

Thije, J.D. ten (2009). *The self-retreat of the interpreter. An analysis of teasing and toasting in intercultural discourse*. In K. Bührig, J. House & J.D. ten Thije (Eds.), *Translatory Action and Intercultural Communication* (pp. 114-154). Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

## **5. The self-retreat of the interpreter<sup>1</sup>.** *An analysis of teasing and toasting in intercultural discourse*

JAN D. TEN THIJE  
Utrecht University, The Netherlands

*This paper reconstructs the process of achieving intercultural understanding during the interpreting of humorous teasing in toasting situations at an international research meeting. The analysis focuses on the self-retreat of the interpreter. This self-retreat is an extreme result of the discursive handling of the interpreter's role conflict, which stems from the fact that he or she transmits the utterances of the original speakers and is at the same time an autonomous participant of the interaction. Proposals are discussed that assign certain translatory actions of the interpreter to the continuum depending on his action space. At one end of the continuum, the interpreter is regarded as a so-called translation machine; at the other end, he is considered to be an equal participant in the interaction. The self-retreat of the interpreter has not yet been extensively addressed in the research literature but can be reconstructed with respect to this continuum. The analysis also shows how interpreters reflect and act upon the achievement of functional equivalence in the tripartite discourse structure. The paper concludes in stating that the distinction between 'professional' and 'non-professional' interpreters is actually questionable.*

### **1 Introduction**

Linguistic research in the field of intercultural communication has recently changed its focus of interest. Misunderstanding no longer dominates analyses, and with self-evident and successful intercultural discourse now attracting increased attention. Moreover, it is now recognized that the mere presence of people with different linguistic and cultural backgrounds does not automatically yield an *intercultural* discourse. Individual analyses must show to what extent the discourse is institutional and to what extent it can be characterized as intercultural (ten Thije 2006a).

This paper does not focus on intercultural misunderstandings. Rather, it reconstructs the process of intercultural understanding by reflecting on institutional and intercultural discourse structures. 'Non-professional' interpreters (Knapp-Potthoff and Knapp 1987) have a special task in mediating cultural differences, yet the potential of their translatory actions is limited. This becomes clear in cases in which interpreters resign from their position and are replaced by other colleagues. In this paper, stretches of discourse that document the

---

<sup>1</sup> I wish to thank Tatsjana Heinz, Ann Patrick, Katja Müller, Natalia Solovjeva, Carola Weise, and Conny Wustmann and Bernd Müller-Jacquier for their participation and contributions in the research project at the Department of Intercultural Communication at the Chemnitz University of Technology, in which they collected, transcribed and contributed to the analyses of the data in the international project (cf. ten Thije 1998, 2003 and 2006b). Moreover, I want to thank the participants of the workshop on intercultural discourse at the 6th International Pragmatics Conference, Reims, 19-24 July 1998 and the participants of the workshop 'Translatory Action and Intercultural Communication', which took place at the conference of the Societas Linguistica Europaea, 19-24 August 2001 in Leuven for their valuable comments on earlier drafts of this paper (see ten Thije 1998). Birgit Apfelbaum, Kristin Bührig, Nicholas Burke and Juliane House contributed with valuable comments to an earlier version of this paper. Finally, I thank the Dutch, Russian, German and Danish participants of the international project who allowed me to record their team meetings and visits over a period of several years. The names of persons and places have been changed. Despite the support of so many people, the author remains solely responsible for all potential errors in the text.

interpreter's retreat are regarded as *rich points* (Agar 1994). These cases can be taken as a starting point for an analysis concentrated on the special characteristics of intercultural understanding. In fact, by reconstructing the translatory action in multilingual and multicultural constellations, one gains insight into the process of intercultural understanding conducted by interpreters in general.

In this paper I reconstruct the *internal dilation of the speech situation* (Bührig and Rehbein 2000) in which, in the specific case considered here, a 'non-professional' interpreter helps to overcome the linguistic barrier (Dutch/English/Russian) that arises during the interpretation of humorous teasing in toasting situations at an international research meeting. I will analyze the discursive handling of the interpreter's role conflict which stems from the fact that he transmits the utterances of the original speakers and is at the same time an autonomous participant of the interaction. The analysis reveals how interpreters reflect on the achievement of functional equivalence in this tripartite discourse structure.

The structure of the paper is as follows: In section 2, I begin with a clarification of different theoretical approaches to the interpreter's discourse and continue by questioning the distinction between 'professional' and 'non-professional' interpreters (Apfelbaum 1998, 2004). Proposals are discussed that place translatory actions of the interpreter on a continuum depending on his action space (e.g. Wadensjö 1998; Bot 2005). At one end of the continuum, the interpreter is considered to be a so-called *translation machine*; at the other end, he is considered to be an equal participant in interaction. The self-retreat of the interpreter has not yet been addressed in detail in the literature but can be reconstructed with respect to this continuum, as will be shown in section 3. In section 4 I present the data from an international academic project. The analyses of institutional toasting discourse and the discursive structures of teasing are delivered in sections 5 and 6, respectively. Section 7 contains the analysis of the data and section 8 the conclusions.

## 2 Translatory actions along a continuum

The concept of interpreter is ambiguous. In the most elementary sense, an interpreter is solely an 'in-between' between two primary speakers who do not speak or understand each other's languages (Knapp and Knapp-Potthoff 1986a, 151). The task of the interpreter in a *triadic conversation* (Wadensjö 1998, 10) can be realized in different modes depending on the action space the interpreters have at their disposal when translating the primary speakers.

Various analyses on interpretation refer to the role of the interpreter as a continuum. Bot (2005) uses the notions *translation-machine* versus *liberal interactive model* as the two poles of the continuum. The translation-machine model assumes that the interpreter merely translates the utterances of the primary speaker into the other language without actually participating in the interaction himself. Consequently, the interaction between the primary speakers develops following the same interaction patterns as it would in a monolingual configuration. The only difference relates to the fact that the so-called translation-machine is positioned between the two primary speakers. The liberal interactive model gives the interpreter more action space, which leads him to rely more on his own initiative. Instead of merely functioning as a translation-machine, the interpreter becomes a third participant who bridges the gap between the primary speakers by organising turn-taking and ensuring thematic continuity, for example.

The same continuum can be found in the work of Knapp-Potthoff and Knapp (1986, 1987), who distinguish between a *professional* and a *non-professional interpreter*. The professional interpreter corresponds to the translation-machine, as he transmits the utterances between the primary speakers precisely. According to Knapp-Potthoff and Knapp (1986), the function of the non-professional interpreter moves continuously along the continuum and is situated somewhere

between transmission and mediation. In his or her role as a mediator, the non-professional interpreter not only transmits the interactions of the primary speakers but also explains and explicates presumptions and can even introduce new topics to the conversation. Hence, he or she participates as an autonomous third interactant. Knapp-Potthoff and Knapp (1986, 153) stress the fact that the participation of the non-professional interpreter can change its position along this continuum throughout the course of the interaction. They refer to the non-professional interpreter as *'the man or woman in the middle'* (ibid).

Apfelbaum (2004) argues that the distinction between professional and non-professional interpretation is based on text-external criteria such as education, training and payment. Based on a conversation analytical study of the interpretation carried out during international expert communication, she concludes that the discursive means and strategies of both professional and non-professional interpreters are essentially the same and that their distinct use can be characterized in a more sophisticated manner based on a continuum that complies with the fundamental linguistic structures of authentic speech.

Wilton (this volume) also presupposes such a continuum with respect to the different roles of the interpreter in translatory action. Her analyses of the interpretation of humorous activities in informal everyday conversations confirm one extreme of the continuum. In fact, Wilton analyses interactants whose main role is that of a fully competent and integrated participant who only takes on the role of a translator on certain occasions during the interaction. They are so-called "self-selects as translators". They switch fluently between the role of a translator and the role of a normal participant depending on the needs for the progression of the informal conversation.

Wadensjö (1998) proposes a so-called *dialogical interpretation* model. According to this model, the interpreter does not function as a translation-machine but rather participates in the interaction process on his or her own. She describes the task of the interpreter as that of *relaying and co-ordinating*. She analyses the translations of the interpreter by focussing on the fundamental question of what relationship exists between the interpreter's contributions and the original contributions of the primary speakers. In this context Wadensjö distinguishes between *renditions* and *non-renditions* with respect to the contributions of the interpreter. The latter notion concerns all of the interpreter's contributions that do not contain a translation or reformulation of an utterance made by a primary speaker. The former notion relates to the coordinating task of the interpreter within the interaction. For instance, the interpreter may clarify turn assignments and meta-communicative comments. Wadensjö states that renditions and non-renditions can also co-occur in one contribution. She proposes a taxonomy of six renditions including close renditions, expanded renditions, reduced renditions, substituting renditions, summarizing renditions, and lack of renditions (1998, 70).

Meyer (2004) considers Wadensjö's taxonomy to be a reductive model, since it does not account for the institutional configuration in which translatory actions are carried out and the interpreter must fulfil his task of relaying. In comparing Wadensjö's model with the analyses of Bührig and Rehbein (2000), Meyer (2004) finds that both approaches analyze the interactive structure of interpretation by focussing on deletions and additions on the part of the interpreter. Wadensjö (ibid.) categorises these changes in her text linguistic-based taxonomy of (non-)renditions as previously indicated. Within a functional pragmatic framework, Bührig and Rehbein (ibid.) reconstruct the consequences of the interpreter's changes in the propositional content for the institutional actions of the primary speakers. They assume that an interpreter is both observer as well as transmitter of the interaction of the primary speakers. Consequently, the interpreter is able to plan his or her contribution based on the mental schemata developed by primary speakers when structuring their contributions.

While Bot (2005), Knapp-Potthoff and Knapp (1986), Apfelbaum (2004), Wilton (this volume) and Wadensjö (1998) all concentrate on the external formal interactional characteristics of the interpreter's actions, Bührig and Rehbein (2000) focus on the mental dimension of the

interpretation process. In their theory of *reproductive action* they assume that the interpreter's translation does not consist of the arbitrary transformation of an utterance from the source language (SL) into an utterance in the target language (TL). They assume that the interpreter's translation of speech actions results from a reproductive process in which the interpreter's knowledge is directly related to the translation process itself.

Their reconstruction is based on the following argument (see also Bührig 1999; 2004): The interpreter acts as a transmitter in an interaction in which interactants do not speak the same language. This means that the normal input and output conditions which characterize monolingual interaction are no longer guaranteed. The speech actions of primary speakers are characterised by a rupture between two languages, with the interpreter helping to overcome this rupture. As a consequence of this process of 'going-in-between', the speech situation of the primary speakers is dilated by the interpreter. The primary speakers receive a *mediated* rather than an *original* message. In summary, Bührig and Rehbein (ibid.) analyze specific characteristics of the interpreted speech situation based on the assumption that interpretation is realised within an *internal dilated speech situation*.

One of the means used by the interpreter to bridge the barrier is to *characterize* the speech action of the original speakers. Bührig and Rehbein (ibid.) identify the following dimensions of the interpreter's characterisations: (1) the propositional content of the action of the primary speakers, (2) their action purposes, (3) the pre-history (causes) of their actions, (4) their constellation, (5) the discourse species (the genre) of the speech actions, and finally, (6) the interactional nexus (connectivity). The relevance of these dimensions and the extent to which these characterisations are adopted by interpreters depend on the actual need to bridge the language rupture, which varies according to specific speech actions in the source language or the specific action configuration. Not all translatory actions imply the use of characterisations. In fact, Bührig and Rehbein's six dimensions can be compared to Wadensjö's taxonomy of (non) renditions with respect to the fact that both account for the change between original and translatory action. However, the former accounts for the institutional constellation in which the change is taking place. The dimensions can be traced back to a functional pragmatic approach to discourse (Ehlich 1991; Rehbein 2001; Bührig and ten Thije 2005).

A discursive rupture is not characteristic of the interpreter's discourse alone. This rupture occurs in all speech situations in which time and place do not correspond with one another. According to Ehlich (1984; 1991), dilation occurs whenever a textualised message is transmitted instead of the original message. Ehlich uses the notion of *text* in order to denote this transmission of knowledge in a dilated speech situation in either a written or an oral mode. Bührig and Rehbein (2000) also refer to knowledge transfer in a dilated speech situation as a form of *textualization*. Characterization is one of the possible forms of *textualization*. The way people characterize their messages depends on *textuality*- in other words the *transmissibility of the linguistic action*. Texts with a high transmissibility have a special linguistic structure, as in the case of rhymes, for instance. Rhymes can be remembered more easily than an improvised oral story, for example.

Bührig and Rehbein (ibid.) consider an interpreter in a face-to-face interaction to be a *messenger*. The dilation of the speech situation is *internal*, as only the temporal orientation of the transmitted speech action is dilated in a given speech situation, whereas the spatial orientation remains constant. In the case of external dilated speech actions, interactants have neither a common spatial nor temporal orientation. It is essential for both internal and external dilation that the messenger characterizes the speech actions, resulting the textualisation of the speech actions (Bührig 2004).

Bührig and Rehbein (2000) claim that the existence of an interpreter as a translation machine is impossible. Changes always occur as a consequence of translatory action, these not being arbitrary but rather dependent on the systematic translation process that takes place in the mind of the interpreter. This translation process is determined by the interpreter's mental acti-

vities. He or she does not repeat the utterances of the primary speakers but rather reproduces them. The interpreter produces an utterance in his or her L2 that is already available via his or her L1 knowledge, embedding utterances in the ongoing discourse while also realizing his or her own purposes.

Primary speakers – in contrast to interpreters – must organize and structure their knowledge before producing an utterance. Their production requires a speaker plan that differs from an interpreter's speaker plan. When a primary speaker realizes an utterance, the interpreter becomes subject to the following situation: The utterance of the primary speaker is available in the source language (SL), while the utterance in the target language (TL) is unknown for the primary hearer (H). This utterance is *Rheme* for the (primary) hearer; it contains new knowledge. Since the interpreter understands the source language, it becomes *Theme* of his knowledge (known). The interpreter thus has the task of transmitting the utterance from SL to TL for the hearer, i.e. from *Rheme* to *Theme* of H's knowledge. Hence, the translatory knowledge relation concerns the relation of *Rheme* to *Theme*.

The interpreter in consecutive<sup>2</sup> translation has a double task. First, he or she transmits knowledge from Rheme to Theme for the hearer by realizing translatory actions. At the same time, the interpreter functions as the third speaker in the discourse by realizing speech actions on his or her own accord. Hence, the interpreter is simultaneously translator and third interactant. With respect to the interpreter's translatory actions, this means that he or she reproduces these actions second hand. Consequently, the illocutions of the primary speaker are not reproduced as *actions* themselves, but rather as *perceptions of the primary speaker's actions*. The utterance 'bon voyages' in the first fragment below is translated by 'he wishes you bon voyages'. According to Austin (1962), this distinction can be seen as a change from *phatic* to *rhetic* speech.

In summary, face-to-face translatory discourse can be considered from a functional pragmatic approach to be realized in an internal dilated speech situation. The interpreter characterises the original speech action with the purpose of delivering a textualized speech action. The interpreter always participates in a double role, both as transmitter and as third participant. The resulting tripartite discourse structure is constituted by interrelated mental and discursive dimensions. The analysis aims at a reconstruction of this interrelatedness.

### 3 The end points of the continuum: constellations for retreat

In light of this functional pragmatic theoretical framework I introduce the question of which constellations can lead to the interpreter's retreat. The retreat of an interpreter is characterized by the interpreter ending his or her translatory actions. This issue has not yet been the subject of intensive consideration in translation studies. Various constellations can lead to a retreat of the interpreter. Only some of these are discussed in the literature on translatory action:

- The interpreter determines that the primary speakers understand each other even without his translations, making translatory actions redundant. Bronsdijk (2006) analyses interrogations

---

<sup>2</sup> Bührig and Rehbein (2000), like many other researchers (Pöchhacker and Shlesinger 2002), distinguish between three constellations, specifically translations on the one hand and simultaneous and consecutive interpretations on the other hand. When translating a written text, the translator is able to oversee the complete text structure including the underlying knowledge structure in SL before transferring the text into the other language (TL). However, in the case of *simultaneous interpretation*, the interpreter must anticipate this overall knowledge structure based only on parts of the linguistic structure, as these are uttered in a linear sequential manner. Consequently, the interpreter transfers pieces of utterances from language (SL) into pieces of utterances in language (TL) by presupposing an overall plan on the part of the original speaker. Finally, in the case of *consecutive interpretation* or so-called 'turn related interpretation', the interpreter is able to oversee a completed turn and therefore understands the utterance and the underlying knowledge structure before the actual transmission into another language is executed. This overall insight into the mental plan of the original speaker enables the interpreter in consecutive interpretation to translate the utterances from language SL into language TL having already acquired an overall understanding of the discourse purposes of the original speakers.

of asylum seekers by Dutch functionaries. The presence of an interpreter is legally required during these interrogations. However, since some asylum seekers have lived in the Netherlands for a long time prior to these interrogations, they already understand Dutch and are capable of answering the questions of the functionary directly. Consequently, the interpreter often retreats.

- Interpreters retreat because primary speakers start to use a language that they cannot translate appropriately. Ten Thije (2007) reports on the interpreter's practice in interviews in which asylum seekers must display their language competencies in all language varieties of their region of origin. The assigned interpreter is not always capable of translating all these different varieties and languages. As a result, the interpreter retreats.
- Interpreters are requested to stop their translatory actions due to the fact that they create a communicative breakdown between the primary speakers, who are then no longer content with the suggested translations. Bührig (1999) analyses the retreat of a conference interpreter as a consequence of the discontent of the primary speakers.
- The interpretation is linked to a very specific discourse type (e.g. a humorous genre). Wilton (this volume) illustrates in her analyses the *self-select* and, consequently, the *self-retreat* of the interpreter in informal conversation depending on the specific need to explain a punch line. The interpreter retreats after the translation of the punch line.
- The interpreter becomes tired and thus physically and mentally incapable of fulfilling his or her translatory actions in the appropriate manner and thus retreats.
- The primary speakers structure their interaction in such a way that translatory actions cannot be realized at all by realizing turns that last for too long without a pause, for instance.
- The interpreter retreats because the primary speakers talk about a topic that requires professional expertise or specific inside knowledge that he or she ostensibly lacks.
- The interpreter retreats because he can no longer handle the double involvement as both a translator and third discourse participant. Subsequently, a changeover of the interpreters takes place in order to guarantee the continuation of the interaction.

This paper focuses especially on the last constellation of self-retreat. Hence, the paper focuses on the question of how the double involvement of an interpreter may become contradictory. This double involvement is inherent in translatory actions. Consequently, the reasons for contradiction can be reconstructed from the two extreme ends of the continuum: (1) from the role of the interpreter as a translator and (2) from his or her role as a third interactant. From the first perspective, one could imagine that the interpreter characterizes speech actions of the primary speaker in such a way that the translated speech action pattern is abandoned and another pattern is adopted in which the interpreter his- or herself is addressed as primary speaker. The resulting translatory actions cannot be combined with his or her actions as a third actor. From the second perspective, one could imagine that primary speakers discuss a topic in which the interpreter is addressed directly as a primary speaker. Consequently, the interpreter must realize speech actions on his or her own account in order to continue the interaction between primary speakers and thus fails to realise the translatory actions.

Based on authentic data, I will examine in detail how these contradictions are dealt with in discourse. It is important to begin this case study by analyzing the institutional and intercultural constellation (see also ten Thije 2002) in order to be able to reconstruct the specific institutional qualities of the interpreter's contradictions.

#### **4 The data**

The data for this paper were collected in the context of an international academic project in which Germans, Dutch and Danes worked together with Russians (see also ten Thije 1998, 2003, 2006b). The main purpose of the project was to develop a curriculum for new forms of training in the field of 'social work' in post-Soviet-Union society. Russian colleagues were

trained at Western European universities by Western European colleagues in order to become acquainted with the theory and practice of social work in Western European countries. The coordinating team consisting of representatives from each of the countries involved in the project met regularly in Russia. The team worked together for a long period of time and experienced a large number of administrative difficulties in accomplishing their tasks. The goals of the project needed to be reached within a strict time schedule. In this respect, the project resembles many other cooperative supranational projects which can be seen as a result of the Eastern European expansion of the European Community and the rebuilding of societal systems in Eastern Europe (De Stefani 2000). The core of the Russian team consisted of six women, whereas all of the members from the Western European countries were men, meaning that gender also played a role in shaping the institutional and intercultural teamwork.

Although English was used as a *lingua franca*, the restricted language competencies of the Russian team members did not always guarantee mutual understanding. Certain team members therefore took up the role of 'non-professional' interpreters (Knapp / Knapp-Potthoff 1985) in order to facilitate the intercultural understanding for their colleagues. This type of communicative situation created a transparent constellation (Müller 1989), since half of the Russian team members were already moderately proficient in English and could understand the foreigners speaking English directly. Emerging intercultural misunderstandings were sometimes dealt with and sometimes neglected, with team members often discussing assumed expectations tied to linguistic and cultural knowledge. Consequently, team discussions reflected the process of reorganisation of fixed expectations and the emergence of a common ground. Ten Thije (2003) analyses this process as the genesis of a *discursive interculture* within the international project.

The multilingual Dutch-English-Danish-Russian constellation offered all parties the opportunity to use their own language for internal consultations, even during official meetings. When using their Dutch or Russian mother tongue, participants could be sure that non-Dutch speaking or non-Russian speaking team members were not able to understand what was being said. Müller (1989) characterizes these constellations as non-transparent constellations. Obviously, these non-transparent constellations also affected the interaction in English. This group-specific manifold communicative potential contributed to a type of *discursive interculture* which Fienemann and Rehbein (2004, 264) refer to as a "*lingua franca interculture with a multilingual base*".

Each the meetings of the multicultural coordination team were audio-recorded over the course of three years. During working visits in Russia, the delegation visited many different social institutions. Consequently, the recordings included meetings, receptions, presentations, guided tours, general small talk, preliminary consultations, conversations during dinner and the proposing of toasts. The total length of the corpus is about 40 hours. For this paper, a subset of the corpus containing the toasts proposed during a team visit to Russia was extracted, transcribed and analyzed in detail. Ten Thije (1998) presents a first analysis of the discourse species of toasting. This paper expands upon this study by means of an analysis of institutional and homileic (i.e. phatic) discourse while focussing on translatory actions.

## 5 Toasting as institutional discourse

Frake (1972) has shown in his classic sociolinguistic study that proposing a toast in other cultures can be seen as an elaborate institutional discourse species: among the Subanum, the procedure of toasting establishes social hierarchy and administers justice. Kotthoff (1995; 1997) presents an extensive analysis of the thematic, interactive and institutional structures of toasting in Georgia.

In Western European cultures, the discourse of toasting is not as significant as in Georgia. Nonetheless, the discourse of toasting can be considered an expression of a polite

action in many cultures. Fienemann and Rehbein (2004, 225) state that by using polite forms of speaking and acting, interactants express a certain courteous goodwill by acting in accordance with the respective social measures, i.e., their - potentially - incompatible control field (i.e. their sphere of command) is "neutralised" and their respective "action fields" (i.e. power dispositions) are calibrated. Subsequently, the authors (ibid.) state that by acting politely, speakers usually undergo a process of reflexivity in which they view the constellation from the perspective of a third party, i.e. they take on a "bystander-role" (Goffmann 1981).

By proposing a toast in intercultural discourse, interactants demonstrate their "courteous goodwill" towards one another. They act according to social conventions in order "to neutralise" potential threats stemming from their different social and cultural standards, while their courteous words simultaneously reveal to what extent they take existing power relations into account. In fact, the analysis will assess how the toasts express these mutual estimations. Moreover, verbalisation of the reflective activities from a 'bystander position', as suggested by Fienemann and Rehbein (ibid.), may provide insight into the interculturality of their interactions. Consequently, whenever a toast is realized in a multilingual constellation in which an interpreter is needed, the interpreter's translatory actions result in specific discourse structures. Thus, one may gain specific insights into the process of intercultural understanding conducted by interpreters by means of reconstructing translatory action of toasting in multilingual constellations.

As guests of the Russians, the Western European team members became familiar with Russian toasts and learned to respond appropriately to this verbal expression of hospitality. The Russian toast is less literal or stylised than the Georgian one, yet nonetheless represents a part of everyday discourse (cf. Kotthoff 1995, 1997). Toasts are often proposed when people drink vodka or champagne together (cf. Jatzkowskaja 1994) and rules the pertaining to the content, form and order of toasts are expected to be adhered to (Richmond 1992).

As an example of a Russian toast, I will present the following text excerpt in which a Russian official, Vladimir, proposes a toast to the Dutch delegation at the end of their working visit at the Russian institution (see also ten Thije 1998). In his toast, the director of the department addresses the two Dutch team members. Hans is the project coordinator and has already been to Russia several times, whereas Otto is visiting Russia for the first time. The Russian official thanks the Dutchmen for their participation in the international project. Fienemann (2006) describes the speech action pattern of *rendering thanks* as a reflective communicative process that interrupts the exchanges of gifts. Rendering thanks is not only an expression of emotional feelings, but also a reflection of the social means that constitute courteous goodwill whereby the speaker enables the hearer H to act in accordance with this goodwill. (Fienemann and Rehbein 2004, 256). The toast below displays both courteous goodwill as well as reflections on social measures of the international cooperation.

Since I begin with an analysis of the discursive structures of toasting, the translatory actions of the interpreter are left out in the first two fragments. The deletion of the translation actions is marked with the signs (\*\*\*). The toast of the Russian host official is as follows:

*Fragment 1: Toast of the host*

Participants:

RV: Vladimir (Russian official)

NH: Hans (Dutch delegation leader)

NO: Otto (Dutch team member)

RW: Wera (Russian team member, non-professional interpreter)

All: six Russian team members

RV: [1] Now my dear friends I would like to thank you from all our heart for / for the splendid work you've done here.



- [2] We'll wish you bon voyage. nach / nach Holland. (\*\*\*)  
 All: [3] laugh  
 RV: [4] Well for just for Hans, while Hans is quite a different situation because he's been part of our teaching staff already. (\*\*\*)  
 [5] He is / As for / as for / as for Otto to whom I would like to have him as our constant member in the future. (\*\*\*)  
 [6] So for our future cross cultural contacts for many many years ahead. (\*\*\*)  
 [7] So happy return home. (\*\*\*)

This toast includes typical characteristics of a Russian toast, e.g. standard formulations such as *from all our hearts, splendid work, so for our future ... contact for many, many years ahead*, and even the required creative expressions, such as the double code-switching '*bon voyage nach Holland*', which alludes to the special multilingual framework of the project. The toast expresses praise for the activities carried out during the working visit, respect towards the individual members of the delegation, a certain satisfaction with the international company, the hope of continuing the cooperation, and the wish for a safe return home. According to Fienemann (ibid.), this toast reflects social measures that constitute courteous goodwill within an international team, whereby the host enables the Dutch partners to act according to the social measures of academic colleagues.

The second example of a toast was proposed by the Dutch delegation leader, Hans, during the same working visit to an old people's home. After proposing an initial toast in which he thanks the director of the home for his hospitality, he proposes a second toast in which he specifically addresses the six female Russian team members, as the visit to the home coincided with International Women's Day (March 8<sup>th</sup>). This second toast from the Dutch project co-ordinator is presented as follows:

*Fragment 2: A toast on International Women's Day*

Participants:

- NH: Hans (Dutch delegation leader)  
 NO: Otto (Dutch team member)  
 RS: Stanislav Stanislavovitsch, forename Alec (Russian, director of the rest home)  
 RB: Boris (Russian student, non-professional interpreter)  
 RZ: Zina (Russian team member)  
 RW: Wera (Russian team member)  
 RN: Natasha (Russian team member)  
 RA: Anna (Russian team member)  
 RI: Ida (Russian team member)  
 RT: Tanja (Russian team member)  
 RX: an unnamed Russian team member

- NH: [1] Alec, may I bring another toast?  
 [2] In Holland I am not used to bring so many toasts. (\*\*\*)  
 [3] But now I got a special reason for it. (\*\*\*)  
 [4] It's äh/ the first was about the visit to this (institution). (\*\*\*)  
 [5] My second goes to äh the fact that it is the eight of March today (\*\*\*)  
 [6] and we are glad that we have six of such beautiful examples of the female human nature among us (\*\*\*)  
 RW: [7] *laughs* (\*\*\*)  
 RZ: [8] it's compliment (\*\*\*)  
 RB: [9] it's joke (\*\*\*)

- NH: [10] Some / some/ äh sometimes äh our compliments are a bit doubted (\*\*\*)  
 [11] But this is a very serious one (\*\*\*)  
 [12] I am very glad to be here with you and  
 [13] I äh I wish you everything good in your life, all the things that you as a woman  
 deserves to have in you life. (\*\*\*)
- RA: [14] Good said
- NH: [15] (*raising his glass*) Tanja, Zina, Ida
- RI: [16] Thanks. You are the right / you are the right gentlemen.
- All: [17] *Clinking of glasses*

After asking for permission from the director to propose another toast in segments s1 and s2, the Dutchman announces the special reason for his second toast (s3). Subsequently, he reminds the audience of his first toast (s4) and refers to the actual date, the eighth of March (s5). In s6, he compliments the female team members on their beauty. The compliment provokes different reactions: Wera laughs (s7) and Zina explains that the toast is meant as a complement (s8), whereas Boris, the non-professional interpreter, remarks that it is a joke (s9). The Dutchman seems to recognize the various interpretations, as he hesitates at the beginning of his utterance in s10 and subsequently confirms that his compliments are not always taken seriously by the Russian team members. However, he states in s11 that this time his complement should be taken seriously, he reinforces the compliment, expresses his pleasure with respect to the present company (s12,) and he wishes all of the women “all the things they deserve in life” (s13).

The reactions in s14 and s16 clearly show that the translatory constellation in this discourse fragment is partially transparent (Müller 1989.), since at least two Russian team members obviously understand English and are capable of responding directly in English. The compliment is accepted and appreciated. In s16, the Russian team member first thanks and then compliments her Dutch colleague by addressing him as *the right gentlemen*. According to Fienemann and Rehbein (2004, 225), this fragment shows various polite forms of speaking and acting, as the male and female actants demonstrate mutual courteous goodwill by acting according to standards of mutual politeness. Both refer to particular female standards on the occasion of International Women’s Day that are regarded as high social values both in Russia and in Western European countries.

To sum up, the toast shows that the Dutch team member is capable of proposing a toast in an adequate and appreciated form and is even capable of repairing possible misunderstandings. Moreover, the toast shows that the relationship between men and women in the team is respected and addressed in an honourable manner. These observations are important since the relationship between men and women is one of the issues addressed in the next toast. The teasing within the next toast is responsible for the replacement of the interpreter (see the fragments below). Accordingly, the next section focuses on the discourse structure of teasing.

## 6 Teasing as homileic discourse

Humour is often regarded as very important for the success of intercultural understanding (cf. Hofstede 1991). Although research on humour in general is extensive, little work has been carried out in the field of intercultural communication. Although Chiaro (1992), for instance, has discussed problems in translating humour and Kotthoff (1998) has presented different analyses of humour in interaction, the matter of how humour shapes intercultural discourse is scarcely analysed. Lee's work (1994) contains an example in which he discusses how jokes can cause considerable conflicts in intercultural communication due to the fact that hidden cultural knowledge is often presupposed. He presents some discourse strategies developed

especially for coping with these problems in achieving intercultural understanding. While Lee (ibid.) focuses on the intercultural understanding of cartoons and Dimova (2000) investigates the translation of jokes, Wilton (this volume) analyses conversational humour and the interactive translation of punch lines. Bührig (2004) analyses the interpretation of persiflaging discourse. Persiflaging and teasing can both be regarded as features of homileic discourse. According to Ehlich and Rehbein (1979), homileic discourse refers to discourse forms such as small talk, telling stories, jokes, etc., which function primarily in establishing a community but can also be functionalized for institutional purposes. In everyday language, one could speak of *applied humour* (cf. Mulkey (1988 cit. in More 1993).

According to Eder (1993) and Günthner (1996), teasing exhibits a double actant's structure: on the one hand, the speaker, i.e. the *teaser*, makes a provocative remark - which can include mock challenges, negative commands or even hostile threats, if taken literally - towards another person, the *teased person*. The teasing remark can contain exaggerations, contradictions and implausible expressions, or it can be accompanied by para-verbal or meta-communicative comments, signalling to the teased person that he or she should take the remark in a playful manner. The success of teasing depends to a large extent on the reactions of the *audience*. As long as the audience laughs, the teasing is successful. As soon as the audience quiets down or agrees with objections raised by the teased person, teasing has then failed. The best possible reaction for the teased person is to turn the situation around and to tease the teaser<sup>3</sup>. According to Alberts (1992), the positions of teaser and teased person cannot be as easily reversed in the context of male-female communication in the workplace. Thus, when a man teases a woman in the context of workplace communication, this may result in an allegation of sexual harassment.

The toast presented below is proposed by the Dutch leader of the delegation in response to the farewell toast offered by the official Russian host (see fragment 1). In his response toast, the Dutchman initially pays respect to the institutional toasting conventions discussed in section 4. Subsequently, he realizes certain speech actions and addresses topics which belong to the discourse of teasing. The embedding of the teasing in the toast results in contradictive provocative claims by the Dutchman towards the interpreters, resulting in their retreating twice.

## 7 The self-retreat of an interpreter

In the following, I will take a closer look at the self-retreat of the interpreter. The complete fragment of the response toast proposed by the Dutchman can be found in appendix 2. Fragment 3 below contains the discourse stretches in which the interpreter, Wera (RW), retreats resulting in her colleague Vladimir (RV) taking over. This exchange occurred as the result of a teasing remark made by the Dutchman, who states that he himself has been harassed. The exchange of interpreters takes place after RW confesses that she was the subject of the teasing. In section 3 above, I concluded that an interpreter can occupy two possible positions: translator and third participant. The thesis suggests that the interpreter can retreat when these two positions contradict each other. In the following fragment, the primary speaker indirectly mentions a topic in which the interpreter is addressed as primary speaker.

This fragment begins after the Dutchman expresses his thanks towards the Russian official for his hospitality in accordance with the conventions of toasting. He then makes the following remark in his toast.

---

<sup>3</sup> Bührig (2004) differentiates between *persiflaging* and *teasing*. She argues that while teasing starts with the teaser making a negative remark towards the teased person, persiflaging is also concerned with the communicative prehistory of the negative remark and aims at the reflection of the teased person towards the exaggerated comments made by the teaser.

*Fragment 3: T4/20-33; 'Toast to say goodbye'*

RV: Vladimir (Russian official, second interpreter during toast)

RB Boris, (Russian student, interpreter during working visit)

NH: Hans (Dutch delegation leader, proposer of the toast)

NO: Otto (Dutch team member)

RW: Wera (Russian team member, first interpreter during toast)

All: six Russian team members

√  
≥ >v  
≥NH≥ [37]And I have to tell you one problem we had to deal with.  
≥ ✕

20 ✕  
√  
≥ >v  
≥NH≥ [38]There was really one serious problem.  
≥ ✕  
≥ >v  
≥RW≥ [39] одна очень серьезная  
≥ ≥ *one very serious*  
≥ ✕

21 ✕  
√  
≥ >v  
≥NH≥ [40]Except from the harrassment of some of your employees.  
≥ ✕  
≥ v  
≥RW≥ проблема  
≥ ≥ *problem.*  
≥ ✕

22 ✕  
√  
≥ >v  
≥NH≥ [42]There was an/ [43] You can translate as well  
≥ ✕ [41]coughs  
≥ >v  
≥RW≥ [44] и и  
≥ ≥ *and and*  
≥ ✕

23 ✕  
√  
≥ >v  
≥NH≥ [45]At/ At) Apart from the harrassment by one of your employees.  
≥ ✕

24 ✕  
√  
≥ >v  
≥RV≥ [47]harrassment это значит вот помимо, значит,  
≥ ≥ *that means / that by the way means*  
≥ ✕  
≥ >v  
≥RW≥ [46] чё такое?  
≥ ≥ *What exactly?*  
≥ ✕

25 ✕  
√  
≥ >v  
≥RB≥ [48]ну вот о чём мы говорили, смеялись в воскресенье ...  
≥ ✕ *well, that's what we talked about , laughed about on Sunday.*  
≥ >v  
≥RW≥ [49] ага, ага  
≥ ≥ *uh-huh, uh-huh*  
≥ ✕

26 ✕  
√

≥ >v  
 ≥RV ≥<sup>50</sup> помимо значит беспокойства, которое представл/которое представляла  
 ≥ ❌ *Apart from the bother*  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RW ≥ [ <sup>51</sup> повышенный интерес  
 ≥ ≥ *intense interest*  
 ≥ ❌  
 27 ❌  
 √  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RV ≥ для него одна из работниц нашего университета.  
 ≥ ❌ *caused for him by one of the employees of our university.*  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RW ≥ [ <sup>52</sup> ну это я  
 ≥ ≥ *Well, that was me.*  
 ≥ ❌  
 28 ❌  
 √  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥NH ≥ [ <sup>56</sup> There was really one serious problem that  
 ≥ ❌  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RV ≥ [ <sup>53</sup> да  
 ≥ ≥ *yes*  
 ≥ ❌  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RW ≥  
 ≥ ≥ [ <sup>54</sup> laughs  
 ≥ ❌  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥R? ≥ [ <sup>55</sup> laughs  
 ≥ ❌  
 29 ❌  
 √  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥NH ≥ [ <sup>57</sup> was the problem of trust. [ <sup>58</sup> It was not possible for Otto and me to  
 ≥ ❌  
 30 ❌  
 √  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥NH ≥ know when we can trust people or not.  
 ≥ ❌  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RV ≥ [ <sup>59</sup> Ага, значит, он сказал,  
 ≥ ≥ *Uh-huh, that means, he said*  
 ≥ ❌  
 31 ❌  
 √  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RV ≥ что была одна проблема , мы с Отто тут обговорили, в общем  
 ≥ ≥ *That there was one problem, Otto and I have already discussed this, in general*  
 ≥ ❌  
 32 ❌  
 √  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RV ≥ мы не знаем , кому можно доверять, кому нельзя  
 ≥ ❌ *We don't know, who we can trust and who not.*  
 33 ❌

The analysis below is structured according to the following three argumentative steps: the first step is related to the question of how teasing is realized within this multilingual discourse fragment. The second step concerns the translatory actions of the interpreter, while the third step refers to the self-retreat of the interpreter.

The realisation of the teasing phases can be reconstructed as follows: In s37-38 the Dutchman (NH) addresses the Russian official, Vladimir (RV) as the representative of the institution and announces that the Dutch delegation has had a serious problem during their

working visit to the Russian university. The interpreter, Wera (RW), summarizes this announcement in s 39 by reproducing that a problem exists. Subsequently, NH formulates in s40 a side sequence (cf. Jefferson 1972) starting with *apart from*, followed by *the harassment by one of your employees*. Within the pattern of teasing, this remark can be considered as a provocative one. The remark is directly addressed at the official by making use of the deictic procedure *your* and, therefore, his institutional responsibility is engaged which makes the allegation even more severe. No translation is formulated by RW. In s41 NH coughs, and begins to repeat his remark, but stops and addresses the interpreter RW directly by asking her to translate *you can translate as well*. This direct request to translate is remarkable in a constellation in which RW has been the interpreter from the very beginning of the toast. Within the pattern of teasing, this request could be interpreted as an indication that something uncommon or unexpected is at hand, in which the addressed person plays a special role. The interpreter (RW) hesitates in s44 uttering *and and* in Russian. Subsequently, NH repeats his remark in s45, and rephrases his allegation more precisely by stating that not *some* but *one* of the Russian employees has behaved impolitely. According to the teasing pattern (Günthner 1996), the teased person is always addressed directly. It is striking that in this stretch of discourse the teased person is addressed by way of an allusion. Wilss (1988) notes that allusions can only be understood if the alluded knowledge is available to all participants involved in the discourse. In this case, the teaser creates a specific group-bound communicative task of discovering the person intended by his remark regarding the harassment.

The reproach of the teaser is not translated immediately. Rather, it initiates an internal non-transparent (Müller 1998) Russian discourse, in which the speech situation is no longer dilated, instead creating an interaction space of its own. The language rupture between English and Russian is not bridged. Consequently, the Russian discourse cannot be understood by the Dutch participants. It is striking that the interpreter (RW) does not formulate a clarification turn by asking the primary speaker to explain his speech, something which happens quite often in non-professional interpretation (Knapp-Potthoff and Knapp 1987). In that case the interpreter would have asked NH what he means by *harassment*. Instead, she indicates to her English speaking Russian colleagues RV and RB that she does not understand this notion. The subsequent Russian discourse s47-s55 includes the clarification of the notion *harassment*, but also the realisation and completion of the teasing pattern. In s47 the Russian official (RV) starts to describe the word *harassment* and is interrupted in s48 by RB. The latter is the Russian student who was responsible for interpretation during the entire working visit. He refers, in s48, to a common humorous experience at an earlier stage of the working visit. Within the teasing pattern his remark can also be considered a *meta-communicative comment*. RW acknowledges this humorous event in s49 and confesses in s51 that she herself is the person who is being blamed for the harassment. This means that she accepts being the teased person. The official (RV) accepts RW's confession in s53 and, subsequently RW and an unidentified person (R?) start *laughing* (s54, s55). This laughter can be considered the positive audience reaction within the teasing pattern by at least part of the audience.

Within the monolingual teasing pattern (cf. Günthner 1996), this laughter indicates the success of the intended teasing. One must observe, however, that most members of the audience do not react verbally to the teasing remark and remain silent, meaning that the teasing was not successful for everybody in the audience. Moreover, in the multilingual constellation in which the Russian discourse is not being translated, we can conclude that the teaser (NH) has formulated a provocative remark in English. This initiated a teasing pattern that led to the Russian-only speech situation. RW accepts the position of the *teased person* in the newly initiated Russian speech situation. The teased person (RW) and part of the audience (R?) begin laughing in s54 and s55 as a reaction to the confession of the teased person. Her confession is not translated to the teaser himself. Nonetheless, the non-verbal reactions of laughing can be observed and interpreted by the teaser. Although the speech situation in Russian is not internally dilated at this moment, laughing may overcome the language rupture, i.e., the teaser (NH) might

conclude that his teasing was at least partially successful. From the subsequent discourse during the remaining part of the toast it becomes clear that after her confession of being the teased person, RW does not verbally react to the Dutchman's provocative remark. She only comments on the toast at the end by saying Ah, *what a joke* (s91).

On the basis of the reconstruction of teasing, we can now progress to the next step of the analysis by asking the question of how the interpreter translates the utterances made by the primary speaker. The answer to this question will shed light on the question of how the non-transparent Russian discourse functions in the overall translation and also help us to understand what caused the self-retreat of the interpreter. Interestingly, the dimensions of the characterisation presented by Bührig and Rehbein (2000) can be used to analyze the speech actions in the Russian discourse. In s46 the interpreter (RW) indicates that she does not understand the *propositional content* of the primary speaker's speech action (i.e. the meaning of the word *harassment*). RW can consider NH's utterance as a *Rheme* of her knowledge. RV begins to characterize the propositional content by using his linguistic knowledge of English. He is interrupted by RB who, in s48, characterizes the propositional content by mentioning the *prehistory* of the speech situation and realizing the *common group knowledge* with respect to the discussion and laughter on the previous Sunday. In fact, RB characterizes the common experiences as a *discourse species* with homileic qualities. His characterization clarifies the potential *action purpose* of the speech action of the primary speaker (NH), both for the interpreter (RW) and for the rest of the Russian audience. From the common knowledge of the prehistory, the indirect realization of NH's reproach can be interpreted as a provocative remark directed at RW. Subsequently, RV translates the notion of *harassment* in s50 with the notion of *bother*. RW accepts and reformulates this characterization in s51 as *intense interest*. Furthermore, RV changes *one of your colleagues* in s48 into *one of the employees of our university* in Russian. Hence, RV changes the deictic and symbolic procedures of NH's speech action. He redirects the personalized address of the remark initially directed at himself as the academic official in charge of the project by indicating that some member of the general academic community of the university is responsible for the harassment. In the utterance made by the primary speaker (NH), RV is addressed in his institutional position. RV's reformulation of *the institutional constellation* in the actual speech situation is adequate because he splits his roles of the interpreter (RW) and primary speaker (RV). He thereby indicates that he can handle the potential contradiction of the interpreter's double role.

The successful *functional equivalence* of RV's translation can be seen in the reaction of RW in s52, in which she confesses that she is the member of the university that NH is referring to. In sum, NH's reproach is translated for the Russian audience by referencing (1) the *prehistory* and (2) the *propositional content* as well as through (3) the *constellation* in the actual speech situation and (4) the *discourse species* (i.e. genre) of the speech actions. Although (5) the *purpose* of the speech action (i.e. reproach) is not explicitly *textualized*, the different dimensions of characterization as a whole clarify the reproach of NH. The confession made by RW in the Russian discourse makes it clear that RV's translation is also successful from another perspective, i.e. that the speech action pattern of a reproach is conventionally followed either by a denial or a confession. RW's confession removes the potential threat of NH's reproach for the whole Russian delegation. If the accusation had remained unanswered, these courteous words would indicate that the power relations between the Dutch and Russian delegations could end up out of balance.

One might observe that the translatory actions of RV and RB do not characterize (6) the *interactional nexus* (e.g. connectivity) of NH's speech action in s40/s45. In fact, the connectors '*expect from*' in s40 and *apart from* in s45 are not actually translated. The side sequences that these formulations would normally initiate create a new speech situation here in which the speech pattern of teasing is not only translated but also realized and completed. This completion seems reasonable in the constellation of the international cooperation in which one of the

employees of the responsible official is being accused of acting impolitely. The translatory actions can be considered to be functionally equivalent.

Finally, in the third step of the analysis, the self-retreat of the interpreter RW will be analyzed: RW does not know the Rheme of the speech action of the primary speaker in s40 and s45. As soon as she realizes what is meant by *harassment* as a result of the clarification by her colleagues (RV and RB), she understands that she is actually being addressed as the primary speaker herself. In the discourse type of toasting, in which the toaster has the right to speak for a longer period of time, she accepts that it is not possible to react to the primary speaker immediately as a third speaker. However, in the Russian non-transparent speech situation, she openly takes responsibility for the presumed impolite action and also publicly admits that she is the person being teased. The Russian discourse is not translated for NH. Consequently, he cannot understand that RW has confessed to her colleagues in Russian. Due to the non-verbal laughing of RW and R?, NH might conclude that his teasing has been acknowledged by the teased person RW and by some other members of the audience (R?). The self-retreat of the interpreter is the result of the contradiction of her double role. Through her self-retreat, she also contributes to the successful continuation of the toast. The Russian official (RV) takes over the position of the interpreter in s59.

In the next fragment we see how the toast continues. RW has retreated and RV has taken over the interpretation, but the latter also hands over his role. In fact, the subsequent interpretation is carried out in tandem, with two interpreters being involved. Wilton (this volume) illustrates the same reason for a change of interpreter within interactive translation. The interpretation in the next two fragments contains a cooperative narrative in which additional participants work together in order to recall and display common group experiences (Quasthoff 1980). The exchange between the interpreters reveals discourse structures that are fundamental to translatory actions. Self-retreats in our data nicely show how the double role of the interpreter as both transmitter and third participant can be coped with successfully.

Fragment 5 is taken from the last part of the same toast shown in fragment 4. After the critical remarks concerning the sexual harassment, the Dutchman addresses other precarious topics that for space reasons cannot be analyzed in this paper in detail. I will therefore merely mention the subsequent speech actions. NH reveals that the Dutch team members did not know whether they could trust their Russian colleagues. He explains this statement by asserting that the Dutch made compliments during their working visit which the Russians did not accept or take seriously. NH continues by stating that the Dutchmen had agreed to reduce the number of compliments and to only tell the truth. Afterwards, he begins to tell a story that is shown in the fragment below.

The speech actions of the proposer of the toast can be considered reflections on polite actions and courteous goodwill within this type of international cooperation. Again, their provocative formulations comply with the teasing structure, in which the teased person is not addressed personally- here, the Russian team members are addressed - and teased - as a group. The Russian official (RV) is the interpreter of the toast. It is striking that RV comments on the toast during his translatory action (see s69 in the annex) by saying in Russian that the proposer of the toast (NH) expresses himself in a very complicated manner. This comment indicates to the audience that the speech actions of the toast might be ambiguous.

The second self-retreat can be observed in s79, shown in fragment 5 below. The interpreter (RV) notes that he was not present at the described event and therefore retreats. Subsequently, the previous interpreter (RW) again takes over by translating this utterance (s80). Afterwards, RV continues translating until the end of the recording.

*Fragment 5: T4/47-56: Continuation of the 'toast to say goodbye''*





√XX  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RW≥ из товарищей, у кого мы были в гостях,       сказал:  
 ≥ ≥ *the home of one of our friends,           he said:*  
 ≥ №

49 √XX  
 √XX  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RW≥ так, ну вечер подходит к концу       [<sup>81</sup> ((2 sec.))]  
 ≥ ≥ 'So, now the evening is coming to an end'.  
 ≥ №

50 √XX  
 √XX  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥NH≥ [<sup>82</sup> So of course again we thought this is honest. [<sup>83</sup> So we/ we shamed/  
 ≥ №

51 √XX  
 √XX  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥NH≥ we felt shamed and we packed our things and run out of the door.  
 ≥ №

52 √XX  
 √XX  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RV≥ [<sup>84</sup> но они восприняли это серьезно естественно э э они подумали, что  
 ≥ ≥ *But of course, they took it seriously and they thought, that*  
 ≥ №

53 √XX  
 √XX  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RV≥ действительно значит что вечер подошёл к концу  
 ≥ ≥ *it did indeed mean that the evening was coming to its end.*  
 ≥ №  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RW≥   [<sup>85</sup> всё честно по честному  
 ≥ ≥   *Everything the honest truth*  
 ≥ №

54 √XX  
 √XX  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RV≥ [<sup>86</sup> и мы так сказать уже собрали свои вещи и покраснели  
 ≥ ≥ *and we so to gathered our things and we blushed.*  
 ≥ №

55 √XX  
 √XX  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥NH≥ и нам было неудобно и мы собрались уходить.  
 ≥ ≥ *We were uncomfortable and we wanted to leave.*  
 ≥ №

56 √XX

In s79 the Russian official (RV), instead of translating the previous utterance of the primary speaker (NH), states that he was not present at the event referred to in the toast. In professional interpretation, not being present would not be a valid argument for a change of the interpreter, but this fragment indicates that personal involvement and knowledge of the prehistory of the communicative events addressed by the primary speakers are important prerequisites for effective interpretation. From ethnographic sources we know that the Dutchmen never left the house, nor did the hostess scream out of the window. In fact, this story represents a 'persiflage' of what actually took place. The formulations used by the proposer of the toast correspond to the kind of exaggerations that are characteristic of teasing.

The story of the toast made by the toast giver refers to the repair of a misunderstanding that can be traced back to a lack of cultural knowledge on the part of the Dutch with respect to the social sequence of Russian toasting at home. The penultimate toast is reserved for the hostess to praise her guests and thank them for their presence. The last toast should be



```

v@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@
 ≥ >v
 ≥NH≥92 So it is not / we don't know when you have
 ≥ ⌘
 ≥ >v
 ≥RX≥ [93 ну они и шутят
 ≥ ≥ So, that's how they make jokes.
 ≥ ⌘
 61 ⌘@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@
 (end of the tape)

```

The comments made in s91 and s93 are highly important for the overall analysis of the toast since they show that at least two interactants actually interpreted the teasing in the toast as humour. In fact, the formulation of the second comment (s93) firmly categorizes the toast as a joke. The utterance made by RX contains a generalization in which the Dutchman's joke is qualified as a group characteristic of how *they make jokes*. However, one does not know whether she is referring to *that's the way men joke* or *that's the way the Dutch joke* or *that's the way Western Europeans joke*. In any case, according to Barth (1969), one could note that a cultural boundary has been interactively constructed, separating an in-group and an out-group. In summary, one can conclude that intercultural understanding does not mean that all participants agree on the same values; rather, they seem to recognize and respect them.

It should also be noted that these comments are not actually transferred to the Dutch speaker, i.e., the proposer of the toast and teaser does not know whether the teasing contained in his toast has actually been understood. The ultimate grounds for my diagnosis of successful mutual understanding are based on ethnographic sources.

**8 Conclusions**

This paper has described a case study of institutional, intercultural and translatory discourse. The analysis exemplifies the functional pragmatic approach to translatory action by focussing on an extreme action of the interpreter, namely his self-retreat.

In a survey of different theories of translatory discourse, I have shown that the distinction between professional and non-professional interpreters should be rejected and replaced by the concept of a continuum of the interpreter's action space. On one pole of this continuum the interpreter is considered as a sole transmitter of utterances between the original speakers and on the other pole is regarded as an autonomous (third) participant equal to the original speakers. The action space of the interpreter can be conceptualized by an internal dilated speech situation in which the language rupture between the original speakers is bridged by the reproduction of their speech actions in various translatory modes. The stages of this continuum can be reconstructed as different forms of textualization by the interpreter. The characterization of the primary speaker's utterances is one means of reproduction.

The analysis of the translatory actions has been reconstructed in recurrent analytical phases that can be summarized as follows (cf. also ten Thije 2002):

Firstly, the institutional constellation of the cooperation of an international team is analyzed in order to determine the institutional positions of the Russian and Dutch officials and their functionaries. The reconstruction reveals different language competencies in English, Russian and Dutch with respect to the various team members. These differences in language competency explain the need for interpretation for some of the Russian team members. This language constellation also explains the occurrence of non-transparent speech situations both in Dutch and Russian; both parties can speak their own language without being understood by the others. This multilingual constellation appears to be an important factor in international cooperation and the establishment of a discursive interculture (Koole and ten Thije 1994, 2001; ten Thije 2003).

Secondly, the discourse type or genre of toasting is reconstructed as a form of polite action in which courteous goodwill is formulated while paying respect to social measures. Certain standards of this discourse type could be identified on the basis of the Russian discourse type of toasting. The characteristics of an intercultural realization of this discourse type could then be reconstructed based on these cultural standards. This intercultural realization was determined by embedding the speech action pattern of teasing in the toasting. The proposer of the toast simultaneously acts as the teaser, while the interpreter is addressed as the teased person and the other participants are treated as the audience of the teasing.

The analysis of the embedding of teasing (Günthner 1996) in toasting (Kotthoff 1995, 1997) led in a third analytical phase to the conclusion that this concurrence of discourse structures provided the Dutch with the opportunity to playfully reflect on differences in Russian and Dutch social measures of polite action. The main topic of the toast refers to the problem of giving compliments and showing personal interest in male – female international cooperation. The issue wittily addressed by the toast giver refers to the question of to what extent giving compliments must to be taken seriously, when such compliments actually support effective team cooperation, and when they are overdone and hence might be considered personal harassment. The analysis demonstrates the characteristics of the complexity of gender discourse in intercultural communication. Although this case study may only hint at the importance of gender discourse, it is quite clear that gender should not be considered as a language external factor but should rather be incorporated in the discourse analysis from the beginning (Eckert and McConnel-Ginet 2003).

Finally, I wish to summarize the conclusions with respect to the analysis of translatory action. By presupposing an internal dilated speech situation for translatory action, I was able to reconstruct the manner in which the teasing pattern was initiated in a dilated speech situation and completed in a non-transparent Russian interaction space. In fact, the problem of translating the notion of *harassment* was resolved by initiating a clarification turn that was not directly addressed at the original speaker, as one would expect, but rather at the Russian audience. As soon as her Russian colleagues explain the notion and the interpreter understands the propositional content of the speech action of the Dutch primary speaker, she displays her understanding by realizing the hearer-side of the illocution of his reproach in the target language. The interpreter confesses that she was the person involved in the harassment. The analysis reveals the collapse of the two roles of the interpreter, which subsequently leads to her withdrawal from the position of interpreter.

The constellation of the self-retreat of an interpreter has scarcely been discussed in translation studies. This case study reconstructs in great detail how the roles of an interpreter as a transmitter on the one hand and as an independent third participant on the other contradict each other and result in the retreat of the interpreter. At first glance this conclusion corresponds to the common sense rule that interpreters should not be actively involved in the discourse they are interpreting. However, as I concluded from a review of the state of the art of translation studies, interpreters are always more or less involved in the discourse, a phenomenon that can be described on the basis of a continuum. Consequently, paying more attention to the constellation of self-retreat increases our understanding of translatory action in general. This case study shows one case of self-retreat caused by an excessive degree of personal involvement and one caused by a case of too little involvement on the part of the interpreter. The theoretical impetus of this case study thus relates to the reconstruction of the everyday notion of the personal involvement of the interpreter.

## 9 References

- Agar, Michael (1994) *Language Shock. Understanding the Culture of Conversation*, New York: Morrow.
- Alberts, Jess K. (1992) 'Teasing and Sexual Harassment. Double-Bind Communication in the Workplace', in Linda A. Perry, Lynn H. Turner, and Helen A. Sterk (eds.) *Constructing and reconstructing gender*, Albany: SUNY Press, 185-197.
- Apfelbaum, Birgit (1998) "I think, I have to translate first..." Zu Problemen der Gesprächsorganisation in Dolmetschsituationen sowie zu einigen interaktiven Verfahren ihrer Bearbeitung', in Birgit Apfelbaum and Hermann Müller (eds) *Fremde im Gespräch. Gesprächsanalytische Untersuchungen zu Dolmetsch-Interaktionen, interkultureller Kommunikation und institutionalisierten Interaktionsformen*, Frankfurt: IKO - Verlag für interkulturelle Kommunikation, 21-46.
- Apfelbaum, Birgit (2004) *Gesprächsdynamik in Dolmetsch-Interaktionen. Eine empirische Untersuchung von Situationen internationaler Fachkommunikation unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Arbeitssprachen Deutsch, Englisch, Französisch und Spanisch*, www.verlag-gespraechsforschung.de, last visited: 15 July 2007.
- Austin, John L. (1962) *How to do Things with Words*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barth, Fredrik (1969) 'Introduction', in Fredrik Barth (ed.) *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. The Social Organisation of Cultural Difference*, Bergen & Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 9-39.
- Bronsdijk, Myrthe (2006) *Interpreter in the language analysis interview. Translation machine or second interviewer?* Master thesis Communication studies Utrecht: Utrecht University.
- Bot, Hanneke (2005) *Dialogue interpreting in mental health*, Amsterdam & Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Bühlig, Kristin (1999) 'Konsekutives Übersetzen Englisch-Deutsch', in Heidrun Gerzymisch-Arbogast, Daniel Gile, Juliane House and Anneli Rothkegel (eds) *Wege der Übersetzungs- und Dolmetschforschung. Jahrbuch der deutschen Gesellschaft für Übersetzungs- und Dolmetschwissenschaft*, Tübingen: Narr, 241-266.
- (2004) "'Che devo dire?'" – Zu einigen Möglichkeiten und Schwierigkeiten in der Thema-Rhema-Progression in der mehrsprachigen Familienkommunikation', in House, Juliane, Werner Koller, Klaus Schubert (eds) *Neue Perspektiven in der Übersetzungs- und Dolmetschwissenschaft. Festschrift für Heidrun Gerzymisch-Arbogast zum 60. Geburtstag*, Bochum: AKS-Verlag, 151-172.
- and Jochen Rehbein (2000) *Reproduzierendes Handeln. Übersetzen, simultanes und konsekutives Dolmetschen im diskursanalytischen Vergleich*. Arbeiten zur Mehrsprachigkeit, Folge B 7, Hamburg: SFB.
- and Jan D. ten Thije (2005) 'Diskurspragmatische Beschreibungsmodelle', in Ulrich Ammon, Norbert Dittmar, Klaus Mattheier (eds) *Sociolinguistics – Soziolinguistik. An international Handbook of the Science of Language and Society*, Berlin: Mouton, 1225-1250.
- Chiaro, Delia (1992) *The Language of Jokes. Analysing verbal play*, London: Routledge.
- De Stefani, Elwys, Johanna Miecznikowski, and Lorenza Mondada (2000) "'Können sie vielleicht kurz übersetzen'". les activités de traduction dans des reunions de travail plurilingues', *Revue Française de Linguistique Appliquée* 5(1): 25-42.
- Dimova, Anna (2000) 'Humor zwischen Sprachen und Kulturen: Läßt sich Humor übersetzen?', in *Elias Canetti. Internationale Zeitschrift für transdisziplinäre Kulturforschung* 2(2), 40-56.
- Eder, Donna (1993) "'Go Get Ya a French'". Romantic and sexual teasing among adolescent girls', in Tannen, Deborah (ed.) *Gender and conversational interaction*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 17- 30.
- Eckert, Penelope and Sally McConnel-Ginet (2003) *Language and Gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Ehlich, Konrad (1984) 'Zum Textbegriff', in Anneli Rothkegel and Barbara Sandig (eds) *Text – Textsorten – Semantik. Linguistische Modelle und maschinelle Verfahren*, Hamburg: Buske, 9-25.
- (1991) 'Funktional-pragmatische Kommunikationsanalyse. Ziele und Verfahren', in Dieter Flader (ed.) *Verbale Interaktion. Studien zur Empirie und Methodologie der Pragmatik*, Stuttgart: Metzler, 127-143.
- and Jochen Rehbein (1979) 'Sprache in Institutionen', in Hans Peter Althaus, Herbert Ernst Wiegand, and Helmut Henne (eds) *Lexikon der Germanistischen Linguistik*, Tübingen: Niemeyer, 338-345.
- Fienemann, Jutta (2006) *Erzählen in zwei Sprachen. Diskursanalytische Untersuchungen von Erzählungen auf Deutsch und Französisch*, Münster: Waxmann.
- and Jochen Rehbein (2004) 'Introductions: Being polite in multilingual settings', in Juliane House and Jochen Rehbein (eds) *Multilingual Communication*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 223–278.
- Frake, Charles (1972) 'How to ask for a drink in Subanum', in Pier Giglioli (ed.) *Language and Social Context*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 87-94,
- Goffman, Ervin (1981) *Forms of Talk*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Günthner, Susanne (1996) 'Zwischen Scherz und Schmerz - Frotzelaktivitäten in Alltagsinteraktionen', in Helga Kotthoff (ed.) *Scherzkommunikation. Beiträge aus der empirischen Gesprächsforschung*, Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 81-108.
- Hofstede, Geert (1991) *Cultures and organizations. Software of the mind*, London: McGraw.
- Jatzkowskaja, G. (1994) 'Russisch-deutsche Tischgespräche und Essgewohnheiten', in Richard Brutting and Günter Trautmann (eds) *Dialog und Divergenz. Interkulturelle Studien zu Selbst- und Fremdbildern in Europa*, Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 235-242.
- Jefferson, Gail (1972) 'Side Sequences', in David Sudnow (ed.) *Studies in Social Interaction*, New York: Free Press, 294-328.
- Knapp, Karlfried and Annelie Knapp-Potthoff (1985) 'Sprachmittlertätigkeit in der interkulturellen Kommunikation', in Jochen Rehbein (ed.) *Interkulturelle Kommunikation*, Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 450-464.
- Knapp-Potthoff, Annelie and Karlfried Knapp (1986) 'Interweaving two discourses – The difficult task of the non-professional interpreter' in Juliane House and Shoshana Blum-Kulka (eds) *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication. Discourse and Cognition in Translation and Second Language Acquisition Studies*, Tübingen: Narr, 151-169.
- (1987) 'The man or woman in the middle. Discoursal aspects of non-professional interpreting', in Karlfried Knapp, Werner Enninger and Annelie Knapp-Potthoff (eds.) *Analyzing Intercultural Communication*, Berlin & New York & Amsterdam: de Gruyter, 181-212.
- Koole, Tom and Jan D. ten Thije (1994) *The construction of intercultural discourse. Team discussions of educational advisers*, Amsterdam & Atlanta: RODOPI.
- (2001) 'The reconstruction of intercultural discourse. Methodological considerations', *Journal of Pragmatics* (33): 571-589.
- Kotthoff, Helga (1995) 'The social semiotics of Georgian toast performances. Oral genre as cultural activity', *Journal of Pragmatics* (24): 353-380.
- (1997) 'Rituelle Trinksprüche beim georgischen Gastmahl: Zur kommunikativen Konstruktion von Vertrautheit und Fremdheit', in Annelie Knapp-Potthoff and Martina Liedke (eds) *Aspekte interkultureller Kommunikationsfähigkeit*, München: iudicium, 65-93.
- (1998) *Spaß verstehen. Zur Pragmatik von konversationellem Humor*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.

- Lee, W.-S. (1994) 'Communication about humour procedural competence in intercultural encounters', in Larry A. Samovar and Richard E. Porter (eds) (1994) *Intercultural communication: A reader*, Belmont: Wadsworth, 373-382.
- Meyer, Bernd (2004) *Dolmetschen im medizinischen Aufklärungsgespräch. Eine diskursanalytische Untersuchung zur Wissensvermittlung im mehrsprachigen Krankenhaus*, Münster: Waxmann.
- More, E. (1993) 'The role of humour in workplace communication - Training implication', Paper presented at International Conference 'Communication in the Workplace: Culture, Language and Organisational Change', Sydney, 1-4 September 1993.
- Müller, Frank (1989) 'Translation in bilingual conversation. Pragmatic aspects of translatory interaction', *Journal of Pragmatics* (13): 713-739.
- Pöchhacker, Franz and Miriam Shlesinger (eds) (2002) *The Interpreting Studies Reader*, London: Routledge.
- Quasthoff, Uta M. (1980) *Erzählen in Gesprächen. Linguistische Untersuchungen zu Strukturen und Funktionen am Beispiel einer Kommunikationsform des Alltags*, Tübingen: Narr.
- Rehbein, Jochen (2001) 'Das Konzept der Diskursanalyse', in Klaus Brinker, Gerd Antos, Wolfgang Heinemann, and Sven F. Sager (eds) *Text- und Gesprächslinguistik. Linguistics of Text and Conversation. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung. An International Handbook of Contemporary Research. 2. Halbband. Vol.2.*, Berlin & New York: de Gruyter, 927-945.
- Richmond, Y. (1992) *From Nyet to Da. Understanding the Russians*, Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.
- Thije, Jan D. ten (1998) 'Proost Pieter, Een toast op de interculturele communicatie', in Adriene Bruyn and Jacques Arends (eds.) *Mengelwerk voor Muysken. Voor Pieter C. Muysken bij zijn afscheid van de Universiteit van Amsterdam*, [Publicaties van het Instituut voor Algemene Taalwetenschap 72] Amsterdam: Universiteit van Amsterdam, 35-40.
- (2002) 'Stufen des Verstehens in der Analyse interkultureller Kommunikation', in Helga Kotthoff (ed.) *Kultur(en) im Gespräch. Studien zur Fremdheit und Interaktion*, Tübingen: Narr, 57-97.
- (2003) 'Eine Pragmatik der Mehrsprachigkeit: Zur Analyse diskursiver Interkulturen', in Rudi De Cillia, Josef Krumm, Josef and Ruth Wodak (eds) *Die Kosten der Mehrsprachigkeit - Globalisierung und sprachliche Vielfalt / The Cost of Multilingualism - Globalisation and Linguistic Diversity / Le Cout du Plurilinguism - Mondialisation et diversité linguistique*, Wien: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 101-125.
- (2006a) 'Beyond Misunderstanding; Introduction', in Kristin Bührig and Jan D. ten Thije (eds.) *Beyond Misunderstanding. The linguistic analysis of intercultural communication*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1- 11.
- (2006b) 'The notion of 'perspective' and 'perspectising' in intercultural communication research', in Kristin Bührig and Jan D. ten Thije (eds) *Beyond Misunderstanding. The linguistic analysis of intercultural communication*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 97-153.
- (to appear in 2007) 'Meertaligheid in de asielpcedure' *Toegepaste Taalwetenschap in Artikelen*.
- Wadensjö, Celia (1998) *Interpreting as Interaction*, Linköping: Linköping University.
- Wilss, Wolfram (1988) *Anspielungen. Zur Manifestation von Kreativität und Routine in der Sprachverwendung*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Wilton, Antje (this volume) 'Interactional Translation'.











v@@  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥NH> [25 So uuuhh, Vladimir. [26 Thank you foruuhh confirming my position  
 ≥ ✕  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RX> [27 ( )  
 ≥ ✕  
 12 ✕@@  
 v@@  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥NH> in your staff and inviting Otto to be in the staff here.  
 ≥ ✕  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RV> [29 Hmhm.  
 ≥ ✕  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RW> [28 Владимир, спасибо большое  
 ≥ ≥ Vladimir, thank you very much,  
 ≥ ✕  
 13 ✕@@  
 v@@  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥NH> [30 I promise you we will best / I'll do my/  
 ≥ ✕  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RW> за то, что ты подтвердил свою роль в университете  
 ≥ ≥ for confirming your position at the university.  
 ≥ ✕  
 14 ✕@@  
 v@@  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥NH> We will do our best . to involve them so much in Holland, that  
 ≥ ✕  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RW> и за то, что ты развернул  
 ≥ ≥ and for developing that.  
 ≥ ✕  
 15 ✕@@  
 v@@  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥NH> they won't come back here [32[that they will be in our staff,].  
 ≥ ✕  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RX> [31 и . и (lachen)  
 ≥ ≥ and . and  
 ≥ ✕  
 16 ✕@@  
 [2 laughing slightly  
 v@@  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RW> [33я начало прослушала и [34так надеемся, что да что вам так  
 ≥ ≥ I missed the start and therefore we hope, that yeah, that you  
 ≥ ✕  
 17 ✕@@  
 v@@  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RW> понравится, что вы туда не вернётесь,  
 ≥ ✕ will like it so much, that you won't go back there,  
 18 ✕@@  
 v@@  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥NH> [36 ((2 sec.))  
 ≥ ✕  
 ≥ >v !  
 ≥RW> сюда не вернётесь  
 ≥ ≥ won't come back here.  
 ≥ ✕





vXX  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥NH≥ [56 There was really one serious problem that  
 ≥ №  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RV≥ [53 да  
 ≥ ≥ yes  
 ≥ №  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RW≥  
 ≥ ≥ [54 laughs  
 ≥ №  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥R?≥ [55 laughs  
 ≥ №  
 29 vXX  
 vXX  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥NH≥ [57 was the problem of trust. [58 It was not possible for Otto and me to  
 ≥ №  
 30 vXX  
 vXX  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥NH≥ know when we can trust people or not.  
 ≥ №  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RV≥ [59 Ага, значит, он сказал,  
 ≥ ≥ Uh-huh, that means, he said  
 ≥ №  
 31 vXX  
 vXX  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RV≥ что была одна проблема , мы с Отто тут обговорили, в общем  
 ≥ ≥ That there was one problem, Otto and I have already discussed this, in general  
 ≥ №  
 32 vXX  
 vXX  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RV≥ мы не знаем , кому можно доверять, кому нельзя  
 ≥ № We don't know, who we can trust and who not.  
 33 vXX  
 vXX  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥NH≥ [60 We gave a lot of compliments and they were not taken for serious  
 ≥ №  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RX≥ [61 inhale  
 ≥ №  
 34 vXX  
 vXX  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RV≥ [62 и мы/ мы/ мы значит говорили много комплиментов,  
 ≥ ≥ and we/ we/ we have voiced many compliments  
 ≥ №  
 35 vXX  
 vXX  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RV≥ но их не воспринимали серьёзно, как нужно было воспринимать,  
 ≥ ≥ but they were not taken seriously like they were meant  
 ≥ №  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥RW≥ [63 ( )  
 ≥ №  
 36 vXX  
 vXX  
 ≥ >v  
 ≥NH≥ [64 So we agreed to reduce the number of compliments, but to be  
 ≥ ≥  
 ≥ №









