Abstract

This research focuses on two subjects: directionality and modes of interpreting. We examined the differences between simultaneous interpreting (SI) and sight translation (ST) performed by six students of translation and interpreting at Bar-Ilan University. The interpretations were from the subjects' C language, English, into their B language, Hebrew (C < B) and into their A language, Russian (C < A). We focused on the following parameters: shifts (omissions, additions, changes in time concordance, use of generics, form-based translation, lexical errors, syntactic errors, grammatical errors and mispronunciations), as well as self-corrections.

We tested two hypotheses: a) more shifts and self-corrections are likely to occur in C < B; b) more shifts will occur in SI than in ST.

Our results showed mode-dependent differences between outputs. For instance, omissions of numbers, generics and elaboration additions were found to be more numerous in SI while self-corrections were more frequent in ST. Some results contradicted our assumption regarding directionality: omissions of geographical terms and a proper name, omissions of numbers, addition of qualifiers, additions used for emphasis, use of generics instead of long names, and errors in prepositions were found to be more numerous in renditions from C into A. There were also results that supported our assumption that more shifts would occur while interpreting from C into B. We indeed found that omissions of single words and sequences of words, omissions of numbers, omissions of long names, omissions of sentence endings, additions that compensated for omissions, elaboration additions, usage of generics, time concordance changes, lack of gender agreement, lack of number agreement, form-based translations, incorrect translations of numbers, false friends, pronunciation errors and self-corrections were more prevalent while interpreting from C into B.

In conclusion, the hypothesis that in SI the participants would have to cope with more obstacles than in ST, was confirmed. Moreover, our results supported the assumption that interpreting from C into B is more problematic than interpreting from C into A, as reflected in the larger number of shifts. Given the methodological limitations, particularly the small number of participants, the results were not always striking. However, there were several findings worth noting; e.g. the number of self-corrections differed markedly between interpreting modes and directionalities. In ST the participants produced almost six times as many self-corrections as in SI; in renditions from C<B we found almost twice as much self-corrections as in C<A (see , chapter 5, table 7).