The Interpreters' Newsletter 2022 (27), 1-19
DOI: 10.13137/2421-714X/34389 ISSN 1591-4127 (print) ISSN 2421-714X (online)
https://www.openstarts.units.it/dspace/handle/10077/2119

Addressing others through an interpreter: is the directness reduced across the pragmatic spectrum?

Magdalena Bartłomiejczyk
University of Silesia in Katowice

Abstract

This corpus study aims to explore, both qualitatively and quantitatively, how simultaneous interpreters handle face-threatening, face-enhancing and neutral utterances addressed directly at specific individuals or larger groups participating in plenary debates of the European Parliament. The corpus under analysis comprises all English and Polish material from seven debates held between 2016 and 2020. Eleven hours of original speeches and interpretations were manually annotated for second-person deixis and nominal forms of address. Based on previous research, it was expected that interpreters would tend to reduce directness by omitting and transforming addressative forms, and that face-threatening ones would be prone to mitigation. The results of the analysis disprove these initial hypotheses. While the number of addressatives is indeed reduced in the interpretations, this roughly corresponds to the overall text compression rate. Moreover, face-threatening addressatives are transferred and added by interpreters slightly more often than neutral ones, which, in turn, are omitted more often.

Keywords

Simultaneous interpreting, European Parliament, directness, addressative forms, personal deixis, honorifics

Introduction

Conference interpreting may be described as overwhelmingly monologic, especially if viewed against the background of community interpreting, where the primary interlocutors typically enter into a dialogue enabled and coordinated by the interpreter (see, e.g., Tiselius 2022). Still, also in conference settings speakers sometimes do directly address their audience, or specific members thereof. This is definitely the case for plenary debates of the European Parliament (EP). Simultaneous interpreting of interactions (particularly between participants using different languages) vividly shows parliamentary interpreting as part of a triadic exchange. At the same time, the interpreter's role as a mediator and coordinator is extremely limited due to his/her spatial distancing from the participants (in contrast to community interpreting, see, e.g., Wadensjö 1998). Interpreter-introduced shifts may sometimes visibly steer the interaction during the debate in a different direction (e.g., Bartłomiejczyk 2019: 403).

Previous research (e.g., Knapp-Potthof 2005; Monacelli 2009; Warchał *et al.* 2011) has shown the tendency of interpreters to reduce directness. This trend is particularly well-documented for face-threatening content. For interpreting in the EP, Bartłomiejczyk (2016) shows widespread use of mitigation, which is often manifest in face-threatening acts becoming more indirect in the interpretation. This effect is achieved mainly through deictic shifts, impersonalization and omission. However, the corpus in that study is limited in terms of representativeness as the speakers from one political party (UKIP) were deliberately selected to include primarily highly face-threatening content, and only one interpreting direction is examined. Having a larger and more balanced (although also highly adversarial) corpus at my disposal, I would like to explore the questions whether directness tends to be reduced and whether there are any noticeable differences in how addressatives are transferred across the pragmatic spectrum. More specifically, I take into consideration second-person deixis and nominal forms of address as interpreted between Polish and English (in both directions) throughout seven plenary debates held in the years 2016-2020. While (in)directness is obviously a much broader concept (see, e.g., Grainger/Mills 2016), these linguistic forms may be seen as interesting entry points to explore possible shifts in interpreted political discourse, as "pronouns of address are often the site for complex negotiations of face" (Hatim/Mason 1997: 68).

1. Addressing others: a theoretical background

Address Studies is a branch of linguistics that endeavours to answer the question: "Who uses which form towards whom, in what situation and for what purpose?" (Moyna *et al.* 2019: 2). Address research basically deals with second-person deixis (i.e., forms whose addressees can only be derived from the situational context) and nominal forms of address (i.e., vocatives and honorifics that specify a particular addressee), sometimes also with third-person personal reference. As rightly argued by Truan (2021: 2), in parliamentary debates "choosing how to refer to other discourse participants is a strategic, argumentative, and dialogical act". Her contras-

tive research on monolingual parliamentary discourse vividly demonstrates the exploratory potential of what she calls "the politics of person reference". This paper aims to take a similar, pragmatically-oriented approach to interpreted parliamentary debates. It is ultimately grounded in widely acknowledged (im)politeness theories (Goffman 1967; Brown/Levinson 1987; Bousfield 2008; Culpeper 2011) and informed by more focused explorations of adversarial parliamentary discourse (e.g., Harris 2001; Ilie 2004). Understandably, interpreting adds to the complexity of the communicative event, and my analysis cannot be limited to second-person forms only, as interpreters often transform them so that the meaning they carry is expressed by other means. Moreover, the original speaker's communicative goal is not necessarily achieved to the same degree for source and target language audiences, and this needs to be accounted for through detailed comparative analysis.

Addressing others may substantially differ cross-linguistically, which is a challenge for translation. Considering the two languages involved in the current study, I will try to outline very briefly the relevant differences between Polish and English (for details, see, e.g., Kiełkowicz-Jankowiak 1992; Bogdanowska-Jakubowska/Bogdanowska 2021).

As for nominal forms of address, formal ones employing the addressee's second name rather than position, which are neutral in English, are deemed rather impolite in Polish. Consequently, literal translations (e.g., *Mr Tusk – panie Tusk*) may not be pragmatically equivalent and in most cases Polish interpreters make the necessary adjustment (*panie przewodniczący* 'Mr President' or *panie przewodniczący Tusk* 'Mr President Tusk').

The situation is much more complex when it comes to second-person deixis. As a highly inflectional language, Polish tends to omit personal pronouns and the meaning they carry in English is encoded in verb or adjective endings. Including the pronoun will usually serve emphasis. That is why it is often more appropriate to refer to YOU-perspective as a more general term, not necessarily involving pronominal use. Even more importantly, there is a striking contrast between the versatility of *you* in English and a wide range of corresponding second-person forms in Polish. First, they differ for singular and plural. Second, as a language with a T-V distinction, Polish offers a choice between informal/more intimate forms and formal/more distanced forms. While the former may be expressed relatively straightforwardly with second-person pronouns (*ty* – singular, *wy* – plural) and/or matching second-person verb forms, the latter is more complex. In singular, pronominal nouns *pan* (masculine) or *pani* (feminine) are accompanied with third-person singular forms. In plural, *państwo* (or, possibly, *panowie* when addressing only men or *panie* – only women) may be accompanied either by second-person plural verbs (more informally, e.g., *słyszycie państwo* 'you can hear') or by third-person plural (more politely, e.g., *słyszą państwo* 'you can hear'). Finally, both in English and Polish YOU-perspective can express some general truths, but its generic use appears more informal in Polish (where an impersonal construction is preferable in formal contexts). Consequently, transferring *you* into Polish may be quite difficult, as it requires selecting among a number of possible forms on the basis of the context.

From a monolingual perspective, personal deixis is a prominent topic for analysts of political discourse (e.g., Billig 1995; Chilton 2004). Bani rightly points

out that "personal deixis facilitates the transmission of political convictions and is used to accept or reject linguistically the responsibility for an action" (2016: 5). According to Tyrkkö, "personal pronoun use is never more intensively purposeful than in political rhetoric" (2016). However, it is first-person deixis, and in particular the highly ambiguous *we*, that attracts the most scholarly attention (e.g., Proctor/Su 2011). In comparison, *you* seems relatively underresearched, especially in English (but see, e.g., Bull/Fetzer 2006). Still, there are interesting studies concerning languages making a distinction between T and V forms, such as Kostro/Wróblewska-Pawlak (2011) analysing a presidential campaign debate between Tusk and Kaczyński, who try to undermine each other's positions under the pretence of overt politeness.

2. Dialogism in plenary debates of the European Parliament

Simultaneous interpreting is generally associated with interlingual transfer of monologic discourse rather than of interactions among delegates. Interpreting plenary debates of the EP also largely fits into this pattern. As argued by Kent, "[a]lthough described as 'debate', the speeches given by Members during plenaries are mainly directed to consumption by home country audiences via the internet, television and radio rather than as engagement with colleagues who are in the same room" (2009: 57). Marzocchi (1998) also notes lack of spontaneity and little interaction among speakers in the plenary, and points out that real discussions are conducted in other types of meetings with scarce public exposure. Consequently, addressing someone directly may be an exception to the general rule of monologism, but such instances are not particularly rare.

The plenary debates are highly structured events and the time allotments for speakers are short, particularly for MEPs representing small political Groups or unattached. Generally, the debates tend to be more monologic at the beginning, as they start with longer pre-prepared statements by the Council and the Commission. As the debate progresses and MEPs representing ever smaller (and, oftentimes, more radical) political Groups take the floor, the contributions become shorter, more spontaneous (with fewer read-out speeches), more dialogic and, incidentally, also more impolite. Dialogism culminates in the so-called blue card procedure, when MEPs ask short (30 seconds) questions of the speaker who has just finished, and the speaker is supposed to answer, taking maximally one minute. Though the question may even not be interrogative, but take the form of a challenge, and the answer might be very evasive, terms of address and personal deixis are common here.

Incidentally, the level of directness in parliamentary discourse is often artificially limited through institutional restraints. This is very conspicuous in the British House of Commons, where, *inter alia*, interlocutors should address the Speaker rather than their opponent, which is "a distancing strategy, which heightens the formality of the interaction in a way which is almost invariably associated with negative politeness" (Harris 2001: 463–464). In fact, also the EP's Rules of Procedure require that "Members […] shall address the President", but this is neither widely respected (with the exception of the perfunctory initial vocative *Mr/Madam President*) nor enforced.

3. Literature review

The relevant research falls into two categories: pragmatically-oriented studies that explore the postulated distancing effect in interpreting in a more general way, often alongside other shifts, and research focusing specifically on personal deixis. However, only a fraction of the studies (Chang/Wu 2009; Monacelli 2009; Duflou 2012; Bani 2016; Bartłomiejczyk 2016 already mentioned in the Introduction) report on observational research involving simultaneous conference interpreting as performed by professionals.

Studies representing the first category are very numerous, therefore, the discussion will be highly selective. For instance, Knapp-Potthoff (2005) experimentally investigates mediation of (im)politeness by ad-hoc interpreters (three foreign language students). They interpret various versions of a telephone conversation in which the addressee is asked to return an overdue book. The analysis reveals "levelling of politeness" (2005: 70), i.e., far-reaching omission of both politeness and impoliteness strategies. The author hypothesizes that this might be inherent in interpreting. In simple terms, impolite source texts would tend to become less impolite, and polite ones less polite.

In her groundbreaking study of professional community interpreting, Wadensjö (1998) presents evidence of facework performed by interpreters to ensure good rapport between the participants. Their efforts involve, for example, rendering the more formal Russian plural address form *vy* with the more friendly Swedish second-person singular. On the other hand, when the interpreter in the British immigration office addresses Polish interviewees using second-person singular forms in the study by Mason/Stewart (2001), this appears very face-threatening due to the power difference between the interlocutors.

Monacelli (2009), in turn, explores simultaneous interpreting as performed by professionals in authentic conference settings in Italy. The analysis shows, *inter alia*, how stance, voice and face are modified by interpreters through shifts in personal deixis, in transitivity patterns, and in illocutionary force, respectively. The general trend is towards reduced directness and illocutionary force as well as increased distance.

The second category abounds in research on community interpreting, likely to involve some confusion due to primary participants' unawareness of the conventions governing interpreted exchanges. Angermeyer (2005), for instance, outlines how interpreted second-person address can be misunderstood in court if it is directed at someone else than the target language listener. Bot (2005), in turn, examines interpreted psychotherapy sessions. Interpreters frequently depart from the speaker's perspective, either adding *s/he says* and retaining the original deixis, or using fully-fledged reported speech. No specific types of utterances seem particularly prone to this; the author perceives the shifts as idiosyncratic translational behavior that does not lead to misunderstandings.

Dialogue interpreting in high-level political settings is much closer to my field of interest. Here, Zhan (2012) presents the Chinese perspective, characterized by interpreters' clear allegiance to one party, i.e., the Chinese government who employs them as civil servants. The detected shifts fall into two categories according to whether or not the interpreter's footing changes. The category re-

taining the original footing is dominant and it comprises shifts between first or second and third person. They do not display a clear pattern and some are assessed as awkward. By contrast, the author identifies three clear aims interpreters pursue when using *I* on their own behalf: "to avoid misunderstandings or impoliteness, to cope with frequent changes of speaking subjects, and to correct an error in the rendition" (2012: 214). Many interesting examples are provided, such as the interpreter explaining that the Chinese official is just being modest when he says that his work is of low quality.

In the context of conference interpreting, the study by Warchał *et al*. (2011) is highly relevant, albeit carried out on interpreting trainees recorded in a lab. They interpret consecutively fictitious speeches either criticizing or praising the audience while addressing it very directly as *you*. The envisaged audiences vary across source texts. When the interpreters themselves are among the addressees (students of their university), they tend to employ distancing strategies such as passive and impersonal constructions, nominalization of verbal clauses, or deictic shifts (from *I* and *you* to first-person plural, from *you* to third-person plural). Interestingly, this trend is observable for both criticism and praise.

Chang/Wu (2009), in turn, focus on Q&A sessions from international conferences held in Taiwan. Shifts in addressative forms occur more often when the simultaneous interpreter mediates between two speakers using different languages rather than when s/he enables others to follow an exchange in one language. Interpreters tend to adapt address forms to target language norms (that differ substantially between Chinese and English) and to add them when deemed necessary to clearly identify the addressee.

As an EU interpreter and therefore a 'practisearcher', Duflou (2012) reports on observed departures from the first-person norm, i.e., switches into the so-called "reporting mode". They occur primarily when the interpreter needs to explain some technical problems (such as the speaker's failure to switch on the microphone) or to specify who is being interpreted in case of rapid or overlapping exchanges. However, *says the speaker* may also be added to distance oneself from factual errors or opinions with which the interpreter strongly disagrees.

Bani (2016), in turn, examines first-person singular and plural deixis in authentic Spanish-Italian interpretations provided during a journalism festival in Italy. The analysis reveals a similar prevalence of this type of deixis in the source and target texts, however, the occurrences do not necessarily correspond to each other. In other words, first-person deixis is frequently omitted, added or modified. Omissions tend to decrease the subjectivity of the text, while additions seem to function mainly as 'padding' giving the interpreter extra time for planning. Some additions emphasize the speaker's foreign origin, i.e., where the speaker uses the name of his/her country alongside third-person verb forms, the interpreter introduces first-person plural deixis (e.g., *in Venezuela abbiamo una crisi*).

On the whole, departures from the norm that dictates adherence to source text deixis and personal reference seem frequent across a wide range of interpreting modes and settings. As Zhan rightly notes, shifts of this type "indicate how the interpreter participates in the communication, and point to how s/he perceives and performs the role of a mediator as against the expected/normative role" (2012: 197). They are attributed to various motives and they clearly require more scholarly scrutiny.

4. The study

4.1 Data

The material under analysis comes from the extensive bidirectional, parallel EP-Poland corpus (nearly 21 hours of recordings, over 157,000 tokens) that comprises all the English and Polish contributions to 11 plenary debates of the European Parliament held in the years 2016–2020 (Bartłomiejczyk *et al.* 2022). The analysis covers seven debates – see Table 1 for details. The interpreting directions English-Polish and Polish-English are represented almost evenly. The main topic is the rule of law crisis triggered by the Law and Justice government in Poland, along with other, related moves that limit citizens' rights (bills aimed at a total abortion ban and at forbidding sexual education in schools – debates 3 and 5, respectively). Most of the speakers clearly fall into two opposing camps, arguing either that the democratically elected government has the right to do as it sees fit and the EU should not interfere, or that the government is a danger to democracy and its actions should be thwarted by the EU.

	Date	Title	No. of tokens	Duration of speeches delivered in Polish	Duration of speeches delivered in English	Duration of original speeches in both source languages
1	2016-01-19	Situation in Poland	23,684	58 min 46 sec	36 min14 sec	95 min 00 sec
2	2016-09-13	Recent developments in Poland	8,654	19 min 08 sec	16 min 27 sec	35 min 35 sec
3	2016-10-05	Women's rights in Poland	12,106	29 min 25 sec	17 min 31 sec	46 min 56 sec
4	2018-02-28	Commission decision to activate Article 7 (1) TEU	9,257	09 min 34 sec	25 min 47 sec	35 min 21 sec
5	2019-10-21	Criminalization of sexual education in Poland	6,342	15 min 36 sec	12 min 10 sec	27 min 46 sec
6	2020-01-15	Ongoing hearings under article 7(1) regarding Poland	12,405	16 min 40 sec	31 min 43 sec	48 min 23 sec
7	2020-02-11	Ongoing threat for the rule of law in Poland	10,318	13 min 06 sec	28 min 29 sec	41 min 35 sec
Total			82,766	162 min 15 sec	168 min 21 sec	330 min 36 sec

Table 1: Overview of the material

4.2 Method

For the needs of this study, the material has been manually annotated by the author for addressative forms, which involved a detailed, pragmatically-oriented comparative analysis. The annotation is illustrated in Table 2 (with an additional gloss). Addressative forms in either language are classified as face-enhancing <Add+>, face-threatening <Add-> or neutral <Add=>. As Polish syntax makes a distinction between singular and plural forms, in this language, singular ones are coded as <1>, while plural ones as <2>. Likewise, in Polish, less and more formal forms are coded as <T> and <V>, respectively. The part after the slash refers to the equivalence between the source text (ST) and the target text (TT) or lack thereof. Forms that have their close counterparts are coded as </Eq>, and those which do not as </ST> (present only in the source text, i.e., omitted by the interpreter) or </TT> (present only in the target text, i.e., added by the interpreter). </ST> or </TT> may be followed by </sys> if lack of an equivalent addressative form is due to systemic differences between the two languages. Finally, </D-SHIFT> means that the deictic perspective has been modified by the interpreter, while </F-SHIFT> means that the interpreter has performed some facework, changing the pragmatic status of the addressative form (e.g., from face-threatening to neutral or vice versa). The annotations are placed after the relevant item.

Janusz Korwin-Mikke, unattached	Gloss	Interpretation
Panie Przewodniczący! <Add=1V/Eq> Ja nie jestem demokratą. Demokracji nienawidzę, demokracją pogardzam, ale wy jesteście demokratami <Add-2T/ST>. W takim razie przyjmijcie do wiadomości <Add-2T/Eq>, że lud polski, legalnie i demokratycznie, wybrał PiS. Chcieliście demokracji <Add-2T/Eq>, no to ją macie <Add-2T/Eq>.	Mr President, I'm not a democrat. I hate democracy, I despise democracy, but you are democrats. Then, acknowledge that the Polish people, legally and democratically, has elected PiS. You wanted democracy, so you've got it.	Mr President, <Add=/Eq> I'm not a democrat. I hate democracy. @ D-Democracy is vile. I want you to understand <Add-/Eq>, the democrats in Poland voted for PiS. You wanted democracy <Add-/Eq>, you've got democracy <Add-/Eq>.

Table 2: An example of corpus annotation for addressative forms

In Table 2, the fragment is transferred relatively closely in terms of addressative forms, even though, interestingly, there is one very clear shift in the overall meaning (*the democrats in Poland voted for PiS*). The ST is decisively face-threatening, which is reflected in the presence of four face-threatening addressative forms. Not only do they express face-threatening acts such as blaming and criticizing, but also they are all T forms, not fully appropriate in parliamentary discourse. The latter, obviously, cannot be transferred into English, which may lower the perceived level of face threat. The initial address to the chairperson is classified as neutral due to its purely perfunctory role. Out of the five addressative forms present in the ST, four are transferred to the TT and none is added by the interpreter. The pragmatic status of all the transferred forms (i.e., <Add=> or <Add->) remains the same. More divergent renditions will be illustrated in Section 4.4.

4.3 Quantitative analysis

Out of 1,168 addressative forms present in the STs, 647 were transferred into the TTs (albeit not always with the same pragmatic status), while 521 were omitted and 337 were added in the TTs. Therefore, 55% of the original addressative forms were transferred to the TTs, and 45% were omitted. In the TTs, on the other hand, transferred addressatives account for 66%, and added ones for 34%. This suggests that the interpretations are somewhat less direct than the originals, however, such a conclusion could be misleading. It should be taken into consideration that simultaneous interpreting generally involves more omission than addition and the TTs tend to be shorter than the originals. Across the EP-Poland corpus, the text compression rate is 14.33% (Bartłomiejczyk *et al*. 2022: 116), while in the material under analysis, the reduction rate for addressatives is 15.84%. These values are quite close.

As already indicated, some modifications are attributable to systemic differences between the two languages involved. Among forms present only in the STs, 74 (14.20%) belong to this category, and among forms present only in the TTs – 48 (14.24%). The shares of language-dependent omissions and additions are therefore almost identical, and they should not act as a confounding factor in the analysis. A great majority (over 85%) of omissions and additions are optional.

Facework shifts changing the pragmatic status of an addressative occurred only 19 times, and deictic shifts 78 times. The facework shifts mainly caused mitigation of face-threatening addressatives, which were neutralized 12 times. The opposite shift occurred five times, and in two cases face-enhancing addressatives were neutralized. The deictic shifts resulted in 36 non-equivalent second-person forms in the STs and 42 in the TTs. These include 62 face-threatening addressatives as compared with 10 neutral and 6 face-enhancing ones.

Results accounting for the pragmatic status of addressatives across the material are shown in Table 3. They suggest a tendency for interpreters to boost face-threatening content: face-threatening addressatives seem somewhat more likely to be transferred closely or added than neutral ones. The number of face-enhancing addressatives is probably too low to venture any generalizations, but there also seems to be a slight tendency to add rather than omit them. The emerging pattern in transferring addressative forms according to their pragmatic status was tested with the Chi-square test (significant at $p<.05$). The obtained result is $\chi^2= 18.97$, $p<.001$, which indicates that the detected differences are significant.

Addressative forms	Neutral (<Add=>)	Face-threatening (<Add->)	Face-enhancing (<Add+>)	Total
Transferred closely (pairs of equivalent addressatives in ST and TT)	253 (40.29%)	338 (53.82%)	37 (5.89%)	628
Omitted (present only in ST)	269 (51.63%)	220 (42.25%)	32 (6.14%)	521
Added (present only in TT)	139 (41.25%)	171 (50.74%)	27 (8.01%)	337

Table 3: Transfer of addressative forms according to their pragmatic status

4.4 Qualitative analysis

The (in)frequent use of addressative forms seems to be a feature of individual speakers' style. A mixture of addressatives of varying pragmatic status often co-occurs with first-person singular forms, which are relatively rare and decisively outnumbered by first-person plural forms across the corpus. Therefore, there seems to exist a distinct 'personal' style, whose representatives include MEPs from various political Groups (and using either source language) such as Guy Verhofstadt, Syed Kamall, Sophia in 't Veld, Ryszard Legutko and Robert Biedroń. In this section, I will briefly discuss the most typical interpreting shifts that either make this style less apparent or boost it.

4.4.1 Omission proper

There are several distinct reasons why an addressative form that is present in the original may be missing in the interpretation. The most straightforward one is the interpreter deleting whole propositions in which addressatives are embedded, i.e., what I call omission proper – see Table 4.

Example no. & original speaker	Source text	Gloss	Interpretation
1. Stanisław Żółtek, ENF	Zajmijcie się <Add-2T/ST> lepiej tym, co sami stworzyliście, <Add-2T/ST> czyli napływem zarazy islamskiego terroru.	You'd better work on what you've created yourselves: the influx of the plague of Islamic terror.	–
2. Patryk Jaki, ECR	I państwo celowo kłamiecie <Add-2V/ST> i wprowadzacie <Add-2T/ST> wszystkich w błąd.	And you are deliberately lying and you are misleading everyone.	–
3. Ryszard Legutko, ECR	Nie ma niczego złego w takiej konstrukcji i żeby pan nie wiem jak arytmetycznie to obracał, <Add-1V/ST> to i tak pan tego nie udowodni, <Add-1V/ST> bo to jest całkowicie racjonalna, normalna konstrukcja.	There is nothing wrong with this construction and however you swivel it arithmetically, you will not prove it, because it's a totally rational, normal construction.	There is nothing wrong @ with @ this composition of the Tribunal. It's totally rational and normal construction of the composition of a court.
4. Julie Ward, S&D	So, thank you. <Add+/ST> Continue <Add+/ST> to speak up. Together we can be strong.	Together we will be strong.	Wspólnie będziemy silne.

Table 4: Omission proper

Examples 1-3 illustrate omission of highly face-threatening content, with Examples 1 and 2 addressed more generally at the speaker's opponents in the audience, and Example 3 – at MEP Verhofstadt, who took the floor directly before MEP Legutko. The face-enhancing Example 4 is addressed at Polish pro-choice activists whose representatives are present in the gallery.

While it would be tempting to attribute the shifts in Examples 1-3 to the interpreters' desire to mitigate the message, omission may easily stem from other considerations than reducing danger to the addressees' face, such as difficulty to keep up in view of the speakers' high delivery rate. Comprehension problems seem less likely, as in all three cases we deal with A-B interpretations provided by native speakers of Polish. Cognitive constraints and the tendency not to offend may in fact both conspire, which results in a mitigated TT version.

4.4.2 Meaning shifts

Sometimes omission and/or addition of addressatives is related to shifts in meaning that affect a longer text fragment – see Table 5.

Example no. & original speaker	Source text	Gloss	Interpretation
5. Guy Verhofstadt, ALDE	So, I have only one question to you, < Add-/ST> and I think you can respond <Add-/ST> to that at least, as Prime Minister. If the Venice Commission gives a negative opinion, shall you follow this opinion <Add-/Eq> of the Venice Commission? And can we maybe have answer immediately?	I hope that I have answered, and that you are responsible for this as Prime Minister, for this also. If the Venice Commission gives a negative opinion, you should track this opinion and act in accordance with it. Maybe this is the answer.	Mam nadzieję, że odpowiedziałem, i że pani jest za to odpowiedzialna <Add-1V/TT> jako premier, za to również. Jeżeli Komisja Wenecka wydaje negatywną opinię, to to powinien powinni państwo <Add-2V/Eq> śledzić tą opinię i postępować według niej. Być może to jest właśnie odpowiedź.
6. Janusz Korwin-Mikke, unattached	To wy chcieliście <Add-2T/ST> w Polsce demokracji. Gdyby w Niemczech panowało cesarstwo, to Adolf Hitler byłby w pałacu cesarskim tylko raz do roku: na konkursie akwarelistów. To dzięki demokracji tacy ludzie jak Hitler, Obama, Trump dochodzą do władzy.	It is you who wanted democracy in Poland. If the empire had ruled in Germany, Adolf Hitler would be in the imperial palace only once a year: during a contest for watercolourists. It is thanks to democracy that people like Hitler, Obama, Trump come into power.	It is you who are undermining <Add-/TT> democracy in Poland. But I mean, really, you know, <Add=/TT> sometimes I wonder wheth- @ what you're doing, <Add-/TT> whether Adolf Hitler isn't here sometimes. I mean, you adopted <Add-/TT> that kind of pose.

Table 5: Substantial meaning shifts

In Example 5, we deal with two different speech acts. What was clearly a question in the original, one addressed at PM Szydło, becomes a suggestion in the interpretation. This has some impact on further interaction, as, predictably, PM Szydło does not answer, and MEP Verhofstadt insists on asking later on. Example 6 illustrates a very major shift in meaning, although the speech act remains the same: accusation. MEP Korwin-Mikke's anti-democratic stance and his peculiar joke are not transferred, while the gist of the accusation itself changes and the argument is developed to finally compare the addressees to Hitler. Strikingly, the only matching elements in the TT are *democracy in Poland* and *Adolf Hitler*, and the interpreter seems to be improvising on the basis of them and the general accusatory tone.

In both the cases, the interpreters (each of whom is working from their foreign language) probably faced serious problems with understanding the original message, and they resorted to the strategy of inferencing or even parallel reformulation (Gile 2009). Consequently, adding and deleting addressatives appears to be a side-effect of emergency strategic processing.

4.4.3 (Im)personalization

Impersonal constructions conceal the agent of an activity, or at least foreground the activity and background the agent. In English, they are mainly associated with passive voice and the indefinite pronoun *one*. In Polish, the range is wider, including passives of transitive and intransitive verbs (e.g., *mówiono* 'one spoke') as well as subjectless constructions with modal uninflected verbs (e.g., *trzeba* and *należy* 'one should'). The analysis reveals both transformations in which second-person forms are rendered as impersonal constructions (Table 6, Examples 7 and 8) and vice versa (Examples 9-11).

Example no. & original speaker	Source text	Gloss	Interpretation
7. Terry Reintke, Verts/ALE	You could have had <Add-/ST> an open debate also looking at liberalising the abortion law that there is in Poland, but you did not. <Add-/ST> You proposed <Add-/ST> only to move forward with one of the proposals […].	One could have an open debate, also considering a potential liberalization of the law. This was not done, the proposal included going to the commission with only one proposal […].	Można było przeprowadzić otwartą debatę, zajmując się także potencjalną liberalizacją prawa. Tego nie zrobiono, propozycja @ obejmowała pójście do komisji tylko z jedną propozycją […].
8. Sophia in 't Veld, ALDE	Madam Commissioner, <Add=/ST> I heard you say <Add=/ST> – and I only partially agree with you <Add-/ST> – that abortion is not an EU matter.	I can say that I only partially agree that abortion is not a European matter.	Mogę powiedzieć, @ że tylko po części się zgadzam, że aborcja nie jest kwestią europejską.

9. Guy Verhofstadt, ALDE	The point is and what makes us concerned and alarms most Members here in the House, and what a democrat never does, is is then to use or abuse this huge majority to dismantle the checks and balances in the country.	What really is at stake here and what arouses our concern and what alarms many among us is that you're using, you're abusing this significant majority to dismantle the regulatory mechanisms in the country.	O co tutaj naprawdę chodzi i co wzbudza @ naszą troskę i co alarmuje wielu spośród nas to to, że używacie, <Add-2T/TT> lub nadużywacie tej istotnej większości <Add-2T/TT> do tego, żeby rozmontowywać system mechanizmów regulacyjnych w kraju.
10. Beata Szydło, PM of Poland	[…] wydaje mi się, że wiele ważnych, niezwykle ważnych spraw, niezwykle ważnych problemów, które zasługują na pochylenie się i naszą uwagę, dzieje się obecnie w Europie.	[…] it seems to me that many important, highly important things, highly important problems that deserve interest and our attention are happening now in Europe.	I think that you, <Add+/TT> honourable Members, <Add=/TT> have many important issues to discuss. I think there are many problems that you address <Add+/TT> at the moment, that you need to grapple with. <Add=/TT>
11. Robert Iwaszkiewicz, EFDD	Otóż odpowiadam na wszystkie te pytania: ręce precz od Polski!	So, I'm answering all these questions: hands off Poland!	To those questions I say: leave Poland alone. <Add-/TT>

Table 6: (Im)personalization

Example 7 shows typical grammatical shifts, including the use of the subjectless verb *można* 'one could', an active-passive transformation (*this was not done*) and replacing a verbal phrase with a nominal one (*the proposal*). All this deflects the blame, and the opposite effect is achieved in Example 9, where infinitives are replaced with second-person forms. Impersonalization as I understand it, however, goes beyond the term as used by grammarians. In Example 8, we see very local omissions of an honorific and two second-person forms that make the face-threatening act off-record, i.e., the interpreter does not say explicitly whose view the speaker questions and therefore does not directly challenge Commissioner Jourová. By contrast, in Example 10, the interpreter adds an honorific and several second-person forms to enhance the positive image of the EP, which facilitates the PM's attempt to divert attention from the rule of law crisis in Poland. Example 11, in turn, shows that a personal and an impersonal imperative may be equally impolite.

Impersonalization and its opposite may also be achieved by a variety of other means that cannot all be illustrated here due to space constraints: for instance, by deleting or adding an optional subject of a transitive verb, or replacing personal pronouns with other pronoun types.

4.4.4 Deictic shifts

Deictic shifts are defined here narrowly as referring only to personal deixis (i.e., they do not encompass, for example, place deixis expressed with pronouns such as *here*). The interpreter can either replace second-person deixis with other personal forms (Table 7, Examples 12 and 14) or vice versa (Examples 13 and 15).

Example no. & original speaker	Source text	Gloss	Interpretation
12. Ryszard Legutko, ECR	Jeżeli mówi się, że w Polsce dokonano zamachu stanu, to znaczy, że ten, kto to mówi, nie rozumie sensu słów, których używa, albo specjalnie ten sens ten sens zmienia.	If one says that a coup d'etat was committed in Poland, it means that the one who says it does not understand the sense of the words they're using, or they're deliberately changing this sense.	If you talk <Add=/TT> about a coup d'etat in Poland then you either don't know <Add-/D-SHIFT> what you're saying <Add-/D-SHIFT> or you are deliberately twisting language. <Add-/D-SHIFT>
13. Stanisław Żółtek, ENF	Komisarze unijni, <Add-2T/D-SHIFT> zapomnieliście <Add-2T/D-SHIFT> gdzie jest wasze miejsce <Add-2T/D-SHIFT> i chcecie rządzić <Add-2T/D-SHIFT> swoimi panami, to jest narodami, które was mianowały <Add-2T/ST> przez poprzez swoje rządy.	European Commissioners, you have forgotten where your place is and you want to rule your masters, that is, the nations that nominated you through their governments.	But the European Commissioners seem to have forgotten wh- their place. They want to @ basically rule over the countries that they have @ effectively taken over by s- @ overthrowing governments.
14. Joanna Kopcińska, ECR	Nie straszmy ludzi polexitem.	Let's not scare people with Polexit.	Do not scare <Add-/D-SHIFT> people with Polexit.
15. Rasmus Andresen, Verts/ALE	And the worst thing you can do <Add-/D-SHIFT> is to ban sex education from public. If you ban <Add-/D-SHIFT> sex education out of public schools, young people will ask others or they will be anxious.	The worst thing we can do is to ban public education in public schools. If we do this, young people will anyway investigate and ask questions.	Najgorszą rzeczą, jaką możemy zrobić, to zakazać @ edukacji publicznej w szkołach publicznych. Jeśli to uczynimy, @ będą i tak drążyli i zadawali pytania młodzi ludzie.

Table 7: Deictic shifts

The most typical shifts occur between second-person and third-person forms, usually preserving the number (see Examples 12 and 13), and between second-person plural and inclusive WE (see Examples 14 and 15). Deictic shifts usually affect face-threatening acts that are perceived as more direct and offensive if they include second-person deixis. The interpreter's transformations, therefore, may exert a significant ideological impact. By using third-person forms, criticism is

"deflected from its original target, the audience […], the blame for the state of affairs apparently laid on a third party, not involved in the communication event" (Warchał et al. 2011: 786). Truan argues that third-person reference is a "marked linguistic choice to refer to someone who is present" (2021: 4). By using first-person plural, in turn, criticism is blunted as the speaker rhetorically accepts a part of the responsibility. If the interpreter introduces WE-perspective, they may well be imposing on the original speaker a political identity that the latter does not wish to assume (on the ideological implications of WE, see, e.g., Pavlidou 2014).

4.4.5 Addition proper

Addition of addressatives that are clearly unrelated to any elements in the ST and do not fall under major meaning shifts (as illustrated in 4.4.2) is rare. It may occur at the beginning of a speech in the form of adding perfunctory honorifics and/or thanks for being given the floor that were missing in the original – see Table 8, Example 16.

Example no. & original speaker	Source text	Gloss	Interpretation
16. Zdzisław Krasnodębski, ECR	Ja może zacznę od tego odpowiedzi, bo pani in 't Veld nie udzieliła odpowiedzi na moje pytanie.	Maybe I will start with this answer, because Ms in t' Veld hasn't answered my question.	Thank you very much, <Add=/TT> Madam President. <Add=/TT> First of all, I would like to comment on what @ Ms in 't Veld said.

Table 8: Addition

In Example 16, the addition seems to be something in between an appropriateness repair on behalf of the speaker who fails to respect the conventions and a filler giving the interpreter the opportunity to hear a longer ST chunk (in line with the observations by Bani 2016). The strategy of inserting fillers is observable not only at openings; added addressatives are typically neutral and include *honourable Members, ladies and gentlemen, (as) you know, you see* and their Polish counterparts.

4.4.6 Facework shifts and other facework

While most of the shifts described in the previous sections obviously affect facework, few of them radically change the pragmatic status of an utterance. Examples of those that do are presented in Table 9.

Example no. & original speaker	Source text	Gloss	Interpretation
17. Jadwiga Wiśniewska, ECR	Panie Biedroń! <Add-1V/F-SHIFT> Powiem wyraźnie i pomału, żeby pan zrozumiał. <Add-1V/Eq>	Mr Biedroń, I will say it clearly and slowly, so that you understand.	Mr Biedroń, <Add=/F-SHIFT> I will say it clearly, so you can understand. <Add-/Eq>
18. Syed Kamall, ECR	But before you unleash a volley of words, <Add-/F-SHIFT> let me <Add=/ST> make a plea […].	Before you take the floor, please […].	Zańmnim panowie, państwo @ zabiorą głos, <Add=2V/F-SHIFT> proszę […].

Table 9: Facework shifts

In Example 17, the shift is caused by the literal translation of the initial honorific, which is impolite in Polish but neutral in English and would require some modification to obtain a similar illocutionary effect. The rest of the utterance is equally face-threatening in both the ST and the TT. Many of the detected shifts going in either direction concern such honorifics. Example 18, in turn, shows euphemization through replacement of a rather poetic and clearly critical phrase with a neutral one that does not pass a judgement on the manner in which the addressees typically talk.

More subtle facework that is not reflected in my annotation may also come into play. The interpreter may mitigate or boost face threat to the extent that does not change the status of a given addressative form – see Table 10.

Example no. & original speaker	Source text	Gloss	Interpretation
19. Syed Kamall, ECR	So, if you decide to gang up today <Add-/Eq> on the democratically elected government of Poland […].	So, if you want to accuse of something the government, democratically elected in Poland […]	Więc jeżeli państwo tutaj chcą zarzucać coś <Add-2V/Eq> rządowi demokratycznie wybranemu w Polsce […].
20. Ryszard Legutko, ECR	Nie wiecie, <Add-2T/Eq> co to jest kornik drukarz.	You don't know what European spruce bark beetle is.	Do you know what these beetles are? <Add-/Eq>

Table 10: Subtle facework

Example 19 is similar to Example 18 in that it affects the choice of a particular evaluative phrase describing the addressees' actions. However, the assessment

is clearly negative in both cases, though the phrase used originally is definitely stronger and more colloquial. In Example 20, a very direct accusation of lack of knowledge is transformed into a rhetorical question that obviously implies the same but changes the status of the face-threatening act from on-record to off-record. Such moves, in either direction, are quite frequent across the material.

5. Conclusion

The obtained results run counter to the initial expectations based on previous research. First, there is no clear reduction of directness through elimination of addressative forms by the interpreter. Although there are fewer addressatives in the TTs than in the STs, the reduction rate of nearly 16% is only slightly higher than the overall text compression rate in the corpus. Direct comparison with existing studies, though, is not possible due to marked differences in methodology. None of the studies discussed in Section 2 actually takes into consideration the general tendency towards omission rather than addition in simultaneous interpreting.

Second, the expected trend towards mitigation of face-threatening content was not in evidence. To the contrary, face-threatening addressatives were transferred and added in the TTs slightly more often than neutral ones, which, in turn, were omitted more often. The difference is not very pronounced, but statistically significant. This is surprising, but may be partly attributable to my classification according to pragmatic status, which, admittedly, is not very fine-grained and disregards subtle facework such as exemplified in Table 10.

In line with the results reported by Bani (2016) for first-person deixis, the addressative pattern of the ST is considerably modified by interpreters. Many second-person forms are omitted or added even though this is not enforced by systemic differences between the source and target languages. However, as shown by the qualitative analysis, the omitted or added addressatives often have clear counterparts in other personal forms or various impersonal constructions. When we take a more holistic view at a speech and its interpretation, addressatives introduced by interpreters often seem to compensate for others that were deleted elsewhere, so that the overall personal style of the speaker is represented quite faithfully.

A further question related to addressatives that emerges now is whether other factors beyond the pragmatic status might also play a role in how they are transferred by interpreters. The variables that may be worth investigating are the interpreting direction (English-Polish or Polish-English) and the speaker's political positioning (pro- or anti-EU). More broadly, I envisage a follow-up taking into consideration other deictic perspectives, in particular, first-person singular forms whose modification may have serious ideological and psychological implications.

References

Angermeyer P. S. (2005) "Who is 'you'? Polite forms of address and ambiguous participant roles in court interpreting", *Target* 17/2, 203-226.

Bani S. (2016) "Personal deixis in Spanish-Italian simultaneous interpretation", in C. Calvo Rigual / N. Spinolo (eds) *Translating Orality,* Special Issue of *MonTI* 3trans, 1-16.

Bartłomiejczyk M. (2016) *Face Threats in Interpreting. A Pragmatic Study of Plenary Debates in the European Parliament,* Katowice, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Bartłomiejczyk M. (2019) "Pragmatic equivalence as a challenge for interpreters of political discourse", *Linguistica Silesiana* 40, 385-408.

Bartłomiejczyk M. / Gumul E. / Koržinek D. (2022) "EP-Poland: building a bilingual parallel corpus for interpreting research", *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies* 22/1, 110-126.

Billig M. (1995) *Banal Nationalism,* Los Angeles, SAGE.

Bogdanowska-Jakubowska E. / Bogdanowska N. (2021) "Addressing the other in Poland (the 20th and 21st centuries): Different times, different contexts, different meanings", *Journal of Pragmatics* 178, 301-314.

Bot H. (2005) "Dialogue interpreting as a specific case of reported speech", *Interpreting* 7/2, 237-261.

Bousfield D. (2008) *Impoliteness in Interaction,* Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.

Brown P. / Levinson S.C. (1987) *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Bull P. / Fetzer A. (2006) "Who are we and who are you? The strategic use of forms of address in political interviews", *Text & Talk* 26, 3-37.

Chang C. / Wu M. M. (2009) "Address form shifts in interpreted Q&A sessions", *Interpreting* 11/2, 164-189.

Chilton P. (2004) *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice,* London, Routledge.

Culpeper J. (2011) *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Duflou V. (2012) "The 'first person norm' in conference interpreting (CI) – some reflections on findings from the field", in B. Harris / M. J. Blasco Mayor / M. A. Jimenez Ivars (eds) *Interpreting Brian Harris: Recent Developments in Translatology,* Frankfurt a. M., Peter Lang, 145-160.

Gile D. (2009) *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training. Revised Edition*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.

Goffman E. (1967) *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior,* New York, Pantheon Books.

Grainger K. / Mills S. (2016) *Directness and Indirectness Across Cultures,* London, Palgrave Macmillan.

Harris S. (2001) "Being politically impolite: Extending politeness theory to adversarial political discourse", *Discourse and Society* 12 /4, 451-472.

Hatim B. / Mason I. (1997) *The Translator as Communicator,* London, Routledge.

Ilie C. (2004) "Insulting as (un)parliamentary practice in the British and Swedish parliaments. A rhetorical approach", in P. Bayley (ed.) *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 45-86.
Kent S. J. (2009) "A discourse of danger and loss. Interpreters on interpreting for the European Parliament", in L. Stern / U. Ozolins / S. B. Hale (eds) *The Critical Link 5: Quality in Interpreting: A Shared Responsibility*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 55-70.
Kiełkowicz-Jankowiak A. (1992) *A Socio-Historical Study in Address: Polish and English*, Frankfurt a. M., Peter Lang.
Kostro M. / Wróblewska-Pawlak K. (2011) "Między kurtuazją a deprecjacją. Formy adresatywne jako środek retoryczny w polemicznym dyskursie politycznym" (in English, "Between courtesy and depreciation. Forms of address as a rhetorical device in polemical political discourse"), *Forum Artis Rhetoricae* 3, 37-57.
Knapp-Potthoff A. (2005) "Secondhand politeness", in K. Ehlich / I. Sachiko / R. J. Watts (eds) *Politeness in Language: Studies in its History, Theory and Practice*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter, 203-218.
Marzocchi C. (1998) "The case for an institution-specific component in interpreting research", *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 8, 51-74.
Mason I. / Stewart M. (2001) "Interactional pragmatics, face and the dialogue interpreter", in I. Mason (ed.) *Triadic Exchanges. Studies in Dialogue Interpreting*, Manchester, St Jerome, 51-70.
Monacelli C. (2009) *Self-Preservation in Simultaneous Interpreting: Surviving the Role*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
Moyna M. I. / Kluge B. / Simon H. J. (2019) "Address and address research: Here's looking at you, kid", in B. Kluge / M. I. Moyna (eds) *It's Not All about 'You': New Perspectives on Address Research*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 1-20.
Pavlidou T.S. (2014) "Constructing collectivity with 'we'. An introduction", in T.S. Pavlidou (ed.) *Constructing Collectivity. 'We' Across Languages and Contexts*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 1-19.
Proctor K. / Su I.-W. (2011) "The 1st person plural in political discourse – American politicians in interviews and in a debate", *Journal of Pragmatics* 43, 3251-3266.
Tiselius E. (2022) "Conference and community interpreting: commonalities and differences", in M. Albl-Mikasa / E. Tiselius (eds), *The Routledge Handbook of Conference Interpreting*, London, Routledge, 19-33.
Truan N. (2021) *The Politics of Person Reference*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
Tyrkkö J. (2016) "Looking for rhetorical thresholds: Pronoun frequencies in political speeches", <https://varieng.helsinki.fi/series/volumes/17/tyrkko/>.
Wadensjö C. (1998) *Interpreting as Interaction*, London, Longman.
Warchał K. / Łyda A. / Jackiewicz A. (2011) "Whose face? 'Us' and 'them' in English-Polish consecutive interpreting", *Meta* 56/4, 775-795.
Zhan C. (2012) "Mediation through personal pronoun shifts in dialogue interpreting of political meetings", *Interpreting* 14/2, 192-216.