

SOURCE LANGUAGE INTERFERENCE WITH TARGET LANGUAGE IN CONFERENCE INTERPRETING

ALINA DAILIDĖNAITĖ, JULIJA VOLYNEC

Department of Translation and Interpreting Studies

Faculty of Philology

University of Vilnius

alina.dailidenaite@gmail.com

julija.vol@gmail.com

This article describes an experimental study of lexical interference in simultaneous interpreting from English into Lithuanian and from Lithuanian into English. The paper aims to contribute to the literature on language interference in simultaneous interpreting as well as to identify the influence of lexical interference on directionality and quality of simultaneous interpreting. The experiment was carried out with 6 students working in two directions (from English into Lithuanian and from Lithuanian into English). The paper presents the analysis of the types, frequency and gravity of lexical interference. The results of the study suggest that lexical interference is more common and more detrimental to quality when interpreting into the B language. The results also demonstrate that interpreters experience more difficulties when interpreting word equivalents than phraseological units.

SIMULTANEOUS INTERPRETING AND DIRECTIONALITY

Simultaneous interpreting (SI) is widely used in situations where direct communication is needed among people speaking different languages. It is agreed to be an extremely complex activity, as listening and speaking at the same time is a very demanding task. However, interpreters manage to undertake such an activity for reasonable lengths of time and ensure successful communication even in the most stressful situations. In this context the quality of interpreting is always an issue. Many interpreting scholars and the professional interpreter community regard directionality of SI as one of the factors which is directly related to the quality of SI.

There are two main approaches towards directionality. The classic approach revolves around the idea that it is possible to interpret successfully only when interpreting into one's mother tongue and a number of scholars (including Dejean LeFeal 1998; Seleskovitch 1999; Gile 2005) maintain this position. It is believed that interpreting into one's mother

tongue (language A) will result in a more fluent, correct and eloquent interpretation than into a foreign language because of the level of mastery of the native language.

However, if successful interpreting involves conveying an accurate message to the listener, then an interpreter has to have full comprehension of the source text. Therefore, some scholars maintain that the source language has to be the mother tongue (Denissenko 1989, 157; Pinhas in Gerver 1976, 176) as only the interpreter who has full understanding of the source text can render the message into the target text. According to Garwood, it is hardly possible to apply the classic model of interpreting today because it was developed during the time when SI was not used very often and interpreters were usually working for a rather homogeneous and intellectual audience (Garwood 2004, 305). Christopher Garwood claims that these ideal conditions do not apply to the current situation of SI.

Having the question of directionality in SI in mind, this study aims at analyzing how specific language features of the source language, whether the mother tongue or not, may influence the outcome of interpreting into the target language, and what kind of impact it has on the quality of SI.

LANGUAGE INTERFERENCE

One of the first linguists to research language interference¹ was Uriel Weinreich. He described interference as “instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of familiarity with more than one language, i.e. as a result of contact” (Weinreich 1966, 1).

Language interference in SI was noticed by Henri C. Barik (1971) (in Gerver 1976, 186) in discussing SI errors. Researchers of interpreting and translation, however, have not yet agreed on a single definition of this phenomenon. The most prevalent definition of language interference in translation studies is: “a projection of unwanted features from one language to the other” (Hansen in Lamberger-Felber, Schneider 2008, 279). This definition can be specified as contamination of the target language with the source language lexis, syntax, phonetic and grammatical categories, each of these specifically discussed in a number of works (Weinreich 1966, 1; Kock 1993 in Lamberger-Felber, Schneider 2008, 218; Pöchlhacker 1994; Garwood 2004; Hopkinson 2007; Lamberger-Felber, Schneider 2008, 217, to mention but a few). Some authors provide a more detailed definition of language interference using typologies. Definitions and language interference typologies differ depending on the language pair (cf. Garwood 2004; Lamberger-Felber, Schneider 2008).

Marjorie Agrifoglio (2004) elaborated on language interference when researching sight translation of the English-Spanish language pair. Agrifoglio distinguished lexical

¹ Usually the terms *language interference* and *linguistic interference* are used interchangeably.

interference (calques of the source language words and false cognates), syntactic and grammatical interference, which manifests in the absence of agreement between the subject and the predicate, pronouns and nouns they referred to, discrepancies between gender, number and person, compatibility of tenses of the source and the target languages. Likewise, Alonso Bacigalupe (2010, 53) distinguished the following types of interference between English and Spanish: lexical uniformity (lexical units and names, abbreviations), literal translation markers and phonetic interference.

Heike Lamberger-Felber and Julia Schneider (2008) divide language interference into two macro categories: interference unrelated to SI (phonological, lexical and morphosyntactic) and interference specific to SI (simultaneous short circuit², grammatical agreement with the source text elements). Since detailed research of language interference in SI calls for a study of a bigger scope, for the purposes of this study only one type of language interference will be analyzed, namely, lexical interference. It is based on the definitions of the above-mentioned scholars as a transposition of lexical categories from the source language into the target language, i.e. equivalents with wrong semantic, connotative or functional value and neologisms (Lamberger-Felber, Schneider 2008), lexical units (as borrowings), using the same names and abbreviations not looking for synonyms (Bacigalupe 2010), calques, false cognates (Agrifoglio 2004), false friends, homophones, and metaphors (expressed literally) (Gernsbacher, Shlesinger 1997). These terms are defined in Table 1 below. Also, the analysis includes *phraseological translationese* observed during the pilot study (see section Pilot study).

Table 1. Types of lexical interference

Calques	A word borrowed from another language by literal, word-for-word or root-for-root translation.
Borrowings	A word borrowed from a donor language and incorporated into a recipient language.
False friends	Pairs of words or phrases in two languages that look or sound similar, but differ in meaning.
The same names and abbreviations	Specific terms, names, abbreviations that are used throughout the interpretation without using any existing synonyms.
False cognates	Pairs of words in the same or different languages that are similar in form and meaning but have different roots.
Homophones	A word that is pronounced the same as another word in both languages, but differs in meaning in both languages. Or the use of the wrong equivalent of the source text's homophone in the target text.

² A type of interference that originates in the SI process and that results in a wrong linking of information in the target text.

Metaphors	A literary figure of speech that describes a subject by asserting that it is, on some point of comparison, the same as another otherwise unrelated object expressed literally in the target language.
Neologisms	A newly coined term, word, or phrase that may be in the process of entering common use but has not yet been accepted into mainstream language.
Equivalentents	An equivalent for a word of the source text in the target text but with wrong semantic, connotative or functional value.
Phraseological translationese	Word for word translation of phraseological compounds into the target language. Or meaning for meaning translation, when the meaning perceived by the interpreter is wrong and interferes with the target language.

INTERFERENCE AND QUALITY OF INTERPRETING

Such SI scholars as Seleskovitch and Lederer (1989) described interference between languages as one of the biggest obstacles for good interpreting (in Setton 1999, 39). Franz Pöchhacker (1994) and Sylvia Kalina (1994) referred to language interference as contamination. Sylvia Kalina emphasizes the higher likelihood of language interference in SI because the source text cannot be decoded entirely and the analysis of the text is influenced by interpreters' semantic dependence on the speaker (Kalina 1994). David Gile elaborates that the results of interpreting may be enhanced or reduced depending on language specific factors and language-pair specific factors (Gile 2005, 15–16).

Usually scholars underline the higher likelihood of language interference when interpreting from one's mother tongue into a foreign language (from A to B). Luis Alonso Bacigalupe (2010, 50) contradicts this idea by stating that literal translation in structurally and lexically similar language pairs should not be considered as contamination, but signify a strategy of effort maximization where the interpreter tries to obtain maximum communicative efficiency with minimum cognitive effort. Some authors see interference as the lesser of two evils. If there is a possibility of the interpreter not rendering the message at all, it is better that he or she renders it with language interference (Viezzi, Garzone 2001; Garwood 2004).

The scientific community has not yet come up with one uniform system of evaluating SI. There are different approaches towards the quality of SI. Quality of interpreting may be based on the tasks of an interpreter, ranging from "text possessing" to "communicative text production" and the most generic "facilitating communicative interaction" (Pöchhacker 2002, 97). It is difficult to give one exact judgement of interpretation, as listeners may perceive the transmitted message differently and may have different requirements for the interpreter. Franz Pöchhacker offers a product-oriented approach, in which oral

texts (source and target) are transcribed and compared, which gives an opportunity to evaluate the content the listener actually receives. Pöchhacker agrees that the views of the SI listeners could be added in order to get a clearer picture. Scholars as Giuliana Garzone (2002, 108), Shlesinger et al. (1997) offer a more coherent and effective model of research by analyzing interpreting on three main levels: intertextual (comparison of ST and TT), intratextual (the acoustic, linguistic and logical aspects of the TT) and instrumental (the TT's comprehensibility and usefulness as a customer service).

Bearing in mind the different methods used and proposed by SI scholars, this study resorts to Pöchhacker's product-oriented approach where the focus of the study is interpreting itself (the target text). This method may be criticized for not being deep enough because it only takes into account the text. However, it may be considered as a valuable addition to resolving the question of quality in SI.

The gravity of lexical interference was defined and grouped according to Maurizio Viezzi's (2001) aims of SI. Viezzi suggests evaluating interpretations according to four aims that have to be pursued by an interpreter: equivalence, accuracy, adequacy, and clarity (Viezzi 2001, 175). According to Christopher Garwood, it is widely agreed that equivalence and accuracy are more important than adequacy and clarity. Therefore, in order to fulfil the main goal of communication they can be sacrificed (Garwood 2004, 312; 317).

THE PILOT STUDY

In order to distinguish the main trends of language interference (language pair English-Lithuanian) a pilot study was conducted. Two participants interpreted 1 speech into Lithuanian and 1 speech into English. Both participants had had 2 semesters of SI at the Department of Translation and Interpreting Studies of Vilnius University. They had relatively low or no SI experience on the professional market. All types of language interference (lexical, syntactic, phonetic, and grammatical) were monitored.

The findings of the pilot study suggested that the most significant types of language interference in both interpreting directions were lexical and syntactic. There were 55 cases of syntactic interference when interpreting from English into Lithuanian and 40 cases when interpreting from Lithuanian into English. Lexical interference was more prevalent when interpreting into Lithuanian (29 cases) than into English (20 cases). Phonetic interference was observed but it occurred only once in the interpretation into Lithuanian. There were no examples of grammatical interference. It is probable that phonetic and grammatical interference were not significant because of the small scope of the pilot study.

The results of the pilot study demonstrated a new type of lexical interference (phraseological translationese) that was not observed by other scholars of SI. According to the pilot study, most common examples of lexical interference when interpreting into Lithuanian were loanwords and equivalents with wrong semantic, connotative or

functional value. Also, the participants manifested lexical interference that is SI-related (misinterpretation due to focusing on just several key words). Lexical interference in interpretations into English was of a different nature. Participants in some cases interpreted Lithuanian phrases literally although there are set phrases or collocations in English. There were cases when equivalents with wrong semantic, connotative or functional value were used. Bearing in mind the results of the pilot study, the hypotheses of language interference were formulated.

THE EXPERIMENT

Hypotheses

Taking into account the results of the pilot study, the prevailing idea that interpreters may perform better working into their mother tongue rather than into a foreign language the following hypotheses were formulated:

1. *Interpreters working from English (language B) into Lithuanian (language A) demonstrate more damaging lexical interference that occurs most often using equivalents with wrong semantic, connotative or functional value.*
2. *Interpreters working from Lithuanian (language A) into English (language B) demonstrate more damaging lexical interference that occurs most often when transposing phrases of the source language into the target language.*
3. *Interpretation into Lithuanian (language A) is of better quality and has less damaging lexical interference.*

The Method

The method used for the experiment is based on the product-oriented SI research approach as described by Franz Pöchhacker (1994, 235-238) as well as Maurizio Viezzi's approach concerning the four main aims of SI (2009). In this study, the transcription of the recorded interpretation is used to evaluate lexical interference as one of the possible aspects affecting the quality of interpretation.

Cases of lexical interference that were discovered during the evaluation of the transcribed texts were put into 3 groups according to Viezzi's approach of the 4 aims of translation and interpretation: *equivalence, accuracy, adequacy, and clarity*. The first group is lexical interference cases with a change in meaning (not *equivalent* and *inaccurate*). The second group is made up of lexical interference cases that undermine understanding but do not change the meaning (*inadequate*). Cases of lexical interference that contaminate the fluency of the target language constitute the third group (*unclear*).

For the purpose of this study, cases of lexical interference that change the meaning of the source text are considered signs of poor quality because they deviate from the two

most important aims of interpretation: equivalence and accuracy. Lexical interference of the second group that does not change the meaning of the source text but undermines its understanding is not considered to be a sign of poor quality unless it is endemic (*inadequate*). Fluency of the target language, i.e. clarity, according to Viezzi, is not considered to be paramount for the quality of interpretation.

The Source Texts

The participants of the experiment interpreted 4 speeches. Two speeches were in English and two were in Lithuanian. In order to create a real life situation of SI, previously recorded speeches were transcribed and given live by native speakers. In this way the participants were able to see the speaker. Both English speeches were given by the same speaker. Lithuanian speeches were given by two different speakers.

The topics of the speeches were: *Shortage of Nurses in the Czech Republic* and *Mutual Recognition of Diplomas* (in English); *Depletion of Water Resources* and *Worn out Banknote Management* (in Lithuanian). The speeches were of similar length, density, terminology, included a similar amount of numbers and proper names. All four speeches had a clear structure: introduction, body and conclusion. The length of the speeches was approximately 9 minutes. The speed of the speeches was approximately 120 words per minute. This is recognized as the optimal speed for SI by different SI scholars.

The Subjects

Four 2nd year students, 3 females and 1 male, participated in the experiment. All of them are native Lithuanian speakers (language A) and are highly proficient in English (language B). They had had three semesters of consecutive interpreting and 2.5 semesters of simultaneous interpreting. The subjects of this study had little or no experience of interpreting on the professional market.

The Procedure

The experiment was carried out in two sessions. Both sessions were held at the Department of Translation and Interpreting Studies of the University of Vilnius, Lithuania. The room was fully equipped with SI equipment. Before the experiment participants were given instructions about the experiment and were notified that the results of the experiment will be used for the purposes of the study. Prior to delivering the speech the speakers briefed the students about the topic of the speeches.

Four original speeches and 16 interpretations were recorded and transcribed. The cases of lexical interference were grouped according to definitions proposed by the above-mentioned language interference scholars. Later the cases were grouped into three categories indicating the quality of interpretation in accordance with Viezzi's main SI goal approach.

Results

1. Quantitative analysis of the results

According to the quantitative analysis of the results all participants demonstrated different types of lexical interference. The interference in interpretations from English into Lithuanian was more diverse.

Figure 1. Lexical interference in interpretations B–A and A–B.





Figure 2. Gravity of lexical interference in interpretations B–A and A–B.



After a thorough quantitative analysis of the results further conclusions can be drawn:

- More lexical interference cases were discovered in interpretations into the foreign language than into the mother tongue (187 and 134 respectively).
- The most common types of lexical interference when interpreting into both directions were phraseological translationese, as well as equivalents with wrong semantic, connotative or functional value (more than 80% of interpretations in both directions). The number of these two types was twice as high when interpreting into the foreign language. Calques, the same names and abbreviations were equally prevalent in both interpreting directions.
- Participants were more accurate in interpreting phraseological translationese than equivalents while working in both directions.
- Lexical interference when interpreting into language B was of stronger gravity than interference when working into language A as the contamination of fluency into Lithuanian accounted for 46% of all deviations; meanwhile the distortion of understanding in interpretations into English amounted to 45% of all the deviations.

2. Qualitative analysis of the results

According to the qualitative analysis of the study, the participants experienced the greatest difficulty in interpreting phraseological translationese and word equivalents. The most abundant group of lexical interference was *equivalents with wrong semantic, connotative or functional value* in the interpretations from B to A. For instance:

(1)

Original	...if we nurses look decent and look pretty...
Interpretation	... <i>jei slaugytojos atrodo padoriai ir gražiai...</i>
Correct version	... <i>jei slaugytojos atrodo maloniai (tvarkingai) ir gražiai...</i>

This example shows that the Lithuanian for “decent” in this context would rather be “maloniai” or “tvarkingai”, because “padoriai” in Lithuanian has the meaning of “respectable” and such an interpretation has a wrong connotation in the context of nursing and healthcare.

Another example shows that the meaning changes even when a reflexive verb is used in Lithuanian. For instance:

(2)

Original	80,000 of them obtained diplomas...
Interpretation	80 000 diplomus įsigijo daugiausia Europos Sąjungos...
Correct version	80 000 diplomus igijo daugiausia Europos Sąjungos...

In this case “to obtain” means “to get or to acquire”. In Lithuanian depending on the context it may be interpreted either as “įsigyti” or “įgyti”. The interpreter opted for the reflexive form “įsigyti”; and consequently the meaning changed. The verb “įsigyti” means “to get something in exchange for money; to purchase”. The listener is led into thinking that 80,000 students bought their diplomas abroad.

An incorrect equivalent may distort the meaning of a term that is widely used and recognized. In the following example the term “free movement of workers” is diminished in interpretation to “free movement of blue-collar workers”.

(3)

Original	...to the free movement of workers .
Interpretation	...laisvam darbininkų judėjimui.
Correct version	...laisvam darbuotojų judėjimui.

In the following example the participant of the experiment experienced lexical interference using a wrong equivalent which might have misled the listener into assuming that the speaker is talking about countries that may provoke “a tide” in neighbouring countries, while the speaker was referring to a “flood”. This interference occurred because in Lithuanian “potvynis” means both “a tide” and a “flood”.

(4)

Original	...arba priešingai – sukelti potvynį .
Interpretation	...or artificial tide .
Correct version	...or artificial flood .

The following example of interference is given in the context of money; when banks replace worn-out banknotes. The verb “to replace” means that a person is given a new thing in exchange for an old one. However, when objects or items are “exchanged” it does not imply that one of the items is not fit for further use. Therefore, in the banking sector banknotes are “replaced”. The difference is slight, however, it distorts the understanding of the message.

(5)

Original	...sugadintus banknotus bankai žmonėms pakeičia naujais.
Interpretation	...are usually exchanged to good new banknotes.
Correct version	...are usually replaced by good new banknotes.

There were some instances when the meaning changed simply because of an incorrect equivalent. For example:

(6)

Original	<i>Galima užnuodyti vandenį...</i>
Interpretation	<i>...can pollute the water...</i>
Correct version	<i>...can poison the water...</i>

In this case “užnuodyti” means “to poison” because the speaker was referring to actions taken by countries to harm neighbouring countries. These actions were deliberate; therefore “polluting water” does not convey the meaning of a deliberate action on the same scale.

As the quantitative analysis showed, there were fewer examples of lexical interference in the form of *phraseological translationese* when interpreting from B to A than from A to B. The subjects in some cases resorted to just one of the meanings of the term. In this way the listener may remain misled. For example:

(7)

Original	<i>Western universities tend to deliver...</i>
Interpretation	<i>Vakarietiški universitetai pateikia pažymą...</i>
Correct version	<i>Vakarų universitetai pateikia pažymą...</i>

In this case “Vakarietiški universitetai” means universities anywhere in the world that can be described as Western because of their curriculum, spirit of Western education, etc. However, in this case “Western universities” refers to the location of the universities and not to their specific characteristics. Therefore, in order to avoid a misunderstanding the term “Western universities” has to be interpreted as “Vakarų universitetai”.

If an interpreter fails to render the compounds correctly, the message is distorted. For example:

(8)

Original	<i>...for the very lengthy legalization procedures to be completed.</i>
Interpretation	<i>...legalizavimo procedūros yra pernelyg ilgios...</i>
Correct version	<i>...diplomo pripažinimo procedūros trunka per ilgai...</i>

The interpreter resorts to literal interpretation of legalization procedures as “legalizavimo procedūros”, which puzzles the listener. Here literal translation transgresses the norms of Lithuanian stylistics.

Phraseological translationese in interpretations from Lithuanian into English were common for all participants of the study. For instance:

(9)

Original	... <i>vėl gaminti pinigų.</i>
Interpretation	... <i>in making money again.</i>
Correct version	... <i>printing money again.</i>

In this case the choice of English “making money” was incorrect because it implies “earning money”. However, the speaker was referring to the action of money issuing. In Lithuanian “gaminti” is usually used to define the process of money production. An incorrect collocation in this context leads the listener into thinking that the speaker might have been speaking about “earning money” or “gaining profit” and not “printing money”.

Some of the phraseological translationese changed the meaning of the source text and therefore were considered to be a significant contamination of the target text. For example:

(10)

Original	... <i>jo [banknoto] apsaugos priemonės lengvai ir greitai atpažįstamos...</i>
Interpretation	... <i>its [banknote] safety measures are recognizable.</i>
Correct version	... <i>its [banknote] safety features are recognizable.</i>

Here the phraseological compound “apsaugos priemonės” was interpreted literally as “safety measures”. However, in this context the meaning was “safety features” and the listener, hearing “safety measures,” may start thinking about the actions that are taken in order to protect the banknotes from being counterfeit, while the speaker was referring to “safety features” on the banknotes.

The subjects demonstrated lexical interference by using literal translations of word compounds when one of its components is polysemous in Lithuanian; as a result an interpreter may fall into the trap of conveying the wrong meaning. For example:

(11)

Original	... <i>ir iš apyvartos išimtų pinigų banknotų...</i>
Interpretation	... <i>taken off turnover money...</i>
Correct version	... <i>money withdrawn/ taken out from circulation...</i>

The word “apyvarta” may mean “return (profit)”, “circulation” or “turnover”. In this case the idea is that the money was taken/withdrawn from circulation. When the interpreter

opted for “turnover” in English, the listener was led into thinking that the speaker was talking about the money that is no longer used in business as an investment.

The subjects did not look for synonyms for the key words, especially when interpreting into English. *Calques* were observed in interpretations into both directions:

(12)

Original	... <i>upė skiria Jordaniją ir Vakarų Krantą</i> ..
Interpretation	... <i>Jordan and the Western Bank are separated by the river...</i>
Correct version	... <i>Jordan and the West Bank are separated by the river...</i>

Here the interpreter interpreted the name of the territory “the West Bank” as “the Western Bank” following the Lithuanian version where “West” is an attribute of “Bank”. The listener may be misled and start thinking that the speaker refers to the Western part of the country rather than a specific territory. Such interpretation changes the meaning and confuses the listener.

Working from B to A the use of *borrowings* caused confusion in some cases, but in general did not hinder the understanding of the source text. For example:

(14)

Original	... <i>she could have free liposuction on the thighs and on her stomach.</i>
Interpretation	<i>Taip pat ji sakė, kad labai norėtų atlikti liposakcijos operaciją bei kitus plastinius pasitobulinimus.</i>
Correct version	<i>Taip pat ji norėtų nemokamos riebalų nusiurbimo nuo šlaunų ir pilvo srities procedūros.</i>

Here the listener may be less familiar with the Lithuanian borrowing “liposakcija” than with the more common term “riebalų nusiurbimas”. A person who is not interested in plastic surgery may find it difficult to trace the meaning of the borrowed word back to the Lithuanian equivalent. If that happens the listener will remain confused and the intended meaning will not be conveyed.

In some cases interpreters opt for the closest equivalent of the international word. In order to avoid using borrowings, interpreters could choose to explain the same notion by using a more Lithuanian equivalent. For example:

(15)

Original	... <i>and it is what I want to focus on today in the context of one particular country.</i>
Interpretation	<i>Ir kalbėsiu remdamasi vienos konkrečios šalies kontekste.</i>
Correct version	<i>Ir kalbėsiu remdamasi vienos konkrečios šalies patirtimi.</i>

In this case the Lithuanian word “patirtis” i.e. “experience” can be used to avoid the borrowing “context”. In this way interpretation into Lithuanian is not contaminated by borrowings from English and the meaning stays the same.

Taking into account the above-mentioned examples, it can be stated that as far as the quality is concerned, lexical interference usually distorted the understanding of the message in interpretations into English and contaminated the fluency when working into Lithuanian. However, it should be emphasized that the changes in meaning were rare.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of the present study demonstrate that interpretations into Lithuanian (language A) were of a better quality and had less damaging lexical interference than interpretations into English (language B). Firstly, there were more cases of interference when interpreting into the foreign language. Secondly, the gravity of lexical interference when interpreting into the mother tongue mainly resulted in the contamination of fluency. Meanwhile lexical interference in the interpretations into the foreign language usually distorted the understanding. Since this kind of lexical interpretation was endemic and accounted for almost a half of all cases of lexical interference when interpreting into English, the interpreters deviated from the aims of accuracy, adequacy and clarity.

As the quantitative and qualitative analysis indicated, the subjects working from English (language B) into Lithuanian (language A) demonstrated lexical interference usually by using equivalents of a wrong semantic, connotative or functional value. However, wrong equivalents when interpreting from English into Lithuanian were of minor gravity, contaminated the fluency of interpretation or slightly distorted the understanding. When working from Lithuanian (language A) into English (language B) the subjects did not demonstrate a more damaging lexical interference in the form of phraseological translationese. In general the participants were more accurate when interpreting phraseological translationese than equivalents.

It is important to emphasize that the subjects who interpreted into the mother tongue always used borrowings and calques for international words and did not use synonyms when they were available. This is a case in point that being under constraint inexperienced interpreters resort to interpreting specific words and do not detach from the original lexis. In some cases this resulted in confusion and distortion of the original message.

In conclusion, lexical interference in simultaneous interpreting is difficult to avoid. Interpreters who work into Lithuanian should be more conscious about correct and fluent Lithuanian language. In some cases when interpreting into English, reformulation of an utterance, by completely detaching oneself from the lexis of the source language, would have helped to convey the message without distorting the understanding. It is important to focus on lexical interference during the interpreter training process. Bearing

in mind that accuracy is paramount in simultaneous interpreting, lexical interference can be tolerated as long as it does not distort the message.

It has to be acknowledged that due to the limited scope and methodological limitations of this experimental study, the results of the experiment are not final and can be a subject for further research. A more extensive, more detailed study involving all types of language interference and focusing on different language pairs can be carried out in order to better understand language interference and its impact on the quality of simultaneous interpreting.

REFERENCES

- Agrifoglio M. 2004. Sight translation and interpreting: A comparative analysis of constraints and failures. *Interpreting* 6 (1). Philadelphia, 43–67.
- Bacigalupe L. A. 2010. Information processing during simultaneous interpretation: a three-tier approach. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 18 (1). London, 39–58.
- Denissenko J. 1989. Communicative and Interpretative Linguistics. *The Theoretical and Practical Aspects of Teaching Linguistics*, eds. Gran, L., Dodds, J. Udine: Campanotto, 155–158.
- Garwood C. 2004. L'interferenza nell'interpretazione simultanea: il caso della lingua inglese. *Lingua, mediazione linguistica e interferenza*, eds. Garzone G., Cardinaletti A. Milano: Franco Angeli, 303–323.
- Garzone G. 2002. Quality and norms in interpretation. *Interpreting in the 21st Century. Challenges and opportunities*, eds. Garzone G., Viezzi M. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 107–120.
- Gernsbacher M. A., Shlesinger M. 1997. The proposed role of suppression in simultaneous interpretation. *Interpreting* Vol.2 (1/2). Philadelphia, 119–140.
- Gerver D. 1976. Empirical studies of simultaneous interpretation: A review and a model. *Translation*. New York, 165–207.
- Gile D. 1997. Conference interpreting as a cognitive management problem. *Cognitive processes in translation and interpreting*, eds Danks J., Shreve G., Fountain S., McBeath M., Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 196–214.
- Gile D. 2005. Directionality in conference interpreting: a cognitive view. *Directionality in interpreting. The 'Retour' or the Native?* eds. Godijns R., Hindedaël M. Ghent: Communication and Cognition. 9–26.
- Hopkinson C. 2007. Factors in Linguistic Interference: A Case Study in Translation. *Journal of translation and interpretation* 2 (1), 13–23.
- Kalina S. 1994. Analyzing interpreters' performance: methods and problems. *Teaching Translation and Interpreting* 2. Philadelphia, 225–232.
- Lamberger-Felber H., Schneider J. 2008. Linguistic interference in simultaneous interpreting with text. A case study. *Efforts and Models in Interpreting and Translation Research: A Tribute to Daniel Gile*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 215–236.
- Pöchhacker F. 1994. Quality assurance in simultaneous interpreting. *Teaching Translation and Interpreting* 2. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 233–244.
- Pöchhacker F. 2002. Researching interpreting quality: models and methods. *Interpreting in the 21st Century. Challenges and opportunities*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 95–106.
- Seleskovitch D. 1978. Language and cognition. *Language interpretation and communication*. New York, 333–341.

Setton R. 1999. *Simultaneous interpretation. A cognitive-pragmatic analysis*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Viezzi M., Garzone G. 2001. *Comunicazione specialistica e interpretazione di conferenza*. Trieste: Edizioni università di Trieste.

Weinreich U. 1966. *Languages in contact*. The Hague: Mouton.

ORIGINALO KALBOS INTERFERENCIJA Į VERTIMO KALBĄ VERČIANT SINCHRONIŠKAI

ALINA DAILIDĖNAITE, JULIJA VOLYNEC

Santrauka

Šiame straipsnyje nagrinėjama kalbos interferencijos problema sinchroniškai verčiant iš lietuvių kalbos į anglų ir atvirkščiai. Straipsnio tikslas – nustatyti, kokią įtaką leksinė interferencija turi sinchroninio vertimo kokybei, kokį poveikį tam daro vertimo kryptis (verčiant iš užsienio kalbos į gimtąją ir iš gimtosios kalbos į užsienio). Eksperimente dalyvavo 6 vertimo žodžiu programos studentai, jie vertė iš lietuvių kalbos į anglų ir iš anglų kalbos į lietuvių. Eksperimento rezultatai atskleidė leksinės interferencijos tipus, dažnumą ir poveikį vertimo kokybei. Aptarus rezultatus, galima daryti išvadas, kad leksinė interferencija pasitaiko dažniau ir labiau veikia kokybę verčiant iš gimtosios į užsienio kalbą ir kad vertėjams sunkiau rasti tinkamą žodžio atitikmenį negu išversti žodžių junginius.