresponding source text. In this case, there are explicitating shifts, but the level of explicitness is raised only at the micro level.

Another shift demonstrating certain prevalence in retour is reiteration. Such surface manifestations of explicitation fall into two distinct groups. One of them is repeating certain word or phrase later in the text, while the other, far more frequent in retour interpreting, results from self-correction, i.e. employ-

ing a strategy of repair. Since the analysis focuses only on successful attempts at explicitation, in the analysed cases both lexical items are correct legitimate equivalents and although the objective of the repetition is self-correction, the second item reinforces the meaning of the first one as in the following example:

(2)
ST: (...) nie ma na razie żadnych oznak ani znamion niepokoju / ale musimy być na każdą ewentualność przygotowani / będziemy na bieżąco informować państwa co kilka godzin o tym jak wygląda stan bezpieczeństwa naszego kraju / i o różnych ważnych punktach, których powinniśmy w tej sytuacji strzec (...)
TT: (...) so far there've been no signs of danger / but ***we have to be ready for everything / we have to be prepared*** */ so that's why we will inform all our citizens about the state of security of our country / about all the points that we should protect in this situation (...)*

The retrospective remarks on reiteration, albeit relatively few, report problems with lexical search. Two interesting cases of mixed motivations for employing reiteration have been reported by one of the participants:

(3)
Again I decided to omit the enumeration of all those parts of Europe. It is clear which countries he means. Instead, I repeated almost the same phrase twice. I wanted to emphasise it.

(4)
Omission of the fragment "jak leczyć przyczynę". I was afraid of a medical calque. Instead, again I inserted there the phrase "how to fight terrorism". Just to fill the gap.

Both retrospective protocols report combining omission with explicitation. Although in the first case the interpreter's primary motivation for omission is redundancy and explicitation is conditioned by the wish to emphasize this segment, these two shifts are obviously related. Taking into account the time pressure, it would be virtually impossible to explicitate without omitting the other segment. The second comment illustrates what Gile (1995) calls transfer resistance, i.e. an interpreter's unwillingness to resort to direct equivalents for fear of making a calque. The resulting gap has to be filled with additional items to avoid a pause. Thus, in both cases there is a clear relationship between omission and explicitation in the form of addition: a given segment is omitted to make space for another one that the interpreter wants to emphasize or explicitation is required due to omission.

Meaning specification, as indicated in numerous retrospective comments reporting such shifts, is sometimes due to adopting the coping tactic of parallel reformulation or padding. The necessity to resort to such techniques is brought about by problems with lexical search or problems with effective processing

capacity management, e.g. directing all available resources to the production effort while working on a previous segment. Both tendencies are illustrated by the following examples of retrospective protocols:

(5)
I didn't hear the beginning of the next sentence, so I decided to add the words "of the attack" to the phrase "to save the victims", because I wanted to fill the gap.

(6)
I added the word "civilisation" just to fill the gap while I was thinking how to translate the word "inclusive".

This tendency has been identified in both directions of interpreting, but it appears to be considerably more frequent in retour.

The retrospective remarks also reveal a higher proportion of disambiguated metaphors in interpreting into a B language. Whereas in the other direction, such explicitations are far more often due to striving for optimal relevance of the interpreted message, thereby facilitating the comprehension task for a target text audience, in retour such shifts are mostly attributable to problems with finding an appropriate stylistic equivalent:

(7)
ST: (...) zaniechanie walki byłoby bowiem równoznaczne z przyzwoleniem na zło i kolejne niewinne ofiary. W dobie globalizacji i zacierania się granic państw, okrucieństwo jakiego doznali mieszkańcy Ameryki może dotknąć także nas. Następne zamachy tym razem mogą zebrać swoje krwawe żniwo i w sercu Europy.TT: (...) giving up this fight would be like agreement for evil and more victims / in a globalised world / cruelty / that the Americans experienced can also / affect us // this time they can attack Europe / (...)*
RC: **There was to time to search for a nice equivalent of the idiom "zebrać żniwo". That's why I used a simpler and much more clear solution "attack".*

(8)
ST: (...) nasza część Europy była niejeden raz w swej historii / także tej całkiem niedawnej / dotknięta chorobą nienawiści i ksenofobii / umieliśmy jednak często płacąc wysoką cenę przezwyciężyć tę chorobę / to nasze bolesne doświadczenie powinno umacniać naszą determinację w walce z fanatycznym terroryzmem / (...)
TT: (...) this part of the Europe of Europe / has been eeem many has been touched by hatred many times in the history / however / we are able to / often paying a high price fight with this problem**/ this painful experience / should strengthen our determination in fighting with eeem terrorism (...)*
*RC: *"Dotknięta chorobą nienawiści" – this type of metaphorical expressions are problematic in simultaneous interpreting. That's why I limited myself to the key word "hatred"*
*RC: ** It is a consequence of the previous translation where I omitted the word "choroba"*

The analysis of all retrospective remarks reporting conscious explicitation provides further evidence that in retour more explicitating shifts are attributable to the interpreting constraints than in the native. Whereas striving for optimal relevance is almost equally frequent in both directions of interpreting, the subjects report more cases of resorting to explicitation due to the interpreting constraints while rendering the source-text into a B language.

6. Conclusions

In conclusion, explicitation appears to be dependent on the direction of interpreting to a certain extent. More frequent occurrence of explicitation in interpreting into English (i.e. the B language) is apparently due, in a relatively large number of cases, to the constraints intrinsic to the process of interpreting. This provides further evidence to support the opinions voiced by numerous researchers (e.g. Déjean Le Féal 2005, Donovan 2005) that retour interpreting is particularly difficult for interpreting students.

However, it must be emphasised that the above-mentioned explanations account only for a certain proportion of explicitating shifts. The vast majority of explicitations identified in both directions of interpreting appear to be either subconscious or automatic and hardly ever attributable to any strategic behaviour.

Finally, it must be underlined that in order to generalize the results of the present study, analysis of the output samples of professional interpreters would be necessary, bearing in mind that any research on explicitation should be carried out on large samples of subjects and source texts since it is a highly idiosyncratic behaviour.

References

Adams, C. 2002. What is a B language? Towards a working definition and selection criteria. In *Proceedings of EMCI Workshop Paris 2002: Teaching simultaneous interpretation into a B language*, 20-22. Paris: ESIT.

Al-Salman, S., and R. Al-Khanji 2002. The native language factor in simultaneous interpretation in an Arabic/English Context. *Meta* 47(4): 607-625.

Baumgarten, N., B. Meyer and D. Özçetin 2008. Explicitness in translation and interpreting: A critical review and some empirical evidence (of an elusive concept). *Across Languages and Cultures. A Multidisciplinary Journal for Translation and Interpreting Studies* 9 (2): 177-203

Bartłomiejczyk, M. 2004. *Strategies of simultaneous interpreting from English into Polish and from Polish into English.* Unpublished PhD dissertation. Katowice: University of Silesia.

Bartłomiejczyk, M. 2006. Strategies of simultaneous interpreting and directionality. *Interpreting* 8(2): 149-174.

Bartłomiejczyk, M. 2015. Directionality. In F. Pöchhacker (ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Interpreting Studies*, 108-110. London: Routledge.

Baigorri Jalón, J. 2000. *La interpretación de conferencias: el nacimiento de una profesión. De de París a Nuremberg.* Granada: Editorial Comares.

Baker, M. 1992. *In other words: A coursebook on translation.* London & New York: Routledge.

Blum-Kulka, S. 1986. Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation. In J. House and S. Blum-Kulka (eds.), *Interlingual and intercultural communication. Discourse and cognition in translation and second language acquisition studies*, 17-35. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Brander de la Iglesia, M., and J.H. Opdenhoff 2014. Retour interpreting revisited: Tuning competences in interpreter education. *Current Trends in Translation Teaching and Learning E* 1: 4-43.

Chang, C., and D. Schallert 2007. The impact of directionality on Chinese/English simultaneous interpreting. *Interpreting* 9(2): 137-176.

Denissenko, J. 1989. Communicative and interpretative linguistics. In L. Gran and J. Dodds (eds.), *The theoretical and practical aspects of teaching conference interpretation*, 155-157. Udine: Campanotto Editore.

Déjean Le Féal, K. 2002. L'interprétacion simultanée vers le B – Les principes. In *Proceedings of EMCI Workshop Paris 2002: Teaching simultaneous interpretation into a B language*, 27-29. Paris: ESIT.

Déjean Le Féal, K. 2005. Can and should interpretation into a second language be taught? In R. Godijns and M. Hinderdael (eds.), *Directionality in interpreting: The 'retour' or the native?*, 167-194. Gent: Communication & Cognition.

Donovan, C. 2004. European Masters Project Group: Teaching simultaneous interpretation into a B language. *Interpreting* 6(2): 205-216.

Donovan, C. 2005. Teaching simultaneous interpretation into B: A challenge for responsible Interpreter Training. In R. Godijns and M. Hinderdael (eds.), *Directionality in interpreting: The 'retour' or the native?*, 147-165. Gent: Communication & Cognition.

Englund Dimitrova, B. 2005. *Expertise and explicitation in the translation process.* Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Fabricius-Hansen, C. 2005. Elusive connectives. A case study on the explicitness dimension of discourse coherence. *Linguistics* 43(1):17-48

Gile, D. 2005. Directionality in conference interpreting: A cognitive view. In R. Godijns and M. Hinderdael (eds.), *Directionality in interpreting: The 'retour' or the native?*, 9-26. Gent: Communication & Cognition.

Gumul, E. 2006. Explicitation in simultaneous interpreting: a strategy or a by-product of language mediation? *Across Languages and Cultures. A Multidisciplinary Journal for Translation and Interpreting Studies* 7(2):171-190.

Gumul, E. 2007. Explicitation in conference interpreting. In M. Thelen and B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (eds.), *Translation and meaning. Part 7*, 449-456. Maastricht: Hogeschool Zuyd. Maastricht School of Translation and Interpreting.

Gumul, E. 2008. Explicitation in simultaneous interpreting – the quest for optimal relevance? In E. Wałaszewska et al. (eds.), *Relevant worlds: Current perspectives on language, translation and relevance theory*, 188-205. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Gumul, E. 2015. Explicitation. In F. Pöchhacker (ed.), *Routledge encyclopedia of interpreting studies*, 156. London: Routledge.

Hopkinson, C. 2008. *Shifts of explicitness in translation. A Czech-English study.* Ostrava: Universitas Ostraviensis.

Iglesias Fernández, E. 2005. Bidirectionality in interpreter training in Spanish universities: An empirical study. In R. Godijns and M. Hinderdael (eds.), *Directionality in interpreting: The 'retour' or the native?*, 101-123. Gent: Communication & Cognition.

Ishikawa, L. 1999. Cognitive explicitation in simultaneous interpreting. In A. Álvarez Lugris and A. Fernández Ocampo (eds.), *Anovar-Anosar, estudios de traducción e* interpretación, 231-257.Vigo: Universidade de Vigo.

Kalina, S. 2005. Quality in the interpreting process: What can be measured and how? In R. Godijns and M. Hinderdael (eds.), *Directionality in interpreting: The 'retour' or the native?*, 27-46. Gent: Communication & Cognition.

Kajzer-Wietrzny, M. 2012. *Interpreting universals and interpreting style.* Unpublished PhD dissertation. Poznań: Adam Mickiewicz University.

Klaudy, K., and K. Károly 2005. Implicitation in translation: empirical evidence for operational asymmetry in translation. *Across Languages and Cultures* 6(1): 13-28.

Martin, A. 2005. Interpreting from A to B: A Spanish case study. In R. Godijns and M. Hinderdael (eds.), *Directionality in interpreting: The 'retour' or the native?*, 83-100. Gent: Communication & Cognition.

Mesa-Lao, B. 2011. Explicitation in translation memory-mediated environments. Methodological conclusions from a pilot study. *Translation & Interpreting. The International Journal of Translation and Interpreting Research* 3(1): 44-57.

Murtisari, E.T. 2013. A relevance-based framework for explicitation and implicitation in translation. An alternative typology. *Trans-kom. Journal of Translation and Technical Communication Research* 6(2): 315-344.

Murtisari, E.T. 2016. Explicitation in translation studies: The journey of an elusive concept. *Translation & Interpreting. The International Journal of Translation and Interpreting Research* 8(2): 64-81.

Nicodemus, B., and K. Emmorey 2013. Direction asymmetries in spoken and signed language interpreting. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 16(3): 624-636.

Niska, H. (1999) *Text linguistic models for the study of simultaneous interpreting*. Stockholm: Stockholm University *http://www.geocities.com/~tolk/lic/licproj_w2wtoc.htm.* [Retrieved 23.04.2003].

Olohan, M., and M. Baker 2000. Reporting 'that' in translated English. Evidence for subconscious processes of explicitation? *Across Languages and Cultures. A Multidisciplinary Journal for Translation and Interpreting Studies* 1(2): 141-158.

Opdenhoff, J.H. 2011. *Estudio sobre la direccionalidad en interpretación de conferencias: de la(s) teoría(s) a la práctica profesional.* PhD dissertation. Universidad de Granada.

Opdenhoff, J.H. 2012. Directionality and working memory in conference interpreting – an experimental study. In M.A. Jiménez Ivars and M.J. Blasco Mayor (eds.), *Interpreting Brian Harris – recent developments in translatology*, 161-171. Oxford: Peter Lang.

Øverås, L. 1998. In search of the third code. An investigation of norms in literary translation. *Meta* 43(4): 571-588.

Pápai, V. 2004. Explicitation: A universal of translated texts? In A. Mauranen and P. Kujamäki (eds.), *Translation universals. Do they exist?*, 143-164. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Padilla Benítez, P. 2005. Cognitive implications of the English-Spanish direction for the quality and the training of simultaneous interpreting. In R. Godijns and M. Hinderdael (eds.), *Directionality in interpreting: The 'retour' or the native?*, 47-62. Gent: Communication & Cognition.

Puurtinen, T. 2004. Explicitation of clausal relations: A corpus-based analysis of clause connectives in translated and non-translated Finnish children's literature. In A. Mauranen and P. Kujamäki (eds.), *Translation universals. Do they exist?*, 165-176. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Schjoldager, A. 1995. An exploratory study of translational norms in simultaneous interpreting: Methodological reflections. In P. Jansen (ed.), *Translation and the manipulation of discourse,* 227-243. Leuven: CETRA – The Leuven Research Center for Translation, Communication and Cultures.

Seel, O.I. 2005. Non-verbal means as culture-specific determinants that favour directionality into foreign language in simultaneous interpreting. In R. Godijns and M. Hinderdael (eds.), *Directionality in interpreting: The 'retour' or the native?*, 63-82. Gent: Communication & Cognition.

Séguinot, C. 1988. Pragmatics and the explicitation hypothesis. *TTR Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction* 1(2): 106-114.

Seleskovitch, D. 1968. *L'interpréte dans les conférences internacionales.* Paris: Minard Lettres Modernes.

Seleskovitch, D. 1999. The teaching of conference interpretation in the course of the last 50 years. *Interpreting* 4(1): 55-66.

Seleskovitch, D., and M. Lederer 1989. *Pédagogie raisonnée de l'interprétation.* Paris: Didier Erudition.

Shlesinger, M. 1995. Shifts in cohesion in simultaneous interpreting. *Translator* 1(2): 193-212.

Stévaux, E. 2003. El mercado de la interpretación inversa. In D. Kelly et al. (eds.), *La direcionalidad en traducción e interpretación*, 327-346. Granada: Atrio.

Tommola, J., and M. Helevä 1998. Language direction and source text complexity. Effects on trainee performance in simultaneous interpreting. In L. Bowker,

M. Cronin, D. Kenny and J. Pearson (eds.), *Unity in diversity? Current trends in translation studies*, 177-186. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Vahedi Kia, M., and H. Ouliaeinia 2016. Explicitation across literary genres: Evidence of a strategic device? *Translation & Interpreting. The International Journal of Translation and Interpreting Research* 8(2): 82-95.

Vinay, J-P., and J. Darbelnet 1958/1995. *Comparative stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Weissbrod, R. 1992. Explicitation in translation of prose-fiction from English to Hebrew as a function of norms. *Multilingua* 11(2):153-171.

Whittaker, S. 2004. Etude contrastive des syntagmes nominaux démonstratifs dans des textes traduits du français en norvégien et des textes sources norvégiens: stratégie de traduction ou translationese? *Forum* 2(2): 221-240.

Sources

George W. Bush: "Address to a Joint Session of Congress on Terrorist Attacks", delivered 20 September 2001. *American Rhetoric – Rhetoric of 9-11*: http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/gwbush911jointsessionspeech.htm.

Rudy Giuliani*:* "Opening Remarks to the United Nations General Assembly Special Session on Terrorism", delivered 1 October 2001, New York. *American Rhetoric – Rhetoric of 9-11*: http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/rudygiuliani-911unitednations.htm.

Oświadczenie Prezydenta Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej Aleksandra Kwaśniewskiego w sprawie akcji przeciwko terroryzmowi; Warszawa, 7 października 2001 [Statement by the President of Poland, Aleksander Kwaśniewski, on the Action against Terrorism; Warsaw, 7th October 2001] http://www.prezydent.pl/x.node?id=1011848&eventId=1506710.

Wystąpienie Prezydenta Polski Aleksandra Kwaśniewskiego podczas inauguracji Warszawakiej Konferencji w sprawie zwalczania terroryzmu; Warszawa, 6 listopada 2001 [Address by the President of Poland, Aleksander Kwaśniewski, at the Inauguration of the Warsaw Conference on Combating Terrorism; Warsaw 6th November, 2001] http://www.prezydent.pl/x.node?id=1011845&announcementId=500137.

Oświadczenie premiera Jerzego Buzka w związku z zamachami terrorystycznymi w Stanach Zjednoczonych w dniu 11 września 2001 r.; Warszawa, 11 września 2001 [Statement by the Prime Minister of Poland, Jerzy Buzek, in Connection with Terrorist Attacks in the United States on 11 September 2001; Warsaw, 11th September 2001] http://www.kprm.gov.pl/4756_4812.htm.