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1. Features of Liaison Interpreting
Liaison interpreting, which is different from conference interpreting, refers to the genre of interpreting which takes place in public service sectors (e.g., communities, hospitals, schools, courts and police stations), scenic spots, companies, government departments, media organs, sports or entertaining venues, etc. and is conducted bi-directionally by the interpreter extempore and on-site (occasionally through telephone and TV).

Unlike conference interpreting, liaison interpreting events usually demonstrate relatively low degree of formality and are closer to daily monolingual communicative activities. It may involve more interpersonal factors. All parties involved in the interaction, the interpreter included, are more likely to take an active part in the conversation and everyone is both the speaker and listener. There is more frequent exchange of turns in the conversation. Besides, because of proximity or “zero distance” between people in liaison interpreting settings, it’s easier for the interpreter to interact more directly with both parties through verbal and nonverbal means. It’s more likely for the two primary parties to involve the interpreter in the interactional process. Also, unlike conference interpreting which is strictly constrained by pre-set agenda, liaison interpreting often enables the three parties to have greater freedom in controlling the content, format and process of
communication. In comparison with conference interpreters, liaison interpreters encounter relatively fewer supervisions and restrictions from the two primary parties and have greater flexibility and interference in the communication process and consequently may have greater impact on the direction and outcome of the interaction.

Before the 1990s, research on liaison interpreting had been far less active than that on conference interpreting. The international academic circle of interpreting had been dominated by conference interpreting and mainly focused on the language skills of interpreters and cognitive process of simultaneous interpretation. This situation had changed very much until the 1990s which saw the rapid growth of court interpreting, sign language interpreting medical interpreting and social service interpreting. This trend has inseparable relations with the increase of the number of immigrants, refugees and ethnic minorities in the developed countries and quick development of international economic, trade and cultural exchanges. Researchers began to take notice of liaison interpreting that has been taking place in every corner of the world in daily life and started to pay close attention to the social and cultural context in which interpreting occurs. While conference interpreting studies is still engrossed in the end product of the interpreter, analyzing the quality of renditions, and treating them as evidence of the cognitive process of the interpreter, research on liaison interpreting has begun to give more attention to the non-linguistic dimension of the interpreting practice, such as the visibility/invisibility, neutrality/partisanship, and the cultural mediating function of the interpreter, as well as the power relations in the intercultural interaction.

2. Problematicness of the Interpreter's Invisibility

In Chinese and Western interpreting history, numerous metaphors have been created to describe the invisible image and powerless status of interpreters. In ancient China, the interpreter was called "She Ren" (tongue man), or "parrot"; in the western world, interpreters were accredited as "echo machine", "voice box", "language converter", "mouthpiece", "bilingual ghost", etc., all aiming at ascribing the feature of invisibility and transparency to interpreters. The most representative of these shall be the "conduit" metaphor and "non-person" metaphor.

The conduit metaphor was first proposed by American cognitive linguist Michael Reddy in 1979. He compares ideas and views to objects, words and phrases to containers or conduits, and believes that using words to express oneself is like
putting objects (views) into a conduit (words) that is transmissible. Once the recipient takes the words out of the conduit, he/she then can receive and understand the message of the sender.\(^5\) However, such concepts about “sending”, “taking out” and “receiving” ideas are quite misleading: Can words fully and accurately express our ideas and feelings? If so, why then do we sometimes feel frustrated about things that are “perceivable but not explainable”, or find that there are times when “words fail ideas”? Moreover, can our ideas and feelings be fully and accurately understood by others? If so, then why are we often fearful of being misunderstood or misinterpreted? There exists no completely identical knowledge structure, modes of thinking and ways of expression between two individuals. What one says may not be the same as what another hears and understands. Besides, spoken words can be ambiguous, and the context of an interaction can be complicated. Therefore, the meaning of an utterance can be fluid and manifold.

If the difficulties in information transmission and receiving in a monolingual interaction are by no means small, things can only be more complex in a bilingual situation. It is then self-evident that the conduit metaphor imposed on the interpreter in inter-lingual and intercultural communication that treats the interpreter as a message transmitting “pipe” incapable of influencing the quality and quantity of information is problematic. Wadensjö, Roy and Angelelli all comment on the problematicness of the conduit metaphor, believing that this way of thinking is to view liaison interpreting as an isolated event taking place in the social vacuum, and the liaison interpreter as a passive participant unable to exert substantial impact on the content of the talk, a transparent “ghost”, or a “non-person”.

According to Ervine Goffman, a “non-person” is a discrepant role who is present in an interaction but is often viewed as not fully present, such as the recording stenographer, broadcasting technician, photographer, or secret policeman, etc. who plays a technical role during an important ceremony but is not a scripted one. These non-persons provide important services, have access to information and regions we would not expect of them. Perhaps the most classic type of non-person in our society is the servant. He/She is present in the front region but is often treated as absent.\(^6\) The definition of “non-person” is in many aspects similar to people’s traditional description and expectations of interpreters.

Although interpreters play an indispensable role in intercultural events, they are invariably regarded as “not fully present”; they can have access to the information and domain that people actually do not want them to approach yet have to allow
their access. Therefore, interpreters are usually called "a necessary evil"; they pay services to all the concerned parties, yet people do not expect them to have any substantial influence on the process and outcome of the interaction.

In fact, the notions treating the interpreter as an information transmitting conduit or a non-person are based on the following presumptions: First, each word has only one explanation that comes from the static dictionary instead of the dynamic context; each sentence has only one meaning resulting from the intention and words of the speaker alone rather than the common efforts of all parties involved in the communication; each meaning has only one correct way of translation, that is, absolute faithfulness to the original without any addition, deletion or modification. Second, the interpreter needs to do mechanical code switching only, and shall remain detached from the interaction as if he/she were not present. Third, the liaison interpreting event takes place in a social vacuum where the interpreter does not have his/her own socio-cultural standpoint, ideology, personal preferences, independent analytical, judgmental and decision-making capability, or at least he/she will not bring these factors to the interaction venue, or these factors will not generate any impact on the communicative event.

Not for the first time have we heard people talk about the image of a "perfect" interpreter in their mind: Ideally an interpreter should not make people feel his/her presence. In other words, He/She should appear to be an invisible or transparent person. He/She only needs to provide services and should not "attract public attention". However, in real-life interpreting, particularly in liaison interpreting settings, such "mythical" description of the interpreter is only an unrealistic theoretical construct destined to be deconstructed. As Wadensjö puts it, just as the primary interlocutors' talk conditions the interpreter's, the interpreter's talk also conditions the talk of others. The interpreter not only provides services, but also acts as an important communicator inevitably influencing the communication process and outcome. He/She is an active participant of the discourse process and a power figure with subjectivity. He/She is fully present and clearly visible.

3. The Liaison Interpreter's Visibility

What does visibility specifically refer to in liaison interpreting? The author of this paper defines a visible interpreter as one who goes beyond the role as a language decoder and encoder and acts as an active participant of an intercultural communicative event to mediate the interactional process in order to bridge the
communication gap between the two primary parties and help them achieve their communication goals. A visible interpreter is aware that, because of the bilingual and bicultural resources he/she possesses, he/she is able to influence the content and format of the information transmitted, the method of information transmission and the outcome of information exchange. He/She is a “power figure” simultaneously doing two interrelated things: translating the speeches of primary interlocutors and mediating the progress of communication (See Wadensjö, 1998).

In view of the author of this paper, the liaison interpreter’s visibility is mainly represented in three aspects: First, the interpreter is a gate-keeper of the speaker’s message; second, the interpreter is a co-interlocutor of the interaction; third, the interpreter is a coordinator/mediator of the discourse process. The roles of the interpreter as a gate-keeper, a co-interlocutor and a mediator concurrently are realized through various kinds of verbal and non-verbal means. Verbal means include strategies of deliberate amplification, omission or reorganization of the speaker’s words, sentences or utterances during translation, or even generation of his/her own words. These addition, deletion and adjustment have nothing to do with the grammatical reconstruction of the message which often occurs in language conversion. Nor does it mean that, when translating, certain expression in the target language has more or fewer words than its counterpart in the source language. Instead, it refers to the modifications of the original meaning at semantic and/or pragmatic levels, often as the intentional act of the liaison interpreter. Nonverbal means include body language (eye contact, nod, facial expressions, gestures, body direction, etc.) and para-language (volume, tone of voice, intonation, rate of speaking, sigh, laughter, cough, catch phrases, etc). In the following part, the liaison interpreter’s visibility will be elaborated from three aspects.

3.1 The Liaison Interpreter as a Gate-keeper

The concept of “gate-keeper” was first put forward in 1943 by Kurt Lewin who maintains that there exist in mass communication some gate-keepers whose task is to examine the information received and allow into the transmission channel only that in compliance with the norms of the general public or the values of the gate-keepers. In other words, a piece of information will be granted passage only after the information has passed a number of “check points”. Lewin names such check point “gate”, and the person or institution responsible for the issuance of “pass” “gate-keeper”. The so-called gate-keeper filters the information received, and the act of filtering is gate-keeping. The gate-keeper in communication process
plays a three-fold role: the first information recipient, the information gate-keeper, and the information disseminator. He/She is a powerful figure in the communication process. As a professionalized medium, interpreters provide special services and also exercise certain control over the conversational process and the information to be transmitted. Therefore it is possible for them to gate-keep both the content and format of the speaker’s utterances. In some sense, the interpreter is also a gate-keeper.

According to Dell Hymes, the participants of an interaction should know when and on what occasion one should (or should not) say what to whom in which way. That is to say, the content of the talk, the amount of information talked about and the linguistic form carrying the information should be appropriate to the context and comply with the given cultural norms. However, in a cross-cultural communication setting, when people speaking different languages and ignorant of each other’s cultural norms get-together for certain communication goals, communication barriers might arise due to linguistic and cultural differences. For instance, because of discrepancies in ways of thinking, customs and traditions, and concepts of values, the topics taken for granted in one culture might sound inappropriate in another, or even become taboos. Forms of expression perfectly normal in one culture might be found too direct or too roundabout in another. Besides, complicated individual factors are likely to increase the complexity of the situation. Once the content and/or format of an utterance regarded as inappropriate in the target culture is faithfully translated by the interpreter and received by the addressee, violations of Cooperative Principle and Politeness Principle might occur, thus constituting a face-threatening act and resulting in differing degree of communication barriers.

In interlingual conversations, when the topic or form of representation of the speaker goes against the cultural norms of the target language, the interpreter usually will not adopt faithful translation strategies, since doing so will be face-threatening, embarrass the recipient, cause misunderstanding, or worse still, trigger conflict and lead to communication breakdown. Mason et al. hold that literal translation under such circumstances may result in threat to faces of all three parties: to the addressee, who is being insulted; to the speaker, whose positive face would be under threat, were he/she aware of the impact of his/her words in a different cultural setting; and to the interpreter, who might appear to be assuming responsibility for the words uttered. To avoid such situations, interpreters will usually use tactics they see fit to filter potential “face-threatening” linguistic and
cultural information. For example, the interpreter may tactfully explain to the speaker the inappropriateness of a topic, deliberately obscure clear expressions, weaken or delete the effect of impolite, extreme, or vulgar wording, modulate the tone of voice so as to make it easier for the addressee to accept the speaker’s speech, thus avoiding potential communication risks.

The following conversation segment taken from a real liaison interpreting setting displays how the interpreter gate-keeps the content of the speaker’s utterance. Ralph, a foreign teacher teaching English at a Chinese language training school, was invited to a dinner in his female boss’ family on a weekend. The boss did not understand English, so she asked a Chinese colleague to act as the interpreter. Her husband and their son, a middle school student, were also present. During the dinner, the boss’ husband offered a brain twister for amusement. When he finished describing the story, he asked people to guess what had happened. The people present made several tries but could not get the right answer. At this moment Ralph seemed to have a reply (H - the boss’ husband; I - interpreter; R - Ralph. Please see the Notes for transcription symbols):

H: 你们猜猜究竟发生了什么？
I: Can you guess what had happened?
+++
R: They had sex!
I: （Laugh, addressing Ralph）This might be a bit inappropriate, Ralph, because usually we don’t talk about sex on such occasions. Do you want me to translate that?
R: Oh, I’m sorry. No, please don’t.
I: 他说猜不出来。

Many eastern countries including China are sensitive to topics about sex in public, whereas most people in western countries do not shun such talks. No wonder Ralph had such mental association. The interpreter realized the inappropriateness of the topic in the larger background (Chinese culture) and specific context (the boss being a female and her underage son was also present), and considered it improper to translate literally Ralph’s guess into Chinese. So she chose to explain to Ralph the cultural difference and asked for his opinion whether or not he still wanted his answer to be translated. She also adopted non-verbal means (laugh) to add
politeness to her explanation. Upon knowing Ralph's attitude, the interpreter chose to cover up for Ralph instead of translating what he actually said. The interpreter's gate-keeping effort on speech content helped avoid possible embarrassment.

In the following segment taken from a TV talk show in Greece, the interpreter performed gate-keeping on the forms of expression adopted by the TV anchorman who interviewed the ambassador of an Eastern European country and asked him to describe his feeling about his country's recent accession to NATO after many years of membership in the Warsaw Pact (H - TV host; I - interpreter):

H: So [Name of the country] and NATO after all. After so many years under the communist regime, in NATO's lap, Mr. Ambassador?

I: A very important question, Your Excellency. After so many years being a part of the Warsaw Pact under communist rule, how do you feel about accessing NATO? [12]

The talk show host was very sharp and direct in his talk. Even in front of an ambassador of a foreign country, he was not afraid to use such impolite expression as "in NATO's lap", violating the tact maxim of Politeness Principle. Obviously, the interpreter noticed that the diction of the anchorman could be face-threatening if literally translated and hence needed filtering. The interpreter's modification of the speaker's style of expression is reflected in two aspects: 1. using honorific title ("Your Excellency" for "Mr. Ambassador") and diminutives ("rule for "regime") to increase politeness and “audibility”; second, using neutral terms ("accessing NATO" for "in NATO's lap") to soften the threatening effect of impolite diction. The interpreter's tactics prevented all parties from losing face and also made his visibility clearly felt in the communication process.

We may also notice that the interpreter added the term "Warsaw Pact" which was not mentioned by the talk show host. Although such addition is not filtering or gate-keeping, it aims to facilitate the audience’s better comprehension, hence also a representation of the interpreter's visibility.

In a nutshell, due to the language and cultural gap between the participants of an interaction, as well as their differences in social status, age, gender, educational background and personality, speakers’ violation of cultural norms, cooperation principle and politeness principle are not rare cases. The interpreter often adopts different tactics to gate-keep improper face-threatening expressions so as to enable
the dialogue to proceed more smoothly.

3.2 The Liaison Interpreter as a Co-interlocutor

In liaison interpreting, what the interpreter utters most of the time is the rendition of the speaker’s message. However, if the interpreter regards himself/herself as an active partaker of the communication event, he/she will sometimes join in the conversation and become a co-constructor of the dialogue. In other words, sometimes the interpreter will also “say his/her own words”. When the interpreter starts to express his/her own viewpoints and becomes a co-interlocutor, he/she is acting on his/her own initiative. This is another way for the interpreter to materialize his/her visibility, though the visibility shown through this way may differ in degree. Angelelli believes that the visibility and the degree of visibility of the interpreter can be manifested through the interpreter’s “text ownership”, i.e. producing utterances not originally said by the primary interlocutors for reasons other than translation or asking for clarification. In liaison interpreting, it is not uncommon for interpreters to generate (oral) texts of their own. They sometimes integrate the speaker’s utterance and their own and transfer the combination to the addressee, and sometimes they say words completely of their own. Therefore, they have partial or whole ownership of certain texts (discourse). The quantity and the content of the interpreter-generated texts determine the degree of visibility of the interpreter.

Angelelli holds that there are three types of texts in an interpreted event: 1. messages produced by the two primary parties; 2. a combination of the primary interlocutor-produced messages and interpreter-owned messages; and 3. wholly interpreter-owned messages. The degree of the interpreter’s visibility ranges from low to high along a continuum that stretches from type one to type three. Even in texts completely owned by the interpreter, the degree of visibility may also vary according to the specific content of the talk.

The following dialogue took place in an American hospital: an English speaking doctor (D) was diagnosing for a Spanish-speaking patient (P) of Mexican origin, a female interpreter (I) with medical interpreting certificate was interpreting for them. The doctor asked the patient whether she had had tuberculosis test (Turn 4). After the interpreter translated this question (Turn 5), the patient replied that she had received some tests before but was not sure whether tuberculosis test was among them (Turn 6). The interpreter then took the initiative to explain to her what tuberculosis was like to help her recall whether she had had such experience.
After getting the patient's answer, the interpreter reported it to the doctor and also summarized for him her conversation with the patient (Turn 9):

1 D: Let's see ... no heart disease runs in the family, right?
2 I: No heart disease running in your family, right?
3 P: No.
4 D: Has she ever been checked for the skin test for tuberculosis?
5 I: Have you ever been tested with the skin test for tuberculosis?
6 P: Well, I had some tests done there, but I don't know if they were to check that...
7 I: It is a needle that is inserts (sic), it injects a little a (sic) liquid under the skin and you have to go back in two or three days so that they can see you (sic) if you (sic) have changed your skin.
8 P: No.
9 I: No, she hasn’t had that. I just described for her what it was as she said she’s had different tests but she wasn’t sure if she has had tuberculosis, so I explained to her how PPD works. [15]

In Turn 4, the doctor intended to address the question to the patient, but instead of the usual second person pronoun, he used the third person pronoun. This is an indication that the doctor actually regarded the interpreter as a participant of the conversation. From the interpreter's perspective, she also thought of herself as a co-interlocutor rather than an invisible person. In Turn 7 the interpreter was not translating, but speaking her own words. This means she had complete "ownership" of the text. Meanwhile, the interpreter also had partial ownership of the text in Turn 9. The interpreter adopted this kind of "text ownership" for the purpose of obtaining the answer the doctor wanted in a more efficient way. Just because of the interpreter's subjective initiative, some unnecessary repetition of certain messages had been avoided and the diagnosis could progress more quickly. No doubt the interpreter demonstrated a high degree of visibility.

3.3 The Liaison Interpreter as a Mediator

Erwine Goffman argues that in a monolingual conversation between two persons, the talk may maintain or fall according to their mutual attention. If a third person wishes to join the conversation, and is agreed by both, that person assumes a mediating function between the two. [16] A liaison interpreting event is in nature a
conversational communicative activity, in which the interpreter as the “third party” is granted participation permission by the two primary parties. The discursive characteristics commonly emerging in a monolingual dialogue also exist in an interpreted-dialogue. As the interpreter is usually the only person capable of translating messages in the interactional event, he/she naturally acquires the function of mediating the conversational process. The most common characteristic in a conversation is turn-taking, i.e., participants of the dialogue speak alternately, and all speakers have the possibility to enter or withdraw from the dialogue, keep or give up his/her right to speak.

Due to differences between two linguistic and cultural systems, the turn-taking mechanism in an interpreted conversation is more complex than that in a monolingual dialogue. In an interlingual interaction, all participants have their own communicative goals. They have different understanding of the proper ways of expressing intentions, providing or acquiring information and therefore have different approaches in presenting their own views and perceiving the relations among all parties. They are usually ignorant of the signals of pause, end of turn and offer of turn in another language system. The interpreter, often the only person in the communicative event who has good command of the norms in both cultures and discourse strategies in both languages, is capable of maintaining and mediating the conversational process, making modifications to inappropriate topics and ways of representations, and therefore is an important figure in keeping the conversation going.

Although the two primary parties are encouraged to look at each other directly when speaking and listening and ignore the existence of the interpreter, in real practice, both the speaker and addressee will exchange turns with the interpreter instinctively and naturally and send all sorts of verbal or non-verbal feedback signals oriented to the interpreter. This means that no matter whether they like it or not, admit it or not, they actually treat the interpreter as a co-participant capable of influencing the interaction. As for interpreters themselves, they are also clearly aware of their status as a subject in the communication process. In addition to occasionally gate-keeping certain linguistic or cultural information that may hinder communication progress, and generating their own texts to enable quicker and more efficient communication, a liaison interpreter may also play the role of a mediator and manager of the discourse process. By adopting the discourse strategies of relaying, creating, interrupting, accepting and terminating turns, the interpreter...
works together with the two primary parties to mediate the start, development, and finish of the conversation, helping the two sides realize their communication purposes, making himself/herself the indispensable visible third party in the intercultural communication events.

At a welcoming banquet arranged by the Chinese side for a foreign delegation, the host and guest encountered a relatively long period of silence after initial exchange of greetings. It might be that the host and guest could not find a proper topic for the moment, or that both sides needed sometime to familiarize themselves with the environment. The interpreter (I) noticed that such silence, if allowed to prolong, might embarrass both sides. So she took the initiative to introduce to the guest the names and origins of the dishes being served. This immediately aroused the interest of the guest (G) who then started to ask related questions. Knowing that the host (H) was well informed in such a topic, the interpreter relayed the turn to the host at once to “keep the ball rolling”:

I: Mr. [name of the guest], look at this dish. It’s called Peacock Welcoming the Guests

[and]

G: [Wow!]

I: And this one here is beancurd called Bear’s Paw.

G: Ah! I’m sorry, bear’s paw?

I: (Laugh): Well, the answer is both yes and no. My boss may explain it to you. He’s an expert on this.

(转向主人):老板，客人想知道这道菜为什么叫“熊掌豆腐”，真的有熊掌在里面吗？还有，比方说那道菜为什么叫“孔雀迎宾”，跟孔雀有关系吗？

Many Chinese dishes have vivid and meaningful names. Some names may sound appalling to the foreigners who do not have any related background information, but they will feel their eyesight broadened once such information is offered. After creating a new topic, the interpreter waited for the chance for shift of turns. On the one hand, through the “yes and no” answer, she aroused the interest of the guest; on the other hand, she intentionally expanded the topic a little bit when handing over the turn to the host, allowing him enough space to play. As a result, the host and guest started a new round of talk in a friendly and relaxed atmosphere.
Liaison interpreters should not only be equipped with profound bilingual and bicultural knowledge, but should also have good conversational competence. They should know well the turn-taking mechanism, verbal and non-verbal signals indicating the start, continuation and completion of turns. As mediators of discourse process, they should make sound judgment about who will speak and when, how to properly create, hold, distribute and terminate turns so as to smooth over communication obstacles and facilitate the dialogue to proceed in an efficient fashion. In the whole process, liaison interpreters are neither passive nor invisible, but active participants displaying different degree of subjective initiative and visibility.

4. Conclusion

As an information gate-keeper, co-interlocutor in the conversation, and discourse process mediator in interlingual and intercultural communicative events, the multi-tasked liaison interpreter is inevitably proactive and visible. However, we must acknowledge that gate-keeping information by way of modification, omission, explanation or zero translation of information will affect the quality and quantity of the speaker’s message to a certain extent and such impact is not always positive. Improper handling of the speaker’s message might incur results contrary to the interpreter’s initial good intention. Therefore, the interpreter must have a correct understanding of the social and cultural context in which the interaction takes place, and make accurate judgment on the special cases in which the gate-keeping tactics have to be adopted. When the interpreter takes part in the dialogue as a co-interlocutor, he/she must make right decision on the proper timing to generate his/her own texts and the quantity and content of the texts. The judgment should be based on the good intention of facilitating smooth and effective progress of communication, and not sacrificing the legitimate rights and interests of either side. It should not be for the personal purpose of the interpreter. At the same time, when the interpreter is involved in discourse process as a coordinator, he/she needs to know when and how much to intervene, and should try his/her best to avoid negative impact brought by his/her intervention. He/She must pay utmost attention not to intervene at will or for no reason. Encouraging the interpreter to be aware of his/her role as an active participant of the interaction should by no means lead to the other extreme, that is, willful deletion of the speaker’s useful information or excessive intervention in the discourse process which is equally detrimental to the
smooth progress of communication.

Meanwhile, criticism of the invisibility and stress on the visibility of the interpreter in liaison interpreting does not mean to undervalue the two primary parties, much less to mean that the interpreter can ignore the duty and obligation to convey the effective message of the speaker. Rather, it aims at unveiling the once shaded image of the interpreter so as to check and balance the previously over-stressed authority of the speaker and restore the true image of the interpreter as a power figure and co-participant of the interaction. Only when the interpreter realizes that he/she is a “legitimate” participant of the discoursal event with subjectivity and entitled to interact with other subjects, can he/she take the initiative to exercise the function of negotiation and mediation, tactfully handle different kinds of linguistic and cultural barriers, consequently playing his/her due role in the entire process of communication between the primary parties, or in a wider sense, between different cultures.
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