BILATERAL INTERPRETING: SOME WAYS OF ANALYSIS (GERMAN–UKRAINIAN / UKRAINIAN–GERMAN)

[a]BILOUS O., [b]PIANKOVSKA I., [c]STEPANENKO A., [d]TARANUKHA T., [e]VEREZUBENKO M.

*[a]PhD, Dean of the School of Foreign Languages,
Volodymyr Vynnychenko Central Ukrainian, State Pedagogical
University, 1, Shevchenko Street, Kropyvnytskyi, Ukraine.
[b]Doctor of Philosophy, Volodymyr Vynnychenko Central
Ukrainian State Pedagogical University, 1 Shevchenka Street,
25006, Kropyvnytskyi, Ukraine.
[c]Doctor of Philosophy, Volodymyr Vynnychenko Central
Ukrainian State Pedagogical University, 1 Shevchenka Street,
25006, Kropyvnytskyi, Ukraine.
[d]Doctor of Philosophy, Volodymyr Vynnychenko Central
Ukrainian State Pedagogical University, 1 Shevchenka Street,
25006, Kropyvnytskyi, Ukraine.
[e]Doctor of Philosophy, Volodymyr Vynnychenko Central
Ukrainian State Pedagogical University, 1, Shevchenko Street,
25006, Kropyvnytskyi, Ukraine.
E-mail: [a]ua.education.com.ua@gmail.com
[b]piankovska@ukr.net; [c]alistep15@gmail.com;,
[d]tetyana.taranukha@gmail.com;, [e] verezubenko@ukr.net.*

_____

Abstract: The paper provides a brief historical insight into the formation history of the types of interpreting in the translation tradition of Western Europe. The objective of our study is to reveal in detail the specifics of such subspecies of interpreting as bilateral interpreting from the linguistic, psychological, and pragmatic points of view. Depending on the requirements, interpreting can be both simultaneous and consecutive. The topicality of our research consists of the fact that bilateral interpreting receives insufficient attention from the point of view of translation studies, psycholinguistics, and pragmatics when it comes to teaching interpreting to students. Relevant is also the fact that the analysis of Ukrainian-German and German-Ukrainian bilateral interpreting has hardly been investigated in Ukraine as opposed to Ukrainian-English and English-Ukrainian interpreting. The paper contains the results of the experiment focused on the practical application of bilateral interpreting by the students of the translation department.

Key words: translation studies, interpreting, technology of interpreting, bilateral interpreting, psycholinguistics, pragmatics, Ukrainian-German, and German-Ukrainian interpreting, experiment.

1 Introduction

Interpreting was the only type of transferring thoughts in other languages until people began to write and perform translation along with it.

To this day, the oldest monuments that testify to the existence of interpreting in ancient times are texts from the Egyptian pyramids, dated about 3,000 years before Christ. At that time, all cultural, economic, political, and military communications in the Middle East were mediated by diplomats with a knowledge of foreign languages, the so-called dragomans. The word dragoman *(translator, ambassador, interpreter)* comes from Arabic, used since the 12th century and adopted from the business lexicon of the Great Steppe Army Empire and Ottoman Empire. The term was used in the records of the Zaporizhian Host, Zaporizhian Host Empire, Russian Empire, etc.

In those far-off days, liaison interpreting (Verhandlungsdolmetschen) for the representatives of different linguistic cultures was the only usual form of interpreting. At that time, interpreting was performed in a short period, usually sentence by sentence.

Over time, with the need to establish more intensive contacts between countries and people, such a form of interpreting as speech interpreting (Vortragsdolmetschen) has developed. Speech interpreting provided for interpreting longer and more extensive speeches/conversations.

Interpreting was performed by amateurs with a knowledge of several foreign languages. This form of interpreting had no theoretical basis, compared to the existing form of translation, and was not considered as a separate mediation activity of an interpreter, nonetheless, it initiated the further development of

the professional activity of an interpreter. As early as 1000 AD, interpreters were trained in Asia.

At the beginning of the 12th century, the French Emperor was invited to establish a school for interpreters, whose graduates were to serve as interpreters during the Crusades to the Holy Land (im Heiligen Land).

At that time, one of the first European schools for dragomans was established in Constantinople. Its graduates entered military service (Best, Kalina, 2002: 30-32).

Liaison interpreting (Verhandlungsdolmetschen), or in other words (communicative) conversation interpreting (Gesprächsdolmetschen), is widely practiced nowadays. We should note that there are some differences in the scope of application of a particular interpreting technology, and different standards are used when applying one of the technologies. The interpreting standard should be understood as a set of requirements for the quality and adequacy of interpreting. When, for example, politicians or businesspeople engage in negotiations, the standards of consecutive interpreting (Konferenzdolmetschen / conference interpreting) are usually applied. Speaking of different interpreting standards, we should note that in the field of medicine consecutive interpreting is used, but its standards differ from interpreting in other fields of science. This is because the attention during interpreting in the field of medicine is placed not on the text (Wortlauf), but on the perception/understanding of what is being said, in other words on the communication of the speaker's intention. This means that the main task (standard) of interpreting in the field of medicine is to correctly communicate information about prescriptions, recommendations, following qualified and professional instructions, and taking the right measures to implement them to the recipient. For clarity, let us consider another case, namely the standards of interpreting in the legal sphere. At the time of interrogating of suspects or interviewing witnesses, conducting court proceedings, etc., word for word interpreting is especially emphasized, as every word can contain important information, and therefore in the legal sphere decisions of the investigative body and judges, as well as fates of people depend on interpreting quality level. We should note that every German-speaking country has completely different legal and judicial provisions, and therefore terminological concepts in these fields also differ.

Therefore, as we can see, the effective standards for consecutive interpreting in various fields of human activity significantly differ.

Based on the relevant scientific developments regarding the application of interpreting standards across a range of fields of human activity that are quite intertangled, but with different statuses of specialists and technologies involved in these fields, the concept of community interpreting (Kommunaldolmetschen) has emerged (Pöchhacker 2000: 33).

The Austrian translation theorist *Franz Pöchhacker* covers all the other of the above-mentioned types of interpreting (community interpreting), depending on the field of activity (settings) and considers conversation interpreting *(Gesprächs)*, liaison interpreting *(Verhandlungs-)*, and court interpreting *(Gerichtsdolmetschen)* as *community interpreting – Kommunaldolmetschen vs. Konferenzdolmetschen* (Pöchhacker 2004). Almost until the first half of the 20th century, all types of interpreting of short and long segments were performed consecutively.

Along with the above-mentioned types of interpreting there also was the so-called chuchotage (Flüsterdolmetschen). The word chuchotage comes from French and means to whisper.

The prototype of the technical means for chuchotage was Hushaphone (variants: Hush-a-Phone, Hush a Phone), a device that was used to connect a phone to the transmitter in order to reduce noise during a phone call and to increase privacy. Chuchotage (*professional slang*) is a type of interpreting with the help of special technical means—a small portable device (transmitter) with a built-in microphone, the so-called "whisperer," for an interpreter complete with a portable device with headphones (receiver) for recipients. Thanks to the whisperer an interpreter can either be next to the speaker or sit next to the participants of a *conference, workshop, presentation*, etc. Participants get receivers with headphones, and the interpreter whispers the translation into the microphone. This type of interpreting became an intermediary step between consecutive and simultaneous and is considered to give birth to simultaneous interpreting. Nowadays, it is also used in certain situations, when interpreting is performed for a small group of people and there are no technical means for simultaneous interpreting in the room: during press conferences, press releases, interviews, etc.

During international conferences, world symposia, United Nations and European Parliament meetings, simultaneous interpreting is the most common type of interpreting. It is performed (almost) simultaneously with the speaker's speech, and its essential attributes are soundproof booths equipped with microphones, headphones, speakers, etc. Since this type of interpreting is physically stressful and exhausting, it is usually performed alternately by several professionally trained simultaneous interpreters.

Due to the intensive use of interpreting mediation in the first half of the 20th century, the first scientific publications (Wirl 1958: 34) on the issues of interpreting and its impact on the situation of mediated inter-language communication began to appear in foreign publications. These studies primarily addressed such issues as linguistic factors that hamper the interpreting process. For example, it has been suggested that consecutive interpreting during conferences, symposia, etc., firstly, constantly disrupts the speakers' speech, because of the need to interrupt it for interpreting, and secondly, the duration of interpreting increases, especially when consecutive interpreting is alternately performed in several languages. This factor has significantly influenced the further use of consecutive interpreting during international conferences, forums, etc., and initiated the widespread use of simultaneous translation in international practice (Nuremberg trials against Nazis are considered the "baptism by fire" of simultaneous interpreting). "Successful experience of simultaneous interpreting in Nuremberg became a guarantee of its further spread in international life" (Saprykin, Chuzhakin 2011: 12). The advantage of simultaneous interpreting is that it can be performed in many languages at the same time. It should be noted that simultaneous interpreters are usually provided with the texts of reports or talking points.

Due to the wide use of interpreting and all the above-mentioned subtypes, in the 60s of the 20th century, it was allocated to a separate academic discipline. In the translation tradition of Western Europe, interpreting has become the subject of research of the interpreting studies – Dolmetschwissenschaft – and psycholinguistics – Psycholinguistik – as the scientific research of the ways and phenomena thanks to which people communicate with one another and find common ground through language, is possible only through interdisciplinary connections of linguistics (in this case, interpreting) with other branches of knowledge, especially psychology and pragmatics. Psycholinguistics studies the relationship between the use of language and such psychological processes as memory, attention, comprehension, and the main components of these processes (Snell-Hornby et al. 2006: 64–65). Therefore, the subject of research in psycholinguistics is – first of all – a language(s) speaker and their ability to master the language(s), comprehend the language(s), produce verbal expressions in the language(s). On the other hand, interpreting studies and psycholinguistics are closely related to pragmatics of human communication – in our case, at least bilingual communication –

and their relationship to the language structures of communication. Therefore, we also consider the pragmatic analysis of speech communications an important part of the study of all types of interpreting, as it empirically analyzes how the translator acts when practically using native and foreign languages.

2 Materials and Methods

In modern translation studies, interpreting is divided into three main types: "…consecutive, sight, and simultaneous" (Chernovatyi 2013: 252)*,* "…consecutive interpreting and bilateral interpreting, simultaneous interpreting, and chuchotage" (Zinukova 2018: 19). These types are divided into several subtypes depending on the communication areas. Let us recall the definition of two main types of interpreting: if the speech of the interpreter follows the speech of the communication participant, then, in this case, interpreting is called CONSECUTIVE; if the speech of the interpreter coincides (almost) in time with the speech of the communication participant, then this type of interpreting is called SIMULTANEOUS. This classification characterizes the types of interpreting only with regard to the time of performing, while the task of our research is a more detailed exploration of such a subtype as bilateral interpreting from the linguistic, psychological, and pragmatic points of view. Depending on the requirements set, bilateral interpreting can be both simultaneous and consecutive. However, the researchers of interpreting "…have no common lens regarding the main characteristics of interpreting that determine its specificity" (Zinukova 2018: 19). In our opinion, it is bilateral interpreting – from the points of view of interpreting studies, psycholinguistics, and pragmatics – that today is given little attention in teaching students; this constitutes *the relevance* of our research. It is also relevant that bilateral interpreting in Ukrainian–German and German–Ukrainian directions are scarcely studied in Ukraine, in contrast with Ukrainian–English, and English–Ukrainian directions, in the field of which, over the years of independence, a large number of scientific articles (the most relevant are Demetska 2019; Zinukova 2018; Kobiakova 2016), four textbooks dedicated to interpreting (Shvachko 2004; Nesterenko 2004; Maksimov 2007; Saprykin; Chuzhakin 2011) and one textbook on the methodology of teaching of translation as a specialty, in which the 4th section is devoted to the teaching of interpreting (Chernovatyi 2013), has been published.

Modern textbooks for German-Ukrainian translation are the fundamental edition of the collective body under the management of an outstanding Ukrainian linguist and expert in translation studies, *Taras Kyiak* (Kyiak 2014), and the textbook of *Svitlana Syniehub* (Syniehub 2018), but these textbooks widely cover only the issues of translation.

Bilateral interpreting *(study object)* is divided into six subtypes: 1) paragraph-and-phrase interpreting – the speaker presents thoughts in small phrases, no more than a few sentences; 2) informal bilateral interpreting (without making notes) – interpreting of conversations, interviews, or just an exchange of remarks, when the situation allows not to make any notes (or make some minimal ones); 3) formal bilateral interpreting (without making notes) – interpreting of business conversations or interviews involving two or more speakers with relatively brief statements in different languages on a special topic; 4) bilateral interpreing (with making notes) – interpreting of formal conversations, interviews, speeches during press conferences, etc., on international (general-political) topic with relatively long statements (up to 3–5 minutes); 5) interpreting of monological speech (with making notes) – interpreting of monological speech (presentation, press release, speech, lecture, address, press conference, briefing, pledge, etc.) in public, indoors or outdoors (sometimes in unsuitable conditions, without sound amplification, with strong noise and noise interference); and 6) sight interpreting – this type combines the characteristics of both translation and interpreting. For this subtype of interpreting, the information is read from a specific medium

(paper, display, etc.) and then interpreted (Saprykin, Chuzhakin 2011: 47–51).

If the interpreting conditions require the interpreter's speech not to coincide in time with the speech of the dialogue participants, bilateral interpreting becomes consecutive. If there is no such condition, the interpreter can interpret the speech of the dialogue participants simultaneously. However, both dialogue participants' speeches and interpreting remain bilateral.

It is necessary to always take into account the fact that regardless of how the bilateral interpreting is performed – consecutively or simultaneously – it (the process) is endowed with certain characteristics that create its specificity, namely, distinguish it from other types of interpreting.

In fact, this is true, as it is not enough to consider only the time factor to characterize bilateral interpreting. After all, both interpreter – while performing bilateral interpreting – and teacher – while developing a methodology for the teaching of types of interpreting – should also keep in mind other factors that affect the nature of listening (comprehension) and interpreting *(the subject of research)*, actually labeling it – bilateral interpreting – as a special type of interpreting.

3 Results

In the professional activity of an interpreter, the place of bilateral interpreting is determined by its purpose. This purpose is to interpret the speech of the dialogue participants in cases when they use different language codes.

Today, bilateral interpreting is performed during negotiations, meetings, conversations, etc., as well as during the interview of witnesses who use foreign languages to respond. Quite often, this type of interpreting comes into the picture during such compositional forms of modern oral communication as press conferences (press releases) or discussions, which are usually based on a variety of alternations or shifts, the interpenetration of elements of spoken and literary languages, because, as the world-famous linguist and psychologist *Reveka Frumkina* notes, the way we speak reflects our inner world in a certain way. Many aspects of a person can be learned from their speech. For example, an educated and well-mannered person may understand *flash language*, but they will either not use it, or – if it is necessary – do it with care. Although in informal speech we express our thoughts quite spontaneously, such a person is unlikely to use words and phrases like *wheelman, queerdo, one can't be bothered.* They are subconsciously forbidden.

What should we understand by the term "colloquial speech?" Colloquial speech is neither vulgar tongue nor the talks of people on a bench. It is also neither the language spoken in literary works in the form of "direct speech" of characters nor the speech of a teacher at the blackboard, a speaker, a TV host. It is about the spontaneous, free speech of educated speakers of modern literary language. This speech is devoid of colloquialism and free from "street" slang and vernacularism.

Developing an idea, *Reveka Frumkina* identifies three features of the extralinguistic situation that encourage the use of colloquial speech: 1) unpreparedness and spontaneity of the speech act, 2) ease of utterance, and 3) direct participation of speakers in the speech act.

Regarding *ease*, it is determined by the presence of informal relations between the participants of the speech act. The speech of TV or radio hosts may – and sometimes even should – be perceived with ease. In fact, it is always deliberate and in style, and manner of speech is closer to the speech of educated people.

According to *Reveka Frumkina*, the features of colloquial speech lie in the fact that much of the information is not in the text of the utterance, but in the communicative situation as a whole (the so-called constitutiveness, namely, the determinability of colloquial speech) when the speaker (unconsciously, but

constantly) is guided by the fact that the listener can easily mark the necessary (although not available) information: after all, the listener is equally accessible to the multi-layered context of the communication situation.

What are the components of this context? First of all, they are the time and place of communication, which are common to participants, their facial expressions and gestures, features of communication style, namely speech etiquette, which is typical for this environment, etc. (Frumkina 2008: 194–210).

Bilateral interpreting is a specific form of communication with a mediator (connecting link) – an interpreter. The presence of this link has a certain impact on the speech of the communication partner. Thus, the speech of communication partners may be less spontaneous than dialogical speech in the field of everyday communication. On the other hand, communication partners tend to seek to adapt to the mediator, namely, to the interpreter. This circumstance also affects their speech to a certain extent, but it is still dialogical. Therefore, bilateral interpreting should be considered, first of all, as interpreting of such speech material that is inherent in the characteristics of dialogical speech (Metodyka navchannia inozemnykh mov u zahalnoosvitnikh navchalnykh zakladakh: pidruchnyk [Methods of Teaching Foreign Languages in General Educational Institutions: A Textbook] 2010: 147–152). These characteristics include a) limited amount of time for speech processing, b) spontaneity, c) wide use of colloquial forms of speech, and d) frequent use of imperfect external forms. In the dialogue, there is a rapid change of intonation, a motley alternation of various forms of speech melody, a wide range of extralinguistic means of communication, such as facial expressions, gestures, mobility (of movements), eye contact, poses of partners in conversation, etc. Direct interpreting is performed in the sounding of socially familiar speech formulas. In addition, dialogical speech is also distinguished by the fact that "it is a process of spoken interaction between two or more participants of communication" (Metodyka navchannia inozemnykh mov u zahalnoosvitnikh navchalnykh zakladakh: pidruchnyk [Methods of Teaching Foreign Languages in General Educational Institutions: A Textbook] 2002: 146–147).

The world-renowned psycholinguist *Oleksii Leontiev* notes that dialogical speech is based on the same general principles as "figurative memorization" of speech. In other words, dialogical speech is not programmed. It does not necessarily follow from the idea and thought that is internally formed by the subject, most often it is situational and incomprehensible without knowledge of this real situation or imaginary situation. Meanwhile, dialogical speech (chain reaction) is typically reactive, replica–response of interlocutor is a normal paraphrase or a repetition of a question or remark. According to the scientist, dialogical speech is based on the "stimulus-response" model. The replica of the first interlocutor most often allows a relatively small number of possible answers, at least in terms of content. The speech "function" of the second interlocutor is reduced to choosing the most probable of these possible answers – in this situation and for this subject. Thus, the connection of the first and second interlocutors' replicas is easiest to interpret with the help of an ordinary classical conditioning connection. This allows, by the way, "not to listen" to the interlocutor, who says that he knows he has a certain answer, and that allows laying out the lines, when one interlocutor has not finished talking, and the other one started talking, interrupting the first one (Leontiev 2005: 168).

Based on the aforesaid information, it is possible to ascertain, that in the dialogical speech the simultaneous interpreting is rather tangential from the psychological and pragmatic points of view, which subtype, as it was noted above, is bilateral interpreting.

Simultaneous interpreting is the least studied in Ukraine, especially regarding psychological and pragmatic issues. In our opinion, this means that a brief review of opinions on this type

of translation from the point of view of psycholinguistics and pragmatics in this study will be relevant.

Oleksii Leontiev is trying to present the most general psychological characteristic of simultaneous interpreting. In an optimal case, when there is a highly qualified translator with a high level of automation in the cabin (for simultaneous interpretation). A lot of automation, which we do not pay attention to, is based on a fairly accurate forecast of the probability of certain events. As the scientist further notes, the ability of a person to bring "meaning" and structure to a priori "unintelligible" language material has become an obstacle to psychological experiments on memorizing unintelligible syllables. But the same fact prompted scientists to investigate what our implicit knowledge of our speech, that is, what knowledge of speech skills is difficult to even imagine, it is a kind of monological speech, where the speech mediator (program) is programmed from the outside.

All other types of (simultaneous) interpreting have this characteristic in addition to oral interpreting. Common for several types (but not for all) of interpreting is such a feature, which can be characterized as resistance to isolated language units, that is, if in normal speech there is enough intermediary language (a person understands himself well and does not need any additional means to clarify and fix the content of the program, that is, the intermediary language), then in "synchronous speech," as a rule, in addition to the work associated with the programming of statements in general, the interpreter performs the work on the direct recoding of the language.

Developing his idea, *Oleksii Leontiev* states that simultaneous interpreting has one specific feature that distinguishes it from all other types of interpretation. This is the "gap" of the intermediary language, in other words, the simultaneous interpreter does not "push" the whole heard phrase into the program (intermediary language) in order to "unfold" this program (intermediary language) in a phrase in another language again, but performs this action with the individual components of the phrase, namely, with such (components), which in a certain sense are universal for expression in any language regardless of its structure.

As an illustrative example, *Alexei Leontiev* cited the translation of the phrase "*The skills of simultaneous listening and speech should be done in parallel with the study of a foreign language, not after mastering it.*" The translator will wait for the word "*speech*" and translate this component. Gap. "*Should be made.*" Translation, gap. "*In parallel with the learning of a foreign language.*" Translation. Gap and so on."

Already from the above example, we can see how the translation depends on the actual division (topic and comment) of the statement and in general on its logical structure. If the word "*parallel*" is clearly contrasted in the "*after*" speech, a pause and a "gap" should be expected before it, but if there is no such separation (and for the translator, the words "*not after…*" would be a surprise), it is possible that the "minimum unit of translation" is "*should be done in parallel with the foreign language learning*" (Leontiev 2005: 170).

Obviously, in simultaneous translation, the known "outrageous" effect is on the order of components in the language phrase and the "language of translation". Everybody has heard how mediocre simultaneous interpreters generate native language phrases with a known non-native syntactic organization, preferring the risk of forgetting some essential components of the statement when the "minimum translation unit" is increased. In terms, this problem, according to the scientist, can be described as a problem of grouping the components of the intermediary language (i.e. the program).

This points to the problem of external consumption of the target language (program) as a characteristic feature of all types of translation. The scientist notes that this opinion can be expressed

differently: in the translation, as you know, there is a certain invariant, which is constant when transforming the expression of the language 1 and the language of 2. (Here we are not talking about artistic translation, where the invariant is the dominant artistic structure of the work). What is the invariant for interpretation? It (invariant) is defined as "the community of the proclaimed… …of semantic content," as the identity of "elementary semantic units of the mediator language, put in accordance with this statement," as… the "direct, intuitive reflection" of connections and relations, finally, as "the same thoughts, feelings, desires." These definitions, according to the scientist, quite clearly fall into two groups depending on whether they are pronounced by linguists or psychologists… The first two definitions derive from the notion of the objective, substantive and logical identity of translation units… The other two definitions are more closely related to the true situation. However, both are not quite correct. However, both are not quite correct. After all, it is clear that "the same thoughts, feelings, desires" are not fully exhaustive and concrete formulation, even if we paraphrase it (formulation) and talk about the same subject and logical and emotional content and the same motivation." What (after all) is the interpretation invariant? *Oleksii Leontiev* considers (Leontiev 2005: 170–172), that such invariant is exactly the internal program (speech-mediator) of speech statement—the system of functionally "not loaded" by senses elements of the subject and image circle or the certain actions directed on these elements. And as the sense is the function of correlation of motivation and purposefulness of activity, then the choice of the program is caused by previous experience of a human organism (probable forecasting), and the structure of the program (language–intermediary) – by factors of a situation and context, as all these factors are relevant at translation and have to be involved at psychological and pragmatic analyses (though in typical cases for translation some of these factors are neutralized – for example, the factor of experience and the factor of a situation).

4 Discussion

In the process of two-way interpreting, the interpreter needs to understand and translate all those speech formulas, stamps, ellipses, and even archetypal expressions that occur in a lively dialogue and that occur regardless of the topic of communication and conversation, excellent knowledge of which should be absolutely necessary for all those involved in the field of dialogue interpreting.

The ability to translate common cliche formulas, expressions of spoken language, exoticism, dialecticism, wordplay, etc. (Baran 2008 et al.: 195–234) testifies that the interpreter is familiar in truly dialogical speech, in those expressions which are not learned through a book or school education but are passed on from mouth to mouth.

It is known that the norms of human behavior have their own linguistic congruencies, not necessarily the same for different peoples. Hence the task of the interpreter: not just to translate, but to learn, in the process of the bilateral interpreting, to use conversational expressions that are most appropriate for the particular communication situation. Knowing all kinds of stereotyped expressions, which are typical for dialogic speech, and the ability to use them correctly in the translation process, will embody the confidence in the interpreter and help to most emotionally affect the recipient, because the speech material addressed to him (the recipient) is formulated according to the speech usus correctly, that is, the same words and expressions that the listener is used to use in such situations.

Besides, knowledge of expressions inherent to dialogical speech, acquaintance with speech behavior of native speakers allow to understand them (native speakers) in half-word, which, in turn, creates better conditions for translation activity and part of it encourages faster and better translation.

Thus, a number of such syntactic constructions are used in a dialogical speech that is completely unsuitable for monological

speech (Vaskivska et al. 2019). It should also be noted here that, as a rule, dialogical speech is often characterized by grammatical errors and deviations from the language norm, is not typical for monological speech, because it is usually an organized type of oral speech and more prepared (Metodyka navchannia inozemnykh mov u zahalnoosvitnikh navchalnykh zakladakh: pidruchnyk [Methods of Teaching Foreign Languages in General Educational Institutions: A Textbook] 202: 167*).

As for deviations from the language norm, it should be noted that even the culturally educated part of society makes mistakes in speech, so the interpreter from Ukrainian to German and vice versa from German to Ukrainian should not "lose his head" and lose the pace/rhythm of translation through grammatical errors *(order of words in appendage sentences, use of articles, temporary forms, etc.)*. However, illiterate bilateral interpreting has no permanent "excuse" for a translator. Perform grammatical and lexically adequate translation – "translation, causes the foreign recipient to have a reaction corresponding to the communicative setting of the sender" (Cherednychenko 2017: 17) – should become the main goal and task of the translator. In order to achieve this goal and effectively perform the task, you should always find the time and "fresh traces" to thoroughly study each translation and thoroughly analyze errors and/or to avoid them in the future (Chuzhakin 2002: 7).

Then the question arises: how easy it is to understand dialogic speech with "grammatical errors?" This question is simply answered in the affirmative because, in the process of professional training at a university, the future translator usually only gets acquainted with the correct speech. Its teachers are already doomed to speak only correctly because of the need to do so. In academic sound recordings, students are also usually only offered the correct speech. Now it should be noted that correct speech is, in a certain sense, a speech standard, and it is a great rarity. Most people speak much worse and it is much more difficult to understand them, especially by hearing. World-famous playwright and the great teacher of acting *Kostiantyn Stanislavskyi* wrote on this occasion:" …I studied both myself and others, and as a result, finally made sure that people need to go back to school and start everything from the basics. We do not feel our language, phrases, syllables, letters, and therefore easily distort them… Add to this hyperism, lisping, squealing, squeaking, craunching, and all sorts of stammering" (Stanislavskyi 2017). Immediately, it should be noted that such a disappointing characteristic applies not only to native speakers of Russian (after all, it was the genius of the stage), it applies to all languages, not to mention the "surzhyk" in Ukraine (Bilous 2015).

That is why we believe that for the successful implementation of the bilateral interpreting it is necessary to get acquainted beforehand (previous awareness) with the speech of the most native speakers, such as German (Bilous, Piankovska 2019), and not only with the speech of those who, so to speak, is the linguistic elite of this or that ethnos.

Speaking about the wrong speech, we would like to dwell on the experiment, which is constantly conducted at the fourth bachelor's and first master's degree courses of the Translation Department at the University of Kropyvnytskyi/Ukraine. The experiment allowed us to reveal that the perception of wrong speech in the native language is significantly different from the perception of wrong speech in foreign languages, in our case in German.

And it is really so, perceiving information in the native language, our students tend to allegedly "fall on deaf ears" all repetitions (tautology), parasite words, and other speech phenomena. And this happens even when students are specifically assigned the task of recording this type of linguistic phenomena, and the students themselves had the opportunity to listen to each expression declared many times. When perceiving wrong speech in German (*and to this we should add the traditional saturation of German with different dialectisms, because each federal state or canton of German-speaking countries has its own dialect*) we

observed another picture: mistakes in the speech of the speaker led to mistakes in understanding of the listened speech material, or even to complete (partial) rejection of the listened material.

The examples of German spontaneous dialogic/monologic speech available to the students in the audio-video recordings not only contained certain thoughts (worldview conclusions, personal attitude to certain events, actions, etc.) of the participant of the communication but also represented in a certain sense the search for the most adequate form of expression. Inability (incompetence) to reveal a special function of dialogic speech in these searches led to the fact that future translators lost the essence of the translation, could not comprehend/understand the logic of the speaker's presentation *(for example, when using German conjunctiva when substituting indirect direct speech, etc.)*. This was a consequence of the fact that they (students) got used to well prepared monologic speech, which is characterized by complete expressions, clarity of designations/definitions, and often lack of spontaneity.

5 Conclusion

Based on the above, it is possible to conclude: in the bilateral interpreting process, the interpreter should understand speech not only at the level of various grammatically correctly accepted syntactic constructions and elliptical turns, which are inherent in dialogical speech but also to understand this speech with those typical speech mistakes, which hypothetically can be made by native speakers as participants of the communication act.

In the process of dialogic speech, its participants can perform certain speech actions that can change a pre-planned communication situation. The interpreter's task is to adequately convey the essence of the speaker's speech act through the recipient's language. Since communication partners are constantly changing roles, the interpreter also has to constantly change the direction of the translation. This in itself is an additional challenge for the interpreter. On this basis, it should be noted that if the interpreter often makes a translation in two directions, he or she faces the danger of "gradually losing the ability to distinguish between the mediation processes (processes of intermediary activity of the interpreter) (Chernovatyi 2013: 43), which are inherent in each language, and increasingly mixed features of the two languages when coding. In other words, the bilateral interpreting process tends to transform a system of correlations between language, being, and consciousness, reflected in the linguistic picture of the world of one language, into a system of combining related but not identical speech concepts of two or more languages.

This "cunning" of the bilateral interpreting must be borne in mind by methodologists when developing didactic guidelines for teaching two-way interpretation. Indeed, the bilateral interpreting process is a kind of "harmful production" in which the interpreter's skills of switching from one language to another are introduced under difficult conditions, when the interpreter needs to neutralize the interference of two languages (from Latin *inter – between*, *reciprocally* and *ferens, ferentis – carrier, transfers – interaction of language systems in the conditions* of *bilingualism, which occurs during the process of language contacts, etc*). As noted by the researchers of interpretation, the constant changes in the direction of switching involve special work on neutralizing the influence of two languages, which is manifested in linguistic literalism, artificial constructions, fragmented speech (Chernovatyi 2013: 2634–266; Chuzhakin 2002: 16–19; Maksimov 2007: 89–92;).

Summing up the above, we can summarize the following: As an interpreter's professional activity, bilateral interpreting should be distinguished from other types of interpretation, given its specificity. This specificity of the bilateral interpreting is determined primarily by two circumstances: first, unlike other types of interpretation that deal with monologic speech, which is usually pre-prepared, the bilateral interpreting is the translation of spontaneous dialogue speech with all its consequences; second, constant changes in the direction of the switchover

require the interpreter to be able to neutralize the influence of not one but two languages during coding.

The students of the interpreting departments (when studying all types of interpreting) should be given the following advice: in educational and real interpreting it is necessary to constantly take care of the availability of at least some materials on the subject of the interpretation, try to collect as much information as possible about the participants of the negotiations, speakers: personal data, titles, ranks, positions, names of companies/enterprises and their field of activity and the like. After all, previous awareness has always been, is, and will be the key to high-quality and complete interpretation.

Unfortunately, in our opinion, in Ukrainian universities, where the professional translation is studied, not enough attention is paid to interpreting. The reason for this is the fact that when entering the specialty *"Translation"* applicants in Ukraine have no choice who to be after graduation – interpreter or translator. In Ukraine, in contrast to the progressive world practice, all graduates of the translation departments receive a general qualification – "Translator" with the indication of language or several languages, and therefore the curriculum and work plans for the training of translators are more general, rather than subject-oriented, which significantly affects the quality of training of specialists in the field of interpretation.

Literature

1. Baran, Ya., Zymomria, M., Bilous, O., Zymomria, I. (2008). *Frazeolohiia: znakovi velychyny. Navchalnyi posibnyk dlia studentiv fakultetiv inozemnykh mov* [Phraseology: Significant Values. A Textbook for Students of Foreign Language Departments]. Vinnytsia: Nova Knyha. 256 p.

2. Best, J., Kalina, S. (Hrsg.). (2002). *Übersetzen und Dolmetschen: eine Orientierungshilfe* [Translating and Interpreting: A Guide]. Tübingen: Basel: Francke. 341 p.

3. Bilous, O. (2013). *Teoriia i tekhnolohiia perekladu. Kurs lektsii: doopratsiovanyi ta dopovnenyi. Navchalnyi posibnyk dlia studentiv perekladatskykh viddilen* [Translation Theory and Technology. A Course of Lectures: Modified and Supplemented. A Textbook for Students of Translation Departments]. Kirovohrad: RVK KDPU im. V. Vynnychenka. 200 p.

4. Bilous, O. (2015). *Surzhyk und Streben nach geistiger Wiedergeburt der ukrainischen Sprache: aus der Sicht westlicher Forscher* [Surzhyk and the Pursuit for the Spiritual Rebirth of the Ukrainian Language: From the Perspective of Western Researchers]. Naukovi zapysky. Series: Filolohichni nauky, 137. Kirovohrad: Publisher Lysenko, V. 336–343 pp.

5. Bilous, O., Piankovska, I. (2019). *Natsionalni varianty nimetskoi movy (u linhvoheohrafichnomu, sotsiolinhvistychnomu, linhvistychnomu ta linhvokulturnomu aspektakh): Navch. posib.* [National Variants of the German Language (in Linguistic and Geographic, Sociolinguistic, Linguistic, and Linguistic and Cultural Aspects): A Textbook]. Kyiv: Tsentr uchbovoii literatury. 314 p.

6. Cherednychenko, O. (2017). *Pereklad – Kultura – Identychnist* [Translation—Culture—Identity]. Kyiv: Publisher Zaslavskyi, O. 224 p.

7. Chernovatyi, L. (2013). *Metodyka vykladannia perekladu yak spetsialnosti: pidruchnyk dlia stud. vyshchykh zaklad. osvity za spetsialnistiu "Pereklad"* [Methods of Teaching Translation as a Specialty: A Textbook for Students of Higher Educational Institutions in the "Translation" Specialty Area]. Vinnytsia: Nova Knyha. 376 p.

8. Chuzhakin, A. (2002). *Mir perevoda. Ustnyy perevod XXI. Seguel: praktika+teoriya. Sinkhron* [The World of Translation. Interpretation XXI. Seguel: Practice+Theory. Synchronous]. Moscow: R. Valent. 232 p.

9. Demetska, V. (2019). Adaptyvna model perekladu v psykholinhvistychnomu vymiri [Adaptive Translation Model in Psycholinguistic Dimension]. *Psykholinhvistyka, 26* (2). Series: Filolohiia. Pereiaslav-Khmelnytskyi: FOP Dombrovska, Ya. pp. 70–90.

10. Frumkina, R. (2008). *Psikholingvistika: uchebn. posobiye dlya stud. vyssh. ucheb. zavedeniy. 4-e izd., ster.* [Psycholinguistics: A

Textbook for Students of Higher Educational Institutions. 4th Edition, Stereotyped]. Moscow: Publishing Center "Akademiya". 320 p.

11. Kobiakova, I., Shvachko, S. (2016). Teaching Translation: Objective and Methods. *Advanced Education, 5.* Kyiv: Kyiv Polytechnic Institute. 9–13 pp.

12. Kyiak, T., Naumenko, A., Ohui, O. (2014). *Perekladoznavstvo (nimetsko-ukraiinskyi napriam): pidruchnyk dlia studentiv vyshch. navch. zakl. 3-e vyd., dop. i pererob.* [Translation Studies (German-Ukrainian): A Textbook for University Students. 3rd Edition, Supplemented and Modified]. Chernivtsi: Publishing House "Bukrek". 640 p.

13. Leontiev, A. (2005). *Psikholingvisticheskiye edinitsy i porozhdeniye rechevogo vyskazyvaniya. Izd.* 3-e, stereotipnoye [Psycholinguistic Units and Speech Utterance Generation. 3rd Edition, Stereotyped]. Moscow: KomKniga. 312 p.

14. Maksimov, S. (2007). *Usnyi dvostoronnii pereklad* (anhliiska ta ukraiinska movy): Navchalnyi posibnyk. Vydannia druhe, vypravlene ta dopovnene [Bilateral Interpreting (English and Ukrainian): A Textbook. Second Edition, Corrected and Supplemented]. Kyiv: Lenvit. 416 p.

15. Nesterenko, N. (2004). *A Course in Interpreting and Translation.* Posibnyk dlia studentiv ta vykladachiv vyshchykh navchalnykh zakladiv [A Course in Interpreting and Translation. A Guide for Students and Teachers of Higher Educational Institutions]. Vinnytsia: Nova Knyha. 240 p.

16. Nikolaieva, S., et. al. (2002). Metodyka vykladannia inozemnykh mov u serednikh navchalnykh zakladakh: Pidruchnyk. Vyd. 2-he, vypr. i pererob. [Methods of Teaching Foreign Languages in Secondary Schools: A Textbook. 2nd Edition, Corrected and Modified]. Kyiv: Lenvit. 328 p.

17. Panova, L., Andriiko, I., Tezikova, S., et al. (2010). *Metodyka navchannia inozemnykh mov u zahalnoosvitnikh navchalnykh zakladakh: pidruchnyk* [Methods of Teaching Foreign Languages in General Educational Institutions: A Textbook]. Kyiv: Publishing Center "Akademiia". 328 p.

18. Pöchhacker, F. (2000). *Dolmetschen. Konzeptuelle Grundlagen und deskriptive Untersuchungen* [Interpreting. Conceptual Basics and Descriptive Studies]. Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag. 336 p.

19. Pöchhacker, F. (2004). *Introducing Interpreting Studies.* London: Routledge. 252 p.

20. Saprykin, S., Chuzhakin, A. (2011). *Svit usnoho perekladu: navchalnyi posibnyk* [The World of Interpreting: A Textbook]. Vinnytsia: Nova Knyha. 224 p.

21. Shvachko, S. (2004). *Problemy synkhronnoho perekladu: Navchalnyi posibnyk* [Simultaneous Interpreting Problems: A Textbook]. Vinnytsia: Foliant. 112 p.

22. Snell-Hornby, M., Hönig, H. G., Kussmaul, P., Schmitt, P. A. (Hrsg.). (2006). *Handbuch Translation. Zweite, verbesserte Auflage* [Translation Manual. Second Improved Edition]. Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag Brigitte Narr GmbH. 434 p.

23. Stanislavskyi, K. (2017). *Rabota aktera nad soboy v tvorcheskom protsesse perezhivaniya* [The Work of an Actor at Improving Himself in the Creative Process of Experiencing]. Moscow: Makhaon. 512 p.

24. Syniehub, S. (2018). *Theorie und Praxis der Übersetzung: Deutsch – Ukrainisch* [Theory and Practice of Interpreting: German–Ukrainian]. Kyiv: Publishing Center of KNLU. 272 p.

25. Vaskivska, H., Palamar, S., Poriadchenko, L. (2019). *Psykholinhvistychni aspekty formuvannia kultury dialohichnoho* spilkuvannia [Psycholinguistic Aspects of Formation of Culture of Dialogical Communication]. Psykholinhvistyka, 26 (2). Series: Filolohiia. Pereiaslav-Khmelnytskyi: FOP Dombrovska, Ya. pp. 11–26.

26. Wirl, J. (1958). *Grundsätze zur Problematik des Dolmetschens und des Übersetzens* [Principles on the Problems of Interpreting and Translation]. Vienna: Stuttgart: Braumüller. 79 p.

27. Zinukova, N. (2018). Navchannia studentiv mahistratury usnoho poslidovnoho perekladu [Teaching Consecutive Interpreting to Graduate Students]. *Danish Scientific Journal, 2* (10). pp. 18–23.

Primary Paper Section: A

Secondary Paper Section: AA, AI