TYPES OF DECOMPRESSION IN SIMULTANEOUS INTERPRETATION.

Ruzioboyev Temur Narzullo o`g`li
Master of Uzbekistan State World Languages University

Simultaneous decoding (SI) is believed to be one of the most severe and arduous activities. With its unheard of intellectual and psychological press on an interpreter, SI stays the pinnacle fantastic way to interpret in phrases of time, correctness and quantity of information to be transferred. It has been proved that, at least, two elements make SI possible: the one is the likelihood prediction mechanism underlying simultaneous interpreting; the different one is the mechanism of compression utilized by using a skillful simultaneous interpreter (Chernov, 1978, 1987, 2004; Shirayev, 1979).

I do no longer intend to dwell in element on the essence of the two mechanisms. But it can be mentioned, in passing, that kinds of compression have been exhaustively described and even categorized (Chernov, 1987; Sdobnikov, 2016;

Shirayev, 1979), and the use of compression is considered as an necessary precondition of first-rate interpretation. B. Moser-Mercer argues that "optimum exceptional in expert deciphering implies that an interpreter gives a whole and correct rendition of the unique that does now not distort the authentic message and tries to seize any and all extralinguistic facts that the speaker would possibly have supplied concern to the constraints imposed by means of positive exterior conditions" (Moser-Mercer, 1996:44).

My intention is to draw interest to the phenomenon that has hardly ever been seen through students engaged in the investigation of SI. Yet, the phenomenon deserves shut interest as, in my opinion, the interpretation great generally relies upon upon whether or not this mechanism is used in the method of interpretation or not. This mechanism (still difficult to understand to the readers) can be termed conventionally as "decompression". The time period implies that the mechanism is contrary to what is regarded as compression. Below I shall talk about whether or not this is genuinely a case.

The essential aim is to outline the essence of decompression, to describe its sorts as nicely as the elements that make decompression integral or possible.

Decompression Defined

Decompression is understood as something opposite to compression. If compression is viewed as any shortening of the linguistic form used to express a notion or an idea in SI, then decompression might be defined as any expansion of the linguistic forms as compared to those in the source text (ST).

James Nolan justly argues that "the first step in good interpreting is to 'get beyond the words'. The words are nothing more than a container for the ideas. The interpreter must pour those ideas into a new container: the target language" (Nolan, 2005:39).

Under some circumstances the interpreter may or must decline the compressed version that would be the best in another situation, and can use a more "expanded" version.

We may define decompression in SI as a result of a longer/expanded idea formulating vs. the probable compressed version we might use in the normal conditions of interpretation.

Types of Decompression

Texts Analyzed

Translations of two texts made concurrently have been analyzed to discern out sorts of decompression as properly as the motives for it. The first one is the speech made via Jean-Claude Juncker, the President of the European Commission, at the Saint-Petersburg International Economic Forum on sixteen June 2016. The other one is the opening tackle by way of Vladimir Putin to the All-Russian People's Front Forum committed to training growing in Russia. Thus, the first speech was once interpreted from English into Russian whilst the 2nd one used to be interpreted from Russian into English. Russian is language A (a mom tongue) for the interpreter whilst English is language B (the first foreign language). I presume that deciphering from A into B and reverse would possibly have distinct consequences in phrases of the utilized approaches and operations. But greater huge research are required to discover out whether or not there is any hyperlink to directionality between the language pair.

Both interpretations have been made via the equal simultaneous interpreter in a putting that simulated the authentic surroundings of the events.

Methodological Approach

Following the provisions stated above, I refused to compare directly the TT with the ST or any segments thereof. Instead, I compared specific TT segments the wording of which seemed to be superfluous with the probable compressed versions of interpretation to establish whether decompression really occurred in interpreting as well as to determine the factors that made decompression necessary. In the both cases the speed delivery rates (SDRs) were moderate or even less than average. The delivery rates were kept moderate intentionally to press the interpreter to use decompression. If measured in words per minute, SDR was 95.2 words per minute for Jean-Claude Juncker's speech and 78.2 words per minute for Putin's speech. I fully agree with Athil Khaleel Farhan who states that using words as an index for SDRs is imprecise because, among other factors, "words vary in length within the same language and vary even more greatly from one language to another" (Farhan). It fully applies to the English-Russian pair: it is well-known that an average Russian word is longer than an average English word. Moreover, different numbers of words are required to express an idea in English and Russian. English seems to be more laconic than Russian. Yet, in our study SDRs were measured in words per minute just to give the readers an approximate idea of the pace with which the texts were pronounced.

A general analysis of the two interpretations demonstrated that the interpreter used a complex of interpreting tactics combining compression with decompression. It also showed that compression was a prevalent tactic in comparison with decompression, especially in interpreting from Russian into English. The fact explains why the Russian target text is smaller than the English original if measured in words: the length of the English text is 1714 words vs. 1535 words in the Russian translation. Yet, the Russian original seems to be shorter than the English translation:

514

But we should take into account the articles used in English and non-existent in Russian. It is obvious that with allowance for the number of the articles in the English texts, the rate of the target texts delivery might come down to almost the same figures

First of all attention should be paid to those cases of decompression which can hardly be explained by any lingual or extralinguistic factors. For example:

Putin: Именно поэтому считаю очень востребованным обсуждение серьёзных ини¬циатив в сфере образования на площадке Общероссийского народного фронта с уча¬стием представителей профессионального сообщества, общественных организаций, родителей, потенциальных работодателей, что очень важно.

Interpreter: And that's why I firmly believe that it is important and urgent to discuss those initiatives in education in the framework of the All-Russian People's Front with the involvement of the professional community, public organizations, families and future employers. This is another important point here.

Interpreting a clause by a complete sentence is certainly superfluous, especially when compared to a literary translation ("which is very important") which is also most appropriate in this case.

Based on the observations of the causes for decompression, we can classify it as follows: I. Unjustified decompression.

Justified decompression.
1.   SDR conditioned decompression;
2.   SL conditioned decompression.
3.   TL conditioned decompression.
4.   ST conditioned decompression.
5.   TT conditioned decompression.
6.   Audience conditioned decompression.

The classification presents the major types of decompression. Certainly, more extended investigation into the reasons for and types of decompression is needed, though the classification reveals the main factors that underlie decompression in SI, making it both necessary and possible.

REFERENCES:

1. Chernov G. (1978). Theory and Practice of Simultaneous Interpreting. Moscow, Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya.

2. Chernov G. (1987). Fundamentals of Simultaneous Interpreting. Moscow, Vysshaya Shkola

3. Donato V. (2003). "Strategies adopted by student interpreters in SI: a comparison between the English-Italian and the German-Italian language-pairs", In The Interpreters' Newsletter, 12, 101-134.

4. Farhan A. The Influence of Speech Delivery Rates on Simultaneous Interpreter's Performance [Electronic resource], http://www.iasj.net/iasj?func=fulltext&aId=10894.

5. Liontou K. (2011). "Strategies in German-to-Greek Simultaneous Interpreting: A Corpus-Based Approach", In Gramma: Journal of Theory & Criticism, 19, 37-56.

6. Moser-Mercer B. (1996). "Quality in interpreting: some methodological issues", In The Interpreters' Newsletter, 7. Trieste, Edizioni LINT, 43-55.

7. Nolan J. (2005). Interpretation. Techniques and Exercises. Multilingual Matters Ltd.

8. Riccardi A. (2005). "On the Evolution of Interpreting Strategies in Simultaneous Interpreting", Meta: Translator' Journal, 50, 2, 753-767.

9. Sdobnikov V. (2011). "Translation Strategy Revised: The Communicative-Functional Approach", Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences, 4/10, 1444-1453.

10. Shiryaev A. (1979). Simultaneous Interpreting, Moscow, Voenizdat.