користуватимуться розробленими захисними стратегіями, володітимуть здатністю до навчання, а отже, і здатністю до розмежування між варіативними стимулами, зафіксованими сенсорними пристроями.

Однак жодна з перелічених функцій не має нічого спільного з думкою (мисленням), яка побудована на пропозиційному змісті. Очевидно, робот помилятиметься, тобто виконуватиме помилкові дії, але ці дії будуть помилковими лише з точки зору людини (людської логіки), а не з точки зору машини. Отже, усім знанням, змодельованим у комп'ютерній системі, незалежно від їхньої якості й глибини, бракуватиме концепту правдивості або концепту об'єктивності, які дають змогу людям диференціювати інформацію за ознакою правдивості або помилковості. Тому в моделюванні мовленнєвої поведінки комп'ютерної системи слід покладатися на попередньо встановлені когнітивні та асоціативні залежності, проявлені на рівні утворення концептуально-структурованих знань під час мисленнєвої діяльності людини й уже прокласифіковані людьми як правдиві та об'єктивні. Інакше кажучи, не варто очікувати від комп'ютерної системи здійснення аналітичних операцій під час обробки вербальної й концептуальної інформацій. Однак результативна комунікація так чи інакше передбачає апелювання до правдивості / неправдивості фактів, викладених фактів. Тому єдиний шлях подолання цієї неузгодженості – розробка лінгвокогнітивних моделей знань з урахуванням їх правдивості та об'єктивності per se.

Наведені міркування засвідчують, що під час моделювання знаннєвої компетенції комп'ютера, поки що неможливо здійснити повну імітацію мисленнєвої діяльності та побудувати концепти правдивості й помилковості, об'єктивності та суб'єктивності відповідно до їх ментальних репрезентацій у мозку людини. Тому подальші наукові розвідки логічно скерувати на розгляд питання про формалізацію лінгвальних та екстралінгвальних знань. Слід з'ясувати, яка кількість знань людини про світ не вимагає мисленнєвої діяльності й оцінки, а отже, може бути формалізована й оброблена автоматично. Решта моделей включатимуть елементи оцінювання з можливістю їх подальшого групування в категорії та класи.

Список літератури

1. Арутюнова Н. Д. Время : модели и метафоры / Н. Д. Арутюнова // Логический анализ языка. Язык и время. – М. : Индрик, 1997. – С. 51–61.

2. Біскуб І.П. Англомовний дискурс програмного забезпечення як модель мовленнєвої взаємодії людини й комп'ютера : монографія / І.П. Біскуб. – Луцьк : Волин. нац. ун-т ім. Лесі Українки, 2009. – 388 с.

3. Бердяев Н. А. Человек и машина (проблема социологии и метафизики техники) / Н. А. Бердяев // Вопр. философии. – 1989. – № 2. – С. 157–162.

4. Carpenter B. Human versus machine : psycholinguistics meets ASR / Carpenter B. // Proceedings of the IEEE Workshop on Automatic Speech Recognition and Understanding. – Keystone, CO., 1999 – P. 225–228.

5. Collins H. M. Artificial Experts. Social Knowledge and intelligent Machines / Collins H. M. – Cambridge ; MA : MIT Press, 1990. – 287 p.

6. Collor M. Electronic language: a new variety of English / M. Collor, N. Bellmore // Herring S. (Eds.) Computer-mediated Communication : Linguistic, Social and Cross-Cultural Perspectives. – Amsterdam : John Benjamins, 1996. – P. 13–28.

7. Davidson D. Problems of Rationality / Davidson D. – Oxford : Clarendon Press, 2004. – 280 p.

8. Haraway D. A Cyborg Manifesto : Science, Technology and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century / Haraway D. // Simians, Cyborgs and Women : The Reinvention of Nature, New York. – N.Y. : Routledge, 1991. – P. 149–181.

9. Johnson D. Computer Ethics / Johnson D. – N. J. : Prentice Hall, 1985. – 110 p.

10. Myers T. Introduction : Representation and inference in reasoning and discourse / T. Myers, K. Brown, B. McGonigle // T. Myers, K. M. B. Brown eds. Reasoning and discourse processes. – London. etc. : Acad. Press, 1986. – P. 1–11.

11. Schmidt A. Implicit human-computer interaction through context / A. Schmidt // Personal Technologies. – London : Springer-Verlag Ltd., 2000. – № 4. – P. 191−199.

12. Shneiderman B., ed. Software Psychology : Human Factors in Computer and Information Systems / Shneiderman B., ed. – Cambridge, MA : Winthrop Publishers, 1980. – 320 p.

Svitlana Budzhak-Jones (State College)

TO BREATHE OR NOT TO BREATHE: CHALLENGES OF SIMULTANEOUS INTERPRETING

Simultaneous interpreting is a complex psycholinguistic and cognitive phenomenon. The lack of appropriate training accounts for the wide range in quality of conference interpretation. Various theories, including the Efforts Model, attempt to explain the complex mechanisms accounting for this complex brain activity. Teaching conference interpreting in Universities can help train skilled interpreters, providing them with coping tactics and tools for overcoming challenges of cognitive overload.

Keywords: *Simultaneous interpreting, conference interpretation, translation, the Effort Model, cognitive load, coping tactics, training.*

Interpretation is probably one of the oldest professions that have existed, since the time there were two unintelligible languages. Translation is a younger phenomenon which most likely corresponds to the appearance of a writing tradition. However, simultaneous interpreting is comparatively very young. In fact, it is still in its early stages of professional development. Comintern congresses in the thirties were first to explore this activity. Then at the Nuremberg trials the foundations of the new profession were laid out and cemented [Gaiba, 1998]. Many colleges and universities now offer training programs in translation and interpretation. However, simultaneous interpreting is yet to find its place at university curricula.

Nowadays, many if not most simultaneous interpreters are usually self-trained. Hence, it is possible to see a range of the very best and the very worst interpreting. Unfortunately, the system of simultaneous interpreting, i.e. speaking in a booth over the microphone at the same time as the speaker does, provides a convenient cover for rather asinine interpreting. If done incorrectly and unskillfully, simultaneous interpreting could be no better than a computerized translation. So, what make simultaneous interpreting so challenging and complicated?

From the psycholinguistic perspective, simultaneous interpreting is a very complex linguistic and cognitive phenomenon. It involves speech perception and production, content analysis, decision making, storage, retrieval, comparison of sounds and other information in various components of memory at the same time under the influence of professional, sociological, and psychological factors [Gile, 2001]. Learning how to deal with all these processes simultaneously and distribute one's brain efforts appropriately, is extremely difficult. It requires years of training and practicing. Even very proficient, top-notch interpreters with excellent interpreting skills and vast world knowledge, still encounter omissions and errors in their simultaneous interpretation due to tremendous cognitive load.

According to the Efforts Model, simultaneous interpreting can be represented by the following formula [Gile, 2009:168]:

$$SI = L + P + M + C,$$

where L stands for the listening and analysis effort, i.e. all comprehension-oriented operations from analyzing sound waves of the source language, identifying words and deciding on the meaning of the source language segment; P is for the production effort which includes everything from retrieving initial message from memory, speech planning and the implementation of that plan into speech; M stands for the memory effort, especially short-term memory; and finally C is for coordination effort required to coordinate the first three efforts [Eysenck and Keane, 2000].

At any point in time speech consists of segments A, B, C, D, etc. During simultaneous interpreting, production (P) is working on segment A, memory (M) on segment B and listening and analysis on segment C. Usually, the three basic efforts are simultaneously active during interpretation, hence, they are most likely to affect each other resulting in some undesirable consequences.

There is ample evidence now that simultaneous interpreters are listening and speaking at the same time [Gerver, 1976]. Moreover, language competence involves only one part of the brain (i.e. the parieto-temporal area), while thinking requires the participation of other areas (i.e. the frontal lobes) [Barbizet, 1969]. Some scientists even suggest that such intense cognitive event requires a separate working memory to handle all these cognitive processes [Timarova, 2008]. And with the development of expertise in interpreting, highly experienced interpreters even develop long-term working memory which allows them to actually circumvent a number of common cognitive constraints [Moser-Mercer, 2000].

The assumption that cognitive load on a simultaneous interpreter is so high, that only anticipation (i.e. prognosis) of the speaker's statement makes it possible to interpret, led to another theory of simultaneous interpreting - Probabilistic Prognosis Theory [Chernov, 2004]. Based on this theory, it is presumably easier to interpret from language B to language A, since anticipation is presumably easier when working from one's native language because of better knowledge of transitional probabilities and cultural patterns.

There are many various theories on the mechanics of simultaneous interpreting. But it essentially comes to the following: (1) the proximity of the source language still ringing in the interpreter's ear while he/she is speaking, and (2) reduced time available for processing and production.

The more information needs to be processed per unit of time, the denser the cognitive load will be, and the harder it will be to provide a good quality interpreting. High speech density can lead to a cognitive overload which in turn will result in one of the two things: 1) either the execution of the task is delayed by putting even heavier cognitive load onto another segment which eventually will lead to an error, or 2) the task is not executed, leading to an omission. High information density is the most frequent cause of omissions and errors. It is associated with the fast speed of delivery in the source language; strong, accent; poor sound quality; enumerations, which lack low density connective segments; and prepared speeches, especially when read from the polished text. Read speeches have less false starts and hesitations than spontaneous speech, which increases the density of delivered information. It has also been argued that the read speech has a different intonation pattern, which is less helpful for comprehension than the one in spontaneous speech [Dejean le Feal, 1978].

Unfamiliar terminology will definitely lead to failure in such strenuous environment with extremely limited time for information processing. Proper familiarization with terminology is absolutely essential. Prior preparation for the interpreting event must be mandatory and should never be avoided. Excellent interpreters, whatever their skill and competence, need a thorough preparation before dealing with matters they are not familiar with. Technical complexity of speech could be considerably less of a burden if an interpreter familiarizes himself/herself with the terminology in advance. If someone has never dealt with compunds like *"cross-revision report"* (акт зустрічної звірки), *"feasibility study"* (науково-технічне обґрунтування), or *"dependency ratio"* (коефіцієнт пенсійного навантаження), it would be hard to come up with the correct target language counterpart without distorting the intended meaning, i.e. its sense.

Another challenge for simultaneous interpreting is information reordering associated problems. Some names or titles consisting of several components may need to be reordered in the target language. An interpreter is forced to wait

until the entire name is unfolded before making a decision on how to reorder it (e.g., *"South Central Preparedness & Emergency Response Learning Center"* or *"World Bank Science Technology and Innovation Global Expert Team"*). Moreover, translating such names may require constant scanning and comparison to the source language name, which will slow down interpreting process even further, putting an even higher load on the memory. Compound technical terms pose similar problems, e.g., *"sealed-beam mounting ring"* or *"diamond mesh metal lath"*. An unprepared interpreter under high information load may come up with a translation no better than the computerized one. In case of the former, the computer provided the following version: *"запечатаними кріплення кронштейна кільце"* and for the latter - *"алмаз сітка металева сітка"*. Obviously, none of these translations make sense, and so won't the unprepared interpreter. Correct translation should be *"монтажне кільце фари, яка не розбирається"* or *"монтажне кільце нерозбірної фари"* for the first compound and *"металічна сітка з ромбовидними отворами"* for the second one. Frequent occurrence of the same complex name or term will require less time for reordering, since an interpreter can cope with it by anticipation without delaying the production until the entire compound is pronounced in the source language.

Abbreviations and acronyms in the source language will often cause a distress for an interpreter. An unprepared interpreter will have difficulties finding equivalents in the target language even for occasional abbreviations, e.g., *IRR* (Internal Rate of Return) - *"внутрішня норма рентабільності"*, or *P&L sheets* (profit and loss sheets) - *"облік прибутків і збитків"*. But some utterances will be impossible to interpret by any interpreter, irrespective of how skilled and prepared they are. For example: *"HRC ADA Branch, OPMD managers at the HRCoE at Fort Knox, Kentucky"* (Compare its full version: *"Human Resources Command's Air Defense Artillery Branch, Office Personnel Management Division managers at the Human Resources Command Center of Excellence at Fort Knox, Kentucky"*). Military personnel is especially fond of such speech. It sounds almost like an entirely different language. I like to call it Abbrenglish. In those case, the interpreter has to interrupt the speaker and ask for not using abbreviations.

An interpreter also has to make a split second decision whether to use a target language abbreviated counterpart, as in *ОБСЄ* for *OSCE* (Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe), or to spell it out, as in IRA, i.e. Individual Retirement Account. Sometimes an interpreter has to decipher the correct meaning of the abbreviation, if it is polysemic, like in *AAA*, which could denote <u>American Automobile Association, abdominal aortic aneurysm, anti-aircraft artillery</u> or *Amateur Athletic Association*. In addition, pronouncing a compound in full takes longer than its abbreviated version leading to a significant cognitive overload, as well.

Differences in syntactic structures of the two languages, unclear logic, errors in the source language may also delay speech production. An interpreter is again forced to wait until the entire segment is uttered and then he/she make a decision on how to reformulate that segment in the target language.

To withstand such intense cognitive load and provide a high quality interpretation, an interpreter has to come up with some coping tactics. No matter the kind of coping tactics, each of them will have a price, i.e. potential information loss, credibility loss, impact loss, and time and processing capacity cost [Gile, 2001]. Consulting a dictionary in the booth or explaining and paraphrasing the term which had equivalent in the target language will be costly in time. So will be note-taking for not-to-forget names, numbers or dates, since it adds writing activity. Both cases could lead to memory overload.

Obviously, simultaneous interpreting is very strenuous and demanding. A large scale empirical study, commissioned by the International Association of Conference Interpreters in 2001 showed that simultaneous interpreting was clearly in the category of high-stress professions with high burnout levels. The main stressors were identified as following in that order: speakers reading from texts, fast speakers, lack of background material, difficult accents, booth discomfort, lack of preparation time, and undisciplined speakers.

Whatever the challenge, an interpreter remains under a double bondage: he/she has to be faithful to the speaker's ideas and at the same time faithful to the ways of his/her own language. Beyond this bondage an interpreter is free, free in relation to the source language, free to find in his language the most appropriate words and phraseology that will adequately give rise to *sense* in his/her listeners' mind [Seleskovitch, 2008].

High quality simultaneous interpreting requires many years of intense and systematic training under the guidance of experienced interpreters, excellent command of source and target language vocabularies, syntactic structures and idiomatic expressions. It is recommended to master it after getting skilled in consecutive mode of interpretation [Seleskovitch, 2008]. A good interpreter must also have an extensive world knowledge, since language in communication is never exclusive of non-linguistic knowledge [Seleskovitch, 2008]. Hence, simultaneous interpretating should be done as the second or third level of education.

Finally, some practical advice for those who aspire to become skilful, high-quality simultaneous interpreters:
- Know your languages inside and out.
- Speak naturally, idiomatically and with elegance.
- Miss nothing.
- Make no serious mistakes.
- Do not obsess with words, pay attention to sense.
- Do not add anything that was not said.
- Be a top-notch communicator.
- Always thoroughly prepare for a meeting.
- Be honest. If something essential is not understood, ask the speaker to repeat it.
- Be user-friendly, mind audience's specific needs.
- Be courteous to your colleagues and event organizers.
- Be punctual.
- Mind your personal hygiene, especially when working in a booth with a colleague.

- And don't forget to breathe at the appropriate places.

Remember: "Before you can do it fast and almost without thinking, you must be able to do it right; and in order to do it right, first you must do it slowly and thinking a lot" [Viaggio, 2003]. Never stop translating.

REFERENCES:
1. Barbizet, Jacques. 1969. *Psychopathology of Memory*. New York: Masson.
2. Chernov, Ghelly. 2004. *Interference and Anticipation in Simultaneous Interpreting. A probability prediction model*. 2004, Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
3. Dejean le Feal, Karla. 1978. *Lectures et improvisations — Incidences de la forme de I'enonciation sur la iraduction simultanee*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Universite Paris III.
4. Eysenck, Michael, and Keane, Mark. 2000. *Cognitive psychology: A student's handbook*. Psychology Press Lmd.
5. Gile, Daniel. 2001. Conference Interpreting as a Cognitive Management Problem. In F. Pochhacker and M. Shlesinger (eds.) *The Interpreting Studies Reader*. Routledge Language Readers, pp.162-177.
6. Gile, Daniel. 2009. *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training: Revisited*. Benjamins Translation Library.
7. Gaiba, Francesca. 1998. *The Origins of Simultaneous Interpretation: The Nuremberg Trial*. University of Ottawa Press.
8. Gerver, David. 1976. Empirical Studies of Simultaneous Interpretation: A Review and a Model. In R.W. Brislin (ed.) *Translation: Applications and Research*. New York: Gardner, pp.165-207.
9. Moser-Mercer, Barbara. 2000. Simultaneous interpreting: Cognitive potential and limitations. *Interpreting*. Volume 5, number 2. pp. 83-94(12).
10. Seleskovitch, Danica 2008. Teaching Conference Interpreting. In. P. Krawutschke (ed.). *Translator and Interpreter Training and Foreign Language Pedagogy*. American Translators Association Scholarly Monograph Series, Vol. III, John Benjamins Publishing Company
11. Timarova, Sarka. 2008. Working Memory and Simultaneous Interpreting. In P. Boulogne (ed.) *Translation and Its Others. Selected Papers of the CETRA Research Seminar in Translation Studies 2007*.
12. Sergio Viaggio, 2003. *The tribulations of a chief interpreter*. Proceedings of AIIC (International Association of Conference Interpreters).

УДК 811.111'37'42   Войтко Т.В. (Київ)

ЗМІНИ У ФУНКІОНАЛЬНІЙ СЕМАНТИЦІ БАНКІВСЬКИХ НОМІНАЦІЙ У ПУБЛІЦИСТИЧНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ

Розглянуто публіцистичний дискурс та функціонування у ньому банківських номінацій. Показано, що найчастіше вживаними компонентами банківськими номінаціями є ***credit, loan, money***, ***bill, business, company***, ***fund, deposit, profit*** *та* ***account***.
Ключові слова: дискурс, первинна номінація, вторинна номінація, банківський термін.
Рассмотрены публицистический дискурс и функционирование в нем банковских номинаций. Показано, что наиболее часто применяемые компоненты банковские номинации – ***credit, loan, money, bill, business, company, fund, deposit, profit*** *и* ***account***.
Ключевые слова: дискурс, первичная номинация, вторичная номинация, банковский термин.

The article deals with the journalistic discourse and how banking nominations function in it. The result shows that such nominations as ***credit, loan, money***, ***bill, business, company***, ***fund, deposit, profit*** *and* ***account*** *are the most used components of banking nomination.*
Key words: discourse, primary nomination, secondary nomination, banking term.

Постановка проблеми. Суть лексичної системи полягає в наявності ієрархічних зв'язків і відношень мовних елементів, що її становлять. Наочним підтвердженням системності лексики є можливість звести її до обмеженої кількості основних типів семантичних категорій і лексичних функцій. Дослідження механізму мовної номінації пов'язане з потребою комплексного дослідження змісту цього явища, особливо – взаємодії одиниць первинної та вторинної номінації, у спеціальному – дискурсі та публіцистичному, де вживаються особливі номінації та формуються нові підсистеми банківського лексикону і, таким чином, відбувається термінологізація.

Огляд останніх досліджень і публікацій. Англійські банківські номінації як засіб вербалізації концепту «BANK» до цього часу не розглядалися. Хоча М.В. Белозьоров вивчає новотвори у сфері економіки, де розглядалися її структурний, семантичний та соціофункціональний аспекти. Зв'язки біржової лексики зі спеціальною лексикою суміжних підсистем розкрито Н.О. Ждановою. Виділено О.І. Дудою термінологія кредитно-банківської справи зі складу загальноекономічної як самостійної лексико-семантичної підсистеми у