

Simultaneous Interpretation of Neosemanticisms in EU Press Conferences: Translations of «Hotspot», «Relocation» and «Resettlement» into Dutch and German

La interpretación de neosemanticismos en las ruedas de prensa de la UE: la traducción de «Hotspot», «Relocation», y «Resettlement» al neerlandés y al alemán

Mathieu VAN OBBERGHEN

Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB)
mathieu.van.obberghen@vub.ac.be

Rita TEMMERMAN

Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB)
rita.temmerman@vub.ac.be

Koen KERREMANS

Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB)
koen.kerremans@vub.ac.be

Resumen: En este artículo trataremos los «neosemanticismos» de la UE (términos ya existentes que reciben un nuevo significado en un contexto concreto) desde la

perspectiva de los intérpretes. A diferencia de los traductores, que tienen más tiempo para buscar una traducción adecuada, los intérpretes de cabina deben trasladar el mensaje al instante. Así pues, ¿qué soluciones terminológicas proponen los propios intérpretes? ¿Qué estrategias emplean en el fragor del momento? Para ofrecer una respuesta a estas preguntas hemos analizado dos conferencias de prensa interpretadas de la UE sobre la crisis europea de los refugiados. Analizamos los neosemanticismos «hotspot», «relocation» y «resettlement» empleados en el discurso original y la forma en que los intérpretes de la UE los tradujeron al neerlandés y al alemán. En este estudio se prestó especial atención a elementos de *contexto dinámico*, como el contexto situacional, cognitivo y lingüístico. Las sesiones de interpretación incluidas en el análisis contenían una variación terminológica considerable, y los intérpretes parecen haber utilizado sobre todo estrategias dependientes del idioma para trasladar los neosemanticismos a la lengua de destino.

Palabras clave: interpretación simultánea, terminología, neosemanticismo, contexto dinámico, rueda de prensa de la UE, discurso de la UE.

Abstract: In this article we will discuss EU «neosemanticisms» (i.e. existing terms that receive a new meaning in specific contexts) from the interpreter's perspective. As opposed to translators, who have more time to search for a suitable translation, simultaneous interpreters have to convey the message straight away. So, which terminological solutions do interpreters themselves propose? Which strategies do they use in the heat of the action? To answer these questions, we examined two interpreted EU press conferences regarding the European refugee crisis. We analysed the neosemanticisms «hotspot», «relocation» and «resettlement» used in the original speech, and how they were translated into Dutch and German by EU interpreters. For the analysis, particular attention was given to elements of *dynamic context*, such as situational, cognitive and linguistic context. It appears that the interpreting sessions concerned contain quite some terminological variation, and that the interpreters made use of mainly language-dependent strategies to convey neosemanticisms into the target language.

Keywords: simultaneous interpreting, terminology, neosemanticism, dynamic context, EU press conference, EU discourse.

1. INTRODUCTION

With an overall population of 511,5 million people¹, 28 different nationalities and 24 official languages, the EU is clearly a vast project that entails many linguistic challenges for its own EU institutions. Therefore, translators and interpreters are indispensable in order to let the EU operate properly. It is not surprising that the EU institutions set to work

1. Eurostat. s.d.. *Population on 1 January - Persons*. Accessed May 17, 2018. <<http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/tgm/table.do?tab=table&plugin=1&language=en&pcode=tps00001>>

the largest translation service in the world (Koskinen 2000: 50). Although EU institutions internally communicate in a limited number of working languages, all communication towards European citizens needs to be available in the official languages of the Member States. In this study, we will focus on EU press conferences, which have to be situated within this framework of multilingual communication. EU press conferences most of the time are organized offering simultaneous interpretation in multiple languages.

Simultaneous interpreting implies the skilful mastery of listening to the speaker's words, analysing the message and reproducing it in the target language. All of these actions have to be effectuated by the interpreter simultaneously. However, in some cases the competence of interpreters can be exposed to a much higher degree of complexity, for instance, if the speaker talks at a high pace or if he makes use of specialized jargon, without any prior notice to the interpreters working in the booth. In this respect, we can assume that the occurrence of neologisms in an address may be particularly challenging for interpreters.

In our study, we will focus on a particular subtype of neologisms. More specifically, we will examine already existing terms that receive a new meaning in a particular situational context. These terms are also called *semantic neologisms* or *neosemanticisms* (Schüler 2006).

The aim of the study is to find out how interpreters deal with neosemanticisms in the EU context of press conferences and what solutions they come up with. We will try and distinguish between different types of strategies. Of course, we should make clear that this small-scale case study cannot offer a general and conclusive answer in any way whatsoever. Our intention is to deduce and formulate some tentative conclusions, which certainly need to be studied in greater depth at a later stage.

In order to achieve our aim, our research focused on one specific case study within the context of the European refugee crisis. In an attempt to stop irregular migration and to come to grips with the massive influx of refugees, the *European Agenda on Migration* (hereafter referred to as the *Agenda*) was published by the European Commission on 13 May 2015². We used this EC Communication as a starting-point in our study and analysed two EU press conferences related to this document. These press conferences were made accessible on the internet in various official languages via simultaneous interpretation. For this case study English, Dutch and German were taken into account.

For each press conference we analysed neosemanticisms that were expressed in the original speech, and how the interpreters dealt with them. The framework in which this analysis took place, was aimed at reflecting upon several contextual parameters, making use of the theory of *dynamic contexts*, as formulated by Temmerman (2016), a framework which was specifically developed for translations. We will show how this framework can also apply to interpreting.

2. European Commission. 2015. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions - A European Agenda on Migration. COM(2015) 240 final

First of all, our research focuses on terms that were already in use by the UNHCR³ and the IOM⁴ but that have developed new meanings in the context of the *Agenda*: i.e. the English terms *relocation* and *resettlement*. Both terms—as intended in this specific EU context—already appear at the end of 2014 in an EMN⁵ publication⁶, which is also accessible via the website of DG Migration and Home Affairs⁷. The detailed definitions demonstrate that these terms were given a narrower meaning as compared to their meaning in other international organizations. When the EMN Glossary was published in 2014, the *Agenda* and its key concepts were in the process of being conceptualised. This implies that some translations (cf. Dutch and German equivalents for *relocation*) differ from the official EU terms that were used in the 2015 *Agenda*. Secondly, we will also examine the English term *hotspot*, a metaphorical expression which, in the context of the EC's *Agenda*, has become a term with a new meaning.

In Section 2 we describe our research framework, by reflecting on the theoretical idea of *dynamic contexts*. We then discuss neologisms and neosemanticisms, their significance in interpreting situations and possible strategies to cope with them when they are used for the first time and users (interpreters) are not familiar with them yet. Section 3 offers an outline of our research methodology. In Section 4 we will give an analysis of two selected EU press conferences and discuss the strategies used for interpreting neosemanticisms. Lastly, Section 5 provides for an overall conclusion of our study, and some suggestions for further research are formulated.

2. RESEARCH FRAMEWORK

In this part, we first discuss Temmerman (2016)'s theory on *dynamic contexts*, which we will relate to the work of interpreters. The situational, cognitive and linguistic context will be dealt with separately. Second, we examine the object of this article—*neosemanticisms*—more in detail, again by linking them to the activity of interpreting.

2.1. Understanding in context

Temmerman (2016: 144) distinguishes «between five types of dynamic context that may help translators understand terminology [...]: linguistic context, cognitive context,

3. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

4. International Organization for Migration

5. European Migration Network

6. EMN. October 2014. *Asylum and Migration Glossary 3.0*. Accessed May 21, 2018.

<<http://www.emn.at/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/emn-glossary-en-version.pdf>>

7. DG Migration and Home Affairs. s.d.. *EMN Glossary*. Accessed May 21, 2018. <https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/networks/european_migration_network/glossary_en>

situational context, cultural context and metaphorical context.» Of course, these five types of context «that play a role in understanding languages and their terminology» are not only of vital importance to translators. Interpreters too depend heavily on contexts in which terminology appears. Context plays a key role in the process of understanding. Therefore, Temmerman's concept of *dynamic contexts* (the linguistic, cognitive and situational context in particular) is relevant for both translators and interpreters.

2.1.1. Situational context

In essence, the *situational context* refers to the domain within which terms make their appearance and how their meaning is negotiated. Quite clearly, the situational context does not exist as such, since it can be subdivided in e.g. political context, institutional context, professional context, cultural context, etc. In addition, also the communicative setting in which a term occurs—e.g. in a dialogue between specialists, in a public address to specialists at an international conference, etc.—exerts influence on the use and understanding of terminology.

Speaking of «*situational context*», particularly within the EU institutional context, we cannot ignore the increasing influence of English as a lingua franca. Albl-Mikasa (2010: 126) states that the «century of international conference interpreting has now been superseded by the century of English as a lingua franca, the century of ELF communication. (Native and non-native) English has become the most widely used language in conferences.» We could assume that this recent trend, especially when English is used by non-native speakers, creates new difficulties for interpreters to understand language and terminology in context. Seeber (2017, 84) puts it as follows: «[...] the processing of foreign-accented speech should therefore be associated with even more cost for the interpreter.» We will take up this point in the discussion of our case study (Section 4), since non-native English that has to be interpreted simultaneously by EU interpreters is at stake here.

2.1.2. Cognitive context

To understand what is meant specifically by *cognitive context*, we quote Temmerman (2016).

In order to understand a term in a text a translator also needs to rely on the cognitive context. Terms occurring in texts play a role in the cumulative construction (in the working memory of the mind) of understanding a message as a process. Terms in texts are part of lexical chains (Rogers 2007, 17). Such a lexical chain consists of cohesive ties sharing the same referent, lexically rather than grammatically expressed. (Temmerman 2016, 145).

Cognitive context shows us that a language utterance is not understood simply and solely on the basis of its form and structure (cf. linguistic context). Connections with respect to content, between separate linguistic elements, are important too if one wants to understand the message. In other words, in the first case context is being realized through grammatical ties, in the second case it is done through lexical ties.

For interpreters—as well as for translators—cognitive context plays an essential role in understanding and «decoding» linguistic expressions, especially when it comes to newly created concepts or neologisms. For instance, the political speech, in which these neologisms are enclosed, constitutes the framework for an interpreter that can support him/her at unravelling the basic idea behind the term at hand. This framework can even enable him/her to think ahead, reflecting on preceding clues in the speech, and to anticipate potential pitfalls that are yet to come.

In practice though, most EU interpreters, when working in press conferences for the European Council, receive the entire speech that is going to be delivered in advance, so they can quickly identify any new terms before entering the booth, or at least before starting to interpret⁸. In addition, it is important to realize that first these speeches were proofread by legal experts and linguists. The question and answer session (Q&A session) of a press conference however, has a totally different situational context, since it will result in spontaneous language use, which is free of any external verification.

Nevertheless, if neologisms are known by interpreters before the start of the meeting, even then they have to come up with a comprehensible translation in their target language, which is not an easy task. Given the recent nature of neologisms, some glossaries or terminological databases propose several equivalents—causing confusion and ambiguity—or, in most cases, do not mention them at all.

2.1.3. Linguistic context

The final element to close our reflection on contextual parameters, is the *linguistic context*. By linguistic context is meant here «that the language user needs to be knowledgeable about a language as a system in order to be able to understand a message expressed in that language.» (Temmerman 2016, 144). It is perhaps the most primordial type of context that enables us to understand words and terms in their corresponding meaning, and thus to remove ambiguity. An individual word, that is not expressed as part of a sentence, could hypothetically refer to closely related, yet different concepts, or it could even refer to different lexical categories. On the other hand, words that are embedded in a syntactical structure, can be disambiguated thanks to their specific positioning and function; the general linguistic context.

Interpreters—of course—should be perfectly proficient in their mother tongue (A language), should have a high degree of active proficiency in their B language(s), and

8. We received this information from a terminologist of the Dutch language-unit of DG SCIC.

should perfectly understand each additional C language⁹. What is more is that EU interpreters need to have awareness of and experience with the Euro-variety of their working languages. Despite of all these demanding competences, one will never be familiar with every single lexical unit of a language. Luckily, words are being used to communicate a particular message, and they are understood as a part of the whole. As a result, linguistic context—complemented by both situational and cognitive context—constitutes a major factor in «interpreting» any unknown expression, or by extension, any newly created term.

The linguistic context for EU interpreters is very specific. The 24 official languages of the EU have a specific EU vocabulary that has been developed within the EU legal and political context. It is important to realize that EU interpreters are used to interpreting from e.g. Euro-English into Euro-Dutch or Euro-German.

2.2. Neologisms and neosemanticisms

2.2.1. Object of study

We consider the aforementioned three terms—«hotspot», «relocation» and «resettlement»—to be real neologisms in the context of the EU press conferences in our study. These terms are no «occasionalisms» (Schüler 2006), i.e. words or terms invented by the speakers that are only used for the specific occasion, since all three words already existed in the English lexicon. In spite of this, these words are «new coinages» in the context of the EC's *Agenda*.

According to Rey (2005, 312), a neologism can be defined as «a lexical unit perceived as recent by language users». Generally spoken, neologisms can be regarded «as new units in a specific linguistic code» (ibid.). However, one crucial question remains unanswered in this definition; what is the intended meaning of «new»? Rey (2005: 318-321) explains that a chronological view on neology (i.e. on the basis of the first appearance in language) does not suffice to prove the existence of neologisms. In his view, only *functional newness*—many neologisms can be constructed in theory, but they only receive significance when executing a real communicative function within language—determines a genuine neologism.

In Schüler (2006: 63), a distinction is made between different types of neologisms. The *Urschöpfung* (primal creation) refers to *ex nihilo* term creation—or based on the arbitrary combination of phonemes—which in practice hardly ever occurs. The *Neosemantismus* (neosemanticism) implies an additional meaning for an already existing term. Generalization, concretization or metaphorization of the original meaning of the lexeme can take place. The process of taking over a word from a source language

9. AIIC. April 29, 2012. *Working languages*. aiic.net. Accessed January 4, 2017. <<http://aiic.net/page/4004/working-languages>>

and introducing it in the target language, is also known as *Entlehnung* (borrowing). Finally, the *Wortbildungsprodukt* (product of term creation) is the most commonly used method to create neologisms, namely via compounding or derivation.

In a context of translation and interpreting, it is important to make the distinction between neologisms in the source language (*primary neology*) and neologisms coined in processes of knowledge transfer between multiple language communities (*secondary neology*). See e.g. Fischer (2010), Cabré et al. (2012) or Peruzzo (2012). In their study Vermeiren and Vandewaetere (2017) distinguish the way translators deal with what they refer to as «terminological uncertainty» as compared to interpreters.

When applied to the EU translation context, EU term formation takes place in two stages: 1) primary formation of concepts and terms in one of the procedural languages (in most of the cases English), and 2) secondary formation of the term in all of the remaining official EU languages.

We will examine this process of secondary term formation more closely by studying how the English EU neologisms—or more specifically, neosemanticisms (cf. Section 1)—«hotspot», «relocation» and «resettlement» have been translated by interpreters into Dutch and German during two EC press conferences (see further). Before we turn to the discussion of our methodology and results, we first need to say a few words about the specific complexity of translating neologisms in interpreting situations (Section 2.2.2) and about the possible strategies that interpreters can apply in order to deal with neologisms (Section 2.2.3).

2.2.2. Neologisms in interpreting situations

The profession of a conference interpreter is varied since each and every conference has a different setting, different theme, different speakers. As a result, the interpreter has to be prepared for the unexpected and needs to cope with challenges at all levels, despite his diligent efforts to prepare for the meeting, reading background material and studying lists of terminology.

The activity of interpreting entails some specific, inherent difficulties and restrictions. According to Jones (2002), two elementary difficulties seem to apply to simultaneous interpreting in particular: an *acoustic difficulty* and an *intellectual difficulty*. The former results from the fact that in simultaneous interpreting, the interpreter «has to speak and listen at the same time, which is an unnatural activity and has to be cultivated» (Jones 2002: 67). The intellectual difficulty is described as follows:

You do not know where the speaker is going, even as you speak. And this is true both at the macro level of the speech and at the micro level. That is, at macro level you do not know where the speech as a whole is headed; at micro level, you do not know how an individual sentence will continue [...]. (ibid.).

The level of difficulty is high because interpreters need to translate new concepts straight away, as opposed to translators, who have the opportunity to consult different sources of information in order to formulate a well thought-out translation.

Creating—and translating—neologisms is an intrinsic part of a much broader mental process, called *creativity*. Neologisms are the product of *creative* or *innovative thinking*, and once confronted with these terms while interpreting, one will feel the need to rely on one's creative skills. In this respect, the question arises how the activity of interpreting in general relates to the concept of creativity. Therefore, it is worth quoting Riccardi (1998, 172):

If the interpreting process is considered a problem-solving activity where the source-text is the problem and the target-text the solution, then it follows that it is the interpreting mode, the fact that interpreting is «on-line», that leads to a creative process. From a limited set of cues or elements continuously unfolding, with no interruption or thinking longer than a few seconds, the interpreter has to come to a correct conclusion or be able to anticipate the message in such a way that he can organize his language output correctly. In doing so, s/he is not simply repeating something said by somebody else, but also engaging in a creative or productive process.

Quite justifiably, interpreting has to be considered a creative activity. Each interpreter goes through a series of mainly unconscious, cognitive processes in order to *transform* a source text into a target text, which—according to Riccardi—will resemble the original text as regards content, but in spite of this it remains a new and authentic product. Horváth (2010) takes up the same position, stating that basically the task of an interpreter consists in a secondary form of creation, that of *re-creation*.

Finally, Riccardi (1998, 174) argues that within simultaneous interpreting two major strategies are interacting. The *skill-based strategies*, relying on a vast number of automatic, routine expressions, are intended to alleviate the redundant, cognitive strain for the interpreter wherever possible. In doing so, s/he can concentrate on other, more relevant things. The *knowledge-based strategies* are meant for novel situations, requiring a high level of concentration and effort. Analytical processes and acquired knowledge are exploited to the fullest possible extent. It is obvious that the second type of strategies play an essential role when interpreters need to deal with neologisms.

Summarizing, we may say that the simultaneous interpretation of neologisms or neosemanticisms requires a lot of creativity, which—in turn— is an activity characterised by mental effort and cognitive strain. Therefore, we expected to find variation in the ways in which «hotspot», «relocation» and «resettlement» were translated during the interpreting sessions.

2.2.3. Strategies for interpreting neologisms

Our analysis relies to a large extent on Niska (1998)'s descriptive model of strategies that can be applied by interpreters in order to deal with neologisms. These strategies

are suggested «for the translation of terms which do not exist in the target language and/or which are perceived as neologisms by the interpreter» (Niska 1998, 14).

Firstly, the strategy of *omission* is proposed. In this case, the interpreter does not translate the term, but can decide to formulate an equivalent of the concept at a later stage during his interpreting session. The second strategy is the *use of [an] approximate or provisional equivalent*. In this case, the neologism can be translated by means of a more general term or generalization, or by means of a provisional translation, with the possibility of adjusting it at a later stage. Basically, the interpreter is not free to choose; he must convey the message anyhow.

The third strategy is an *explanation of the concept*. The problem of finding a comprehensive equivalent term in the target language can be avoided by simply giving a description of the neologism, i.e. by explaining to the audience what the concept signifies.

Finally, the interpreter himself can propose a *neologism*—a completely new term in the target language—by means of 1) a *loan translation*, 2) a *direct loan/transfer* or 3) by *coining of new word*. A «loan translation» stands for the fairly literal translation of a neologism. A «direct loan» means that the neologism is simply taken over in the target language without any modifications. In addition to the strategies as proposed by Niska, one can of course think of other possible ways of translating neologisms in interpreting situations, but these will not be observed in this particular study.

3. METHODOLOGY

In order to answer our previously articulated research question, we decided to frame a case study, in which selected interpreting performances were analysed, paying particular attention to neologisms and neosemanticisms.

Given the linguistic diversity, its historical connection with conference interpreting, its scale and know-how, the international character, and the digital availability of interpreting recordings, we selected the main interpretation service of the EU institutions, DG SCIC¹⁰ as our case study. Since we were not allowed to attend EU meetings with interpretation physically, we were dependent on the digital availability of meeting videos and their respective recorded audio channels for interpretation. Our research material was taken from the online video database¹¹ of the European Commission.

For the case study, we decided to choose one specific type of meeting, namely «press conferences» (with interpretation in various EU languages). A press conference is a repeated type of gathering, typically composed of two well-delineated sections,

10. DG SCIC is the Directorate General for Interpretation; the European Commission's interpreting service and conference organizer.

11. Online accessible via <http://ec.europa.eu/avservices/>

consisting of 1) a press statement, and 2) a question and answer session (Q&A). Regarding the topic of the press conferences, it was of essential importance to select current events or new phenomena, which are located within a sphere of *mental productivity*, and thus giving rise to term creation.

Even if a press conference comes after a summit or meeting, and the interpreters know well beforehand what will be communicated, they still need to convey the message in their own target language. And especially in case of neosemanticisms occurring, it is the translation which can be problematic. The interpreter must find a way to render the neosemanticism into his target language, without losing or altering the new meaning and—preferably—without being unclear to the audience.

Considering the significance, the range and the recent character of the European refugee crisis, we selected the domain of *Asylum & Migration*, a shared competence of the EU and its Member States. Two EU press conferences¹² were analysed, both of them thematically linked to the *European Agenda on Migration*. Although the language regime during these conferences fluctuated, we limited our analysis to the English, Dutch and German interpreting performances.

In the first phase, we gathered the EU neosemanticisms from the original speeches and then we executed an analysis of how interpreters conveyed these neosemanticisms in their target language. As we were only interested in those fragments where neosemanticisms were expressed, it would have been irrelevant to produce a full-length transcription of the speech. Instead, a document was compiled in which we listed the neosemanticisms from the original discourse, together with their respective Dutch and German translations. For each language a time code was added.

A terminological evaluation was made to identify the interpreters' solutions with regard to neologisms and neosemanticisms in each individual language, and an interlinguistic comparison was carried out to indicate possible language-dependent divergences in interpreting strategies. Besides that, the prime focus of our research was on the potential influences of contextual parameters during the press conference on the interpreters' performances.

In the second phase, we wanted to involve the EU interpreters that had been working during the two press conferences, together with some officials of DG SCIC, to participate in our research and to get involved in a discussion. In doing so, we would have gathered possibly relevant reflections on interpreters' personal experiences while interpreting neologisms and neosemanticisms. While our terminological analysis enabled us to focus only on the verbal output of interpreters, i.e. the *interpreting product*, we have no access to the underlying *interpreting process* whatsoever. Furthermore, EU officials could have answered the question whether EU interpreting services (or language Units) do impose general or language-specific guidelines/policies on how to interpret, applicable for all their interpreters.

12. 1) Press conference of the European Council, 23/04/2015 (codes «I-101917» and «I-102255»); 2) Press conference of the European Commission, 13/05/2015 (code «I-102707»)

We drafted a questionnaire, consisting of 14 questions, and presented it to the Head of the Dutch language Unit of DG SCIC. Given that our research was a small-scale study and due to lack of time, the German language Unit was not contacted. Unfortunately, we were informed that EU institutions cannot disclose the names of the interpreters who worked during the two press conferences. In spite of this, the possibility was given to these interpreters to react on their own initiative, but no single interpreter took this opportunity. Nevertheless, we had informal conversations with accredited freelance interpreters and we received a lengthy and interesting response from a terminologist of the Dutch language Unit of DG SCIC.

A comprehensive discussion of our questionnaire and of the answers received would lead too far afield, but what we can say is that interpreters of the Dutch language Unit felt hesitant about neologisms and were very careful about using new Dutch terminology, particularly when these terms might have led to confusion rather than clarity. Delegates find it important to use and hear the right words, but for Dutch-speaking delegates—Dutch and Belgian nationals—that does not imply that only Dutch language is accepted. Delegates use a lot of English terms themselves. The terminologist reported that «convenience» plays a role too; it is often far easier to borrow English words than having to search for an equivalent in Dutch.

We were also able ascertain that interpreters from DG SCIC are not bound to certain written interpreting rules or policies. In principle, each and every EU interpreter is free to use the term he or she deems appropriate. Of course, we cannot say for sure whether other language Units share the same view.

4. RESULTS

In this section we will present and discuss the main findings of our research, on the basis of the two selected EU press conferences with simultaneous interpretation. For each press conference we will analyse neologisms that were expressed in the original speech, and the respective interpreters' reactions. The framework within which this analysis took place was aimed at reflecting upon several contextual parameters, making use of the theory of *dynamic contexts*, as formulated by Temmerman (2016) and described above (Section 2.1).

4.1. Press conference A: European Council, 23/04/2015

Firstly, we will concentrate on the *situational context* (Section 4.1.1), by giving an overview and the background of the press conference to gain a better insight. Subsequently, the *cognitive* (or conceptual) *context* will be dealt with in Section 4.1.2, focusing on main EU concepts and ideas as formulated by the speakers. In closing,

an analysis of the *linguistic context* is presented (Section 4.1.3), with a comparison of verbal utterances by the speaker and the interpreter.

4.1.1. Situational context

As we explained in our research framework (Section 2), the *situational context* is the combination of multiple situational factors that—as a whole—constitute the observable circumstances that frame a verbal expression. In this case, talking about the EU not only concerns a political context, but also a clearly institutionalised context. The setting in which the communication takes place is that of a press conference, which once again reminds us of the professional context. Besides, we cannot ignore the role of English as *lingua franca* since almost all speeches are in English.

Returning to the specific background of this press conference, on 19 April 2015 a ship wrecked on the Mediterranean Sea, causing the death of over 700 refugees. As a result of this disaster, the European Commission and the European Council organized an exceptional meeting on 23 April 2015 to discuss the refugee issue at the EU's external borders. During the subsequent press conference, Donald Tusk (President of the European Council) and Jean-Claude Juncker (President of the European Commission) gave an address to the gathered press, whereupon questions could be asked. The prime language of the conference was English, but in spite of this, Juncker formulated his statement in French (answering to questions in English).

The available language regime for interpretation consisted of English, French, German, Italian, Spanish, Greek and Dutch. We can only assume that the language regime was chosen for the following motives: English, French and German as standard procedural languages of the EU institutions; Italian, Spanish and Greek as the languages spoken in the countries that were confronted with the migration crisis. We were not able to determine why Dutch interpretation was also available.

Donald Tusk (born in Gdańsk, Poland, 1957)¹³ acted as the President of the European Council, representing the position of all EU Member States. As in most press conferences, he stood in front of the press room, behind a lectern with microphone, dressed formally, which reminded the public of his authoritative status. Based on his opening words, the press conference was organized in the evening. In his speech¹⁴, he referred to the dramatic situation in the Mediterranean. Saving people's lives and addressing illegal migration was the number one priority in EU migration policy.

Therefore, the EU was planning specific actions. First, cooperation was going to be intensified to eliminate smuggler networks. Second, the border mission «Triton» was

13. European Council. June 1, 2015. *Donald Tusk*. Accessed January 11, 2017. <<http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/european-council/president/biography/>>

14. Online accessible via <<http://ec.europa.eu/avservices/video/player.cfm?sitelan-g=en&ref=1101917>>

going to receive more funding. Third, irregular migration flows needed to be limited. Finally, refugee protection was going to be improved through new action plans such as *resettlement* and *relocation*. The EU clearly had the intention of ending this humanitarian crisis.

In the Q&A session¹⁵, three questions were asked by Italian, British and Spanish journalists. The Italian journalist asked her question in French; the two others spoke English. So we might hypothesize that questions were supposed to be asked in English and French (perhaps German too). Given that only the latter one made use of neosemanticisms, we concentrated on the final part. The Spanish journalist —working for *El País*—asked very briefly if some Member States promised already to apply *relocation* on a voluntary basis. She was seated in the press room and used a mobile microphone. Her question was in English. It was Jean-Claude Juncker who replied. In contrast with the previous press statement, it is clear that for this answer, he did not rely on a written text. On the contrary, his answer was a genuine example of spontaneous, «oralised» language, in line with the journalist's question.

Incidentally, we would like to emphasize the difference between a speech and a question with regard to its directionality. A press statement or speech is directed towards an audience, and its function simply consists in informing the public. The function of the question time following the statement is to elucidate on any missing, unknown, vague or partial information, which means that a reply is required. For interpreters, this fact will exert an influence on the way in which they understand and translate, as the situational context will be altered.

Summing up, we can assume that the situational context in this case was a clear accumulation of contexts, all set against a specific EU background. Since Tusk and Juncker—both in the capacity of politicians—were delivering a speech, and since the subject of the press conference was to be situated within EU migration policy, the *political context* was obvious. The press conference was organized by EU institutions, so it was set in an *institutional context*. Finally, a press conference is a type of meeting characterised by its professionalism—as opposed to amateurism—resulting in a *professional context*.

In this regard, reporters are supposed to understand the statements preferably in the appropriate words. This means that in an ideal setting, a Dutch-speaking reporter should solely hear Dutch terms in the interpretation, and a German-speaking reporter should only hear German terms. But as it turns out, language groups tend to have their own distinct preferences when it comes to the use of new terminology—and the acceptance of English loan words—so interpreters need to adapt.

The Dutch terminologist from DG SCIC even reported that Dutch-speaking delegates themselves ask the interpreters to use English terms instead of their Dutch equivalents, since most of the conceptual work was done in English (occasionally in French) and they have become accustomed to these terms. We don't know about

15. Online accessible via <<http://ec.europa.eu/avservices/video/player.cfm?sitelan-g=en&ref=1102255>>

any practices in the German language Unit, but based on our results we may already hypothesize that the German audience does not have that kind of preference, since not a single English term was used by German interpreters.

4.1.2. Cognitive context

As already mentioned, *cognitive context* is realized through lexical ties (or connections with respect to content), whereas *linguistic context* is achieved through grammatical ties (or connections with respect to form and structure). Interpreters heavily rely on the cognitive context in order to constantly decode language and terminology, and to attribute the correct meaning to words. Cognitive context is particularly important if the interpreter misheard something, assisting him or her in figuring out what the speaker might have meant.

Two terms at the centre stage in the *Agenda* are mentioned during this press conference: *relocation* and *resettlement*. Both terms are interesting from a terminological perspective, as they were used originally—at any rate within the domain of *Asylum & Migration*—by the UNHCR and the IOM. Then, the EU recycled—as it were—the terms. *Relocation* and *resettlement* were borrowed, but they were «terminologized» in the EU context, receiving a new, EU specific meaning. Ahmad & Rogers (2007) define «terminologization» as the process whereby a commonly known word is given a more specific meaning in a restricted professional field. Referring to the IOM *Glossary on Migration*, no separate entry has been assigned to *relocation*, as opposed to *resettlement*; the first term even appears in the definition of the latter one.

Resettlement: the relocation and integration of people [...] into another geographical area and environment, usually in a third country [...] (IOM 2011).

At the time of conceptualising the *Agenda* in 2015, the EU took over both terms, but was forced to draw a distinction between them.

In the EU context, «resettlement» is only used for the transfer of refugees from non-EU countries to Member States. For the transfer of refugees between Member States, the term used is «relocation»¹⁶.

This distinction was not clear to the Spanish journalist, who asked a question on *relocation* during the Q&A session. In fact, she refers to the concept of *resettlement* (which happens on a voluntary basis), while using the term *relocation*. Juncker understood that by *relocation* the journalist meant *resettlement*, so he replied by mentioning *resettlement*. Of course, for every simultaneous interpreter it will be

16. Resettlement. 2015. In IATE. Accessed July 28, 2016. <<http://iate.europa.eu/FindTermsByLilId.do?lilId=853470&langId=en>>

extremely hard, even close to impossible, to comprehend this misunderstanding and to rectify it in time by using the appropriate term.

In addition, it is worthwhile making a comparison with commonly used language. According to the Oxford English Dictionary (OED), *resettlement*¹⁷ holds seven different meanings (e.g. the act of resettling, or of resettling a person or group, in a place of residence), whereas *relocation*¹⁸ mentions three of them (e.g. the action or fact of locating something in a new place).

In conclusion, it is true that the OED definitions are of a general nature, and theoretically speaking their meanings can be adopted in the field of migration. However, it has become clear that for the EU institutions both terms have a fundamentally divergent meaning, although in general language this distinction does not really exist.

4.1.3. Linguistic context

Lastly, the *linguistic context*—based on the complete set of rules of individual languages—enables the interpreter to understand what is being said. It is by far the most essential context, without which communication wouldn't even be imaginable. In this case, interpreters needed to have a solid proficiency in (non-native) English, as nearly all speakers during the press conference used it, even if they were not close to native speaker level. It is also important for interpreters, working in this type of setting, to be familiar with Euro-varieties, because over the years a lot of EU officials have developed an institutionalised variety of English.

At this point, it might be interesting to give an overview of the most apparent neo-semanticisms that were expressed by the speakers during the press conference. In addition, we compare these terms to the interpreters' solutions in the Dutch and German booths.

EN	NL	DE
resettlement (02:17)	hervestiging (02:18)	angesiedelt werden (02:25)
emergency relocation (02:23)	noodrelocatie (02:25)	Umsiedlungen (02:27)

Table 1. Speech by Donald Tusk

17. Resettlement. s.d.. In OED. Accessed July 28, 2016. <<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/163529?redirectedFrom=resettlement#eid>>

18. Relocation. s.d.. In OED. Accessed July 28, 2016. <<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/162003?redirectedFrom=relocation#eid>>

EN	NL	DE
resettlement (05:17)	<i>resettlement</i> (05:19)	Neuansiedlung (05:18)
relocation (05:18)	<i>relocation</i> (05:21)	Umverteilung (05:19)
relocation (05:20)	<i>relocation</i> (05:22)	Umverteilung (05:20)
resettlement (05:36)	<i>resettlement</i> (05:36)	Wiederansiedlung (05:36)

Table 2. Q&A Session

In the Dutch interpreting version, we can observe that different terms have been used to translate one and the same concept in the source language, resp. *resettlement* and *relocation*. In the first part of the conference (cf. Table 1), the interpreter used two Dutch equivalents, but it's unlikely that the interpreter created them in the heat of the action, since *hervestiging* and *relocatie*¹⁹ were already inserted in IATE²⁰ (and—to a certain extent—also in the EMN Glossary²¹) at that time²². Based on this, we can hypothesize that in effect the interpreter made use of IATE. In the second part of the conference (cf. Table 2), the interpreter²³ resorted to another strategy, defined by Niska (1998) as a «direct loan/transfer». Both English terms were borrowed in Dutch. This strategy guarantees that the crucial distinction between *resettlement* and *relocation* is maintained.

In the German interpreting version, no single «direct loan/transfer» appears. We cannot retrace any borrowing of English terms in this performance. Instead, German interpreters systematically translate by means of genuine German compounding (e.g. *Umverteilung*). Furthermore, terminological variation for one single concept is clearly present (cf. *Neuansiedlung* and *Wiederansiedlung* / *Umsiedlung* and *Umverteilung*). However, this kind of variation within the same speech may lead to confusion in the audience. Referring back to the cognitive context, both terms indicate the same referent, of which the interpreter is well aware, but not necessarily the audience. Finally, also grammatical transformations do occur in order to convey the meaning of neosemanticisms (cf. *angesiedelt werden*)²⁴.

19. Please note that in IATE the term *relocatie* was altered into the current official term *herplaatsing* on 12 June 2015.

20. We were able to determine the exact date of creation of the terminological entry, as we were granted admission to the internal version of IATE.

21. See footnote 6.

22. Even if the term *resettlement* dates back to 1991, it is given a new and much narrower meaning in this specific context of the EC's *Agenda*. That is why we talk about neosemanticisms.

23. To avoid any kind of misconception, it is important to realize that two or more interpreters usually work in the same booth, which explains the divergent translations. Interpreters are in no way obliged to reuse a translation that was previously expressed by a colleague in the booth.

24. In this case it concerns the transformation of a noun into a verb.

4.2. Press conference B: European Commission, 13/05/2015

Following our discussion of the situational context (Section 4.2.1), the cognitive context will be dealt with in Section 4.2.2, focusing on one other key concept of the *Agenda*. In closing, an analysis of the linguistic context is presented (Section 4.2.3).

4.2.1. Situational context

On 13 May 2015 a press conference was organized by the European Commission to present its *European Agenda on Migration* to the general public. This long-awaited plan provided for a solution of the European refugee issue, consisting of short-term and medium-term actions. Frans Timmermans (First Vice-President), Federica Mogherini (High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy) and Dimitris Avramopoulos (Commissioner for Migration and Home Affairs) took the floor, followed by a Q&A session. Given the importance of the press conference, as it involved the official presentation of a major EU action plan, presented by three high-ranking Commissioners, simultaneous interpretation was available in 23 official EU languages.

For this case study, we will be reflecting only on the speech²⁵ given by Frans Timmermans, because his speech contains all of the terms under investigation. Besides, a discussion of the two other speeches was not feasible considering our time frame and would have been largely redundant. This press conference was organized in a far greater conference room, which was more suitable for presenting the *Agenda* officially, as opposed to the first press conference. In accordance with tradition, the Vice-President, the High Representative and the Commissioner stood in front of the room with a large screen behind them, showing a logo of the *Agenda*, and being surrounded by cameramen. Next to the Commissioner stood a spokeswoman, who took care of introductions, questions and conclusions.

Frans Timmermans, who has a Dutch nationality, acted as the First Vice-President of the European Commission, representing the public interest of the entire EU. He started by introducing the *Agenda* which had been adopted very recently, explaining that the EU had to undertake action in the refugee crisis, as it was promised in the European Council. The plan consisted of both immediate and future, sustainable measures. Then, he presented it in much more detail, subdividing the most important chapters. The first part was aimed at preventing human tragedies and reinforcing the mechanisms for emergency situations, e.g. the proposal of *hotspot teams* to give support on the ground in Member States where pressure was worst.

Besides, a *relocation* mechanism was proposed, which provided for a balanced distribution scheme of refugees, already staying in Europe, across the Member States.

25. Online accessible via <http://ec.europa.eu/avservices/video/player.cfm?sitelanguage=en&ref=1102707>

For this purpose, a distribution key had been established: an example of intra-EU solidarity. Finally, the *resettlement* scheme aimed at accommodating refugees from outside Europe. In conclusion, he emphasized that remaining silent in this debate was not an option, so the EU needed to assist its Member States, and needed to comply with EU citizens' demands, namely to stop the humanitarian tragedy in the Mediterranean and to offer a long-term solution to the problem.

4.2.2. Cognitive context

In addition to the concepts *resettlement* and *relocation*, that were discussed in Section 4.1.2, the *Agenda* mentions one more essential neologism, namely the metaphor of *hotspot*. As from its conceptualization within the EU, the term *hotspot* never really received a clear definition. Because of conflicting interests in the field of migration between EU institutions and Member States, this vagueness was almost necessary. This specific term is not the first example for which vagueness—or flexibility—is required; it is a phenomenon that is essential to the political construction of the EU.

Hotspot, as part of common language usage, is a word that has multiple meanings in various domains. It could be a «volcanic active part of the earth's crust», an «area with extremely high levels of radioactivity», a «place to be», a «place where wireless internet is made available», or a «place where a certain activity can be found frequently»^{26,27}. *Hotspot*, as it is meant in the EU context of migration, quite obviously belongs to the latter definition. As a matter of fact, the vague nature of the term is even more intensified within its EU context, since it can refer to two different concepts. In the first case, a *first reception centre*²⁸ (i.e. facilities and infrastructure to register newly arrived refugees) is intended. In the second case, *hotspot* means the «geographical area in the EU that is heavily confronted with the migratory influx»²⁹.

Similarly to *relocation* and *resettlement*, *hotspot* can undoubtedly be designated as a genuine neosemanticism (Schüler 2006); an already existing word receives a specific meaning, in this case at European level. However, *hotspot* was not borrowed from the lexicon used by e.g. the UNHCR and the IOM. On the contrary, *hotspot*—as a

26. Hotspot. s.d.. In Van Dale Online. Accessed August 5, 2016. <<http://vowb.vandale.be.ezproxy.vub.ac.be:2048/zoeken/zoeken.do>>

27. We were not able to provide a link that can be consulted publicly. However, all five meanings as written in Van Dale Online are reported here.

28. Hotspot. 2015. In IATE. Accessed August 5, 2016. <<http://iate.europa.eu/FindTermsByLilId.do?lilId=3566411&langId=en>>

29. Hotspot. 2015. In IATE. Accessed August 5, 2016. <<http://iate.europa.eu/FindTermsByLilId.do?lilId=3566745&langId=en>>

metaphor evoking a very strong image—was a creation of EU policymakers to point out an emerging European phenomenon.

4.2.3. Linguistic context

In order to analyse the speaker’s neologisms and parallel them with the Dutch and German interpreting versions, we refer to all the relevant information listed in the table below.

EN	NL	DE
hotspot teams (02:54)	<i>hotspot teams</i> (02:57)	[Unterstützung] (03:08)
relocation mechanism (03:09)	<i>relocationmechanisme</i> (03:12)	[einen Mechanismus] (03:14)
resettlement scheme (04:00)	<i>resettlementssysteem</i> (04:12)	Neuansiedlungssystem (04:03)
resettlement (05:36)	<i>resettlement</i> (05:36)	Wiederansiedlung (05:36)

Table 3. Speech by Frans Timmermans

Starting with the Dutch interpretation, one can observe that the influence of English is clear. *Hotspot teams* is borrowed in an unaltered way. Further—and in line with the second part of the previously discussed press conference (cf. Table 2)—the terms *relocation* and *resettlement* are also retained in Dutch. In this case though, the interpreter uses the English loan words to build an authentic Dutch compound word (cf. *relocationmechanisme* and *resettlementssysteem*).

Firstly, it is clear that this procedure is very effective, since the interpreter does not need to search for a real Dutch equivalent. Instead, he can just keep the English term, resulting in a reduced cognitive effort. The terminologist who was consulted on this, indicated that, most of the time, the Dutch-speaking audience asks for English terms to be used by interpreters.

Secondly, although at the moment of the press conference some Dutch equivalents may have existed already, they are not yet generally accepted. Since the public might be less familiar with possible new constructions in Dutch, the interpreter deemed it appropriate to stick to the English words, at least in this specific case.

Thirdly, especially in simultaneous interpreting one will not be inclined to translate new, crucial terms in a discourse right away, as long as the meaning is not entirely clear to the interpreter. From a theoretical perspective, this strategy has been called «least commitment»; «a strategy that will grant the greatest number of possible solutions from the linguistic point of view, trying to avoid commitment to a one-way solution.» (Riccardi 1998, 178).

In the German interpreting performance, two of the three terms were rendered in the target language in an approximative and generalizing way: a generic «*Unterstützung*» (support) for «hotspot teams», «*einen Mechanismus*» (a mechanism) for the more

specific «relocation mechanism». For these examples we may assume that a substantial part of relevant information was omitted. Finally, *resettlement scheme* is translated in accordance with other German equivalents mentioned earlier, whereby the interpreter creates a compound word (cf. *Neuansiedlungssystem*) on the basis of the direct equivalent of *resettlement* (*Neuansiedlung*), which is likely to evolve into a standard translation.

Even though our case study is limited to only two press conferences, when comparing the Dutch and German interpreting performances, we can deduce that the activity of interpreting into Euro-Dutch implies making choices and using strategies that are different from interpreting into Euro-German. We are therefore inclined to generalise on the existence of interpreting traditions that appear to exist for certain official languages of the EU institutions.

5. CONCLUSIONS

First and foremost, we can sum up by saying that discourse taking place during EU press conferences contains quite some new terminology, especially *neosemanticisms* (Schüler 2006). As far as we could observe, interpreters did not give the impression of experiencing any exceptional difficulties whilst translating these neosemanticisms. And no significant mistakes were made. We have to mention though that apparently —as a general rule for EU press conferences—interpreters receive different sorts of preparatory documents or terminology before starting to work, so it is less likely that they actually are overwhelmed by neologisms.

Regardless of whether interpreters were informed in advance or not, we could distinguish several interpreting strategies for dealing with neosemanticisms. Relying on Riccardi (1998) it is justifiable to say that the occurrence of neosemanticisms in interpreting situations mainly requires the use of a *knowledge-based strategy*, because new terms or terms with a new meaning fall within the category of «novel situations». Furthermore, the interpreting strategies were clearly different in Dutch and German based on our observations. It appears that during the interpreting sessions that we observed, the Dutch and German language booths of DG SCIC apply different methods for interpreting neologisms, most of the time in a successful way. However, due to the fact that interviewing interpreters was not allowed, we were unable to gain a better insight.

With our research, we wanted to explore how neosemanticisms in the EU context of press conferences are dealt with by both Dutch and German interpreters. Based on our findings, it is possible to distinguish between various types of strategies used.

In Dutch, practically all neosemanticisms were translated by means of a «direct loan/transfer». However, in the first press conference translations were not consistent, as one single Euro-English concept was expressed through both the «use of [an]

approximate equivalent» and a «loan word», possibly confusing listeners (cf. Section 4.1.4).

In German though, quite the opposite phenomenon could be observed. Indeed, only the strategy of an «approximate equivalent» was used for translating neosemanticisms. No single «loan word» was formulated in the German booth, which might indicate a slightly puristic attitude towards the German language. On the other hand, on two occasions the message was conveyed either ambiguously or incompletely. In the first press conference, the single concept *resettlement* was rendered via two distinct German equivalents; *Neuansiedlung* and *Wiederansiedlung* (cf. Section 4.1.4). In the second press conference, *hotspot teams* was merely translated as «support» (cf. Section 4.2.3); this is likely to be an omission (and definitely a *partial* omission).

Further research in the area of simultaneous interpretation of neologisms needs to be encouraged. Case studies on a larger scale and investigations by means of large interpreting corpora could enable us to elaborate multiple and well-defined language-dependent strategies in order to interpret neologisms. For that purpose, we would like to emphasize that preferably the interpreters themselves should be involved more actively. *Dynamic contexts* (Temmerman 2016) may play an important role in specifying those strategies. In doing so, not only interpreters themselves will gain a better understanding of neologisms and neosemantics, but also the public that is relying on interpretation will benefit from clearer communication.

The results emerging from this kind of research could have manifold and valuable implications for the EU institutions, the actual performance in the booths (i.e. the language Units), the terminology Units within the EU institutions, the interpreters' professional competencies, the audience's confidence in interpreters, and also the research community in interpreting studies. The insights we gained in this study can be a new source of information for future interpreter training. For instance, students could learn about primary terminology in English and what to do with it in their own language, or in other words, which strategies are suitable for translating neologisms. The theoretical curriculum could be complemented by discussions on interpreters' creativity, the role of *dynamic contexts* in the interpreting process and the steadily growing influence of English as a lingua franca on the strategies to be applied when faced with neologisms and/or neosemanticisms.

6. REFERENCES

- AHMAD, Khurshid, and Margaret ROGERS (eds.). 2007. *Evidence-based LSP. Translation, Text and Terminology*. Series: Linguistic Insights. Bern: Peter Lang.
- ALBL-MIKASA, Michaela. 2010. «Global English and English as a Lingua Franca (ELF): Implications for the Interpreting Profession». *trans-kom* 3 (2): 126-148.
- CABRÉ CASTELLVÍ, Maria Teresa, Rosa ESTOPÀ BAGOT and Chelo VARGAS SIERRA. 2012. «Neology in specialized communication». *Terminology* 18 (1): 1-8.

- FISCHER, Márta. 2010. «Language (policy), translation and terminology in the European Union». In *Terminology in Everyday Life*, ed. by Marcel Thelen and Frieda Steurs. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 21-33.
- HORVÁTH, Ildikó. 2010. «Creativity in interpreting». *Interpreting* 12 (2): 146-159.
- IOM. 2011. *Glossary on Migration - 2nd Edition*. Geneva: International Organization for Migration.
- JONES, Roderick. 2002. *Conference Interpreting Explained*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- KOSKINEN, Kaisa. 2000. «Institutional Illusions: Translating in the EU Commission». *The Translator* 6 (1): 49-65.
- NISKA, Helge. 1998. *Explorations in translational creativity: Strategies for interpreting neologisms*. Workshop paper. Accessed July 29, 2016. <<http://www.reocities.com/~tolk/lic/KREENG2.HTM>>.
- PERUZZO, Katia. 2012. «Secondary term formation within the EU: term transfer, legal transplant or approximation of Member States' legal systems?». *The Journal of Specialised Translation* (18): 175-186.
- REY, Alain. 2005. «The concept of neologism and the evolution of terminologies in individual languages». *Terminology* 11 (2): 311-331.
- RICCARDI, Alessandra. 1998. «Interpreting strategies and creativity». In *Translators' strategies and creativity: Selected papers from the 9th International Conference on Translation and Interpreting, Prague, September 1995. In honour of Jiří Levý and Anton Popovič*, ed. by Ann Beylard-Ozeroff, Jana Králová and Barbara Moser-Mercer. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 171-180.
- ROGERS, Margaret. 2007. «Lexical chains in technical translation: A case study in indeterminacy». In *Indeterminacy in LSP and Terminology*, ed. by Bassegy E. Antia. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 15-35.
- SCHÜLER, Anja. 2006. «Neologismen als Übersetzungsproblem». *Lebende Sprachen* 51 (2): 62-66.
- SEEBER, Kilian. 2017. «Interpreting at the European Institutions: faster, higher, stronger». *CLINA: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Translation, Interpreting and Intercultural Communication* 3 (2): 73-90.
- TEMMERMAN, Rita. 2016. «Translation and the Dynamics of Understanding Words and Terms in Contexts». In *Meaning in Translation: Illusion of Precision*, ed. by Larisa Ilynska and Marina Platonova. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 139-160.
- VERMEIREN, Hildegard, and Sara Vandewaetere. 2017. «How Translators and Interpreters Cope in Different Ways with Lexical/Terminological Uncertainty When They Deal with English as the Lingua Franca: A Rationale for Specific Terminological Training». In *Terminological Approaches in the European Context*, ed. by Paola Faini. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 64-81.