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ABSTRACT

The objective of this study is to analyze and describe the various techniques followed by three different skilled interpreters of the inaugural speech delivered on Friday, January 20, 2017 by former U.S. President Donald Trump on the West Front of the United States Capitol Building in Washington, D.C. Three separate interpretations by Arab interpreters working for three existing Arabic TV stations, Al-Jazeera, RT Arabia, and France 24 Arabic, were analyzed using culture-bound elements in the speech. It is indicated by analyzing the interpreting techniques used that interpreters’ wisdom performing better in their mother tongues cannot be maintained. The study also reveals that transcoding was the most commonly used technique.

1. Introduction

With globalization, the importance of knowledge sharing between people from various sources increases. In the case of the European Union or the United Nations, the universal language of communication is mostly Arabic, Chinese, English, Russian, French and Spanish, although not all people can communicate fluently in these languages. Therefore, sometimes simultaneous or consecutive interpretations are required to overcome this language barrier. Globalization is entering a world where people of diverse cultural backgrounds are increasingly dependent on each other (Chen, 2010). (Chen, 2010). It has become more and more frequent for intercultural contact. The great need of society is a person who has a strong command of knowledge and can interact with people from different countries. Therefore, more attention has been given to cultivating the intercultural knowledge of interpreters since intercultural awareness is the cognitive component of intercultural communication competence that refers to the perception of cultural norms that influence how we think and act (Chen, 2010). Estimates range from 4000 to 6000 for the number of current languages today.

The current research examines the possible effect of cultural influences on the understanding of intercultural interactions. Of course, all interactions involving interpreters are necessarily intercultural interactions, but without interpreters’ participation, many intercultural interactions can (and quite often do) take place. In the context of political speeches, it aims to evaluate the most common interpretation techniques used by interpreters when dealing with cultural difficulties. The meaning of understanding political debate is brought to light by this work. It also focuses on the importance of gaining cultural awareness to fully understand, as in the West and the Arab and Muslim world, among people of different languages and cultures.

2. Studies on interpretation

Interpretation is a general concept, not just in literary studies. It is used by artists and attorneys, performers and priests, translators, psychoanalysts, computer scientists and diagnoses, and some time ago, when private aircraft were introduced on the market, there were publications on how to view clouds. Of course, it is not uncommon for a word to be borrowed from a number of occupations and then used with a slightly changed sense, or metaphorically, or even in an unrelated way. Interpretation is
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noteworthy, I believe that the essence of its meaning has remained unchanged everywhere the word has been adopted. Interpretation is a human endeavor that goes well beyond the limits of literature. Interpretation takes in any human activity, such as behavior, language, traditions, scientific theories and archaeological remains, and considers them to be the focus of interpretation. Therefore, the theory of literary interpretation should be based on the general theory of interpretation. Interpretation is regarded as an oral means of interpreting messages between speakers of different languages and is one of the oldest human practices, although its professional status has only recently been recognized.

We speak of “interpretation” in a number of different but not unrelated contexts. Interpreting is, in principle, making clear the meaning of something we do not understand. In this first sense we may speak of the interpretation of dreams, of a problem, of a difficult book. An interpreter is also a translator, a person who turns into one language the meanings he understands in another language. But we also speak of an actor as an interpreter and musicians as interpreters. With these uses the wider sense of interpretation becomes clearer. The interpreter is the one who makes clear, or the one who makes something available (Sanskrit phath- ‘to spread around’) — the one who acts as a mediator between an original semiotic activity and a receiver. We might as well have started with etymology; the interpreter is in between, inter, and gives a new shape to a semiotic complex which would otherwise be incomplete or problematic in some way. Some activities, like music or theatre, give the interpreter a role comparable to that of the author; while a novel does not need anybody but its author and its reader, a symphony or a play cannot be appreciated by most receivers unless we have a whole army of interpreters to give it a concrete embodiment. Every new production of the play and every concert are a completion of the original work: not necessarily a “version” or an “adaptation” (which, in turn, are also a further modality of interpretation, a “reading”). The structural need of an interpreter is an important criterion to classify artistic activities — and interpreters, since they are notoriously prone to appearing as well in those places where their presence is not required.

In everyday speech, translation and interpretation are used interchangeably, but they differ greatly in context. These two words apply to the transition and exchange of meaning between two or more languages. Translation refers to the conversion of meaning from text to text with time and access to tools such as glossaries, dictionaries, etc. On the other hand, interpretation is an academic practice that consists of facilitating oral or sign language contact between two or three or more speakers. Translators are given comprehensive practice with representative texts in different subject areas. They learn how to compile and maintain glossaries of specific terms and how to master the use of both current document-related software (e.g. word processors, desktop publishing systems, graphics or presentation software) and computer-assisted translation software tools. On the other hand, interpreters are specialized in precise listening skills under taxing circumstances, memory and note-taking strategies for consecutive interpretation, and split-attention for simultaneous interpretation.

3. Simultaneous Interpretation

While one of the most recently developed systems, simultaneous interpretation has become a method of interpretation that most people would readily identify as a professional practice. Simultaneous interpreters are as you can tell from looking at the words — someone who interprets someone in another language while the speaker talks without interruption. This is the opposite of sequential interpretation since a consecutive interpreter waits for his turn and does not stop speaking until the speaker gives him time to do so. Simultaneous interpretation is one of the most common forms of interpretation, but it is also the most complicated. Very few translators (who are used to having time to really think about their translations) can do it, and not all interpreters can do it well. Simultaneous mode is used if witnesses, most commonly defendants, play a passive role in court cases, such as indictments, hearings or trials.

International conferences offer the most frequent environment for this form of interpretation: people from various countries meet to discuss the latest developments in particular fields, mostly highly technical and group-specific. It is a very complicated method to translate at the same time, one that only a few interpreters can do well. The speaker is speaking, and the speaker does not stop or pause. He’s still talking. Therefore, when the speaker is speaking, the translator must do the following: listen to what the speaker says; translate it in his mind; make the translation in his microphone; and (and this is the most complicated part) at the same time listen to what is said while he talks himself. As Angelelli (2000) points out in such situations, members of the public have similar professional and educational experiences, share interest and expertise in a specific topic and belong to the same speech culture. In this case, the interpreter has almost no contact with either the audience or the speakers, mainly due to the physical barrier represented by the booth in which he/she works. Pöchhacker (1992) argues that the extent and viability of cultural mediation in simultaneous perception is often extremely limited. It is also important to remember that the time lapse between the original expression and the translation is too short to enable any significant reframing or cultural mediation on the part of the interpreter. Gile (2001) stresses the ‘period time constraint’ to which simultaneous interpretation is subject.
4. Context and culture in simultaneous interpretation

Oral translation, in particular simultaneous interpretation (SI), takes place in living situations in which the interpreter shares with participants the majority of the manifest cognitive environment and is thus better able to plan and control the contexts in which his addresses process their words. Because the state of simultaneity strongly limits the choice of stimuli by the simultaneous translator, it relies heavily on this access to the immediate context and the inferential abilities of its audience. Text translators need time to project meaning and select their stimuli, while in SI, access to live contexts compensates for time constraints. The special issue of a leading pragmatic journal devoted to context in translation must reflect the expectation among some linguists, at least, that this specific form of language use will shed light on the role of context in linguistic communication in general. In comparison to studies in interpreting research that examine interpreting as text processing, this study takes a more sociological and organizational approach to how interpreting is done and in what (social) context it is done and tries to analyze simultaneous interpreting in context.

Transmission of messages has a chance to succeed in translating and interpreting, as well as in communication in general, if the recipient shares the cultural and social experience. If not, the wording is irrelevant to the receivers – it is not the same as any fact they witnessed (Reeves 1994:42). Assuming that certain basic concepts of human communication rely on imports, and that their performance is ostensive inferential, tend to depend on two fundamental factors; the choice of stimuli (their skills) by communicators and the selection of contexts (and the constraints on these contexts) (alternating, overlapping, deferred, and by whom it is determined). The dialogue and monologue, reading and writing, translation and interpretation give each of these parameters major differences in their context.

There are two kinds of contexts in Cicourel's model, namely—narrow and—broad. Knowledge on both levels is required in the study of the use of language as an interaction. It points out that the wider context – including the institutionalized structure of the activities of the candidate, while the narrow context refers to the locally coordinated and negotiated engagement of the candidate. He points out the significance of ethnographic fieldwork, the study of spoken interaction, and that they complement the analysis of meaning. The sense of any received or generated speech for the speaker-hearer is rooted in a broader context that is enabled and deepened by the ambiguity of the setting and the reflexive availability of short-term and long-term stores that are themselves affected by normative linguistic and non-linguistic social practices (Cicourel 1974:127). Since contexts are not given but are chosen by readers and learners, neither translators nor interpreters can foresee in what contexts their outputs will be processed; but they must do their utmost to recreate and anticipate these potential contexts, but also to establish their stimulus in such a way as to leverage the concept of relevance and direct their listeners/readers as precisely and economically as possible.

5. Data analysis
5.1 Data collection

The data obtained in this analysis was the opening speech delivered by the US president on the West Front of the United States Capitol Building in Washington, D.C., on Friday 20 January 2017.2.2

5.2 Methodology

The analysis is based on three interpretations transcribed by Arab interpreters on three existing TV stations — Al-Jazeera, RT Arabia and France 24 Arabic. The three interpretations were transcribed and evaluated so that techniques for the three interpreters were established. The emphasis is on how the three interpreters treat the segments selected for this study. The strategies of the interpreters are established and the focus is on discovering the most common interpretation strategies.

Table 1: The three renditions of the source text data

| No | Original text | 1st interpreter (24 France channel) | 2nd interpreter (RT channel) | 3rd interpreter (Al-Jazeera channel) |
|----|---------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1  | Chief Justice Roberts, President Carter, President Clinton, President Bush, President Obama, fellow Americans, and people of the world, thank you. | رئيس المحكمة العليا روبرتس الرئيس كرتر الرئيس كلينتن السيد بوش الرئيس أوباما أهيا الأمريكيون أهيا مواطني الأعزاء وكل سكان العالم .. شكرا لكم | وزير العدل الرئيس كرتر الرئيس كلينتن السيد بوش الرئيس أوباما أهيا الأمريكيون أهيا مواطني العالم .. شكرا لكم | روبرتس قاضي القضاة رئيس المحكمة السيد كلينتن السيد بوش السيد أوباما السيد كرتر الأمريكيون والمواطنون العالم .. أشكركم جميعاً |
We the citizens of America are now joined in a great national effort to rebuild our country and restore its promise for all of our people.

Their victories have not been your victories. Their triumphs have not been your triumphs, and while they celebrated in our nation’s capital, there was little to celebrate for struggling families all across our land.

Differences Among English – Arabic Simultaneous Interpreters in Interpreting Trump’s Inaugural Speech in Washington
and right now, we will be young and beautiful students

young and beautiful students cash, but which leaves our education system flush with an education system flush with

across the landscape of our nation, scattered in poverty in our inner cities, rusted out factories, scattered like tombstones across the across the landscape of our nation,

nation, across the landscape of our nation, scattered in poverty in our inner cities, rusted out factories, scattered like tombstones across the across the landscape of our nation,

11

What truly matters is not which party controls our government, but whether our government is controlled by the people.

January 20th, 2017 will be remembered as the day the people became the rulers of this nation again.

The forgotten men and women of our country, will be forgotten no longer. Everyone is listening to you now. You came by the tens of millions to become part of a historic movement, the likes of which the world has never seen before.

At the center of this movement is a crucial conviction that a nation exists to serve its citizens. Americans want great schools for their children, safe neighborhoods for their families, and good jobs for themselves.

These are just and reasonable demands of righteous people and a righteous public, but for too many of our citizens a different reality exists.

9

That all changes, starting right here and right now, because this moment is your moment --- it belongs to you. It belongs to everyone gathered here today, and everyone watching, all across America. This is your day. This is your celebration, and this, the United States of America, is your country.

an education system flush with cash, but which leaves our young and beautiful students

an education system flush with cash, but which leaves our young and beautiful students

this nation exists to serve its citizens. Americans want great schools for their children, safe neighborhoods for their families, and good jobs for themselves.

these just and reasonable demands of righteous people and a righteous public, but for too many of our citizens a different reality exists.

12

At the center of this movement is a crucial conviction that a nation exists to serve its citizens. Americans want great schools for their children, safe neighborhoods for their families, and good jobs for themselves.

These are just and reasonable demands of righteous people and a righteous public, but for too many of our citizens a different reality exists.

13

These are just and reasonable demands of righteous people and a righteous public, but for too many of our citizens a different reality exists.

This is not aJarivay 413: 239-256
| 16 | We are one nation and their pain is our pain. Their dreams are our dreams and their success will be our success. We share one heart, one home, and one glorious destiny.

| 17 | The oath of office, I take today, is an oath of allegiance to all Americans. For many decades, we've enriched foreign industry at the expense of American industry, subsidized the armies of other countries.

| 18 | While allowing for the very sad depletion of our military. We've defended other nation’s borders while refusing to defend our own.

| 19 | And spent trillions and trillions of dollars overseas, while America's infrastructure has fallen into disrepair and decay. We've made other countries rich while the wealth, strength and confidence of our country has dissipated over the horizon.

| 20 | One by one, the factories shuddered and left our shores, with not even a thought about the millions and millions of American workers that were left behind. The wealth of our

---

Deprived of all knowledge, and the crime, and the gangs, and the drugs that have stolen too many lives and robbed our country of so much unrealized potential. This American carnage stops right here and stops right now.

---

The oath of office, I take today, is an oath of allegiance to all Americans. For many decades, we've enriched foreign industry at the expense of American industry, subsidized the armies of other countries.

---

While allowing for the very sad depletion of our military. We've defended other nation’s borders while refusing to defend our own.

---

And spent trillions and trillions of dollars overseas, while America's infrastructure has fallen into disrepair and decay. We've made other countries rich while the wealth, strength and confidence of our country has dissipated over the horizon.
middle class has been ripped from their homes and then redistributed all across the world.

Here we are going to point out the different strategies adopted by the three Interpreters while interpreting the speech of Trump. We are going to focus on the main strategies that can be clearly noticed in the texts.

(1). It can be obviously seen that Int1, Int2 and Int3 have adopted an emergency strategy which is transcoding in interpreting the names of the honor guests who have attended the inaugural speech delivered by Trump as

"رئيس المحكمة الرئيس كرتر السيد بوش السيد أوباما ووزير العدل الرئيس كرترالرئيس كلينتن الرئيس بوش الرئيس أوباما" and

"قاضي القضاة رئيس المحكمة السيد كلينتن السيد بوش السيد أوباما السيد كارتر".

Int2 has adopted another emergency strategy which is omission in which he has omitted the name of the chief justice "Roberts" which is mentioned by the other two Interpreters of the study.

Moreover, Int3 has adopted a cultural equivalent strategy while interpreting the word "president" as "السيد" which means "Mr." in English. This adaptation of the strategy is due to the cultural differences among the Interpreters and the SLT.

Int3 adopted a cultural reformulation strategy which is changing the order of phrases or elements when he interpreted the names of the guests; he made a change in the elements order as "روبرتس قاضي القضاة رئيس المحكمة السيد كلينتن السيد بوش السيد أوباما السيد كارتر". Carter should be mentioned after Roberts but he mentioned him at the end.

Another cultural equivalent strategy is used when the three Interpreters have interpreted the word "chief justice" by giving its equivalent in their own cultures in three ways as "رئيس المحكمة العليا" "وزير العدل" "قاضي القضاة رئيس المحكمة".

Int3 has adopted an expansion strategy in which the Interpreter has used an addition strategy when added the word "مواطنون" which means "inhabitant" though it is not mentioned in the SLT. This word is added by the Interpreter in order to maintain coherence.

(2). From the first beginning of this part of the speech we can notice that it has been interpreted literally by the three Interpreters especially Int2 who has adopted a purely literal interpretation method without conducting any additions or deletions. A transcoding strategy is used in this part.

Int1 has adopted an approximation strategy in which he used the word "سنقوم" which is considered as an equivalent of the word "joined", though it is not literally closer in meaning to the word "joined" but semantically it is correct and it is a clever use of the word by the Interpreter because the word "joined in" carries a functional meaning which can be understood as (we are joined in this effort to do something / to fulfill our promises to the people).

Again Int1 has used approximation strategy by using the word "الاستجابة" as an equivalent to the word "restore " which its original literal equivalent is "يجدد" which means "renew ".

Int1 adopted another expansion strategy which is ‘repetition’ in which he repeated the synonym of the word "احلام" which is "طموحات" which means "ambitions".

Int3 adopted an expansion strategy which is “Addition” to maintain coherence by adding the word "جهودنا " which has no original equivalent in the SLT, it is considered as a simplification strategy in which the SL word is reformulated and simplified by another words.

Also, a reformulation strategy is used by Int3 in the same part of the speech which is simplification of the difficult terms by giving some more explanation to the SL word "promises" and using the clause"ولم نعد ترو荷هم وأعدنا إعادة توزيع هذه الثروة لجميع أرجاء العالم" as an equivalent to it. The Interpreter aims at determining which promises that we should restore.
Int3 tries to replace the SL word “restore” with the word “نسترد” which is a semantic equivalent to the word “restore” so, a cultural equivalent strategy is used too in this part.

A cultural equivalent strategy is used by Int1, Int2 and Int3 in interpreting the word “people”. It has been interpreted as “شعينا”, “مواطنينا” and “ابناء بلدنا”.

(3). In this part of the speech we can find some new interpretation strategies. Int1, Int2 and Int3 adopted a transcoding strategy in interpreting this part when Int2 used a purely literal interpretation method in which a transcoding strategy is typically applied.

Int1 has adopted an expansion strategy which is “Repetition” in which the SL word has been repeated twice in the interpretation though it is mentioned only once in the SLT.

Another strategy is used by Int1 which is “least commitment strategy” in interpreting the two sentences “We will face challenges. We will confront hardships”. These two sentences have been interpreted as a single sentence by the use of least commitment strategy which combined them to a single sentence. So, the two sentences became one sentence which is “سنواجه تحديات ونحن” which means “we will face challenges and hardships” instead of “We will face challenges. We will confront hardships”.

Int1, Int2 and Int3 have adopted a cultural equivalent strategy in two cases which are as follow:

The first case is in interpreting the SL word “hardships”. It has been interpreted in three ways as “محن”, “مصاعب” and “ضراء”.

The second case is in interpreting the SL word “course”. It has been interpreted in three ways as “قدر”, “مسار” and “مسار”.

(4). The first clause of this part of the speech has been interpreted literally in the three renditions. In other words, a transcoding strategy is used by Int1, Int2 and Int3 while interpreting this part with a slight difference among them.

Int1 adopted an omission strategy when he mentioned no equivalent for the prepositional phrase “on these steps”.

The three Interpreters have interpreted the SL word “First lady” in different ways as “السيدة الأولى”, “حرمه” and “السيدة الأولى”. It means that a cultural equivalent strategy has been adopted through the three renditions.

Int1, Int2 and Int3 adopted an expansion strategy in interpreting the SL word “throughout this transition” in which some elements have been added to the original text and they are like this “في هذا الانتقال السلمي للسلطة”, “في هذا انتقال السلطة السلمي” and “التسليم السلمي”. The words “السلمي” and “السلطة” have been added to the three rendition though they are absent in the SL sentence.

The expression “we are grateful” has been interpreted in three ways as “نعرب عن عرفاننا”, “شاكرون” and “ممتنون”. The three Interpreters have adopted a cultural equivalent strategy in interpreting this expression.

It seems that Int3 is more interested to use a transcoding strategy in which he has interpreted this part in a purely literal way using a transcoding strategy to fulfill his aim.

5). Int1 adopted a transcoding strategy in interpreting the whole part of the speech.

He also adopted an expansion strategy in interpreting the word “the people” by using “نعيد السلطة الى الشعب” which contains more details about the subject. In this case we may have also a “Repetition” strategy in which the Interpreter has repeated the semantic equivalent of the expression “and giving it back”, he used in the first sentence “ونعطيها مرة أخرى” and repeated the same meaning in the second sentence as “نعيد السلطة”.

Int2 adopted a transcoding strategy in interpreting this part as it is commonly seen in the method he used during the interpretation process. He also adopted an addition by adding the word “أمريكية” to the SL word “administration”.

Int2 also adopted an omission strategy by omitting the equivalent of the SL word “meaning” and interpreted it as “هي مميز” which means “it is special” instead of “has very special meaning”.

Int3 adopted a transcoding strategy during his interpreting of the whole part. Int3 as well as Int2 and Int1 seem to have adopted a pure literal interpretation method while interpreting this speech. They have adopted a cultural equivalent strategy in interpreting both words “meaning” and “give back”. The first SL word is interpreted as “معنى” and “وتعويدها” while the second word is interpreted as “وندريها”, “وتعليدها” and “ونعيدها”. They have been interpreted in such way to suit their cultural differences.
6. The most common strategy in interpreting this part is the cultural equivalent strategy which is used in different cases. One of the cases where a cultural equivalent strategy is used is in interpreting the SL phrase "For too long" which is interpreted in three ways as "منذ فترة طويلة" and "لمدة طويلة" and "ولفترة طويلة".

Int1, Int2 and Int3 also adopted a cultural equivalent strategy in interpreting the phrase "a small group" which is interpreted in three ways as "قلة" and "مجموعة صغيرة" and "مئتيا".

Int1 and Int3 adopted a cultural equivalent strategy in interpreting the SL word "rewards" which is interpreted in the two renditions as "ثمار" and "مزايا".

Int1 adopted an addition strategy in interpreting the SL word "government" which is interpreted as "السلطة والحكم".

Int2 has committed a mistake by giving a wrong equivalent for interpreting the phrase "reaped the rewards of government" which is interpreted as "نسميها الحكومة" which means "called a government".

Int3 adopted an expansion strategy which is paraphrasing in which the SL phrase "have borne the cost" is interpreted as "أثقلت كاهلهم التكلفة".

7. Int1 and Int3 adopted a transcoding strategy to interpret the first clause of this part "Washington flourished, but the people did not share in its wealth" which is interpreted as "واشنطن ازدهرت ولكن الناس لم يستفيدوا من هذا الازدهار" and "واشنطن ازدهرت ولكن الشعب لم يستفيد من هذا الازدهار" and "ولكن الناس لم يشاطروا ثروة واشنطن".

Int2 seems to adopt a semantic interpretation method while the other two Interpreters adopted a literal method.

Int1, Int2 and Int3 adopted a cultural equivalent method in interpreting the SL word "flourished" which is interpreted as "ازدهرت" and "تعيش نعيم".

A cultural equivalent strategy is adopted by the three Interpreters in interpreting "the people did not share in its wealth" which is interpreted in three ways as "الشعب لم يستفيد من هذا الازدهار" and "الناس الشعب لا يشاركون في هذه الثروة" and "وashington".

Int3 adopted a repetition strategy when the SL word "Washington" is repeated in the same clause for two times though it is mentioned only once in the original text.

Int1 was unlucky when interpreting the word "establishment". He interpreted the word "establishment" as "النخبة" and "تعيش نعيم".

Int2 adopted a code switching strategy to interpret the SL word "establishment" which is interpreted as "الأستابلشمنت" which is the transliteration of the word in Arabic sounds.

Int3 adopted the strategy repetition when the SL word "protected" is repeated in the same clause for two times though it is mentioned in the original clause for one time as "حمت" and "يحمى". This repetition is made to maintain coherence. It is also considered as an adaptation of an addition strategy in which the word "يحمى" is added to the clause during the interpretation strategy though it is mentioned only one time in the original clause.

Int3 adopted an omission strategy in which the SL phrase "of our country" is omitted from the TL text. It means that this phrase has no equivalent in the TL text given by Int3.

(8). Int1 adopted an admission strategy twice when interpreting the text by adding two words "شعب و الساسة " which are not existed in the source text. He also adopted a reformulation strategy which is changing the order of elements or phrases in interpreting the "عائلات التي تكابد وتضحي في كل بلدان لم تتحصل بأي من هذه الاحتفالات " وليس لها ما تحتفل من أجل الآن". Int2, on the other hand, adopted a transcoding strategy in interpreting this part. It has also been seen that he adopted an omission strategy when he interpreted "families" without "struggling". Int3 adopted a transcoding strategy during his interpreting of the whole part. Int3 as well as Int2 has adopted a pure literal interpretation method while interpreting this speech. A transcoding strategy as well as addition strategy has been used by the interpreter. He added one word "وعرضها" which is not existed in the source text.

(9). Int1 adopted a transcoding strategy in interpreting the whole part text. He also adopted an addition strategy twice by adding three words which are not existed in the source text: "بالفعل" and "ففي التفاؤل ملكا لكم".
Int2 adopted a transcoding strategy in interpreting this part. It has also clearly seen that he adopted an addition strategy when he added the word “أنتم”.

Int3 adopted a transcoding strategy as well. Int3 as well as Int2 has adopted a pure literal interpretation method while interpreting this speech. A transcoding as well as an addition strategy have been used by the interpreter. He added two phrases “ذا يعتبر” which are not existed in the source text.

(10). Int1 adopted a transcoding in interpreting the whole part of the speech. An addition strategy was adopted also when interpreting the text by adding the phrase “هذا هو الأهم” which is not existed in the source text. He also adopted a repetition strategy when interpreting the SL phrase “the day” as “اليوم هو اليوم”.

Int2, on the other hand, adopted a transcoding strategy in interpreting this part of the speech. It has also been seen that he adopted a wrong paraphrasing strategy when he interpreted “but whether our government is controlled by the people” as “حكومتنا يجري التحكم بها”. An addition strategy has also been used by Int2 when he added the word “ستجدوا” and deleted the word “remembered” though it is existed in the source text.

Int3 adopted another two strategies which are paraphrasing as well as repetition strategies in which the phrase “هذا اليوم” has been repeated more than once in this part.

(11). Int1 adopted an addition strategy when interpreting the text by adding the word “كل” which is not existed in the source text. He also adopted a transcoding strategy in interpreting the rest of the text.

Int2, on the other hand, adopted an omission strategy twice: he omitted two words “men” and “millions”. For the rest of the text, he adopted a transcoding strategy and an addition strategy when he added the word “وطننا”.

Int3 started his interpretation by adopting an addition strategy when he added “إن الناس” to the source text. A transcoding as well as addition strategies have been used by the interpreter. He added one word “ويشكلو” which is not existed in the source text.

(12). Int1 adopted more than 3 strategies. He adopted an addition strategy when interpreting the text by adding the word “هي” which is not existed in the source text. He also adopted a repetition strategy in which he repeated “وأن الأمة”. Moreover, he adopted a change order strategy in interpreting “مدارس جيدة وأحياء آمنة لأبنائهم”.

Int2, on the other hand, adopted a general paraphrasing strategy for the whole text while.

Int3 adopted a transcoding strategy during his interpreting of the whole part. He has also adopted an addition strategy by adding one word “وضيّح” which is not existed in the source text. Omission strategy has also been used by him when he omitted the word “great” from the target text.

(13). Int1 adopted an approximation strategy to Interpret the SL word “reasonable” which is interpreted as “شرعية” which has a close but not literal meaning of the word.

Int1 adopted an addition strategy in interpreting the SL word “reasonable” in which the word “عادلة” is added to the equivalent word “شرعية” to add more detailed meaning to the word.

An addition strategy is also adopted by Int1 in which the word “بالنسبة” is added to the clause though it has no equivalent in the SLT.

Int1 adopted an omission strategy in which the word “just” which is found in the original text is omitted and has no equivalent in the TLT.

Int2 adopted an approximation strategy in which the SL word “reasonable” is interpreted as “منطقية” which is one of the closest equivalents in meaning to the word.

Int2 adopted another approximation strategy in interpreting the SL word “righteous” which is one of the closest meanings to the word.

Int2 adopted a general transcoding strategy in interpreting the whole part of the speech.
Int3 adopted a transcoding strategy to interpret this part of the speech without using any additional strategy.

It can be clearly noticed that all of the Interpreters adopted a cultural equivalent strategy in interpreting the word "reasonable" which is interpreted in three ways as "شرعية", "منطقية" and "عقلانية" which are used to suit their cultures.

Another use of cultural equivalent strategy is in the interpretation of the word "righteous" which is interpreted by the three Interpreters as "صالح", "بسيط" and "الفضلاء".

14. Int1 adopted the strategy of changing the order of elements in interpreting the first clause of this part of the speech "Mothers and children ......." which is reordered as "أطفال أمهات .....".

Int1 adopted a simplification strategy in interpreting the SL word "our inner cities" which is simplified by using the equivalent word "الضواحي" which is close in meaning to the word.

Int1 adopted a generalization strategy in interpreting the phrase "across the landscape of our nation" which is replaced by a general term as "بلدنا" that means "our city".

Int2 adopted the strategy of changing the order of elements in interpreting the first clause of this part of the speech "Mothers and children ......" which is reordered as "الأطفال والأمهات .....".

Int2 adopted an omission strategy in which the SL word "inner" is omitted and has no equivalent in the TLT.

Int2 seems to have adopted another omission strategy when the word "rusted out" is omitted from the TLT and has no existence in it.

Int2 adopted the strategy of paraphrasing in which the sentence "scattered like tombstones across the landscape of our nation" is paraphrased as "تتحول إلى قبور على أراضينا".

Int3 adopted an addition strategy in which the word "هنالك" is added to the TLT though it has no existence in the original text.

Int3 adopted a repetition strategy when the word "هنالك" which has no existence in the SLT at all is repeated twice in the beginning of these two sentences as "هنالك معامل تصدأ وأطفال ....." and "هنالك معامل تصدأ واطفال ومتأذين من أمهات وأطفال .....".

Int3 adopted a simplification strategy in which the speech "rusted out factories, scattered like tombstones across the landscape of our nation" is interpreted in a simple expression as "معامل تصدأ وتغلق أبوابها .........".

Int3 adopted an omission strategy in which the SL phrase "across the landscape of our nation" is omitted from the TLT and had no equivalent in it.

It seems that Int1, Int2 and Int3 have adopted a cultural equivalent strategy in interpreting the word "trapped" which is interpreted as "يعيشون", "عالقون" and "عالقون .....".

(15). Int1 adopted a transcoding strategy in interpreting the first clause in this part of the speech "an education system ...........of all knowledge" which is interpreted as "ومنطومتنا التربوية ..... من المعارف".

Int1 adopted an omission strategy in which the two adjectives "young and beautiful" which is existed in the original text were omitted and had no more existence in the TLT.

Int1 adopted an addition strategy in which the word "نفسية" which has no equivalent in the original text, is added to the TLT to give more detailed meaning and to maintain coherence.

Int1 adopted another addition strategy in which the word "ودمرت" is added to the TLT.

Int1 adopted an omission strategy in which the SL word "leaves" is omitted and had no equivalent in the TLT.

Another time Int1 adopted an addition strategy and in which the clause "وانخرت في إمكانياتنا العظيمة" which has no existence at all in the TLT, is added to the SLT.

Int1 adopted an addition strategy when the word "ابنائنا" is added to the TLT though it is not existed in SLT.
Int2 adopted a paraphrasing strategy in interpreting the clause “but which leaves our young and beautiful students deprived of all knowledge” which is interpreted as “ولكن ليس هناك من علم في تلاميذنا”.

Int2 adopted an omission strategy in which the phrase “This American carnage” is omitted from the TLT during the interpretation.

Int2 adopted an addition strategy in which the word “لدينا” is added to the TLT though it has no existence in the SLT.

Int2 adopted an omission strategy in which the adjectives “young and beautiful” were omitted during the interpretation process.

Int2 adopted an addition strategy in which the word “هناك” is added to the TLT though it had no existence in the SLT.

Int3 seems to have adopted an addition strategy when he added the word “الكثير” to the TLT to maintain coherence.

Int3 adopted an omission strategy by omitting the adjectives “young and beautiful” from the TLT though it is found in the SLT.

Int3 adopted an addition when adding the expression “كما صح التعبير” to the TLT while it has no existence in the SLT.

Int3 also adopted an addition strategy by adding the word “اليوم” which is absent in SLT.

Int3 adopted an omission strategy in which the expression “of so much unrealized potential” is not interpreted or mentioned during the interpretation process.

(16). Int1 adopted a transcribing strategy to interpret the whole part of the speech which is “We are one ........... and one glorious destiny” as “نحن أمة واحدة ........... وقدر عظيم واحد”.

Int1 adopted an additional strategy in which the phrase “هؤلاء” is added to the TLT though it has no equivalent in the SLT.

Int2 adopted a transcribing strategy to interpret the whole part of the speech which is “We are one ........... and one glorious destiny” as “إننا أمة واحدة ........... وقدر رائع واحد”.

Int3 adopted a transcribing strategy to interpret the whole part of the speech which is “We are one ........... and one glorious destiny” as “نحن أمة واحدة ........... ومستقبل واحد”.

Int3 adopted an additional strategy in which the phrase “بلدا واحدا” is added to the TLT though it is never existed in the SLT.

(17). Int1 adopted a transcribing strategy which is clearly seen in interpreting the first clause of this part of the speech “The oath of office, I take today...........” which is interpreted as “إن اليمين الذي أديته اليوم”.

Int1 adopted an additional strategy in which the word “اداء” is added to the TLT though it is never existed in the SLT.

Int1 seems to have adopted another addition strategy in which the word “وقسم” is added to the TLT though it is absent in the SLT.

Int1 adopted an omission strategy in which the word “many” which if found in the SLT, is omitted from the TLT though the meaning remains the same.

Int1 adopted an omission strategy in which the word “American” is omitted from the TLT though it is found in the SLT.

Int2 adopted a paraphrasing strategy in which the phrase “subsidized the armies of other countries” is paraphrased by this strategy and interpreted in another way though the meaning remains the same “دعمنا الجيوش الأجنبية”.

Int2 adopted an omission strategy in which the word “اليمين” is not mentioned at all in the TLT though it is found in the original course.

Int2 adopted another omission strategy in which the phrase “at the expense of American industry” is omitted from the TLT.
Int3 adopted an addition strategy in which the word "أقطعه" is added to the TLT though it is absent in original text.

Int3 seems to have adopted a transcoding strategy in which the first clause of this part of the speech "The oath of office, I take today "is interpreted as "إن اليمين الذي أديته اليوم........".

Int3 adopted an approximation strategy in which the word "oath" is given the meaning of "وعد" which is n’t the exact meaning of the word but a very close meaning to it.

Int3 adopted an addition strategy in which the phrase "أقطعه على نفسي وهو وعد" is added to the to the interpreted text while it has no existence in the original text.

Int3 seems to have adopted a paraphrasing strategy in which the clause "we’ve enriched foreign industry" is interpreted by the use of this strategy as "الشركات عززت من مفاصلها" which is another way of expressing the meaning of the clause though the original meaning of the clause remains the same.

Int3 also adopted an addition strategy in which the clause "ورفنا الكثير من الدعم الحكومي" is added to the TLT while it is not existed in the SLT.

18. Int1 Adopted a transcoding strategy in which the first clause of this speech "while allowing for the very sad depletion of our military" has been interpreted literally into the SLT as "وسمحنا بذلك وضع جيشنا".

Int1 adopted an approximation strategy in which the word "other" is given the meaning "الأجنبيه" which is not the exact meaning but the closest meaning to this word.

Int2 seems to have adopted a transcoding strategy in which the first clause of this speech "while allowing for the very sad depletion of our military" has been literally interpreted to the TLT as "وسمحنا بتدهور قواتنا العسكرية".

Int2 has adopted a reformulation strategy which is changing the order of the elements to interpret the phrase "other nations’ borders" which has been interpreted in another order to the TLT as "أمم أخرى وحدودها".

Int3 adopted a repetition strategy in which the phrase "other nations" which is found in the SLT for one time whiles it is interpreted into the TLT for 2 times.

Int3 adopted a transcoding strategy in which the last clause of this part of the speech "while refusing to defend our own" has been literally interpreted into the TLT as "بينما رفضنا أن نحمي حدودنا لنحن".

19. Int1 has adopted a transcoding strategy in interpreting the first clause of this part of the speech which is "while America’s infrastructure has fallen into....." is interpreted literally into the TLT as "بينما صناعة الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية سقطت في الأنهيار والاندثار".

Int1 is adopted an addition strategy in which the TL word "تختفي" is added to the text while it had no existence in the SLT.

Int2 adopted a transcoding strategy in which the first clause of this part of the speech which is "while America’s infrastructure has fallen into....." is interpreted as "فهما البنية التحتية الأمريكية سقطت إلى فوضى".

Int2 adopted a generalization strategy in which the TL word "فوضى" is used instead of the SL phrase which is "disrepair and decay.

Int2 adopted a reformulation strategy which is changing the order of elements to interpret the SL clause which is "while the wealth, strength and confidence" is interpreted into the TLT as "في حين الثروة والثقة والقوة".

Int3 adopted a transcoding strategy in which the whole part of the speech "And spent trillions and trillions of dollars overseas..........." is interpreted literally as "لقد أنفقنا ترليونات وتترليونات الدولارات خارج نطاق أمريكا.......

Int3 adopted a paraphrasing strategy to interpret the SLT clause which is "has fallen to disrepair and decay" is interpreted into the TLT as "أصبحت غير قابلة للتصحيح".

Int3 adopted an approximation strategy to interpret the SLT expression "has dissipated over the horizon" which is interpreted into the TLT as "إدراج الريح" which is not the exact meaning of the word but a close meaning of that word.
It is clearly seen that interpreter Int1, Int2 and Int3 adopted a cultural equivalent strategy to interpret the word “overseas” which is interpreted in 3 ways as “في الخارج” و “بأريحا” and “خارج نطاق” which represents the cultural differences between the three interpreters.

20. Here the interpreter Int1 has adopted a reformulation strategy which is changing the order of the elements to interpret the sentence “One by one, the factories shuddered and left our shores” which is interpreted as “واحدة تلوى الأخرى المصانع أغلقت وأغادرت أرضتنا”.

Int1 adopted an omission strategy in which the SLT word “the wealth” is omitted from the TLT while it existed in the SLT.

Int1 adopted a reformulation strategy in which the last clause of this part of the speech “the wealth of our middle class has been....” is interpreted as “الثروة المتوسطة فقدت منازلها وظائفهم وعانت في كل العالم”. Here the word “wealth” is mentioned in the beginning of the sentence of the SLT while it is mentioned at the end of the sentence of the TLT.

Int2 adopted a transcoding strategy in which this part of the speech “One by one, the factories shuddered and left our shores ........” is interpreted literally to the TLT as “واحدة وراء الآخر المصانع أغلقت وغادرت أرضنا”.

Int2 adopted an addition strategy in which the TL phrase “من دون عمل” is added to the TLT while it is absent in the SLT.

Int3 adopted a reformulation strategy which is changing the order of the elements in which the first clause of this part of the speech which is “one by one, the factories shuddered and left our shores” is interpreted in another order as “المعامل أغلقت أبوابها وأحدا بعدها الآخر”.

Int3 adopted an addition strategy in which the clause “الذين هم حشود فقدوا وظائفهم” is added to the TLT though it had no existence in the SLT.

Int3 also adopted another addition strategy in which the TL clause “لم تعد ثروتهم” is added to the TLT though it had no existence in the SLT.

Int3 adopted a repetition strategy in which the TL word “الثروة” is used twice in the TLT though it is used only once in the SLT.

| Interpreting unit | Interpreter 1 | Interpreter 2 | Interpreter 3 |
|-------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| 1                 | Transcoding/ cultural equivalent/ | Transcoding/omission/ cultural equivalent | Cultural equivalent/ reformulation/addition |
| 2                 | Transcoding/ approximation / approximation/ repetition Transcoding/ cultural equivalent / cultural equivalent | Transcoding/Addition/ Reformulation / cultural equivalent |
| 3                 | Transcoding /repetition /reformulation / cultural equivalent | Transcoding / cultural equivalent / | Transcoding / cultural equivalent |
| 4                 | Transcoding / omission / cultural equivalent / addition / cultural equivalent | Transcoding / cultural equivalent / addition / cultural equivalent | Transcoding / cultural equivalent / addition / cultural equivalent / transcoding |
| 5                 | Transcoding / addition / repetition / cultural equivalent | Transcoding / addition / omission / cultural equivalent | Transcoding / cultural equivalent |
| 6                 | Cultural equivalent / addition | Cultural equivalent | Cultural equivalent / paraphrasing |
| 7                 | Transcoding / cultural equivalent / code switching | Cultural equivalent / addition | Transcoding / cultural equivalent / repetition / omission / repetition |
As table 3 shows, transcoding and addition strategies are the most common strategies.
6. Results and Discussion

Through my analysis of the speech, it is apparent that transcoding and addition strategies are the most dominant strategies adopted while interpreting the speech. It is never easy for language translators and interpreters to accomplish their task, but in the field of politics, the job becomes particularly dicey. After all, various meanings of a turn of phrase are known to lead to war. As an interpreter, no matter how heinous and what an outrageous fraud you perceive the speaker to be, your job is to translate the words of a speaker exactly as they are.

The difficulty is even greater when the interpreter attempts to translate terms and phrases that even native speakers find challenging to understand. Such problems are seen as an obstacle for interpreters and translators in foreign languages who have wrestled with Donald Trump’s comments in his campaign for the US presidency. The vague use of his NSFW (Not suitable/safe for work) language and distorted logic have confused translators around the world.

Translators sometimes claim that they dodge Trump’s crude language entirely, either because they have no alternative or because they need to get around internal censors, and this can be clearly seen when the three interpreters have not understood any of his speech as “Int1 as well as INT2 and INT3 have omitted the two adjectives “young and beautiful” from the TLT because of their unnecessary existence in the original text. They decided to omit these adjectives because they did not get their exact meanings in the context because they are mentioned in the original text as a kind of flirting for the American young students. As translators, they need to not only translate the individual words, but the meaning behind that, to do that well they have to really get inside the head of Trump.

Trump’s incoherence and apparent disregard for context are not the only source of headache for interpreters and this leads our three interpreters to get confused. They adopted the strategies which help them to give more details about the interpreted word or expression such as (addition, simplification, paraphrasing and cultural reformulation). From one side, the adaptation of such strategies may help them in clarifying the intended meaning of these words or phrases but sometimes the real meaning of the word or phrase may be lost because of the unskilful interpreter as it happens when interpreting extract number 10 “but whether our government is controlled by the people” by INT2 who interpreted it as “حكومتنا يجري التحكم بها”. The meaning of the sentence is completely lost and took another meaning.

The three interpreters appeared to have no previous cultural and political knowledge about the different job titles in English language and this is obviously seen from the commencement of their interpretation when the three interpreters have interpreted “chief justice” in three different ways as “ رئيس المحكمة العليا” “وزير العدل” “قاضي القضاة رئيس المحكمة” and these three interpretations are for different positions in the field of law.

Furthermore, when it comes to linguistic competence, all three interpreters showed lack of knowledge in this area. For example, none of the interpreters INT1 and INT2 rendered the term “establishment”. They rendered it as “النخبة” “المؤسسات” “الاستقلالمنت”. Int3 succeeded in interpreting it as “المؤسسات”. However, such lack of knowledge is forgivable compared to the lack of knowledge in other instances when the interpreters fail to interpret the word “radical Islam” which is a common term used nowadays to refer to that group of severe Muslims. They have been interpreted by giving a transliteration of the word only. This lack of knowledge leads interpreters to commit many mistakes and adopt different strategies that may lead to the loss of the intended meaning of the speech. There are other cases in which the interpreters’ shortcomings can be seen clearly as follow:

![Chart 1: The frequency of interpreting strategies](chart.png)
- INT2 has committed a mistake by giving a wrong equivalent for Interpreting the phrase “reaped the rewards of government” which was interpreted as "نسميها الحكومة" which means "it is called a government".

- It has also been noticed that he adopted a wrong paraphrasing strategy when he interpreted “but whether our government is controlled by the people” as "حكومتنا يجري التحكم بها".

- INT3 failed to interpret the phrase “and goodness and love” in which he interpreted as "نفسكم للخير" which is a phrase of another meaning. Also, he misinterpreted the phrase "will forever guide us" as "سوف يشكل مهارات لنا".

There are so many cases in which the interpreters used expansion strategies such as (addition and paraphrasing) and reformulation strategies such as (simplification and cultural reformulation) which are used in interpreting the speech to give more clarifications for those ambiguous and illogically used words and phrases in the speech. Here are some examples of such use:

- INT3 adopted an expansion strategy which is “Addition” to maintain coherence by adding the word “جهودنا” in the second extract of the speech. Adding the word “أمريكية” to the SL word “administration” is also another use of addition strategy.

- INT3 in the sixth extract adopted an expansion strategy which is paraphrasing in which the SL phrase "have borne the cost" is interpreted as "أنفتت كاهلهم التكلفة". Another use of such strategies in that aim at providing the listener with some more details about the interpreted word or meaning is the use of cultural equivalent strategy as in the case in which the Interpreters adopted a cultural equivalent strategy in Interpreting the word "reasonable" which is interpreted in three ways as "شرعية", "منطقية" and "عقلانية" which are used to suit their cultures.

This chapter discussed the interpreters’ techniques in the sense of a real interpreting assignment: the speech delivered by President Donald Trump of the United States on Friday, January 20, 2017 on the West Front of the United States Capitol Building in Washington, D.C. The source text in general was studied and in particular, more attention was paid to culture-bound units. The three separate renditions have been transcribed and analysed. The chapter concentrated on describing the interpreting techniques used by the three interpreters to address cultural difficulties in speech.

7. Conclusion
In the light of these concerns, the key concern of this study is the simultaneous interpretation, that is to say, the translation on the fly without breaks (as opposed to the consecutive interpretation in which the speaker and the translator alternate). Interpreting political leaders in such highly sensitive situations puts high levels of stress on simultaneous interpreters, which can affect their choice of tactics and their overall performance.

One of the core goals of this work is to point out the different strategies adopted in interpreting the inaugural speech delivered by Donald Trump. Trump’s speech is analyzed and it was divided into forty-two extracts which are analyzed individually with paying more attention to those extracts which are believed to have posed cultural difficulties for the three interpreters who carried out the interpretations. In our discussions we have clearly seen that transcoding and addition are the most frequently used strategies in interpreting the speech. Other strategies of interpretation are noticeably used and the frequencies of their use have been determined.

Moreover, the study of the entire speech includes forty-two fragments, which demonstrate that the three interpreters lack the proper awareness of the cultural context. This lack of basic knowledge was noticeable not only in the relation to international culture, but also in areas relevant to the Arab and Muslim culture of the interpreters themselves. Finally, the study found that the three interpreters displayed, to varying degrees, poor overall linguistic efficiency, which was noticeable through the incorrect choice of words, the inclusion of unnecessary words and phrases, the misuse of grammar and the inappropriate rendering of meaning.

Translation and interpretation can be used interchangeably. In this study, I sometimes refer to interpreters rather than translators to illustrate the added difficulty when trying to express the words a respondent says, but the fullness of context that can be lost on those who don’t speak the language and understand the cultural references. This was an effort to draw attention to some of the important principles of interpretation and to illustrate the vital position of interpreters. It also comments on some of the difficulties and contradictions that interpreters face in order to fulfill their mission and at the same time, to comply with the law. However, it should be noted that more future studies need to be carried out in the field in order to question and represent the need for more concrete standards of ethical conduct, expanded education and clearer trends of interpreter behavior.
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