

---

## TYPES OF OMISSION AND ADDITION IN SIMULTANEOUS INTERPRETATION

***Mukhriddin Umaraliyev Komoliddin o'g'li***

*1st year Master Student, Simultaneous Interpretation, Uzbekistan State World Languages University*

Omission in simultaneous interpretation, known as an incomplete rendition of the information present in the source language, has long been a contentious issue. Altman (1994), Barik (1994), Gile (1995; 1999) as well as Setton (1999) have perceived omission in simultaneous interpreting either as a mistake or as a technique that interpreters may use only in extremely difficult conditions, when experiencing cognitive overload. Furthermore, Viaggio (2002), Visson (2005) and Pym (2008) draw attention to the pragmatic approach to omission, treating it as a conscious decision made by the interpreter rather than a mistake resulting from miscomprehension. The main purpose of the study is to check whether both interpreting trainees and professional interpreters are sensitive to the pragmatic aspect of omissions. We ask whether they tend to use deliberate omission in a real interpreting task in order to eliminate message redundancy or whether they stick to the original. Exclusion has moreover been treated by a few analysts as a procedure that an translator may resort to as it were when constrained by a few outside trouble. Gile (1995: 173) talks about “high rate of delivery”, “high thickness of the information content” as well as “strong accents” and “incorrect linguistic use and lexical usage” as cases of circumstances which will jeopardize the interpreter’s ability to donate a total version. On the off chance that mediators cannot disentangle what has been said by the speaker, they will be constrained to condense the speech and omit certain data. Typically, in any case, not considered to be a think act by the translator, who might have judged a few parts of discourse as redundant, but as a need coming about from the boundlessness of the speech and the overpowering mental over-burden that the mediator in this way experiences. Expansion is the addition of data not spoken to within the comparing source articulation (see Cokely 1992), i.e. the target transcript (TT) of the translated/interpreted expression contains sections that have no comparing source transcript (ST) section. To include elements to an deciphered message means that the translator must think inventively over the endeavors of tuning in, analyzing, reformulating, memorizing, and creating the target message, subsequently setting a tall request on the restricted cognitive capacity accessible and in this way on translating endeavors (Gile 1995).

Sorts of increments In interpretation and deciphering, the ponder of increments has basically centered on explicitation – coined by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/1995) as “the handle of presenting data into the target dialect which is display as it were verifiably within the source dialect, but which can be derived from the setting or the situation” – so that the term expansion is utilized only to assign “information that's verbalized within the target content [which] is truant from the source content and not deemed to be understood in it” (Krüger 2013: 288), i.e. included things which are i) not inferable from the ST and ii) not portion of the source dialect audience’s common

information (Schreiber 1993: 229 in Krüger 2013: 288). (See too Wadensjö's (1998) distinction between 'expanded renditions' (elaborations on thoughts communicated or inferred within the source expressions) and 'nonrenditions' (augmentations at the interpreter's claim activity).) Various reasons have been proposed as to why interpreters produce additions. Although Barik (1994) considers additions errors, he observes that better qualified simultaneous signed language interpreters add more than less qualified ones.

Braun (2017) observes the same for remote interpreting. This indicates that additions are strategic. By contrast, Gumul (2017) concludes that additions in SI are mostly subconscious, arising from the limitations imposed on interpreters in terms of time constraints and limited access to the source utterance. Although focusing only on explicitation, Baumgarten et al. (2008) propose that the interpreting mode, interpreter experience and linguistic/cultural factors determine the degree of additions. Jacobsen (2003) classifies additions in terms of their semantic or pragmatic impact as negligible (repetitions, fillers, false starts), minimal (repetitions, certain fillers, paralinguistic additions, explicitation of obvious implicit or nonverbal information, added synonyms) or significant (emphasizing or down-toning additions, new information additions).

Negligible impact additions are recognized as coping strategies (Dose 2010; Gile 1995), whereas minimal impact additions indicate attitude and interaction with addressees (non-neutrality), as well as function as either coping or gatekeeping mechanisms (Klaudy 2009; Stone 2009). Significant impact additions imply that interpreters go beyond their normative (conduit) role (Wadensjö 1998). In this article, additions are explored using a text-based parallel corpus comprising approximately four hours of English news broadcasts simultaneously interpreted into Uzbek. Therefore, gloss transcripts were created in MS Word and converted to plain text for analysis in AntConc (Anthony 2018). Due to the high level of annotation required to represent NMFs, source and target transcripts were constructed as separate time-aligned documents.

## REFERENCES:

1. Altman, Janet. 1994. "Error analysis in the teaching of simultaneous interpretation: A pilot study"
2. In S. Lambert and B. Moser-Mercer (eds) Bridging the gap: Empirical research in simultaneous interpretation.
3. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 25-38. Barik, Henri C. 1994. "A description of various types of omissions, additions and errors of translation encountered in simultaneous interpretation".
4. In S. Lambert and B. Moser-Mercer (eds) Bridging the gap: Empirical research in simultaneous interpretation. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.