ALESSANDRA RICCARDI

3 The Concept of Strategies in Translation and Interpreting Studies: Shared and Dissimilar Features

ABSTRACT

After presenting a brief overview of studies analysing and comparing translation and interpreting, the paper describes the main differences and similarities between the two translational activities before comparing and contrasting translation and interpreting through the notion of strategies. It examines what this concept means for translation and for interpreting, what its underlying elements are and whether there are differences in its use. Over the years, multiple terms have been used to indicate the way in which the source text is transferred and rendered in the target text: procedures, techniques, skills, shifts, tactics, plans and operations. More recently, however, the concept of strategy has gained ground when describing how the interpreter/translator solves a certain translation problem. Strategies have been observed and analysed in both interpreting and translation. As a significant research aspect of Translation and Interpreting Studies, their comparison offers new insights in both fields.

1. Introduction

Knowledge of translation and interpreting has grown considerably over the last 25 years. It is now almost common and widespread knowledge that a translator works with written texts while interpreters are engaged with oral assignments, though some confusion about their respective peculiarities still persists. Surfing the net, the search for 'differences between translation and interpreting' or 'translation and interpretation a comparison' yielded more than 48,501,500 results, while the search for 'translation and interpreting' yielded fewer than 48 million results (last search 31 January 2019). Both searches' results included translation companies, professional translation

and interpreting services, as well as associations for practising translation and interpreting professionals, international journals, MA and BA Degrees in Translation and Interpreting, and various kinds of publications. Many of the articles describing the differences between translators and interpreters were from agencies offering translation and interpreting services. This suggests that, although there may be greater awareness of the distinctive features of the two professions in general terms, when translation or interpreting services are offered, the need is felt to illustrate what the differences are in greater detail. As a result, translation and interpreting are often confused and it is probably still not clear, among the public at large, either what the skills and competences of translators and interpreters are, or when preference is to be given to one or the other. This is all the more surprising, especially because both professions are much more in demand than they were in the past, and they have experienced great diversification in the last 15 years to adapt to a changing world, given the rapid development and diffusion of ICTs but also of the greater need at international level both for translation and interpreting in everyday life. Dialogue interpreting is needed in many professional and institutional settings, from the legal, to the social and healthcare. Interpreters are now available over the phone or through videoconferences, and, more generally, remote interpreting is a reality in many sectors. Translators' professions have experienced a similar evolution and the impact of new technologies on them has been even greater, witness machine translation, computer-assisted translation, voice recognition software, translators for dubbing and subtitling, pre-editing, post-editing, terminologists, online translators. The borders between the two professions are sometimes blurred, with translators being required to interpret and interpreters to translate.

When considering translation and interpreting within Translation and Interpreting (T&I) Studies, that is, from the point of view of experts investigating these disciplines, they are fundamentally and predominantly considered twin activities covering complementary sectors of language mediation: they share the same process of language mediation to transfer a given message/content from a source language to a target language, involving a profound knowledge of the languages as well as a wide background and technical knowledge. From a cognitive point of view, they both

require rapid access and retrieval of knowledge and mental lexicon. The distinguishing features reported in the literature pertain mainly to three aspects. The first is the medium through which they are achieved, namely written or spoken language. The second is the time needed for their completion. Interpreting is delivered in real-time with latencies depending on the mode chosen: right after the speaker (consecutive/dialogue interpreting) or while the speaker is talking (simultaneous interpreting). On the other hand, translation is generally carried out after the source text (ST) has been completed and its duration depends on the amount of time needed or granted to the translator to finish his/her assignment. The third aspect, linked to the first two, is the possibility or impossibility of going back to the ST as often as needed and of correcting and revising the target text (TT) once it has been produced (Riccardi 2002). The divergences have given rise to differing positions among scholars in the past on whether to have one single overarching discipline covering translation and interpreting – whose theories and methods would allow the investigation of both translational activities – or two separate disciplines.

1.1. Historical Overview

It is now generally accepted that Translation Studies is the superordinate discipline covering the two sub-disciplines whose object of study is either translation or interpreting, although with the use of Translation Studies it may not always be clear whether both are intended or only written translation. To avoid misunderstandings, the term T&I Studies is often used, specifying, when necessary, either Translation or Interpreting Studies. In the following, T&I Studies will be used to refer to the overarching discipline, and Translation Studies or Interpreting Studies when referring to the single sub-discipline.

In the 1980s, translation scholars applying the functionalist approach used to include interpreting in their General Theory of Translation, often without further specification (Reiß and Vermeer 1984). Researchers have been theorising about their differences for some time, especially to underline the need for distinct studies and different approaches (Pöchhacker

1994). Later on, areas of mutual interest were explored, considering translation and interpreting as acts of communication (Hatim and Mason 1997). Notwithstanding the expansion of both disciplines, there was scarce inter-subdisciplinarity at the time (Shlesinger 2004). Together with Shlesinger, Gile (1999, 2004) is one of the few scholars in Interpreting Studies not only to have addressed the usefulness of contact and interchange between the parent disciplines but to have given a concrete contribution (Gile 1995).

A miscellaneous volume was published in 2004 by Schäffner with the aim of exploring kinship, differences and prospects for partnership between Interpreting Research (IR) and Translation Research (TR), with a position paper from Gile (2004) on the subject giving an overview of the history of research into translation and interpreting, reviewing differences and exploring points in common. His chapter was used by the other contributors as a starting point for further elaborating the ideas proposed, adding 'new perspectives or highlighting gaps and misperceptions' (Schäffner 2004b: 2). In this respect, the volume is one of a kind, since translation and interpreting scholars reflected on common grounds and differences in research and studies.

Within T&I Studies, research papers investigating both translation and interpreting are few and far between. Few scholars have ventured into the empirical investigation of the twin activities in the same study. To the author's knowledge, several research projects have compared translation and interpreting. However, most of them date back to the 1990s (Dollerup et al. 1992; Schjoldager 1995; Hönig 1998; Shlesinger 1999), and some remain incomplete to this day. It may be argued, therefore, that although the usefulness of such empirical studies was often stressed and recognised in the past, their practical realisation was scarce, with few exceptions until the year 2000. Since then, there has been an increasing interest testified by studies with a renewed focus on comparison (Pippa 2003; Shlesinger and Malkiel 2005; Dragsted and Gorm Hansen 2007; Timarová, Dragsted and Gorm Hansen 2011; Shlesinger and Ordan 2014). In the introduction to two studies comparing written translation and simultaneous interpreting, Shlesinger and Ordan (2014: 48) stated that:

> Translation scholars can learn about the process and product of (written) translation by finding out more about interpreting – and interpreting scholars can infer about this high-pressure form of translation by observing the slower, more readily observable process and product of (written) translation. One modality can teach us about the constraints, conventions and norms of the other.

The joint investigation of the two twin activities may, therefore, provide new insight and a different standpoint from which to analyse them, with the result of enriching T&I Studies in general.

In her introduction to the volume on TR and IR, Schäffner (2004b) addresses the possibility of joint research projects across the translation/ interpreting divide, investigating, for example, the professional environment of translators and interpreters, in which boundaries become blurred as new technologies develop, or studying translation strategies of interpreters in comparison to those of translators (Schäffner 2004b: 7). In his entry on *Translation Strategies and Tactics*, Gambier (2012) pointed out that there was no study comparing strategies in translation and interpreting in the literature, and posed the question whether the strategies of addition, omission, compression, etc., mean the same thing in both practices.

2. Differences between Translation and Interpreting

Relevant aspects common to both translation and interpreting have been briefly listed in the introduction. In this paragraph, similarities and differences between the two forms of language mediation are illustrated more extensively before introducing the concept of strategies and the way it has been implemented in the study of translation and interpreting. Special attention is given to the processes underlying translation and interpreting.

Translation and interpreting are based on the same cognitive processes of language comprehension and language production but differ in the medium used: written or spoken language. In both, a source-language text is translated into a target-language text. Knowledge requirements,

that is, language, cultural, encyclopaedic and specialised knowledge, as well as translation competence, are essential for performing both translation and interpreting. To carry out their activity, translators and interpreters have to consider and be aware of the purpose of the ST, the circumstances under which it was written or delivered, and the author or speaker. A further matter of concern is the function of the TT and the recipient or audience: the translated or interpreted text will reflect the expectations arising therefrom. During their activity, translators and interpreters, to a certain extent, can access external resources or consult experts. Translators may use computer-assisted translation tools, terminological databases, dictionaries, specialised publications and glossaries to solve difficulties or clear up doubts; they can ask experts for advice or explanations and, when possible, contact the agency or the author. Depending on the setting and circumstances, dialogue interpreters may interrupt a speaker to ask for clarification of difficult passages, when noticing that something is not clear for one of the participants, or to avoid misunderstandings. The resulting interpretation is thus the result of a joint effort on the part of the participants in the encounter with the interpreter, who has a visible co-ordinating role in the interaction. Simultaneous interpreters can resort to PCs, laptops or tablets in the booth to retrieve information from electronic glossaries or terminological databases, or consult relevant documentation, although this will have a cost in terms of cognitive resources and division of attention. A colleague in the booth may also help, by carrying out searches when unexpected difficulties crop up.

Translation and interpreting differ in many respects, the most evident of which is the diamesic dimension. Speech is ephemeral while writing is indelible. The working memory can retain words or concepts for no longer than two to three seconds in current speech, after which they are forgotten. Printed words are stable and easy to recognise because they have to adhere to written standards, while the degree of oral word recognition varies depending on the speaker – whether s/he is a native or non-native speaker for example, or speaks with a regional accent, and also on the quality of speech input. Furthermore, the speed of delivery, and hence, the processing time, is decided on by the speaker: during simultaneous

interpreting (SI)[9] the interpreter cannot intervene to stop or slow her/him down, s/he has to adapt to the speaker's pace. On the other hand, translators can process the text to be translated at their own pace, though there may be external pressure to deliver the translation at a more or less proximate deadline. Nevertheless, the time it takes to read and translate a text depends on the translator and not on its author. In addition to the temporal delay with which translation is carried out compared to interpreting, the translator works in a different environment to that where the ST is produced. Moreover, a translation may last a few days, several weeks or months. The translator can read the whole translation or a great part of it prior to starting, to recognise or understand the type of text s/he has been assigned, textual features and the communicative purpose of the text. Based on this information, translators decide on the global strategy they will apply. Lexical and syntactical choice and syntactic restructuring can be decided on after having gained an overview of the whole text. A difficult passage or expression can be thoroughly examined; a certain solution may be postponed or reviewed and decisions are consciously made to obtain a certain effect. Translators have greater control over their working conditions and can decide how to distribute their time and efforts.

Time pressure may, therefore, be seen as the greatest variable between the interpreting and translating situations, conditioning comprehension and production processes. Consequently, though the two tasks are comparable in their objectives and are based on the same cognitive processes, the situations in which they are carried out introduce huge differences for their execution. Occurring in real time, interpreting decisions are taken immediately, often unconsciously. They are the result of the input message, which is not only the text but includes the impact of voice, intonation and prosody in the context of the spatio-temporal unity within which a speech is delivered and SI performed. Compared to the separation between author,

---

9   Simultaneous interpreting can also be used in dialogue interpreting, especially in court-interpreting, and in other settings in the form of *chuchotage*. The reason for choosing this modality when discussing the differences between interpreting and translation is that through SI it is possible to better highlight the distance existing between the two translational activities under given circumstances.

translator and recipients, the spatial-temporal unity is an advantage because it allows direct reference to the situation and the event, thereby supporting the comprehension process. In SI, decoding and encoding, comprehension and production, go on continuously and decisions cannot be postponed to a later moment when a more suitable solution might be found; the information-processing load per unit of time is higher and the possibility of corrections is reduced. During the SI process, interpreters always have to find the right balance between the different tasks they have to accomplish. They need to establish a correct balance of all their resources to control the situation. Too much concentration on listening and understanding may produce a shortfall in the output, too much on the output may induce a loss of text portions (Gile 1995). It seems very unlikely that simultaneous interpreters are able to exert some kind of control on the conference situation or the communicative event as a whole apart from the interpreting activity itself.[10] To control what they are doing, they must be aware of all the factors coming into play, which is not always possible. They should also be able to recognise and understand the type of conference or event they are involved in, type of speakers and audience, possible forms of speeches, written or oral texts, topics, technical language, accent, intonation and language structure. Past assignments on similar topics and events help professional interpreters to prepare for new assignments; they will, therefore, consult previous documentation on the subject matter, develop glossaries and prepare the speeches received, thus building up a mental space dedicated to the forthcoming assignment. Knowing in advance the kind of conference or communicative event they will be working in, together with the kind of audience and speakers, will help augment and adapt previous mental schemes, directing and focusing interpreter's attention on a limited set of possible occurrences. The situation is different with a completely new assignment: the number of variables and options is greater because the interpreter knows less about the forthcoming event. S/he will have to build up a new mental scheme, the number of unknown aspects will be greater, preparation will be broader and less circumscribed and there is no

---

10   The position of the dialogue interpreter is different, s/he has a co-ordinating role in the interaction and can interrupt the communication flow if necessary.

knowing whether it will be really useful or not. This may happen more frequently at the beginning of the career, but even for more experienced professionals there is always the possibility of unknown elements cropping up unexpectedly.

To sum up, translators and interpreters may have similar background knowledge and preparation for their assignments, but when it comes to the actual execution, the situation changes dramatically: the time available is decided externally for interpreting and autonomously for translating; the interpreter cannot stop interpreting and has to adapt to the speaker's pace while the translator can decide to suspend translating when s/he thinks fit. Furthermore, s/he has an overview of the text and can plan in advance how to go on working. The translator can resort to translation tools, glossaries, dictionaries and translation memories while translating with the aim of delivering the most accurate translation possible under the given circumstances. In interpreting, the source-speech is work in progress and requires some kind of guessing of what will come next; inference and anticipation play a very important role because interpreters can receive little help from glossaries, dictionaries, specialist texts or the web while working. Therefore, primarily short term memory is exploited while keeping the right balance for comprehension and production.

3. Definitions and Classifications of Strategies in T&I Studies

Many terms have been used in the past to define the way in which the original text/speech is transformed when translated/interpreted into another language and the solutions applied. Since the recognition of translation and interpreting as goal-oriented communication processes, the notion of strategy has established itself in T&I Studies. The notion of strategies is used to highlight the relation between the ST and the TT. Strategies have been observed and analysed in both translational activities and have become an important research aspect of T&I Studies: being common to both activities, their comparison allows new insights in both fields.

Given the interest in interpreting strategies developed over the years by the author (Riccardi 1996, 1998, 2005), the concept of strategies may be considered a good starting point for looking at interpreting and translation in a comparative way. The following sections compare and contrast translation and interpreting through the notion of strategies; they examine what this concept means for translation and for interpreting, what its underlying elements are, and whether there are differences in its use. When examining strategies in translation in this contribution, reference is made principally to non-literary translation. When dealing with interpreting strategies, SI is mainly, but not exclusively, the reference.

3.1. *Translation Studies*

Until the 1980s, when studies on translation were considered a branch of applied linguistics, the term 'strategy' was used rather sporadically to indicate the way in which translators transferred elements of the ST into the target language. Other terms were preferred by the authors to designate the changes, solutions and the decisions adopted by the translator to produce the TT – procedure, method, technique, routine, shift – were much more common to denote the transformations introduced (Vilnay and Darbelnet 1958; Malblanc 1963; Catford 1965; Newmark 1988).

The concept of strategy entered Translation Studies through studies on second-language acquisition, adapting the definition of strategies employed by Færch and Kasper (1983: 36) as 'potentially conscious plans for solving what the individual presents itself [*sic*] as a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal'. The above definition has often been reworded by scholars adopting a psycholinguistic approach to translation within which translation is investigated as a process, not as a product. With the introduction of the method of the Think Aloud Protocols (TAP) from psychology for the study of the translational process, the term 'strategy' became increasingly popular. Krings (1986: 18), one of the first scholars to apply TAP, defined translation strategies as 'translator's potentially conscious plans for solving concrete translation problems in the framework of a concrete translation task'.

Lörscher's (1991: 76) definition of strategy is one of the most quoted in process-oriented studies: 'A translation strategy is a potentially conscious procedure for the solution of a problem which an individual is faced with when translating a text segment from one language into another'. Both quotations are an adaptation of the definition given for communication strategy in second-language acquisition research, mentioned above. Both quotations are an adaptation of the definition given for communication strategy in second-language acquisition research, mentioned above, and it is worth noting that the first studies carried out by Krings (1986) and Lörscher (1991) centred on language students and not on professional translators. There are elements in these definitions that are retained, namely the idea of strategies as 'potentially conscious' plans or procedures (Krings 1986: 175), while others are adapted to the translation context; the idea of individual problems in reaching a particular communicative goal becomes 'translation problems' or a 'problem which an individual is faced with when translating' (Lörscher 1991: 76).

Strategie der Übersetzung is a translation textbook and exercise book by Hönig and Kußmaul (1982). The volume was very successful and has become one of the most widespread publications in Translations Studies in the German-speaking area (Hönig 2004) greatly contributing to the dissemination of the concept of strategies. Since Hönig and Kußmaul (1982) adopted a functionalist approach to translation, their choice of the term 'Strategie' pointed to the fact that translation is to be analysed taking into account its addressees and its function within the target culture. The authors felt the need for a strategy to indicate the best possible way to solve translation problems. Their objective was to convey to the students a translational strategy, not a procedure to solve certain problems deriving from the comparison and contrast of the German language-system with the English one. A strategy oriented towards the translation circumstances, that is a 'strategy that can be compared to the strategy adopted by a chess player, oriented towards the development of the game, the time remaining and the strategy of the opponent' (ibid.: 13, my translation).

The publications discussed so far have a clear orientation towards students, either as explicit addressees, or as subjects of investigation; the concept of strategy in its early stages of study is linked to the teaching of

translation. It is used both in process-oriented and in function-oriented studies. The meaning of the term reveals different connotations that can be synthesised in the opposition between conscious/unconscious process and concrete procedure or mental operation.

Gil-Bardaji (2009) gives an overview of the multitude of terms used for defining the transfer operations described by translation scholars. She examines them in different sections grouping them under the headings of 'translations procedures, technique procedures or translation methods', 'translation processes and strategic processes', 'translation strategies' and finally 'translation strategies and translation techniques'. She covers a timespan of over 40 years, beginning with the study by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) to that of Hurtado Albir (2001). Gil-Bardaji (2009: 162) proposed the concept of translation process operators, defined as 'all the procedural knowledge conscious or unconscious, automatic or controlled, heuristic or algorithmic, that makes up the transfer process which takes place when we translate', to include all the operations carried out by a translator in the process of transferring a ST into a target language. The reasoning behind the choice is that the term operator is an 'expedient conceptual framework' (ibid.: 161) to accommodate a wide range of studies, often conflicting. In her opinion, the use of such diverse terminology is confusing and has led to fragmentation of a 'branch of translation research that proves to be more homogeneous than may appear at first sight' (ibid.).

At present, there is greater awareness about the many definitions used to indicate translational transfer operations and the confusion arising therefrom when comparing studies on the subject. However, no unifying term is yet in sight and there is no shared definition among scholars. Terms like procedure, method and technique are still widely used, sometimes indicating similar operations, sometimes indicating more concrete aspects of language transfer. The term 'strategy' has experienced increasing diffusion over time and it is now used not only in the restricted psychological sense of the underlying mental operations, but in a broader sense, to indicate possible transfer solutions at different levels. Scarpa (2008), for example, has adopted the following categorisation: she employs the term macrostrategy for the objective the translator decides

on following the translation brief and the function and purpose of the TT. She then distinguishes strategies or microstrategies at a lower level, which are consciously adopted for the solution of a problem. Textual strategies, for example, are further divided into syntactic, semantic and pragmatic strategies. General textual strategies are defined 'translation methods', while those employed at a lower level are called 'procedures' or 'techniques' (ibid.). This classification is just one of the many approaches proposed to group and classify strategies. Taxonomies are specific to an author or scholar and, however comprehensive they may be, other authors will always find something to add or change.

Chesterman (2016/1997) discusses production strategies in translation, and in particular local strategies, drawing from several sources (Vinay and Darbelnet 1958; Nida 1964; Catford 1965), he signals the main features as follows:

- Translation strategies apply to a process;
- They involve text-manipulation;
- They are goal-oriented;
- They are problem-centred;
- They are applied consciously (Chesterman 2016/1997: 86–89).

He divides them into three groups that are open-ended: mainly syntactic/grammatical strategies that primarily manipulate form and thus introduce changes at purely syntactic level, for example, changes in the phrase, clause or sentence structure (ibid.: 91–98); mainly semantic strategies, which manipulate nuances of meaning and can be traced back to Vinay and Darbelnet's (1958) concept of modulation, that is, antonymy, hyponymy, paraphrase (Chesterman 2016/1997: 98–104); mainly pragmatic strategies that can be said to manipulate the message itself. They have to do with the selection of information in the TT and are often the result of global decisions concerning the appropriate way to translate the text as a whole, for example cultural filtering, information change and illocutionary change (ibid.: 104–109). Each group comprises 10 categories that overlap to some extent. Pragmatic strategies tend to involve greater changes with respect to the ST, and typically incorporate syntactic and/or semantic changes as well.

3.2. *Interpreting Studies*

SI was used in the 1960s as a research paradigm by psychologists, thereby attracting the attention of cognitive scientists. In particular, dividing attention between reception and production, with a short décalage between the original speech pronounced by the speaker and the interpreted speech, was deemed a great challenge in terms of mental operations. Since its inception, SI called for the study of the distribution of cognitive resources by interpreters and the verification of the hypothesis of automatic responses. During the Seminar on Interpreters and Interpreting in 1968 in the Austrian village of Alpbach, participants discussed, among other issues, mental processes and input variables with an expert. The interest in the process of comprehension and production paved the way for the study of SI as a cognitive process and also to the Interpretive Theory or *théorie du sens* developed by Seleskovitch (1975) and Lederer (1981) at ESIT. They used the term method to indicate the way an interpreted text was obtained from a source speech. The publications of those years reveal a mixture of influences: from contrastive linguistics and information and communication theories to psycholinguistics and cognitive sciences. The 1970s witnessed the first publications where the influence of psycholinguistics in studies describing the SI-process is manifest. In particular, the comprehension process together with inferencing and anticipation skills were discussed in the context of their importance for SI; they were not yet called strategies, but their role was similar. Moser (1978) was the first in the West to apply a psychological model for interpreting, while in the former Soviet Union Chernov (1978) had already developed a model of probability-prediction of SI based on the principles of the Soviet psycholinguistic school.

The term strategies to describe SI was first introduced by Kirchhoff (1976) in a seminal work on strategies in SI, which paved the way to the study of strategies for other interpreting scholars. As a trainer, Kirchhoff delved into the study of the process of interpreting because it could help ascertain a successful interpreting strategy oriented towards the economy of resources. She stressed that strategies continuously need to be refined to achieve maximum efficiency and reach automatic retrieval.

Other scholars have also described methods for overcoming problematic aspects of the interpreting process. Gile (1995: 191) does not speak of strategies but employs the term 'coping tactics', 'a very fundamental practical skill' to be used when problems arise in interpreting because of processing capacity limitations, errors in its management or because of knowledge gaps. A significant contribution to the study of strategies in conference interpreting came from Kalina (1998), who continued the line of studies introduced by Kirchhoff, further elaborating the concept of strategies and its importance for teaching purposes. Her definition of strategy is clear and detailed: 'strategies as strategic processes are oriented towards a scope to establish communication; they build upon cognitive experiences, they are problem oriented and specific for a given situation, potentially conscious and can be changed at a given point in time' (ibid.: 114, my translation). The objective of strategies is communication and, to this end, they draw upon cognitive experiences and are related to specific problems and situations. Bartłomiejczyk (2006: 152) has defined interpreting strategies as 'methods that are potentially conducive to solving particular problems encountered by interpreters or generally facilitating the interpreter's task and preventing potential problems'. Her study was centred on directionality, to recognise and contrast strategies employed by advanced students interpreting into their A and B language. She identified and discussed 21 strategies, derived from several authors, but mainly from Kalina (1998) and Gile (1995).

Setton and Darwant (2016: 72) criticise the very loose use of 'strategy' to refer to 'almost any interpreting technique or tactic, and even for natural unconscious processes like inference'. They differentiate between natural processes, skilled techniques and 'strategies', preferring to reserve the latter for conscious 'goal-oriented decisions at the highest, relational level (mediation) that draw on multiple and not necessarily purely cognitive sub-skills' (ibid.: 71).

When investigating strategies in conference interpreting, the most common classification identifies comprehension, and general and emergency strategies (Riccardi 2005). The concurrent accomplishment of source-speech reception and target-speech production renders the category 'emergency strategy' necessary (see also Gile 1995 on coping tactics): such strategies are needed when there is a processing capacity overload owing

for example to a high delivery speed of a written text or inadequate preparation of the topic. Among emergency strategies, the following elements can be listed: literal translation or transcodage, simplification, omission and substitution. Production strategies include compression, expansion, approximation strategies, generalisation, use of open-ended linguistic forms, restructuring and recasting of elements, the use of prosody elements, such as pauses and intonation. The category 'production strategies' is, comprehensibly, the largest category, because it is made up of all occurrences noted comparing the ST with the IT. Considering the time limits imposed by the interpreting situation, the comprehension stage is fundamental for the production of the interpreted speech. Consequently, comprehension strategies are of paramount importance to interpreters for carrying out their activity. Text anticipation, for example, both at linguistic and extralinguistic level, has been considered a fundamental comprehension strategy adopted by the interpreter whereby s/he is able to predict the development of the ST. Several authors stressed the importance of anticipation to perform SI effectively already in the 1970s (Kirchhoff 1976; Chernov 1978; Lederer 1978, 1981; Moser 1978; Wilss 1978). In her model of SI, Moser (1978) inserted a specific component for anticipation which enables the interpreter to reduce processing time. Chernov (1978) based his model of SI on probability prediction which is determined by the degree of redundancy at all levels – prosodic, syntactic and semantic as well as at content level. Lederer (1978) underlines the importance of sense anticipation which derives from the accumulation of units of sense and the frequency of specific language elements. Wilss (1978: 349) based his study on the interaction between linguistic and extralinguistic anticipation, stating that 'syntactic anticipation leads to intelligent textual prediction triggered by linguistic units'.

The foregoing review of definitions and classifications of strategies from Translation Studies and Interpreting Studies has revealed how the notion of strategy has changed over time in the study of the two disciplines. Given the prevailing influence of a certain paradigm or scientific orientation, the notion changed its outward appearance and was addressed as method, technique, procedure, shift and solution in a linguistically oriented approach, while tactics, strategies, operations and mental processes came about with the functionalist and cognitive turn in translation studies. The changes in

name indicate how certain aspects gained importance and prevailed over others at various points in time.

4.   Common Ground, Common Strategies

Van Dijk and Kintsch (1983: 62) stressed that the objective of strategies for discourse comprehension and production is 'not only the reaching of a goal but that of reaching it in some optimal way (e.g. quickly, effectively, or with low cost)'. They also note, however, that the term strategy in psychology is used in a more specialised way and denotes cognitive behaviour of some kind (ibid.: 68). To the question whether it is appropriate to speak of strategies, even though understanding and speaking are usually almost automatic processes, their answer was affirmative. In their opinion, 'it makes sense to speak of strategies of language use anyway, although those strategies in most cases will not be preprogrammed, intended conscious or verbalizable by the language user' (ibid.: 71).

   Both in translation and in interpreting, strategies have been defined as potentially conscious procedures for solving problems. It has also been said that strategies are not always conscious because after a certain amount of practice and application they become more automatic. Automatic processes have not always been considered positively, especially in interpreting, when knowledge about the overlapping processes in SI was scarce and the term *automatic* would indicate something carried out without much reasoning. Progress in the study of translation and interpreting has shown that strategies are not always conscious. They may be conscious during training, possibly still at the beginning of the profession, but afterwards, work experience imposes their application so often that they become second nature. They are automatised to such an extent that they are no longer conscious. They will be applied automatically, as a routine. In translation, for instance, changes for a given language-combination will be introduced automatically at lexical or syntactical level to avoid various forms of syntactic interference or false friends from the source language.

The discussion about the notion of strategy and what it denotes is no easy one when an exact definition is required. This has become clear through the above review of the notion both in Translation Studies and in Interpreting Studies. Therefore, Chesterman's (2016/1997: 89) interpretation of strategies as a translation memes[11] seems useful, especially when he states that strategies have an inter-subjective character, as 'they are typically formulated in non-formal, rule-of-thumb mode. This makes them learnable and readily accessible: they constitute easily accessible descriptive knowledge concerning a certain kind of procedural knowledge'. His definition explains why so many different terms have been used to clarify what the transfer process in T&I is, what it leads to and what its output is. Strategic processes or transfer mechanisms are individual processes that can be described through their results and partially by the way they develop.

In SI, for example, it is important to economise on cognitive resources as much as possible, because there may be something unexpected or unforeseeable in the forthcoming speech that will require greater concentration of attention. Maximising automatic processing is therefore very important in SI. It may be less important in written translation, as De Groot (2000: 65) suggests: 'to perform a complex task skilfully fluency, automaticity and speed of the sub-components is required. Whereas fluency, automaticity and speed are beneficial in translation, but not at all times indispensable, they are permanently of crucial importance in interpreting'. This might have been true at the time, but working conditions for translators have changed dramatically in recent years and are still changing. Time for an assignment has also become an important variable for working conditions and quality assurance in translation.

In previous studies (Riccardi 1998, 2005), two main categories of strategies for SI were pointed to, which, under present circumstances, could also be applied to translation: knowledge-based strategies and skill-based strategies. The latter may be defined as all those strategies governed by

11   'Translation strategies are also memes. They are memes, that is, insofar as they are widely used by translators and recognized to be standard conceptual tool of the trade' (Chesterman 2016/1997: 85).

stored patterns of automatic responses whose application is triggered by the recognition of a well-known stimulus. They are the result of procedural knowledge and have been internalised and automatised. Their use confers spontaneity and fluency upon output. They may thus come into play at all levels – pragmatic, semantic, textual or morphological – and are dependent on knowledge organisation and experience: they are the hallmark of expertise.

Knowledge-based strategies are the other group of strategies employed; they differ from skilled-based strategies because their activation is the result of conscious analytical processes and they require a conscious effort to be applied. They come into play when actions must be planned online and are controlled to a great extent because no automatic response is found, or because something has led to a momentary memory overload.

Therefore, a distinctive attribute when examining strategies in translation and interpretation is the rapidity with which they are applied, whether their use is automatic or whether they require reflection.

5. Conclusion

The adoption of strategies in translation and interpreting is an expression of the acquisition of knowledge, skills, practices and attitudes, of competence and expert behaviour. A similar role may be also attributed to norms. Norms as regulatory elements of translational behaviour are determined by the socio-cultural context in which translators and interpreters work. They may be seen as internalised behaviour which governs their choices and are expressions of what is deemed correct or appropriate by a given community in a given context, situation or field. In Translation Studies, norms have been the object of many investigations, less so in Interpreting Studies. However, the cultural and social turn in T&I Studies has led to increasing interest in interpreting norms both for conference interpreting and dialogue interpreting.

Shlesinger (1999: 73) has contributed to the study of norms in SI and recognised the intrinsic difficulty for researchers in establishing whether the strategy used by interpreters is traceable to cognitive limitations or to norms, and in 'teasing apart these two factors in accounting for empirical results'. Therefore, a possible field for future research could differentiate between norms governing translation and those governing interpreting. Their comparison would show to what extent they overlap and what their distinctive categories are. The resulting normative aspects could be used to develop a further category of strategies that may be applied to both translation and interpreting: norm-based strategies.

The three categories together – skill-based, knowledge-based and norm-based strategies – could cover the majority of translation and interpreting phenomena, and could be used both for teaching and for descriptive studies. The investigation of strategies in translation and interpreting implies awareness that neither exact results nor definite answers are possible. It is work in progress that, step by step, contributes to the understanding of translation and interpreting and their complexity.

Bibliography

Bartłomiejczyk, M. 2006. 'Strategies of simultaneous interpreting and directionality'. *Interpreting*, 8(2), 147–174.

Catford, J. C. 1965. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chernov, G. V. 1978. *Teoriya i praktika sinkhronnogo perevoda*. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnyje otnosheniya.

Chesterman, A. 2016/1997. *Memes of Translation. The spread of Ideas in Translation Theory*. Rev. edn. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

De Groot, A. M. B. 2000. 'A complex-skill approach to translation and interpreting', in S. Tirkkonen-Condit and R. Jääskeläine (eds), *Tapping and Mapping the Process of Translation and Interpreting*, pp. 53–68. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dollerup, C., L. Fluger and A. Zoëga. 1992. 'Interpreting and translation – Two sides of the same coin?'. *Hermes*, 8, 43–53.

Dragsted, B., and I. Gorm Hansen. 2007. 'Speaking your translation – Exploiting synergies between translation and interpretation', in F. Pöchhacker, A. Lykke Jakobsen and I. M. Mees (eds), *Interpreting Studies and Beyond: A Tribute to Miriam Shlesinger*, pp. 251–274. Frederiksberg: Samfundslitteratur.

Færch, C., and G. Kasper. 1983. 'Plan and strategies in foreign language communication', in C. Faerch and G. Kasper (eds), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*, pp. 20–60. London: Longman.

Gambier, Y. 2012. 'Translation strategies and tactics', in Y. Gambier and L. van Doorslaer (eds), *Handbook of Translations Studies*, pp. 412–418. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gil-Bardaji, A. 2009. 'Procedures, techniques, strategies: translation process operator', *Perspectives*, 17(3), 161–173.

Gile, D. 1995. *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gile, D. 1999. 'Testing the effort model's tightrope hypothesis in simultaneous interpreting – a contribution'. *Hermes*, 23, 51–70.

Gile, D. 2004. 'Translation research versus interpreting research: kinship, differences and prospects for partnership', in C. Schäffner (ed.), *Translation Research and Interpreting Research: Traditions, Gaps and Synergies*, 10–34. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hatim, B., and I. Mason. 1997. *The Translator as Communicator*. London: Routledge.

Hönig, H. G. 1998. 'Sind Dolmetscher bessere Übersetzer?', *Jahrbuch Deutsch als Fremdsprache*, 24, 323–343.

Hönig, H. G. 2004. 'Einige späte Einsichten und ein Ausblick', in W. Pöckl (ed.), *Übersetzungswissenschaft – Dolmetschwissenschaft*, pp. 133–140. Vienna: Edition Praesens.

Hönig, H. G., and P. Kussmaul. 1982. *Strategie der Übersetzung: ein Lehr- und Arbeitsbuch*. Tübingen: Narr.

Kalina, S. 1998. *Strategische Prozesse beim Dolmetschen. Theoretische Grundlagen, empirische Fallstudien, didaktische Konsequenzen*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Kirchhoff, H. 1976. 'Das Simultandolmetschen: Interdependenz der Variablen im Dolmetschprozess, Dolmetschmodelle und Dolmetschstrategien', in H. Drescher and S. Scheffzek (eds), *Thoerie und Praxis des Dolmetschens*, 6/A, pp. 59–71. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Kirchhoff, H. 2002. 'Simultaneous interpreting – Interdependence of variables in the interpreting process, interpreting models and interpreting strategies', in F. Pöchhacker and M. Shlesinger (eds), *The Interpreting Studies Reader*, pp. 110–119. London: Routledge.

Krings, H.-P. 1986. *Was in den Köpfen von Übersetzern vorgeht: Eine empirische Untersuchung zur Struktur des Übersetzungsprozesses an fortgeschrittenen Französischlernern*. Tübingen: Narr.

Lederer, M. 1978. 'Simultaneous interpretation – Units of meaning and other features', in D. Gerver and H. W. Sinaiko (eds), *Language, Interpretation and Communication*, pp. 323–332. New York: Plenum Press.

Lederer, M. 1981. *La Traduction simultanée, expérience et théorie*, Paris: Minard, Lettres Modernes.

Lörscher, W. 1991. *Translation Performance, Translation Process, and Translation Strategies. A Psycholinguistic Investigation*. Tübingen, Narr.

Malblanc, A. 1963. *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'allemand*. Paris: Didier.

Moser, B. 1978. 'Simultaneous interpretation: a hypothetical model and its practical application', in D. Gerver and H. W. Sinaiko (eds), *Language, Interpretation and Communication*, pp. 353–368. New York: Plenum Press.

Newmark, P. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall.

Nida, E. A. 1964. *Towards a Science of Translating*. Leiden: Brill.

Pippa, S. 2003. *Traduttori ed interpreti a confronto: approccio alla traduzione, analisi e valutazione*. Sert 23, Trieste: EUT.

Pöchhacker, F. 1994. *Simultandolmetschen als komplexes Handeln*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Reiß, K., and H. J. Vermeer. 1984. *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Riccardi, A. 1996. 'Language-specific strategies in simultaneous interpreting', in C. Dollerup, and V. Appel (eds), *Teaching Translation and Interpreting 3 – New Horizons*, pp. 213–222. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Riccardi, A. 1998. 'Interpreting strategies and creativity', in A. Beylard-Ozeroff, J. Králová, and B. Moser-Mercer (eds), *Translators' Strategies and Creativity*, pp. 171–179. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Riccardi, A. 2002. 'Translation and interpretation', in A. Riccardi (ed.), *Translation Studies. Perspectives on an Emerging Discipline*, pp. 75–91. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Riccardi, A. 2005. 'On the evolution of interpreting strategies in simultaneous interpreting'. *Meta*, 2, 753–767.

Scarpa, F. 2008. *La traduzione specializzata. Un approccio didattico professionale*. Milano: Hoepli.

Schäffner, C. (ed.). 2004a. *Translation Research and Interpreting Research: Traditions, Gaps and Synergies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Schäffner, C. 2004b. 'Researching translation and interpreting', in C. Schäffner (ed.), *Translation Research and Interpreting Research: Traditions, Gaps and Synergies*, pp. 1–9. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Schjoldager, A. 1995. 'An exploratory study of translational norms in simultaneous interpreting: methodological reflections'. *Hermes*, 14, 65–87.

Seleskovitch, D. 1975. *Langage, langues et mémoire. Etude de la prise de notes en interprétation consécutive*. Paris: Minard.

Setton, R., and A. Darwant. 2016. *Conference Interpreting – A Trainer's Guide*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Shlesinger, M. 1999. 'Norms, strategies and constraints: how do we tell them apart?', in A. Álvarez Lugrís and A. Fernández Ocampo (eds), *Anovar/anosar estudios de traducción e interpretación*, pp. 65–77. Vigo: University of Vigo.

Shlesinger, M. 2004. 'Doorstep inter-subdisciplinariry and beyond', in C. Schäffner (ed.), *Translation Research and Interpreting Research: Traditions, Gaps and Synergies*, pp. 116–123. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Shlesinger, M., and N. Ordan. 2014. 'More spoken or more translated? Exploring a known unknown of simultaneous interpreting', in E. Brems, R. Meylaerts, and L. van Doorslaer (eds), *The Known Unknowns of Translation Studies*, pp. 47–64. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Shlesinger, M., and B. Malkie. 2005. 'Comparing modalities: cognates as a case in point'. *Across*, 6(2), 173–189.

Van Dijk, T. A., and W. Kintsch. 1983. *Strategies of Discourse Comprehension*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Timarová, Š., B. Dragsted and I. Gorm Hansen. 2011. 'Time lag in translation and interpreting', in C. Alvstad, A. Hild and E. Tiselius (eds), *Methods and Strategies of process Research: Integrative Approaches in Translation Studies*, pp. 121–146. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Vinay, J.-P., and J. Darbelnet. 1958. *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais*. Paris: Didier.

Wilss, W. 1978. 'Syntactic anticipation in German-English simultaneous interpreting', in D. Gerver and H. W. Sinaiko (eds), *Language, Interpretation and Communication*, pp. 343–352. New York: Plenum Press.