As a European conference interpreter, I am very grateful to this meeting for teaching me the value of community interpreting and cultural mediation. In fact, I had my first experience of it at breakfast before the conference started when I asked for my fried eggs. I was asked whether I wanted them 'easy over' or 'sunny side up' and without the presence of my Canadian cultural mediator my breakfast would have been irreparably scrambled.

Let me start off by saying with my colleagues that I am tired of several commonplaces about interpreting, as I am tired of hearing that interpreting cannot be taught. I am tired of hearing that language teaching has nothing to do with interpretation - language is after all the interpreter's instrument in the way that a chisel is a sculptor's instrument and he has to learn to manipulate, to wield his instrument correctly. I am also tired of hearing, though the cognitive psychology school has never been responsible for this, that theory and practice of interpretation are mutually antagonistic. My own approach is a linguistic approach, but it is a linguistic approach to interpretation for the training of working interpreters, it is not an approach for the dissemination of interpreting theories, but it is specifically designed for the training of working interpreters.

One or two basic premises: I work as a conference interpreter, I shall be dealing with simultaneous interpretation, simultaneous in our traditional acceptance of the term, which is of course simultaneous in the booth with headphones and a microphone, though I am absolutely convinced that what I am going to say is equally relevant to the process which I have heard described as simultaneous over the past few days, but which we in Europe generally describe with the French term "chuchotage". What I am going to say is relevant for both types of interpreting and I have, in fact, been very pleasantly surprised by the discovery of the extent to which our objectives are
identical whatever type of interpretation we use, our type of simultaneous, chuchotage, consecutive, legal interpretation, community interpretation. Fundamentally our objectives are the same.

What then are my credentials for proposing a teaching methodology for interpretation in the developing world? I have considerable experience of teaching, the teaching of students, to work into English when English is not their mother tongue. That is my basic point. My basic methodology is that of proposing a series of structures within which someone whose mother tongue is not English may feel safe in translating into English. When I thought of this paper, I was thinking in terms of conference interpreting and the reality of conference interpreting, in Africa, for example, is generally English-French, French-English, possibly with the addition of Spanish and Portuguese. Therefore I should be thinking in terms of an approach to simultaneous translation into English from one of the Romance languages. There is no cultural imperialism in this. I just happen to be an English interpreter, I work into English, I teach people who are not English to work into English, though somebody else would equally well deliver the same speech talking about interpreting into French, into Spanish, into Portuguese, from one of the other languages.

There is a kind of dichotomy between professional activity and teaching activity because, as a professional interpreter, like most professional conference interpreters in Europe, I do work into my own language but, as a teacher of interpretation at the University of Trieste, I am teaching people to work into a language which is not their own. This is, therefore, the cardinal point of methodology which I would like to propose.

I am astonished by the identity of views between what Professor Newmark said about translation and what I feel about interpreting, that our objectives are identical; we require clarity, brevity, good structure and ready accessibility to a busy audience. I am simply quoting Professor Newmark to indicate the identity of views we have on this point.

One point I am going to make is that I do insist on the absolute correctness of grammar and syntax in the target language. This is a point of view which may be contested but is something which I feel very strong about. One of the examples I will give you will be correct tense usage and I am thinking of translations from the Romance languages where the present perfect is used to convey any action which has
taken place recently. If this is translated into an English past tense, if somebody says to me translating from one of the Romance languages "Were you in Rome?", then my English ear which is used to a past tense will conclude "Were you in Rome on a specific occasion, for a specific purpose?". That incorrect tense usage will create a sense of bewilderment from having missed something when everybody else was in Rome at the time. I do feel that that tense mistake is actually falsifying the information content - which is a point I shall be coming back to again. I am going to be talking quite a lot about syntax in this sense. My proposal is, in fact, a series of exercises to assist interpreters working from one of the Romance languages into English, to assist them to transform language structures in the source language into acceptable language structures in the target language. I am not going to be dealing with phonology, nor with lexical items, they have been amply dealt with elsewhere, but the particular point, the point I intend to dwell on perhaps more than others is the question of syntax because I feel that correct grammar, correct syntax are essential for the conveying of meaning (as with the example I have just quoted), and I want to illustrate the type of exercises which I ask my students to come up with to assist them in the transformation of language structures from one language into another. As I said here I am quoting the Romance languages into English because that just happens to be the field in which I work. Someone else working from another language, and the other language need not even be a world language, it could be a local language, could still, I feel, take some ideas from this particular approach.

Let me give you an example, another example using verb tenses, not quite the same example, but you know that the Romance languages, as I said, will use a present perfect to describe an event which has taken place recently, whereas in English a past tense is required when any time adverb comes out. If I hear, for example, someone speaking in French and saying 'le premier ministre a rencontré...' and I hear in French a time adverb at the end of the sentence and I have already used 'the Prime Minister has met...', I have the choice of producing a grammatically incorrect sentence by saying "The Prime Minister has met a delegation from the United States yesterday'. The fact is that it is grammatically incorrect although in this case it does not interfere with the flow of meaning. But the simultaneous interpreter working under pressure of time has to find techniques, devices, expedients to avoid that. I would have thought that the thing to do under those circumstances would be to introduce a separate sentence: 'The Prime Minister has met the foreign secretary yesterday' is an incorrect
sentence, but 'The Prime Minister has met the Foreign Secretary. Yesterday.' are in fact two perfectly correct, two perfectly acceptable forms. My own choice of manipulating a Romance language structure into correct English tenses would be the repetition of the modal verb: 'The Prime Minister has met the Foreign Secretary and did so yesterday.', which seems to me to save both the grammatical correctness and to convey the information.

Other structures which are particularly characteristic of Romance languages are my main theme, that is transforming structures characteristic of a source language into structures characteristic of a target language. A Romance language will frequently begin a sentence with a preposition and a noun. This is something we rarely do in English, we like sentences beginning with nouns. For instance, talking about this meeting, if I hear in French 'des résultats de cette conférence jailliront idées nouvelles' then of course the preposition will not be the same one at all, it will be a 'from'. And I would have thought that this kind of structure is something with which students need practice. In the first case I would suggest that the students learn to begin a sentence with a noun, leaving out the preposition, and then altering the verb. Instead of saying 'upon the results of this conference the date of the next one depends', I propose, 'the results of this conference will determine the date of the next one'. Instead of saying "from the results of this conference new ideas will spring", 'this conference will see the emergence, the birth of new ideas'. That is what I mean by transformation of structures in that way. It would be possible of course to begin an English sentence with a preposition structure and say "upon the results of this conference..." but that would be an automatic change in language register and would confer unnecessary solemnity on the occasion and the listener would be expecting to hear something like "upon the results of this conference will depend the fate of humanity". I shall return to language register later. Something else which I have to insist on in a whole series of exercises is the Romance language preference for impersonal structures - "on dit", "si fa". There are perfect ways of transforming these structures into English. I suggest that any Spanish-speaking, French-speaking interpreter who regularly opens sentences in his English version with "one says", "it is done", is not examining his or her target language structures carefully enough, because the target language provides structures that render the repetition of impersonal structures unnecessary. Instead of saying "on dit que le premier ministre est mort", a preferable structure would surely be "the Prime Minister is reported to have died". I give exercises tending towards drill in this particular form
of language transformation, quite specifically to wean the student away from the language structures characteristic of a source language and familiarise him with the language structures characteristic of the target language. My colleague spoke about language interference primarily at a level of lexical items, my own experience is that language interference is equally strong in questions of syntax and this seems to me to be the level at which it has to be ironed out with a series of exercises, with a series of drills of this kind.

Other aspects of the same process, the transformation of structures characteristic of a source language into forms acceptable in a target language include more complicated semantic aspects. Particularly in teaching students whose mother tongue is not English, I do insist on very great simplicity, on the unadorned use of the language, on the transformation of poetry, as it were, into prose, because I feel that anyone who is working into a language which is not his own, which is not her own, should be very very careful about the very specific form of words or phrases that they choose because any alteration in form can tip the balance of language register and render something ridiculous. For example, if I hear from Spanish "perritos calientes", I am suggesting that the translation "a sausage sandwich" or a "sausage roll", though an imperfect translation because they are not the same objects at all, is a basically effective and meaningful rendition of the original Spanish term, whereas any attempt to recreate the original which were not absolutely perfect from a linguistic point of view, would be unacceptable. I would much rather hear that my colleague had eaten a "sausage sandwich" than that he had eaten a "warm dog". Obviously where exact equivalents do exist it is not only possible but advisable to use them. There are plenty of expressions where there are exact equivalents in the source language and target language. "Two birds with one stone" has exact equivalents in Spanish and French, "dos liebres con un tiro", "deux coups d'une seule pierre". There are other occasions though where they will not be so readily available. I was thinking in that particular instance of Italian. For example, the English idiomatic expression " to take coal to Newcastle" which is readily available at all language and cultural levels in British English, has an Italian equivalent which is something terribly learned, it means "taking vasi to Samos" which most of us who have no PhD in classical Greek would be absolutely bewildered about. So, though the meaning equivalent does exist in the other language, it involves such a change, such a distortion of language register and ready accessibility to a busy audience that I would suggest some alternative form of expression would be absolutely necessary.
I have spoken briefly about syntax, transformation of syntax from the source language into the target language, I have spoken briefly about the transformation of figurative speech from the source language into the target language, I also feel that it is necessary to train students in the attempt to produce clear, unadorned, readily comprehensible English to enable them to transform rhetorical style from the source language into the target language. For example, the first morning of this conference I heard someone at the microphone, someone whose native language was Spanish, saying to you "I invite you and urge you to do something". Now, this is a rhetorical style characteristic of the Romance languages in which repetition is used to underline, repetition is used for effectiveness, whereas British rhetorical style will tend to underplay rather than to overplay and a British speaker would have simply used one verb there instead of using a weaker verb first and then following it up by a stronger one. So I do encourage my students to do exercises of this kind in which they transform two verbs, two adjectives, two expressions from a Romance language into a single one in English. Italian is particularly guilty in this way in as much as it uses an awful lot of adjectives, adjectives with an identical meaning. An Italian wishing to say that something is large will say "grande e grosso" whereas the expression "big and large" is a stylistically inadmissible tautology in English. So it will have to be transformed into one single adjective, "enormous", for example. So, this practice of taking two adjectives or three adjectives from a Romance language encouraging students to transform them into one single adjective in the target language seems to me a most important exercise as well.

The final point which I would like to make about transformation is the question of language register which I feel is particularly important for people who are working out of their mother tongue. One does not have, in one's foreign language, the same command of all the delicate shapings of language register that one has in one's mother tongue. So I make it perfectly clear to my students that I am asking them to use a rather restricted range of language registers. I divide language register into colloquial, formal and solemn. Depending on the type of register chosen, the preposition will be chosen accordingly. For example, "in front of" is acceptable for a formal register whereas for the solemn register one would use "before": "I stopped in front of the shop" but "I bowed before the Queen". That kind of use of language register also involves some very cheap tricks. If you wish to impress someone with the solemnity of what you are saying you change every 'on' into an 'upon' and there the matter ends. It is not quite as frivolous as that, but these are some of the exercises which
I give my students in an attempt to transform structures from the source language into the target language which I feel is the most important exercise for all people working into a language of whose implications, ramifications they are in incomplete control. Why do I propose this kind of linguistic approach for interpreting in the developing world? I take it that developing world interpreters will be working into one of the world languages. I take it that they will be wishing to express themselves with absolute clarity, that they will not wish to irritate their listeners with slips from one language register into another, with an incorrect use of particular formulae. Bathos, the literary figure involving a slip from an elevated language register down to a much lower one, is the cardinal sin of a conference interpreter, it is something which he can never allow himself and for that reason I suggest to my students this series of linguistic exercises to reach the objective of the successful conference interpreter which are surely those of targeting a particular type of language onto a particular type of audience.

Let me just quote, to conclude, an experience recounted to me by Professor Denisenko from the University of Moscow. He said that at the United Nations, a Russian delegate made a speech in which he said that things were in a dreadful state in the Soviet Union and that nothing was going right. His interpreter was a cultured Briton who had been through University and had read his "Hamlet" and he translated "something is rotten in the State of Denmark" whereupon the Danish ambassador stood up and left the room. The interpreter had failed to conjugate language register and audience requirement correctly. Let that be a lesson to us all.