

Speaking without an addressee?

Exploring the participation framework of court interpreting

Philipp Sebastian Angermeyer
York University¹
pangerme@yorku.ca

1. Introduction

"Dialogue interpreting" (Wadensjö 2004; Baraldi & Gavioli 2012)
vs. interpreting for more participants

Cues to participant status (and miscues)

2. Court interpreting practices

"Witness interpretation" (Méndez 1997)

- bidirectional, consecutive interpreting mode

"Proceedings interpretation"

- unidirectional, from official language, chuchotage/simultaneous mode

Inequitable distribution of interpreting modes (Angermeyer 2015)

Professional interpreting norms: insistence on source-centered person deixis (Harris 1990)

- E.g. among others, Australia (Hale 2004), Canada (Bergeron 2002), Hong Kong (Ng 2018), South Africa (Moeketsi 1999), Sweden (Wadensjö 2004), US (Berk-Seligson 1990).
- Words of interpreter enter the record as words of the witness, not subject to hearsay rule (Berk-Seligson 2000)
- Source-centered vs. target-centered (Angermeyer 2015)
- Wadensjö (1998): "relaying by replaying" vs. "relaying by displaying"

Language ideology and translation

- "Referential transparency," translation viewed as "exotic costume for shared meaning" (Haviland 2003: 772)
- Silverstein (2003: 86–87) "Transduction:" "source-text indexical values have to be reconstructed in indexical systems of another culture as these can be made relevant to shaping the target text to be doing effectively equivalent 'functional' work."

¹ I recognize that many Indigenous Nations have longstanding relationships with the territories upon which York University campuses are located that precede the establishment of York University. The area known as Tkaronto has been care taken by the Anishinabek Nation, the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, and the Huron-Wendat. It is now home to many First Nation, Inuit and Métis communities. I acknowledge the current treaty holders, the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation. This territory is subject of the Dish with One Spoon Wampum Belt Covenant, an agreement to peaceably share and care for the Great Lakes region

Variation in person deixis (Angermeyer 2009; 2015)

- Systematic deictic shift for chuchotage in Hong Kong courts (Cheung 2012; Ng 2018)
- Shift from "paternalistic" participation framework (Defrancq & Verliefdde 2017)
- Potential for misunderstanding (Berk-Seligson 1990; Wadensjö 1998; Angermeyer 2005)

3. Interpreting in Small Claims Court

3 courts in New York City, 60 hearings recorded, 200+ observed
15 interpreters (Spanish, Russian, Polish and Haitian Creole)

Small claims court as informal justice (Abel 1982; Conley & O'Barr 1990)

- Merry (1990: 86) "weaker parties' challenges to the hierarchies of authority controlling their lives"

Codeswitching and translanguaging common, but discouraged (Angermeyer 2008; 2010; 2015)

(1)

- | | |
|--------------|---|
| Arbitrator: | <i>{addressing the Spanish-speaking claimant}</i> |
| 1 | Do you have any other proof? |
| S. Interpr.: | <i>{for the Spanish-speaking claimant}</i> |
| 2 | Usted tiene [algun otro comprobante?
<i>{‘Do you have any other proof?’}</i> |
| 3 | R. Interpr.: <i>[for the benefit of the Russian-speaking defendant]</i>
[Est’ li u vas eščë kakie-libo dokazatel’stva?
<i>{‘Do you have any other proof?’}</i> |
| 4 | Defendant: = Da.
<i>{‘Yes’}</i> |
| 5 | R. Interpr.: # Ne u vas!
<i>{‘Not you’}</i> |
| 6 | Defendant: A, u nego.
<i>{‘Ah, him.’}</i> |
| 7 | Claimant: # A mí?
<i>{‘To me?’}</i> |
| 8 | S. Interpr.: Sí.
<i>{‘Yes.’}</i> |

- Bakhtin (1986: 99)(1986: 99) addressivity as constitutive feature of an utterance
- Goffman (1981: 132–133): "the ratified hearer in two-person talk is necessarily also the "addressed" one, that is the one to whom the speaker addresses his visual attention and to whom, incidentally, he expects to turn over the speaking role."
- Goffman (1981: 133) Recognizing who is addressed "is often accomplished exclusively through visual cues, although vocatives are available for managing it through audible ones."
- Codeswitching & addressee selection (Gumperz 1982; Auer 1995; Li Wei 1998; Gardner-Chloros 2009),

- (2)
- 1 Arbitrator: Alright (.) why are you suing Green Realty?
 - 2 Claimant: Uhm-
 - 3 Interpreter: Počemu vy sudite G- Green (.) Realty?
{‘Why do you sue Green Realty?’}
 - 4 Claimant: Ja žila- (.5) speak English or what?
{‘I was living’}
 - 5 Arbitrator: (.) No, speak Rus [sian please.]
 - 6 Interpreter: [Govorite po-] [russki.]
{‘Speak Russian.’}
 - 7 Claimant: [Ah, okay.]

Addressivity in multilingual signage

- Punitive multilingualism , Turkish in Germany (Hinnenkamp 1999)
- Hungarian (for Roma addressees) in Toronto (Angermeyer 2017)



Figure 1: Punitive multilingualism in Bonn, Germany (warning about penalty for fare evasion on public transit)



Figure 2: Monolingual public order sign in Toronto, produced with Google Translate; intended to restrict access to gym space in community center (edited to remove the name of the institution)

Treatment of address forms in court interpreting

(3)

- 1 Arbitrator: {*addressing the defendant*} Do **you** have a lease with this lady?
 2 Defendant: (.) I have uh-
 Interpreter: {*for the benefit of the Polish-speaking claimant*}
 3 =Czy **ma Pani** umowę z tą panią?
 {‘Do you, Ma’am, have a contract with this lady?’}
 4 Claimant: No ja to nie [mam umowy-]
 {‘But I don’t have a contract.’}
 5 Interpreter: [Nie nie] nie, Pani. Ja tylko tłumaczę co pani pyta.
 {‘No no no, Ma’am. I’m only translating what the lady is asking’}

(4)

- Arbitrator: {*addressing the defendant; overlap with interpreter not shown*}
 1 [Do **you** have a lease?]
 2 Defendant: No, we had [the ah agreement, we-]
 Interpreter: {*for the benefit of the Polish-speaking claimant*}
 3 [tu **masz** umowę z nią?]
 {‘Here you have a lease with her?’}
 4 Defendant: because [she’s not the] owner in this apartment
 5 Interpreter: [umowę xxx]
 {‘lease xxx’}

Source you: Target address form:	Polish-speaker addressed (consecutive mode)	English-speaker addressed (consecutive or simultaneous mode)
familiar (<i>ty</i> , 2sg verb forms)	0	10
formal/courteous (<i>Pan/Pani</i> , 3sg)	70	5

Table 1 Number of address forms chosen by one Polish/English interpreter in translating *you* when used by an arbitrator to address a litigant (sample of four arbitration hearings)

- (5) Female arbitrator: I have heard this story.
Male interpreter: Ja slyšala uže.
I heard-f already
{‘I’ve heard (it) already’}
- (6) Female arbitrator: Okay, I’m not interested in this.
Male interpreter: Ella no está interesad-a en eso.
she not is interested-f in this
{‘she is not interested in this’}
- (7)
1 Claimant: Uh, he’s travelling from this way, {*pointing at diagram*}
2 Interpreter: Él estaba [viajando hacia aquí.] {*for defendant*}
{‘He was travelling towards here’}
3 Claimant: [and he’s hit **me** right] here.
4 Interpreter: Él **me** dio aquí.
{‘he hit **me** here’}
5 Claimant: (.) **I** travelling [from this way],
6 (Attorney): [(xxx-)]
7 Claimant: (.7) and going to the Jackie [Robinson Parkway]
8 Interpreter: [él venía de la otra] manera
{‘**he** came from the other way’}
9 él dice que Usted iba de aquí, él venía de aquí,
{‘**he** says that you came from here, **he** came from here’}
10 hizo una izquierda, Usted **le** dio por aquí.
{‘made a left, you hit **him** here’}
- (8)
1 Attorney: Is that your car?
2 Witness: (.5) That’s correct.
3 Interpreter: Es el carro de él. {*for the benefit of the defendant*}
{‘It’s his car.’}

(9)

- 1 Defendant: They paid [six eighty seven]
 2 Interpreter: [xxx]
 3 Defendant: and **she** paid two ninety three
 4 Witness: (.) (but when she lived-)
 5 Defendant: But [we rented the apartment to her]
 6 Interpreter: [Šest'sot sorok sem' platila
 {'647 [sic] was paid by'}
 7 Interpreter: [Vos'maja Programma, ostal'noe platili vy]
 {'Section 8, **you** paid the rest'}
 8 Defendant: [the lease is in her name, not the section eight]

4. Conclusion

Language choice and pronominal deixis as cues for addressivity

Recipients may assume to be addressed, unless they have evidence to the contrary:

- Incongruous marking of gender or politeness
- Use of quotatives, explicit marking of participation framework

Court interpreting:

- Speaking without an addressee requires management by interpreter
- Deictic shift from professional norms to target-centered approach avoids inherent problems

Acknowledgment

Research in small claims court was supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant BCS-0317838.

References

- Abel, Richard L. 1982. *The politics of informal justice*. New York: Academic Press.
- Angermeyer, Philipp Sebastian. 2005. Who is “you”? Polite forms of address and ambiguous participant roles in court interpreting. *Target: International Journal of Translation Studies* 17(2). 203–226.
- Angermeyer, Philipp Sebastian. 2008. Creating monolingualism in the multilingual courtroom. *Sociolinguistic Studies* 2(3). 385–403.
- Angermeyer, Philipp Sebastian. 2009. Translation style and participant roles in court interpreting. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 13(1). 3–28.
- Angermeyer, Philipp Sebastian. 2010. Interpreter-mediated interaction as bilingual speech: Bridging macro- and microsociolinguistics in codeswitching research. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 14(4). 466–489.

- Angermeyer, Philipp Sebastian. 2015. *Speak English or What?: Codeswitching and Interpreter Use in New York City Courts* (Oxford Studies in Language and Law). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Angermeyer, Philipp Sebastian. 2017. Controlling Roma refugees with “Google-Hungarian:” Indexing deviance, contempt, and belonging in Toronto’s linguistic landscape. *Language in Society* 46(2). 159–183.
- Auer, Peter. 1995. The pragmatics of code-switching: A sequential approach. In Lesley Milroy & Pieter Muysken (eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*, 115–135. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail M. 1986. The Problem of Speech Genres. In Caryl Emerson & Michael Holquist (eds.), *Speech genres and other late essays. M.M. Bakhtin*, 60–102. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Baraldi, Claudio & Laura Gavioli (eds.). 2012. *Coordinating participation in dialogue interpreting*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bergeron, Gilles. 2002. L’interprétation en milieu judiciaire. *Meta* 47. 225–232.
- Berk-Seligson, Susan. 1990. *The Bilingual Courtroom: Court Interpreters in the Judicial Process*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Berk-Seligson, Susan. 2000. Interpreting for the police: Issues in pre-trial phases of the judicial process. *Forensic Linguistics* 7(2). 212–237.
- Cheung, Andrew K. F. 2012. The use of reported speech by court interpreters in Hong Kong. *Interpreting: International Journal of Research & Practice in Interpreting* 14(1). 73–91.
- Conley, John M. & William M. O’Barr. 1990. *Rules versus relationships: The ethnography of legal discourse*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Defrancq, Bart & Sofie Verliefdede. 2017. Interpreter-mediated “paternalistic” interaction in a judge-centered courtroom. *Interpreting* 19(2). 209–231.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.19.2.03def>.
- Gardner-Chloros, Penelope. 2009. *Code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of talk*. Oxford/Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Gumperz, John J. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hale, Sandra. 2004. *The Discourse of Court Interpreting: Discourse Practices of the Law, the Witness and the Interpreter*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Harris, Brian. 1990. Norms in interpretation. *Target* 2. 115–119.
- Haviland, John B. 2003. Ideologies of language: Reflections on language and U.S. law. *American Anthropologist* 105. 764–774.
- Hinnenkamp, Volker. 1999. Rassismus und Diskriminierung in Alltagsdiskursen. Augsburg.
https://www2005.hs-fulda.de/fileadmin/Fachbereich_SK/Professoren/Hinnenkamp/Hinnenkamp_Sprache_und_Diskriminierung_in_Alltagsdiskursen.pdf.
- Li Wei. 1998. The “why” and “how” questions in the analysis of conversational code-switching. In Peter Auer (ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: language, interaction and identity*, 156–76. London/New York: Routledge.
- Méndez, Miguel A. 1997. Lawyers, linguists, story-tellers, and limited English speaking witnesses. *New Mexico Law Review* 27. 77–99.
- Merry, Sally Engle. 1990. *Getting Justice and Getting Even: Legal Consciousness among Working-Class Americans*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Moeketsi, Rosemary. 1999. *Discourse in a multilingual and multicultural courtroom: a court interpreter's guide*. Hatfield, Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.
- Ng, Eva N.S. 2018. *Common Law in an uncommon courtroom: Judicial interpreting in Hong Kong*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Silverstein, Michael. 2003. Translation, transduction, transformation: Skating “glossando” on thin semiotic ice. In Paula G. Rubel & Abraham Rosman (eds.), *Translating cultures: Perspectives on translation and anthropology*, 75–105. Oxford & New York: Berg.
- Wadensjö, Cecilia. 1998. *Interpreting as Interaction*. London/New York: Longman.
- Wadensjö, Cecilia. 2004. Dialogue interpreting: A monologising practice in a dialogically organised world. *Target* 16(1). 105–124.