

A THEORY OF PREDICTION IN SIMULTANEOUS INTERPRETING

Kengasheva Iroda

UzSWLU, master's degree student

Introduction: A theory of prediction in simultaneous interpreting Simultaneous interpreting is an ecological context in which prediction during comprehension is highly advantageous, as interpreters must simultaneously plan their own upcoming utterances based on the speech to which they are attending.

David Gerver, who came to the same conclusions about simultaneity listening and speaking, asks a natural question: how in such a case "all this can be obtained"? Answering the question "how" offers a psychological model of the mechanism of simultaneous translation.* Based on the Halle and Stevens model of speech perception,** models of "analysis through synthesis", *** D. Gerver considers in his models of the problem of memory and its types, which are included in the implementation of simultaneous translation, the problem of distribution of attention and points to an important, in his opinion, stage of control behind the TL text generated by the translator. Gerver sees the proof of the existence of this stage in the observed corrections, which the interpreter in normal working conditions (good audibility, the optimal rate of speech, the level of complexity of the text in foreign language available for this translator) sometimes inserts into his speech on PY.

Describing his model, Gerver points out: "By synthesizing messages in the source language ..., the translator can thus generate his own translation. However, the situation is more complicated than with one language. The translator needs not only to know rules of analysis at various levels for each of the languages involved in this process, but also at what levels they correspond to each other. Then the process of translation will be associated with the continuous synthesis and analysis of possible translations

of the source message, the continuous generation, control and verification of the translation in comparison with the original message as it is understood by the translator ... Control and possible revision are an integral part of the process rather than additional activities carried out after the translation.”*

In the psychological description of the mechanism of simultaneous translation, suggested by Gerver, the process looks like this.** Synchronist receives a certain portion of the original message until the short-term "buffer" memory is filled (in this case further portion of the message is rejected). As they arrive into the buffer memory of message parts, their processing begins according to scheme: decoding of a part of the IL message and transition from the Surface to the deep level, *** after which the decoded part messages are sent to intermediate RAM temporary storage; next step is recoding from the deep level to the surface level of the TL and again saving the result in RAM. After that received the result is verified for compliance with the deep level of the PJ deep level of the IA, and either, with satisfactory compliance, the result is allowed to be sent to the output of the system, or again the process of processing this part of the message is repeated. In this case, it is possible to overflow the buffer memory at the input of the system, refusal to receive a further portion of the incoming message and resulting in a gap in the translation. In order to be able to control and verify the result of transcoding with the deep level of the IL, that is, the meaning of the message in the IL, another short-term buffer memory is introduced at the output of the system.

A model that considers the various steps in some detail storage of incoming and partially processed parts of the message, that is, various "pantries" of memory, at the same time not only almost completely ignores the stages of processing speech information during its perception and generation,* but - even speaking of control – and such purely psychological moments that are important for the analysis of simultaneous translation as the levels of awareness of control over individual operations. Therefore, this model should be recognized as very "weak" model, that is, a model that does not

have sufficient explanatory power. Indeed, this purely psychological model ignores many speech mechanisms well known to modern psychology.

For example, the American psychologist T. Bever points out: "If the speech perception mechanism could operate without any time restrictions, then the only device needed for

understanding of sentences, there would be "grammar". One of these "time-independent" mechanisms could be the "analysis by synthesis" perceptual model, in which "grammar" is used to generate synthesizable sentences that are "matched" with what is being input. When such a potential offer is generated that corresponds to the one available on input (according to some criterion), the device assigns a specific generated structure to the input sequence. Given an unlimited amount of time to make false guesses about what the input sequence is, such a device will eventually assign all the grammatical structures that should be assigned to a particular sequence. However, real speakers and listeners do not have unlimited time to make incorrect assumptions about the structure of what they hear. Recognizing this fact, various researchers have proposed to include in the "analysis through synthesis" "preprocessor", which performs a rough estimate of the input sequence in order to narrow down as effectively as possible the range of "guesses" that the grammar makes. Such a pre-processor could (hypothetically) target the grammar to guess sentence structure based on some qualities, such as a certain length.

Recent research leads to the idea that there are three main features of the speech perception process carried out in the device pre-processing:

- 1) primary unit of perception is "offer";
- 2) within each "sentence", direct projection rules are attributed to the main components semantic relations between them;
- 3) after processing each "sentence" it is recoded into a relatively abstract form, thereby freeing up immediate memory for processing next "offer".

Such a preliminary device is not provided at all. Many other psychological theories and data of the psychology of speech. In fact, the whole explanation complex process of the joint venture is reduced to an indication of a multi-channel the nature of the processing of incoming information. But the main thing is not this. The main drawback, the weakness of the model is that the "decoding and transcoding" device itself is also as well as a device for comparing the "meaning" of a segment of the IA with the meaning ("deep structure") of the PU segment and control, remain in essence cases are empty. The author only points out the difficulty of disambiguating phrases like ** flying planes can be dangerous

1) to fly planes..;

2) planes that fly.. without any procedures recoding the incoming message.

Thus, in addition to psychological "incompleteness", weakness .This model is manifested in the complete absence of any linguistic procedures. Exaggerating somewhat, one could say that this model can equally well be attributed to the process "simultaneous translation", say, from the code of a marine manual semaphore (signaling with flags) into Morse code. The lack of content of the model is explained by ignoring the factors related to linguistics, to language, speech, speech activity, to translation as such.

Here we come to a very significant point in defining the subject of research. Since we are dealing with a synchronous translation of a speech message encoded by means language and translated into another language, we cannot help but refer to linguistics and, more precisely, to linguistic theory translation. Over the past decade and a half, several models have been created within the framework of the linguistic theory of translation, ***Let us list again the main features of simultaneous translation, which distinguish it from written translation, which serves as usually the real object of the linguistic theory of translation. These features are as follows

1) Implementation of the transfer after a single presentation section of the original text.

2) The need to translate until the completion of not only the message (text), but often the statement - the sentence.

3) Limitation of the translation process (message recoding) by strict time frames (average lag, that is, several seconds).

4) The simultaneity of the processes of listening and speaking (or the simultaneity of the performance of two communicative acts), which can be regarded as the accomplishment of each of the two communicative acts in the conditions of "noise", "interference".*

List of used literature

T. G. B e v e g. Perceptions, Thought, and Language. In: "LanguComprehension and the Aquisition of Knowledge", ed. by R. O. F r e e d l e and John B. Cargo 1 1. V. H. Winston & Sons, Inc., 1972, p. 104.

** By the way, T. Bever, referring to numerous experiments conducted with his participation between 1968 and 1972, points out in the cited work: "... the time for inventing the completion of a fragment of a sentence-stimulus increases due to ambiguity (my discharge. — G. Ch.) of a fragment only when the fragment is an unfinished "sentence" ... In other words, by the time when the the boundary of the "sentence", the fact that the (given) sequence is ambiguous, irrelevant (my discharge. - G. Ch.), since the decision on one of the two meanings has already been made. (T. G. B e v e g. Op. cit.,R. 106)

*** See: A. D. Schweitzer. Translation and linguistics. M., military publishing house, 1973, Ch. I, and also V.N. Komissarov. A word about translation. M., "International. Rel.", 1973; Ya. I. Retsker. Translation theory and translation⁴² depending on their features, to varying degrees applicable to the study of simultaneous translation; speech first talks about the dichotomy: translation as a process - translation as a result process.*