

TYPES OF ANTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS OF INTERPRETATION

Abdullaeva Gulnoza Mirolim qizi

1st year Master Student, Uzbekistan State World Languages University

The given publication work aims at revealing the notion of anticipation, its features and its types in the process of interpretation. According to some scholars Anticipation, no matter whether as a strategy or a phenomenon, plays a crucial role in field simultaneous interpretation and has drawn considerable attention of scholars. However, the study on anticipation is far from being systematic and thorough, and agreements are hard to achieve on some issues related to anticipation among different scholars. We are eager to deal with some basic issues of anticipation in simultaneous interpretation such as the definition, classification and features of anticipation, in hope that this paper can cast some light on the understanding of anticipation in simultaneous interpretation and can invite more attention and studies to anticipation in simultaneous interpretation.

Anticipation, no matter as an unconscious psychological activity or an effective subsidiary device in the process of interpretation, calls for more exploration. Besides, anticipation is an integrated prediction concerning psychological, linguistic, and even cultural aspects, which is up to the prospect of interpreting studies. Important as anticipation in simultaneous interpretation (SI) is, works specific to it in the past decades were precious and rare and they were mostly the display of technical rules or general theories with no specific focus on certain languages. Actually anticipation is language-specific, which will be illustrated later in this paper.

Many interpreting theorists have explicitly or implicitly classified anticipation into several kinds according to their respective criteria. Relevant classifications in the overall research in anticipation are as follows:

Lederer describes two types of anticipation in her famous article "Simultaneous Interpretation: Units of Meaning and Other Features". She holds that apart from the pure, observable kind of anticipation, namely, the interpreter produces a constituent in the target language before the speaker has uttered the corresponding constituent in the source language (Lederer, 2002: 138-148), there exists another type she considers more common. The type called by Lederer as freewheeling anticipation is that the interpreter produces a constituent in the target language after the corresponding constituent has been uttered in the source language, "but so soon afterwards and at so correct a place in his own language that there is no doubt the interpreter summons it before hearing the original" (ibid, 139).

According to the objects interpreter predicts in the process of interpreting, Roderick Jones divides anticipation into three kinds. The first one is the anticipation of the broad structure and sometimes the general thrust of a speech. This anticipation can be possible from the context of a meeting. If there is a discussion or a negotiation where delegations' positions or arguments will become known, they will return to points they have already made, or react to points made by other participants. Such anticipation will be enhanced if the interpreter can also bring to bear other cognitive knowledge available to them. The second kind is the anticipation of speech patterns and rhetorical structures.

For instance, those working from English should know that an Englishman or woman who begins his/her speech with, "This is a fantastic idea" and so on is very possible to be followed with, "but...". The third kind is the anticipation of specific words or phrases in individual sentences. This type of anticipation is actually possible because it is simply so obvious how the sentence is going to end. For most authors, according to the information that interpreters use to predict what speakers intend to say, anticipation can fall into two kinds: linguistic and extra-linguistic.

Besides, according to Wilss, linguistic anticipation is triggered by certain linguistic units (e.g. words or word combinations) which serve as cues. These cues are of two types--co-textual cues and extra-linguistic cues.

It has become more evident over the years that anticipation is enabled by several factors. Interpreters can be helped by linguistic factors, that is to say their knowledge of the source language – mastering expressions, set phrases or being able to quickly locate important key words is fundamental for anticipation. But there are also the so-called extra-linguistic factors. These refer to the text's or the speaker's particular background. Any information about them is really helpful for anticipation. Hence preparation before interpreting events is essential! Also prosody (that is to say non-verbal communication, such as the speaker's tone, intonation, rhythm and body-language) plays an important role. However, it is not always possible to see the speaker. Moreover, the intonation does not necessarily have the same meaning depending on the language. For instance, studies showed English intonations can sound aggressive to German-speaking people, while German intonations are monotonous and boring to an English-speaking audience.

All in all, when interpreting between two languages which do not have the same natural word order, a very in-depth knowledge of the source language is required, even if it is considered to be one of your passive languages (that is to say, if you only interpret from that language). It also highlights the importance of training for an interpreter, because only in this manner will interpreting students learn how to anticipate properly.

To conclude, the widely-accepted classification of anticipation includes linguistic anticipation and extra-linguistic anticipation. According to above mentioned facts we can say that anticipation has a great role in the process of interpretation as it is the important element during interpretation.

REFERENCES:

1. Newmark, P. Approaches to Translation [M]. Oxford: Pergamon. 1981.
2. Newmark P.A Textbook of Translation [M]. New York: Prentice Hall International, 1988.
3. Newmark P. (2006). About Translation [M]. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research.
4. Nord C.A. Functional Typology of Translation [M]. Amsterdam, 1997.
5. Shoabdurahmonov Sh, Askarova M., Hojiev A., Rasulov I., Doniyorov X. Modern Uzbek literary language. – T.: Teacher, 1980. – PP. 137–146.
6. The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations <https://doi.org/10.37547/tajssei/Volume03Issue>.
7. The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations <https://doi.org/10.37547/tajssei/Volume03Issue>.