ISSN:3030-332X
Impact factor: 9,493

PROBLEMS OF SIMULTANEOUS INTERPRETING OF ART STUDIES TEXTS

Maksudov Umed Olimovich
Supervisor: Doctor of Philological Sciences (DSc),
Associate Professor at the Department
of Translation Theory of English Language

Diana Utemuratova
Uzbekistan State World Languages University
E-mail: dianautemuratova02@gmail.com
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20122729

Abstract. This analytical article examines why art studies discourse creates heightened difficulty in simultaneous interpreting and proposes an integrated framework for controlling accuracy, coherence, and rhetorical voice in real time. The study is based on a theory-driven analysis that brings together the Effort Models, the tightrope hypothesis, anticipation, and deverbalization. It argues that art studies texts intensify interpreter overload because they combine dense hybrid terminology, proper-name cascades, evaluative metaphor, compressed theory references, and multimodal presentation. On this basis, the article identifies domain-specific error-sensitive zones and offers targeted solutions: concept-based glossary building, authority-file-based name management, staged precision for fragile references, principled compression, selective visual anchoring, and advance communicative design support from organizers. The paper concludes that high-quality simultaneous interpreting in art studies depends not on maximal literalism, but on a balanced strategy that stabilizes reference, preserves stance, and actively distributes cognitive effort before and during performance.
Keywords: simultaneous interpreting; art studies discourse; cognitive load; anticipation; deverbalization; multimodality; terminology management.

SAN'ATSHUNOSLIK MATNLARINI SINXRON TARJIMA QILISH MUAMMOLARI

Annotatsiya
Mazkur tahliliy maqolada san'atshunoslik diskursining sinxron tarjimada nega alohida murakkablik tug‘dirishi izohlanadi hamda aniqlik, mantiqiy yaxlitlik va nutqiy ohangni real vaqt sharoitida boshqarishga qaratilgan integrallashgan yondashuv taklif etiladi. Tadqiqot nazariy-tahliliy asosda olib borilib, Gile Effort modellari, tightrope gipotezasi, anticipatsiya va deverbalizatsiya g‘oyalari bir tizimga keltiriladi. Muallif san'atshunoslik matnlari tarjimon uchun yuklamani oshirishini gibrid terminologiya, ism va nomlarning ko‘pligi, baholovchi metafora, nazariy ishoralarning siqilgan shaklda kelishi hamda multimodal taqdimot bilan izohlaydi. Shu asosda xatoga sezgir zonalar ajratiladi va ular uchun amaliy yechimlar tavsiya etiladi: konseptual glossariy, authority-file asosidagi nomlar bazasi, bosqichli aniqlik, maqsadli qisqartirish, vizual tayanchdan tanlab foydalanish va tashkilotchilar tomonidan oldindan kommunikativ tayyorgarlik ko‘rish. Xulosa qismida san'atshunoslik matnlarini sifatli sinxron tarjima qilishning eng maqbul yo‘li so‘zma-so‘zlik emas, balki ma'no, pozitsiya va kognitiv resurslar muvozanatini saqlash ekani asoslanadi.
Kalit so‘zlar: sinxron tarjima; san'atshunoslik diskursi; kognitiv yuklama; anticipatsiya; deverbalizatsiya; multimodallik; terminologiya boshqaruvi.

ПРОБЛЕМЫ СИНХРОННОГО ПЕРЕВОДА ИСКУССТВОВЕДЧЕСКИХ ТЕКСТОВ

Аннотация
В статье анализируется, почему искусствоведческий дискурс представляет повышенную сложность для синхронного перевода, и предлагается интегрированная модель управления точностью, связностью и риторическим голосом в условиях реального времени. Исследование

имеет теоретико-аналитический характер и объединяет модели усилий, гипотезу tightrope, механизмы антиципации и девербализации. Доказывается, что искусствоведческие тексты усиливают перегрузку переводчика за счёт сочетания гибридной терминологии, высокой плотности имён собственных, оценочной метафорики, свернутых теоретических отсылок и мультимодальной подачи материала. На этой основе выделяются зоны повышенной переводческой уязвимости и предлагаются практические решения: концептуальные глоссарии, использование авторитетных словарей и файлов имён, поэтапная точность, осмысленная компрессия, избирательная визуальная опора и предварительная коммуникативная подготовка со стороны организаторов. Делается вывод, что высокое качество синхронного перевода в сфере искусствоведения обеспечивается не буквальностью, а стратегией, сохраняющей референцию, позицию автора и устойчивое распределение когнитивных ресурсов.

Ключевые слова: синхронный перевод; искусствоведческий дискурс; когнитивная нагрузка; антиципация; девербализация; мультимодальность; управление терминологией.

INTRODUCTION

Simultaneous interpreting is a resource-limited form of bilingual speech mediation in which listening, analysis, short-term retention, and target-language production proceed under severe temporal overlap. The interpreter does not process source speech in a calm sequence; rather, several operations compete for a limited pool of attention at the same moment. For this reason, even small increases in difficulty may trigger disproportionate losses in accuracy, completeness, and fluency. The Effort Models describe this instability as the consequence of concurrent efforts that draw on restricted processing capacity, while the tightrope hypothesis explains why performance often deteriorates when the interpreter is already working near saturation[1]

Within this general framework, art studies discourse deserves separate examination because it rarely presents only one difficulty at a time. In museum talks, exhibition walkthroughs, art history lectures, or art-theory conferences, the interpreter typically faces several burdens simultaneously: technical material terminology, theoretical abstractions, artist names, artwork titles, institutions, dates, evaluative metaphors, quotations, and slide-dependent deixis. Such discourse is therefore not merely specialized; it is bundled. The problem is amplified by the fact that the audience often depends on the interpreter not only for factual transfer but also for curatorial stance, institutional tone, and interpretive nuance[2].

Another difficulty lies in the rhetorical profile of art studies texts. Speakers frequently hedge their claims, propose interpretive readings, contrast alternative meanings, or use metaphor to position the artwork within ethical, political, or aesthetic debates. If the interpreter simplifies these moves too aggressively, the target version may remain understandable yet become pragmatically distorted. A tentative interpretation may sound categorical, an ironic remark may sound serious, and a critical position may become an endorsement. In this domain, preserving voice is therefore a core semantic task rather than an optional stylistic refinement.

The purpose of this article is to explain why art studies discourse is especially demanding in simultaneous interpreting and to offer a compact, practice-oriented model for reducing recurrent errors. The research addresses three tasks: first, to synthesize relevant interpreting theories; second, to identify the discourse features that create heightened overload in art studies communication; and third, to formulate practical recommendations for interpreters, trainers, and event organizers. The study also responds to a noticeable gap in the literature: while simultaneous interpreting has been extensively studied as a cognitive activity, fewer works isolate art studies discourse as a distinct high-risk configuration of linguistic, referential, and multimodal pressures.

RESEARCH METHODS

[1] Gile D. Testing the Effort Models' tightrope hypothesis in simultaneous interpreting: A contribution // *HERMES – Journal of Language and Communication in Business*. – 1999. – Vol. 12. – No. 23. – P. 153–172.
[2] McKay D. *Translating labels for museum exhibitions*. – Open Book Translation, 2011.

The article uses a theory-driven analytical method. Instead of relying on one empirical corpus, it builds an explanatory framework by combining established insights from interpreting studies with a functional description of typical art studies communication. Four conceptual instruments structure the analysis: the Effort Models and the tightrope hypothesis, anticipation as probability-based processing, deverbalization as sense-oriented reformulation, and controlled-vocabulary support for terminology and names[3].

At the next stage, the study operationalizes art studies discourse through recurrent communicative settings: museum guiding, curator-led discussions, academic lectures, conference presentations, and public programs built around visual material. These settings were chosen because they repeatedly combine explanation, evaluation, historical contextualization, and direct reference to artworks or slides. Across them, several recurring features were identified: hybrid terminology, proper-name density, compressed theory references, stance-bearing metaphor, and multimodal anchoring. The method then maps these features onto known vulnerability points in simultaneous interpreting, including memory overload, lexical delay, lag growth, split attention, and pragmatic flattening.

Finally, the proposed solutions were selected through an internal consistency criterion. A strategy was retained only if it plausibly reduced cognitive load, stabilized reference, or preserved pragmatic stance under real-time conditions. In this way, the article moves from theory to application without turning into an indiscriminate checklist. The result is a compact diagnostic model designed for direct pedagogical and professional use. Because the paper is analytical rather than corpus-based, its claims are interpretive and explanatory, not statistical; however, the framework is suitable for future empirical testing in interpreter training and conference observation.

RESULTS

The analysis shows that art studies discourse becomes especially unstable in simultaneous interpreting when several pressure points converge in the same time interval. Five high-risk zones emerged. The first is terminological hybridity. Art discourse often combines the language of material technique, conservation, stylistic history, curatorial description, and theory. When these registers appear within one sentence, interpreters may retrieve approximate equivalents that sound acceptable but shift scope or register. This is not simply a vocabulary problem; it is a coordination problem in which lexical choice is made under time pressure and partial uncertainty[4].

The second zone is proper-name ecology. Artist names, artwork titles, institutions, cities, collections, schools, and dates often appear in quick succession. Such units carry low redundancy but high referential weight[5]. If one element is lost, the surrounding argument may lose its anchor and later comparisons become opaque. In art studies communication, names are rarely decorative; they organize chronology, provenance, attribution, and intellectual lineage. This explains why even a small phonetic or referential error can generate a much larger coherence failure[6].

The third zone concerns evaluative rhetoric. Art scholars and curators frequently rely on modality, metaphor, and nuance instead of direct judgement. Expressions such as "can be read as," "appears to foreground," or "subtly critiques" carry degrees of epistemic caution. Under cognitive stress, interpreters tend to simplify or normalize these formulations. The outcome may be stance flattening: the source speaker's interpretive proposal is rendered as a fact, or a carefully modulated statement is turned into a vague paraphrase[7]

The fourth zone is intertextual compression. Terms such as "aura," "the gaze," "the archive," or "the apparatus" often function as condensed theoretical packages rather than isolated lexical items. Their

[3] Choi J. The interpretive theory of translation and its current applications // *Interpretation Studies*. – 2003. – Vol. 3. – P. 1–15.
[4] Seeber K. G. Cognitive load in simultaneous interpreting: Existing theories – new models // *Interpreting*. – 2011. – Vol. 13. – No. 2. – P. 176–204.
[5] Setton, R., Dawrant, A. Conference interpreting – A complete course. – Amsterdam: John Benjamins. – 2016.
[6] Meyer, B. Interpreting proper names: Different interventions in simultaneous and consecutive interpreting? // trans-kom. – 2008. – Vol. 1, No. 1. – P. 105–122.
[7] Shorabek A., Pazilova B., Manapova G., Tolysbayeva Z., Mansurov N., Kralik R. The specifics of the evaluative metaphor in English (based on the texts of art discourse) // *XLinguae*. – 2021. – Vol. 14. – No. 2. – P. 245–254.

importance lies in the conceptual chain they activate. If the interpreter misses the allusion, the target text may remain grammatically coherent but lose argumentative force. Here anticipation becomes useful: once discourse cues suggest a theoretical frame, likely equivalents can be pre-activated without premature commitment[8].

The fifth zone is multimodal splitting. In art lectures and museum presentations, the spoken message frequently depends on visual cues: slide captions, deictic expressions, quotations, or a highlighted pictorial detail. Visual input can help confirm names and dates, yet it also competes with auditory attention[9]. Excessive monitoring of slides increases the risk of missed negation, delayed production, or lag spikes. Research on live captioning and screen-based interpreting confirms that additional visual layers may both support and burden processing depending on how attention is allocated[10].

Table 1. Error-sensitive zones in simultaneous interpreting of art studies discourse

Zone	Typical trigger	Probable error	Recommended response
Terminological hybridity	Technique, style, and theory in one segment	Approximate equivalent; register drift	Concept-based glossary and micro-drills
Proper-name cascade	Artist + work + place + date	Omission; substitution; reference drift	Name bank and staged precision
Evaluative rhetoric	Hedging, metaphor, modality	Stance flattening	Sense-based reformulation templates
Intertextual compression	Dense theory reference	Loss of conceptual hinge	Disciplined anticipation and re-anchoring
Multimodal splitting	Speech plus slide-dependent detail	Lag spike; missed negation	Selective visual anchoring

DISCUSSION

The identified zones point to one central conclusion: the difficulty of simultaneous interpreting in art studies arises not from isolated "hard words" but from clustered demands that compete for the same limited attentional resources. This observation confirms the logic of the Effort Models. When the interpreter is already near the limit of manageable coordination, small disruptions - an unfamiliar artist name, an unexpected theoretical turn, a slide glance, or an evaluative metaphor - may trigger a chain reaction affecting memory, delivery, and coherence[11].

From a practical perspective, the data support an integrated strategy rather than a literalist one. Reference-heavy units should be stabilized through preparation infrastructure, especially concept-based glossaries and authority files. The Getty AAT, ULAN, and TGN are useful not merely because they supply words, but because they reduce last-minute uncertainty about preferred labels, spelling, and

[8] Chernov G. V. *Inference and anticipation in simultaneous interpreting: A probability-prediction model*. – Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2004.
[9] Pochhacker, F. Introducing interpreting studies. – 2nd ed. – London: Routledge. – 2016.
[10] Zhu X. Investigating the effect of presentation mode on cognitive load in English-to-Chinese distance simultaneous interpreting: An eye-tracking study // *Proceedings*. – 2025. – Vol. 18. – No. 6. – P. 73.
[11] Gile D. Testing the Effort Models' tightrope hypothesis in simultaneous interpreting: A contribution // *HERMES – Journal of Language and Communication in Business*. – 1999. – Vol. 12. – No. 23. – P. 153–172.

naming consistency in multilingual contexts[12]. This kind of preparation shortens retrieval time and lowers the probability of improvisational error during performance[13].

At the same time, the results indicate that in-booth decision-making must remain flexible. Staged precision allows the interpreter to protect coherence when a fragile reference cannot be confirmed immediately. Principled compression helps preserve the core triad of object identity, claim, and stance when source segments exceed available processing capacity. Sense-based reformulation, especially for evaluative or metaphorical passages, prevents loss of pragmatic force[14]. These strategies do not weaken fidelity; on the contrary, they protect the communicative function of the message when literal transfer would overload the system[15].

The discussion also highlights the institutional dimension of interpreting quality. In art events, organizers influence interpreter performance through communicative design. When slide decks, quotations, correct name lists, and artwork references are provided in advance, uncertainty is reduced before the event begins. This improves both referential stability and rhetorical accuracy. Therefore, art studies interpreting should be viewed as a collaborative communication process in which the interpreter's quality depends partly on the informational ecology created by the institution[16].

CONCLUSION

The study has shown that art studies discourse creates a particularly demanding environment for simultaneous interpreting because it concentrates hybrid terminology, dense proper-name reference, evaluative rhetoric, compressed theoretical allusion, and multimodal support within narrow processing windows. Under these conditions, quality losses are best explained by capacity competition rather than by vocabulary difficulty alone. The article therefore argues that reliable performance in this domain depends on a three-part model: structured preparation, adaptive in-booth strategy, and supportive event design.

For interpreters, the most effective measures are concept-based terminology training, authority-file-supported name management, staged precision for unstable references, and selective use of visual materials. For trainers, the results suggest the need for genre-specific practice that combines slide-based tasks, proper-name cascades, and stance-preserving reformulation drills. For institutions, the findings underscore the importance of pre-event information sharing. Together, these measures help preserve not only lexical accuracy but also the voice, nuance, and interpretive logic that are central to art studies communication. Future research may test the proposed framework empirically by comparing interpreted performance across different multimodal configurations and levels of preparatory support.

REFERENCES

1. Chernov, G. V. (2004). Inference and anticipation in simultaneous interpreting: A probability-prediction model. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
2. Choi, J. (2003). The interpretive theory of translation and its current applications. Interpretation Studies, 3, 1-15.
3. Getty Research Institute. (n.d.-c). Union List of Artist Names (ULAN). Retrieved March 4, 2026, from Getty Research Institute.
4. Getty Research Institute. (n.d.-d). Getty Thesaurus of Geographic Names (TGN). Retrieved March 4, 2026, from Getty Research Institute.

[12] Yuan, L., Wang, B. Cognitive processing of the extra visual layer of live captioning in simultaneous interpreting: Triangulation of eye-tracked process and performance data // Ampersand. – 2023. – Vol. 11. – P. 1–12.
[13] Gillies, A. Conference interpreting: A student's practice book. – 2nd ed. – London: Routledge. – 2024.
[14] Gile, D. The Effort Models and Gravitational Model: Clarifications and update [PowerPoint slides] // CIRIN. – 2020.
[15] Setton R., Dawrant A. *Conference Interpreting: A Complete Course*. – Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2016.
[16] Kalina S. Quality assurance for interpreting processes // *Meta*. – 2005. – Vol. 50. – No. 2. – P. 768–784.

5. Gile, D. (1999). Testing the Effort Models' tightrope hypothesis in simultaneous interpreting: A contribution. HERMES - Journal of Language and Communication in Business, 12(23), 153-172.
6. Gile, D. (2020). The Effort Models and Gravitational Model: Clarifications and update [PowerPoint slides]. CIRIN.
7. Gillies, A. (2024). Conference interpreting: A student's practice book (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
8. Jones, R. (2014). Conference interpreting explained (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
9. Kalina, S. (2005). Quality assurance for interpreting processes. Meta, 50(2), 768-784.
10. McKay, D. (2011). Translating labels for museum exhibitions. Open Book Translation.
11. Meyer, B. (2008). Interpreting proper names: Different interventions in simultaneous and consecutive interpreting? trans-kom, 1(1), 105-122.
12. Pochhacker, F. (2016). Introducing interpreting studies (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
13. Seeber, K. G. (2011). Cognitive load in simultaneous interpreting: Existing theories - new models. Interpreting, 13(2), 176-204.
14. Setton, R. (1999). Simultaneous interpretation: A cognitive-pragmatic analysis. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
15. Setton, R., & Dawrant, A. (2016). Conference interpreting - A complete course. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
16. Shorabek, A., Pazilova, B., Manapova, G., Tolysbayeva, Z., Mansurov, N., & Kralik, R. (2021). The specifics of the evaluative metaphor in English (based on the texts of art discourse). XLinguae, 14(2), 245-254.
17. Yuan, L., & Wang, B. (2023). Cognitive processing of the extra visual layer of live captioning in simultaneous interpreting: Triangulation of eye-tracked process and performance data. Ampersand, 11, 100131.
18. Zhu, X. (2025). Investigating the effect of presentation mode on cognitive load in English-to-Chinese distance simultaneous interpreting: An eye-tracking study. Proceedings, 18(6), 73.