Interpreting in the Libyan Uprising: A Study of Interpreting Strategies from Arabic to English

Asmaa Alduhaim[1]*, Muman Alkhaldy[2]

[1]American International College, Kuwait
[2]University of Birmingham, UK and Ajdabiya University, Libya

Corresponding Author: Asmaa Alduhaim, E-mail: asmaa.alduhaim@hotmail.co.uk

ABSTRACT

This article presents an account of the interpreting process and its strategies in warzones, and most importantly during the Arab Spring, specifically in Libya. The data used is divided into two categories, Mummar Algaddafi speech during the Arab Spring, and press conferences of Libyan officials and two interviews on CNN. The article will present the significant issues interpreters deal with during live interpreting session whether on Live TV or during a conference. The first category to be discussed is omission and the loss of meaning during interpreting. The article will also discuss the way interpreters sometimes tend to add information for explaining purposes or emphasis. Lastly, the importance of creativity and approximating the meaning, as in using metaphors in the TT to interpret ST metaphors. It is evident through the discussion that (1): interpreters deliberately use particular strategies during conflict zones and they are mainly: omission, addition and approximating. This is either to emphasis a particular narrative or shape the audience views. (2) Undoubtedly, interpreters play a major role in rendering the message to the world, as they use different strategies while interpreting some to emphasis a certain narrative, while others simply to clarify the text.

INTRODUCTION

Today, interpreters working in conflict zones are highly regarded as mediators since they operate under different circumstances that inevitably influence their interpretation. The emergence of conflicts across the world, particularly in the Middle East region led to significant need to a fairly new discipline in the Translation Studies area related to interpreters in warzones. Unfortunately, until today, there has been a dearth in research in this particular area; thus

, this article aims to shed light on the various strategies interpreters' use during those times. In this article, we aim to approach the topic from the interpreters point of view, and focus on the strategies interpreters use – whether deliberately or not- while interpreting in conflict zones.

Hence, this article aims to enrich the research conducted about interpreting during times of conflicts by shedding light on specific issues and strategies to which warzones interpreters face during their work. Such issues could either occur due to dialect related issues (i.e. Libyan dialect versus other Arab dialects), or simply because of cultural references that are mainly familiar to the people in that given country. This article intends to highlight several strategies interpreters tend used during conflict times, and highlights the interpreter's role in conveying the message into the TT audience.

INTERPRETING

"The translator's activity is more like that of a writer, while the interpreter's performance is more like that of an actor" (Nolan, 2005: 3). Scholars recognize interpreting as an oral immediate translation (Jones, 2002). There are different types of interpreting; the most common ones are consecutive and simultaneous interpreting. Consecutive interpreting is considered as the oldest and most difficult type of interpreting, it is explained by Gonzalez, Vasquez and Mikkelson as the type where an interpreter waits until the speaker finishes the source language message, and then interpret it into the target language. This type of interpreting requires a set of skills that interpreters should acquire for instance, intensive listening and comprehension skills, note-taking techniques, good knowledge and a trained memory (ibid). Frequently, the interpreters are standing next to the person they are interpreting for in consecutive interpreting and not in an interpreting booth as in simultaneous interpreting.

Simultaneous interpreting (henceforth SI) is defined by Russell as "the process of interpreting into the target language at the same time as the source language is being delivered" (2005: 136). Russell further states that interpreting is a highly complex process in which language is perceived, comprehended, translated and produced simultaneously and under severe time pressure. Mack highlights that SI is the type of interpreting used in conveying information, for example in internationally broadcast summits, meetings and conferences, political statements, press conferences and parliamentary debates. This type of interpreting is sometimes called live voice-over or *revoicing* (2001). The challenging process through which interpreters go during SI may greatly affect their performance. Jones claims that SI is an unnatural activity and has to be cultivated (2014). He asserts that simultaneous interpreters face many difficulties they need to overcome using different approaches. On the other hand, Gerver argues that the difficulty in the process lies within transmitting the speech at a faster rate, rather than in the process of decoding and encoding (1969). The demanding nature of the SI process may affect the interpreter's ability, especially when the speech is too long, which causes fatigue and mental strain. In addition, the breaks that the speaker takes, or the speed at which they are speaking may greatly influence the interpreter and drain their concentration abilities leading to exhaustion (Anderson, 1976). In 1978, Seleskovitch describes SI as a multitasking process that requires a high level of concentration, and similarly Phelan (2001) stresses that interpreters today should not interpret for more than fifteen minutes. Pöchhacker draws attention to a survey conducted in 2002, where interpreters showed a high level of work-related fatigue, exhaustion, and mental stress; they also pointed that it is sometimes challenging to cope with the speaker's language and delivering speed (2004). Benmaman and Framer (2010) state that no matter how experienced the interpreter is, it is impossible to provide a consistent and accurate interpretation after 30 to 40 minutes of continuous SI. They further assert that scientific studies have proven that mental fatigue sets in after approximately 30 minutes of sustained interpretations, leading to loss of accuracy (2010).

It is quite common that interpreters make mistakes due to exhaustion, or simply because they did not hear a word or did not understand it correctly. Jones states that in case a mistake is made, interpreters have two choices, to either correct themselves, or ignore the mistake if it was insignificant (2002). It is in fact essential that interpreters have certain strategies that help them manage such difficulties. Interpreters should be able to understand the message and skilfully transfer it to the target text TT, not necessarily by finding linguistic equivalents of the source text ST in the TT (Seleskovitch, 1978). It is difficult for interpreters to decide how to approach and respond to certain issues while interpreting, for example, the problem of lack of equivalences in the TT, culture specific references, the existence of different dialects, and the issue of what is considered taboo in the TT. As culture and language are intertwined and as they are both essential for the translation and interpreting process (Faiq, 2008), cultural specificities will greatly affect the interpreting process. Dialects pose another challenge, as Tipton and

Furmanek (2016) point out, as it is important to understand and distinguish different dialects to be able to render the meaning correctly. Al-Salman and Al-Khanji (2002) describe nine common strategies that are widely used among interpreters in Arabic-English interpretation when encountering difficulties:

1. Skipping: to leave out unnecessary repetition, redundant expressions or any unimportant information.
2. Anticipating: to expect what will come next and amend the information to put it in the most appropriate way possible in the TT.
3. Summarising: to minimise long sentences by maintaining the content and yet delivering the message.
4. Approximating: to provide the closest equivalent or synonym to have a similar TT expression.
5. Code-switching: to shift the style from standard to informal or colloquial language that is used when the interpreter is under pressure due to the speaker's fast delivery.
6. Literal interpreting: to use literal translation.
7. Incomplete sentence strategy: to utter unfinished sentences due to the occurrence of unfinished sentences by the speaker.
8. Addition: to add extra information to either explain or emphasis
9. Message abandoning: to resort to silence when the interpreter cannot interpret the message due to difficulties they are facing.

INTERPRETING IN CONFLICT ZONE

Though scholars such as Inghilleri and Harding (2010) and Askew and Salama-Carr (2011), suggest that there has been an increasing interest in the role of translators and interpreters in conflict zones over the few last years, other scholars such as Guo (2009), Baker (2010), and Footitt & Kelly (2012) allege that very little scholarly literature is available on the use of language in wartime. Nowadays, the significance of similar studies is due to the globalisation of conflicts via the intervention of the International Community and other human rights and peacekeeping organisations in most conflicts worldwide, which gives more attention to the issue of language mediation in wars. The high demand for war-zone interpreters, which emerges from their effective participation in various aspects relating to the conflict leads to a high demand in studies within the field.

DATA

The data for this research consists of two categories. The first category is of a live interpreting session into English of Algaddafi's speech on Aljazeera English on 22 February 2011. The other category is divided into two parts, (a) an interpreting of two press conferences held in Libya on 18 March 2011 one by the Libyan deputy foreign minister Khaled Kaim while the other by the Libyan foreign minister Musa Kusa, and (b) two interviews broadcasted on CNN channel. Below is the analysis of the interpreting strategies used by interpreting.

THE ANALYSIS

Lost in Interpreting

As mentioned earlier, interpreting is an exhausting task and hence interpreters are likely to make errors such as restating the words in the source text language, deliberately not interpreting some or merely misinterpreting something. In this section, we will discuss two categories where interpreters lost the meaning. When the meaning is lost during interpreting, it is either a strategy used by the interpreter because of the insignificant of the information, or due to difficulty interpreting the ST into the TT for various reasons such as exhaustion or lack of equivalence.

Dialectic issues

Although Modern Standard Arabic is considered the lingua franca for the Arab region, dialects are often used in daily communication. Thus, differences between dialects can create a gap in understanding and in the communication process, which, in turn, can lead to difficulties in interpreting. Das writes in this regard that one word may have different meanings in two different dialects, leaving the interpreter to decide whether to find a regional equivalent or use a standard one (2005). The difficulty does not only lie in understanding certain terminology used within that dialect, but also in the way in which to interpret them and their connotations into the target text language.

Interpreting Algaddafi's speech is fraught with difficulty as he uses the Libyan colloquial dialect and terminology that is mainly used among people of specific tribes in Libya. Consequently, this can lead to misinterpretation and loss in meaning, as the interpreter might be forced to resort to strategies such as skipping or abandoning a message as discussed earlier. This is shown in the following extracts taken from Aljazeera English (Aljazeera, Feb 2011); the underlined phrases are those the interpreter did not interpret:

	Aljazeera English interpreter	Algaddafi
1	<u>What forced us to this?</u> <u>Oh god</u>, Benghazi I built it, brick by brick, we are happy with it and still building it now	<u>شن الي زرنا؟ سبحان الله؛</u> بنغازي بنيتها أنا بنفسي طوبة طوبة

	Aljazeera English interpreter	Algaddafi
2	<u>The leader has a beard and he is telling the women not to go out starting from today. Did you see this setback?</u> He said brought me donations, I am your caliph and I am with Bin Laden and Al-Zawahiri! Oh is that it! Do you want to be governed by Al-Zawahiri?	<u>داير لحية ويقول للنسوان ما عاش يطلعن اعتبارا من اليوم، رأيتم هذه النكسة؟!</u> وقال جيبوا لي التبرعات أنا خليفة وتبع بن لادن وتبع الظواهري! والله باهي يحكمكم الظواهري اخرها

These colloquial phrases are used by Algaddafi, but are not interpreted by the interpreter. Algaddafi uses these phrases as a way of communicating with the public, as his speech is of communicative nature. In the first example, one can notice that the interpreter used the skipping strategy to avoid interpreting the cultural expressions. In contrast to the second example, where the interpreter chose to summarise the ST, perhaps to convey the message in a rather clear way. Thus, it can be argued that the interpreter does not interpret these colloquial words for various reasons: firstly, they are communicative and perhaps less significant as the rest of the phrase in the source text and thus not relevant to the target text audience. For instance the usage of the phrases شن الي زرنا؟/سبحان الله *what forced u/oh god*، is mainly as an exclamation and Algaddafi's way of showing his denial and unbelieve of what is happening in Libya. One can argue that while interpreting phrases of a communicative nature might always seem insignificant.

The second reason is the lack of equivalence between source text and target text language, and a literal translation would be incomprehensible to the target text audience. Thirdly, the interpreter chooses to interpret the relevant message due to the length of the speech and time restrictions, particularly bearing in mind Algaddafi's speed at delivering the message. As mentioned earlier, interpreting is a very hard task, and bearing in mind Algaddafi's improvised speech and his speed of uttering the message may cause several problems to the interpreter. Hence, interpreters usually summarise the gist of the information to interpret, disregarding anything else that they regard as redundant or trivial.

Overlap between arabic and english

It is worth noting that during the interpreting of Algaddafi's speech, there are a number of incidences where the interpreter fails to interpret Arabic words into English and simply repeat the Arabic words, which might be attributed to the interpreter's fatigue or simply to his inability to cope with Algaddafi's speed of delivering the speech. For example, the interpreter literally uses the same Arabic word Algaddafi uses; and interprets them into English, or simply disregards it. Consider the examples below taken from Aljazeera's English interpreter (Aljazeera, Feb 2011):

	Aljazeera English interpreter	Algaddafi
1	Misrata <u>houra</u>, Zliten <u>houra</u>, Khoms <u>houra</u>, Msallata <u>houra</u>..., uhhh..., <u>free as well</u>	مصراتة حرة، زليتن حرة، الخمس حرة، مسلاتة حرة

	Aljazeera English Interpreter	Algaddafi
2	Zawiya ... <u>ām al-qb āl</u> ...the mother of all tribes	أنتم قبيلة الزاوية، أم القبائل الزاوية

The examples above demonstrate the use of two strategies combined together, self-correcting combined with incomplete sentence strategy. This is seen in the first example; Algaddafi lists names of different tribes and states that they have their own free will. He says the name of each tribe and adds the word حرة/*free*, which defines what he means. The interpreter here simply repeats the same list, using the same word in Arabic/houra/, leaving the target text audience in confusion. He later tries to amend the situation by adding the word 'free as well', to correct himself. The interpreter's repeated use of the Arabic word, instead of providing the English translation, can be explained with the speed with which Algaddafi listed the cities, thus creating a rhythmic sound, perhaps leading the interpreter to follow the rhythm and mistakenly repeat the word in Arabic. It is also possible that the interpreter simply lost concentration, as this happens after almost 20 minutes of continuous interpreting. This is similar to the second example, when the interpreter mistakenly repeats Algaddafi's Arabic words, which is followed by a self-correction and an interpretation of the phrase in English at a later point. It can thus be challenging to be able to maintain coherence in a live interpreting session - the difficulty arguably increases even further in improvised, lengthy, and colloquial speech like Algaddafi's.

Addition to the Source Text

Interpreters in wartimes sometimes resort to the addition strategy, which means adding certain material during interpreting process in order to support the narratives of a particular side of the conflict. Various examples of adding expressions by interpreters occurred in the Libyan conflict. In a press conference that took place on 18 March 2011, just one day before the actual implementation of NATO operations in Libya, the Libyan deputy foreign minister Khaled Kaim of Algaddafi's regime announced a ceasefire, whilst the Libyan government spokesman Moussa Ibrahim acted as the interpreter. Moussa Ibrahim used the addition strategy to add information, as shown underlined in following example:

	Moussa Ibrahim the Interpreter	**Khaled Kaim**
1	The other <u>important</u> point is that the armed forces are located outside the city of Benghazi[1]	النقطة الأخرى إن القوات المسلحة موجودة خارج مدينة بنغازي

The interpreter, who is acting as the regime's spokesperson, added the word '*important*' in an attempt to stress the point that could prevent the NATO intervention in Libya for emphasis purposes. This is similarly the case in the following example, during a press conference on the 18th March 2011, where Moussa Ibrahim was the interpreter for the Libyan foreign minister Musa Kusa, when Ibrahim used the addition strategy again to emphasis the problem Libyans will face due to the NATO intervention. In this seen in following example, the underlined phrases are those added by Ibrahim.

	Moussa Ibrahim the interpreter	**Musa kusa**
1	And we believe that this will take the country back to safety and security <u>for all Libyans</u>… Such as the No-fly zone which includes <u>commercial and</u> civilian flights which will increase the suffering of the Libyan nation and <u>Libyan people and</u> will have negative impact on the general life of <u>Libyan people</u>… Also, the total <u>and inclusive</u> freezing of all Libyan assets <u>and investments</u> will have a <u>very</u> negative impact on <u>normal</u> Libyans and will also negatively impact the way or Libya ability to fulfil its contracts and agreements locally <u>and internationally</u>[2]	وذلك بما من شأنه أن يعيد الاستقرار والأمن إلى البلاد ... ومن بينها الحضر الجوي الذي يشمل الطيران المدني والذي سوف يعظم معاناة الشعب الليبي ويؤثر تأثيرا سلبيا على الحياة العامة ... كما أن تجميد شامل الأرصدة والأموال الليبية من شأنه يؤدي إلى الأضرار بالشعب الليبي وعدم قيام الدولة بتنفيذ إلتزاماتها المحلية

There are many factors that would justifies using the addition strategy for this interpreter who is originally a Libyan official, for instance the critical timing of the two press conferences, as well as the serious intention of the Libyan regime to prevent the international intervention. This perhaps is the reason why interpreter play a major role in influencing the way the message is being conveyed to another language, and how it may prevent an international intervention through the addition of particular expressions.

There are rather more similar examples in two interviews that were broadcasted in CNN Channel. In both cases, the CNN interpreters attempted to influence the target text by adding phrases to provoke an emotional reaction in the receptors that the interviewees did not say. The first example occurred in an interview held with the mother of the famous victim of rape Iman Al Obeidi, whose story was broadcasted on several channels.[3] The CNN interpreter managed to influence the target text by using the addition strategy and adding phrases as shown underlined, that the mother of Al Obeidi did not say. Similarly to the other example, in an interview held with a former soldier who had defected from the Algaddafi regime, the former soldier narrated an account of two girls aged 15 and 17 years old who were kidnapped and then raped by the soldiers of pro-Algaddafi troops.[4] Consider the following examples:

1	**The CNN Interpreter**	**The Mother of Al Obeidi**
	It was a feeling any mother would have <u>after talking to her daughter after a very long time</u>… I could not understand a word because she was crying <u>she even made me cry</u>	زي شعور أي أم ... طول ما هي تحكي معايا وهي تبكي ما فهمتش منها كلمة بلكل

2	**The CNN Interpreter**	**The Mother of Al Obeidi**
	Two <u>school</u> girls 15 and 17 years old	زوج بناويت خمسطاش وسبعطاش سنة

It is clearly evident that both interpreters used the addition strategy to add information that have not been said by the narrator in the ST. This can be explained by two main reasons 1) the inepter aimed to emphasis the tragedy by explaining the situation or giving details, 2) by describing the

girls killed using the word 'school girls', which would spike people's rage and provoke their emotions. Regardless, the reason(s) beyond such a practice, using the addition strategy can definitely influence the way the audience receive the message and understood it.

Creativity in Interpreting

It is quite common for interpreters to rephrase or reproduce the target text in various creative and skilful ways. For instance, interpreters may resolve to simplifying the information, reproducing the message in a different way, summarising it and at other times replacing the source text with an explanation. This is mainly to cope with time restrains in understanding the target text and interpreting it, and most importantly to make the target text acceptable to the its audience. Although interpreting is a difficult task, interpreters should be skilful and creative when they render the information, for instance when rendering metaphors and cultural references. For instance, in the example below, from Algaddafi's speech (Aljazeera, Feb 2011), Algaddafi uses the word قبلتها/ *its direction*, which clearly is using the approximating strategy in an in an attempt to draw attention to Libya's importance and how, as a role model, it guides African countries and the world in seeking freedom and liberty. The aim of this metonymy is to illustrate Libya's role in the region, to highlight that its actions should be followed, and promote it as a highly regarded place that everyone wants to visit, and in a way it provides closest meaning to the ST.

	Aljazeera English Interpreter	Algaddafi
1	All african nations consider, consider as the Mecca	كل الشعوب الإفريقية تعتبر ليبيا قبلتها

The Aljazeera interpreter reintroduces Algaddafi's idea using a word that carries the same connotation as the word in the source text. 'Mecca' originally refers to the city of Mecca in Saudi Arabia, the holy city of Islam and the direction to which all Muslims across the world pray (King, 1999). This metonymy has recently been introduced to the English language and is, according to the Meriam Webster Dictionary, used as a reference for a place that attracts many people. Thus, it could be argued that the interpreter uses the word Mecca to highlight the significance of Libya as a country and a role model for all African nations. By doing so, the interpreter skilfully conveys both the message and the stylistic form to the target text audience. To Bernárdez, however, using the metonymy *Mecca* is not a good choice, since the word only carries associations or values in certain societies. He further argues that the word will not be understood by Western cultures, because of its different value in each culture (2013). One can argue that using this term can potentially cause some misunderstanding to the target text audience.

Al-Khafaji highlights that repetition in Arabic "can have didactic, playful, emotional, artistic, ritualistic, textual and rhetorical functions" (2005: 6). Repetition in English Language, however, is considered redundant and undesirable, which may cause a dilemma to interpreters. The

translation of repetitions or the use of more than one synonym differs from one interpreter to another, but there are different mechanisms that interpreters use to approach this issue. The first method is to render the word or phrase into the target text language, using the linguistic equivalent. The second method is to convey the meaning in the most appropriate way possible but without reliance on linguistic equivalence. The third way is omission, which means to delete all unnecessary meanings and words to avoid repetition. The fourth is by providing an explanation to the target text audience (Hassan, 2015).

In the following example, Aljazeera's interpreters deleted there petitions, or explain the repetition to the audience.

Aljazeera English Interpreter	Algaddafi
1 Where are you from? From mariam? <u>Or any other tribe?</u>	أنت من اين؟ من عايلة غيث، أنت من عايلة مريم، أنت من ارفاد، أنت من امزين، عارفين بعضنا، ونشوف هذا الولد ولد من، من عائلة امزين، أو من عائلة ارفاد، أو من عائلة مريم، أو من عائلة غيث

The interpreter chooses to use the summarising strategy by deleting the tribes' name, and by adding his own explanation. Instead of following the sequence in which Algaddafi mentions the tribes' names, the interpreter deletes the second tribe and adds "*any other tribe*". For the target text audience, the beginning of the target text is ambiguous, and that the repetition of tribes' names might confuse the audience who is perhaps not sure whether these names are cities or tribes. One would argue that the interpreter renders the message to the target text audience fully, by explaining the significance behind the statement, and by avoiding repetition that might be confusing to them. By deleting the names of the tribes, the interpreter does not disregard any important information, yet manages to render the message precisely as in the source text.

Similarly in the following examples, the Libyan government spokesperson Moussa Ibrahim was interpreting for the Libyan deputy foreign minister Khaled Kaim during a press conference, where he used several strategies to render the message in the best way that serves Algaddafi regime's narrative and agenda, consider the following example:

	Back translation	Interpreter Moussa Ibrahim	Khalid Kaim
1	The Great Jamahiriya	أن الجماهيرية العظمى	The decision by the Libyan authorities[5]

In the previous example, Moussa Ibrahim was interpreting from English into Arabic forthe Libyan deputy foreign minister Khaled Kaim. Ibrahim somehow used the addition strategy to add the term 'the Great Jamahiriya' instead of 'the Libyan authorities'. This is because the term 'Jamahiriya' is mainly associated with Algaddafi and his regime. This is considered as an embellishment of the term 'the Libyan authorities', because people in the pro-regime had always been proud to quote Algaddafi's phrases. However, in another incident when the same interpreter, Moussa Ibrahim, was interpreting for the Libyan foreign minister Musa Kusa, he did

not replace any terms, and he added only one word. He added the word 'Libyan' to embellish the image of Algaddafi's regime, and the fact that he was still in control of all states in Libya. Consider the following example:

	Back translation	Interpreter Moussa Ibrahim	Musa Kusa
1	Therefore, the state encourages	Therefore, building on this, the Libyan state encourages[6]	من ذلك فإن الدولة تشجع

CONCLUSION

Equally, to any other field, warzone interpreters use several strategies, namely: omission, addition and approximating to emphasis a particular narrative or provoke audience's emotions. Thus, interpreters are not only mediators at conflict times, but they can be the weapon governments use to change the public's views. The above analysis has shown how interpreting is a sophisticated process, but with similar strategies that interpreters apply in different situations. The most common strategies used by interpreters in warzones are omission, whether deliberately or unintentionally. Omission is usually a method used by most interpreters when the speaker is repeating insignificant information, in case of redundancy, or sometimes when they fail to understand or find a proper equivalence for cultural references used in the source text. Contrary to the first strategy, the second strategy is addition of information, mostly for clarification purposes. However, sometimes, as in the cases analysed above in warzones, interpreters are influenced by their ideology or their political agendas. For instance, they add words, or reproduce the source text in a rather different way to portray a message they wish to emphasis by adding particular terminologies. This is the case with the CNN interpreter, whose interpreting aimed to provoke the audience to highlight and support the NATO intervention. The final strategy, which is approximating, which is a mixture of various techniques interpreters learn and adopt throughout the years of their experience, by being attentive, quick, smart and eloquent. Being an interpreters means losing the luxury of having the time to think and edit your translation, thus most interpreters try to familiarize themselves with the current events to be aware of the culture and terminologies they might come across. Sometimes, with famous quotes, or popular metaphors, interpreters/translators opt to render them into a similar quote or metaphor in the target language, others simply choose to explain or omit the quote or the metaphor.

In this paper, we have argued that interpreters play an undoubted role in rendering the message to the target language audience, and at times shaping their opinions according to their beliefs. According to Baker (2006: 105), translators and interpreters face an ethical choice of whether they reproduce the existing ideologies encoded in the narratives of the source text, or if they distance themselves from them. It is especially true during wartime, since interpreters play the role of the mediator between two opposing parties, and what they wish to convey to the world. It is in our conclusion that most interpreters are somehow influenced by their background and ideology whether deliberately or not. This is evident in the

terminology they choose, the strategies of omission addition, or approximating and other factors that affect the target text. Nonetheless, interpreters are sometimes influenced by the network's agenda more than their own, by the way the channel renarrate the interpreting by selecting certain parts to air other than others, or by the way it is reframed within the news. Interpreters are sometimes at a dilemma of being loyal to the text, to their beliefs, or to the media's agenda.

END NOTES

1. The video: (ArchiveLibyan, 2011).
2. The video: (17Feb2011, 2011).
3. The video: (Xgotfiveonitx, 2011).
4. The video: (VexZeez, 2011).
5. The video: (ArchiveLibyan, 2011).
6. The video: (17Feb2011, 2011).

REFERENCES

Alduhaim, A. (2018). *Multimodal translation analysis: Arab Spring speeches in Arabic and English* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Birmingham).

Aljazeera English. (Feb 2011). *Gaddafi's Full Speech* [video]. Available at: http://www.aljazeera.com/video/africa/2011/02/2011223112029216800.html

Al-Khafaji, R. (2005). Variation and Recurrence in the Lexical Chains of Arabic and English Texts. In De Gruyter (ed.), *Poznan Studies in Contemporary Linguistics, 40*, 5-25.

Alkhaldy, M. (2012). "English in Libya: A Vision for the Future." *Indian Literature* 56 (3): 215-226.

Anderson, R. B. W. (1976). Perspectives on the Role of Interpreter. In Brislin RW (ed.), *Translation: Applications and Research*, 208-228.

Al-Salman, S., & Al-Khanji, R. I. (2002). The Native Language Factor in Simultaneous Interpretation in an Arabic/English Context. In *Meta: Journal Des Traducteurs/ Meta. Translators' Journal, 47*(4), 607-626.

ArchiveLibyan (2011). *ALJamahirya2 TV 2011-3-18* من قناة الليبية الفضائية. You Tube, viewed 07 March 2019. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eTU-bAvHLos

Askew, L. and Salama-Carr, M. (2011). "Interview: Interpreters in conflict–the view from within" in *Translation Studies, 4*(1), pp. 103-108.

Baker, M. (2010). "Interpreters and translators in the war zone: Narrated and narrators" in *The Translator, 16*(2), pp. 197-222.

Benmaman, V. & Framer, I. (2010). "Foreign Language Interpreters and the Judicial System". In *Cultural Issues in Criminal Defense*. Juris Publishing, Inc.

Bernárdez, E. (2013). "A Cognitive View on the Role of Culture in Translation". In Rojo, A., & Ibarretxe-Antunano (eds.), *Cognitive Linguistics and Translation: Advances in Some Theoretical Models and Applications, 23*, 313.

Das, B. K. (2005). *A Handbook of Translation Studies*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers & Dist.

Faiq, S. (2008). "Cultural misrepresentation through translation". *Journal of Language and Translation* 9 (2), 31-48.

Footitt, H. and Kelly, M. (2012). *Languages at war: Policies and practices of language contacts in conflict,* London: Springer Nature.

Gerver, D. (1969). *The Effects of Source Language Presentation Rate on the Performance of Simultaneous Conference Interpreters.* Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 2nd Louisville Conference on rate and/or frequency controlled speech.

González, R. D., Vásquez, V. F., & Mikkelson, H. (1991). *Fundamentals of Court Interpretation* (pp. 243-44). Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.

Guo, T. (2009). *Surviving in Violent Conflicts: Chinese Interpreters in the Second Sino-Japanese War 1931–1945.* (Doctoral dissertation, Aston University).

Hassan, A. J. (2015). "Translating Arabic Verb Repetition into English". *Arab World English Journal* Vol. 6, No. 2, p. 144-153.

Inghilleri, M. and Harding, S.-A. (2010). *Translation and violent conflict,* London: Routledge.

Jones, R. (2002). *Conference interpreting explained* (2nd ed.). Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Jones, R. (2014). *Conference Interpreting Explained.* New York: Routledge.

King, D. A. (1999). *World Maps for Finding the Direction and Distance of Mecca: Examples of Innovation and Tradition in Islamic Science* (Vol. 36). The Netherlands: Brill.

Mack, G. (2001). *Conference Interpreters on the Air: Live Simultaneous Interpreting on Italian Television.* Amsterdam: Benjamins Translation Library*, 34,* 125-132.

Nolan, J. (2005). *Interpretation: Techniques and exercises.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters LTD.

Phelan, M. (2001). *The Interpreter's Resource* (Vol. 19). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Pöchhacker, F. (2004). *Introducing Interpreting Studies.* London and New York: Routledge.

Russell, D. (2005). *Consecutive and Simultaneous Interpreting.* Amsterdam: Benjamins Translation Library*, 63,* 135.

Saleh, M. (2018). *A Model for Assessing the Framing of Narratives in Conflict Interpreting: the Case of Libya.* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Birmingham).

Seleskovitch, D. (1978). *Interpreting for International Conferences: Problems of Language and Communication.* Washington, D.C.: Pen and Booth.

Tipton, R., & Furmanek, O. (2016). *Dialogue Interpreting: A Guide to Interpreting in Public Services and the Community.* London: Routledge.

VexZeez (2011). *PROPAGANDA Evidence Of Libyan Systemic Rape: CNNs Nic Speaks To Annoymous Source & Captured Soldiers.* You Tube, viewed 07 December 2017. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BnydcKj3qDA

Xgotfiveonitx (2011). *Libyan Gang-Rape Victim Iman Al-Obeidi UPDATE.* You Tube, viewed 11 October 2018. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D_VZToHH-hwM&t=10s

17Feb2011 (2011). مؤتمر صحفي لوزير الخارجية الليبي موسى كوسا. You Tube, viewed 10 December 2018. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MJ1JkK8x670