The role of translation and interpretation in the diplomatic communication

Tamas Baranyai

***Abstract**: Present short study is dealing with the languages used for diplomatic purposes throughout the history and at present, and concentrates on the different ways for solving the question of language-related understanding between the actors of diplomacy. Since one of the most commonly used methods is the employment of translators and interpreters, this writing is mainly dedicated to the issues concerning translation and interpretation in diplomatic context.*

***Keywords**: diplomatic language, translation, interpretation, heteronymous translator, autonomous translator, linguistic and cultural awareness*

Introduction

Diplomacy whose presence in the history of mankind from the very beginning of civilization has been proved by the archeologists is a formal way of communication between the states. Since in most of the cases the various states use different language or even languages in their internal exchanges, the interstate communication usually meets the challenge of having a common language in order to avoid misunderstandings. This common language used for diplomatic purposes is sometimes called 'diplomatic language'. Although most of the diplomatic lexicons and dictionaries mention and explain the notion of diplomatic language, legally, there has never existed such a language. We should accept the explanation of Pitti-Ferrand according to which a diplomatic language is practically the language used by the parties concerned during the actual international negotiations and during the wording of the actual international legal acts (treaties, conventions, agreements etc.). The parties involved have to come to an agreement concerning this language on the basis of their equality. (Pitti-Ferrand 2003: 3)

Languages commonly used for diplomatic exchanges throughout the history

Even though one single diplomatic language de jure whose usage had been universally and explicitly accepted by every state has never existed, nevertheless, throughout history, there have been languages whose use – even though limited in time and space – have been preferred in the interstate diplomatic exchanges.

The first peace treaty that is known from history had been concluded back in the 12th century B.C. between Ramses II, pharaoh of Egypt and Hattusili III, king of the Hittites. According to the careful analysis of this peace treaty's text that was preserved both in the Acadian and in the Egyptian language, scientists found proof that the original was written in Acadian, while the Egyptian is just a translation. Also texts from later years give accounts of the Acadian being the first known dominant language of diplomatic interactions in the ancient Near East. Its supremacy began sometimes in the first half of the 2nd millennium B.C. and lasted for about a thousand years, when this dominance was put to an end by the Aramean language which became the *lingua franca* for one millennium and a half in the Fertile Crescent.

The conquests of Alexander, the Great, however, increased the importance of the Greek language during the interactions of different empires, and gradually, Greek had been used along with Aramean for diplomatic communication, too. Nevertheless, the descendants of Alexander started to force other peoples to use Greek for official purposes and forbade them the use of any other language. Also the Roman emperors knew, and used the Greek language; however, the spread of Latin was obviously unavoidable. Soon, all the provinces of the huge Empire used Latin for communicating both with each other and with the peoples beyond the borders. This wide-spread use of the language made it possible that it could play a significant role in the diplomatic culture even centuries after the fall of the Empire.

Some other factors that helped to maintain Latin's importance in diplomacy are as follows: In the Middle Age, the diplomatic envoys usually come from the educated layer of the clergy, and also the language of the Church was Latin. Also, being a dead language, the 'official' use of this language in diplomatic interaction didn't hurt the pride of any nation, as it didn't indicate a difference in rank. Since Latin had been used for diplomatic purposes for centuries, it used to have its proper linguistic register for nearly all situations that could occur in diplomacy of those times, and in case any of the decision makers couldn't speak Latin, the exact interpretation of the diplomatic texts was rather easy.

Nevertheless, Latin gradually lost its significance in Western Europe following the age of Renaissance and Humanism. The multitude of modern terms, coming from the fields of jurisdiction, administration, politics, economy etc., which appear in these decades, had no equivalents in Latin. Due to the invention of the printing press, the members of the clergy couldn't maintain their monopoly of reading and writing; what's more, many of the new books had been published not in Latin anymore, but in the vernacular languages which was understood by the simple people, too. More and more diplomats had no ties with the Church, and these people couldn't speak Latin well, or even couldn't speak Latin at all.

In the 1670s, France was at the height of its power, the Sun King was victorious on the battlefields, as well. Yet, the diplomatic negotiations following his wars had been still mostly concluded in Latin, although there was one treaty between Holland and France which was written in French and there was another bilingual, Spanish-French treaty, as well. However, the reign of the descendants of Louis XIV brought along a political decline for France as a European power. As Charles Cogan explains,

> *…under Louis XIV's successor, Louis XV, French diplomacy became less effective, as in the unnecessary renunciation of French gains in the northeast and in Savoy in the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle at the end of the War of the Austrian Succession (1740-48). In this and the next conflict, the Seven Years' War (1756-63), the principal beneficiaries were England, supreme on the seas, and Prussia, now emerging as a powerful land-army state under Frederick II. In the Seven Years' War, France lost two hundred thousand men fighting – in a change of alliances – with Austria against Prussia while losing its colonies in America and India to England for want of men to defend them. From that point until the French Revolution in 1789, France did not play a very active role in European power politics.* (Cogan, 2004: 64)

Despite its political and military decline, France seems to exercise an intellectual hegemony in Europe, and this also contributed to the fact that French soon became the main means of diplomatic communication.

Although the French lost a war against the Holy Roman Empire, the treaty concluded in Rastadt in the year 1714, similarly to the afore-mentioned cases, was formulated in the language of the losing country – but this time, this language was French. The reason why Latin has been completely neglected this time was a rational one. The French general, Villars couldn't speak Latin, while the commander of the Habsburg Empire's army, Prince Eugene of Savoy – who was born in Paris – could speak French very well. Thus, the treaty had been concluded in French, but they added a '*mention spéciale'* to the treaty to indicate that the use of French in this treaty is just an exception and this shouldn't be a precedent for later treaties. However, from this time on, the 'accidental' use of French during the conclusion of treaties occurred more and more frequently, even though for the next half century the special close had always been added to them emphasizing the fact that French is not an officially adopted language for the negotiations.

Yet, the language used for both the diplomatic negotiations and for the diplomatic documents of this time became exclusively the French. It was only the Treaty of Paris concluded in 1763 where the special close about the language use had not been added for the first time. This was a clear sign of the fact that the language that is used in this case and also in later cases is (and remains) French. From this time on, the dominance of French in the international negotiations was not a question anymore.

Although France lost its strong political position with the fall of Napoleon Bonaparte, but its language still could preserve its special place in the diplomatic communication. Nevertheless, beside Prussia, there was another young country emerging, which challenged France in different fields as soon as it appeared in the scene of European politics, the United States. One of these fields was the language use in diplomacy.

Due to the traditional isolation of the Brits from mainland Europe, English was not a language widely-known during the golden age of the British Empire. Despite the vast expansion and the political dominance of the Empire, English hadn't become a prevailing language in diplomatic interactions for long. Since the British had concentrated their attention to the world outside of Europe and had rather been concerned to build up their Empire that contained territories on all continents, the main means of communication in European diplomacy remained French even at the height of Britain's power.

Thus, the language started its 'diplomatic career' only at the end of the 19th century, when not only England was willing to intervene in the matters of mainland Europe, but also the United States appeared as a young political power. Already the Treaty of Paris concluded in 1783 – which acknowledged the independence of the USA – was formulated in English for the special request of the Americans. In 1895, a tribunal was set up in Paris in order to address the difficulties which emerged between England and the United States related to some legal questions concerning the Behring Sea and the protection of sea lions. It was agreed that the problems will be discussed in English. Also the peace of Portsmouth, which was concluded between Japan and Russia – with American diplomatic mediation – was formulated both English and French, although the French version was considered to be the original.

Finally, just like the linguistic competence of the negotiating parties influenced the language use of the diplomatic communication back in 1714, the history repeated itself two centuries later. However, French was the 'victim' this time. In 1919, the peace treaties which put an end to WWI have been prepared by a Peace Conference, and especially by a kind of committee of four statesmen, representing the victorious countries. George Clémenceau and Vittorio Emanuele Orlando had a good command of English; however, the representatives of the Anglo-Saxon countries were not as talented regarding the languages. The British David Lloyd George could speak some French, but not really well, while the American Woodrow

Wilson couldn’t speak French at all. Thus, the conditions of the peace have been formulated both in English and in French, both versions being considered as of equal authority.

Since the peace treaty of Rastadt in 1714, this was the first occasion when not only French had been used in a Western European diplomatic interaction. Of course, the decision was severely criticized by the protectors of the French language. The President of the Republic, the Academy, the public opinion, they all opposed the diversion from the traditional use of French, but the grave consequences were not to be avoided. In Versailles, the hegemony of French as the single language of diplomacy was put to an end. From this time on, there came a period of bilingualism: English and French had been used parallel during the diplomatic communication. This era of bilingualism lasted until the end of WWII, then English has assumed the role that French had played in the previous two centuries.

Languages used for diplomatic communication in our present days

Although the significance of French – from its monopoly in Western diplomatic exchanges – has gradually declined since WWII; however, the use of this language hasn’t completely disappeared from the domain. It still functions as one of the two working languages in the United Nations, similarly to the International Court of Justice in the Haag whose official language is also the French. This language is the working language of the Council of Europe, of the General Court (along with the Court of Justice) of the European Union and of the European Court of Auditors. French is also the official language of the most important recurring event of sport diplomacy, the Olympic Games.

Of course, apart from English and French, a number of other languages are used in our days for diplomatic purposes, especially as working languages in the international organizations that assume multilateral diplomatic activity. These international organizations include a number of member states. As an example for this kind of multilateral cooperation we can mention the Danube Commission, where working languages are French, German and Russian. Another example can be the OPEC which uses Arabic, English and Spanish as its working languages. At the high-level meetings of non-aligned countries, Arabic, English, French and Spanish are used. (Nick 2001: 46-47) In the United Nations, beside the two previously mentioned languages, also Arabic, Chinese, Russian and Spanish are considered to be official languages; however, at the plenary meetings, the participants have their choice even to use their own vernacular language. In this case, of course, the translation of the speech should be provided in at least one of the working languages of the organization.

The cost of translation required by the multilateral diplomatic exchanges in the international organizations is tremendous. As Nick mentions, some years ago a calculation was made concerning this question which resulted that “the translation of one single page to all official languages of the UN amounted to the value necessary to cover the cost of living for one person in India for a whole year” (ibid). However, we don’t wish to deal with the problems of the translation of the written text sin a detailed way, but for those who are interested we highly recommend the short study of Ildiko Hortobagyi which has been published under the title ’*Plurilinguisme et Compétence Interculturelle*’ in the 4th volume of the *Études françaises* series. Although the multilateral diplomatic communication is more complicated and more expensive than bilateral, also this latter meets a number of challenges.

There are some countries, which share the same official language; however, language conventions vary in such a way that there might even be some misunderstanding between people of these countries. E.g. French is spoken not only in France, but also in Belgium, in Canada, in the French-speaking part of Switzerland, and in numerous African countries. The same way, English is shared by a huge number of states beside the United Kingdom and the United States. Also Spanish (Spain and Latin-America) and Arabic (e.g. Maghreb and Mashraq countries) can be listed as examples. Thus, even though these countries share the same language, sometimes the same words and expressions of these languages have different connotations in their language use. (Mathieu 1951: 29)

The ways of solving the language issue in diplomacy-related situations

As we have already referred to it, the problems of mutual understanding – at least as for linguistic competences are concerned – can be solved in various ways between diplomats of different nationality and thus possessing different mother tongue. Nevertheless, we have to admit that none of these solutions is perfect.

Of course, any diplomat has the free choice of using any of the languages he can speak, especially if he knows his counterpart's linguistic background. Sometimes even to make the right decision regarding the language use requires a sense of diplomatic approach. In certain cases it might be tactical to choose the language that he can speak not so well. E.g. a diplomat who can speak Hebrew very well might hurt the sensibility of an Arab diplomat by talking to him using that language. At the same time, it's a sign of good-will, politeness or special respect if someone greets their counterpart in their own language. Many statesman act like this during their visits to foreign countries, just like leaders of diplomatic delegations participating in international conferences, expressing their respect towards the chairman of the event or towards the country in which the conference takes place. His Holiness the polyglot pope John Paul II can stand as a good example for all diplomats.

One way of reaching to a consensus is that one of the negotiating parties is willing to use the mother tongue of his homologue, which at the same time might also mean that he accepts having the chance to have some disadvantages during the communication, as the linguistic competence of a second or third language is seldom in match with that of a mother tongue. As a native speaker, one can be much more aware of the 'hidden', connotative meanings and certain implications of expressions, while in case of a second language these can easily avoid one's attention. This is also one reason why it is not so simple to find a commonly accepted and acknowledged language in the multilateral diplomacy. (Nick 2001: 40)

Another possible way of tearing down the language barriers is the mutual acceptance of using a third language which is spoken by none of the participants as a mother tongue. That results in a situation where theoretically none of the negotiating parties can have an unfair advantage concerning the linguistic competence. Of course, this solution also implies that either (or both) of the parties might not have a complete linguistic mastering of the language, and this can also lead to misunderstandings in extreme cases. Still, this is one of the widely used methods in the practice of international diplomatic communication, especially in less formal occasions, such as receptions or other events. (ibid)

The idea of using an artificial, synthetic language, such as Esperanto, in the communication of diplomacy in order to avoid all the complications of the linguistic kind, emerged long time ago; however, even George Mathieu formed his skeptical opinion about the possible success of such a language as early as back in the middle of the 20th century. (Mathieu 1951: 33)

A special way of solving the issue of different languages is the employment of translators, people mediating between the communicators. This might happen in two cases: either there's no common language shared by the participants of the communicative situation, or they intentionally don't wish to directly communicate by using a common language. This latter has got nothing to do with the lack of politeness, of course. According to the diplomatic protocol, high ranking statesmen, heads of state should use their mother tongue in certain official occasions, and the use of interpreters is a widely used method in diplomatic negotiations for tactical purposes, as well.

Translators and interpreters in the diplomatic communication

Since the Treaty of Versailles made the use of two official languages instead of only one as a norm to be followed, a new profession had to be invented, that of the official diplomatic interpreters. Of course, the use of translators and interpreters was not a completely new phenomenon, as we have proof of the existence of people in charge of this task throughout the history of mankind. The above-mentioned historical event only led to the systematic special training of the diplomatic translators and interpreters.

As early as in the first meetings between representatives of different tribes (later empires and states), there had been the challenge of understanding the other. Since there were issues to discuss, problems to solve, terms to negotiate, understanding has always been essential, thus finding a way to avoid the language barrier was a question of high significance. For this challenge, the actual leaders had tried to find various solutions. As Takeda (Takeda 2008: 2-3) refers to Cronin's research (Cronin 2002: 55-58; 2006: 101-102, 114-115), the first step had usually been the employment of the so-called 'heteronymous interpreters' who were chosen from the members of the opposing party, and who were forced or motivated to learn the language of the 'conquerors' so that they can be used as translators or interpreters. However, sooner or later the loyalty and reliability of these 'heteronymous interpreters' had been questioned, and as a shift of paradigm, the attention turned more and more towards using 'autonomous interpreters', i.e. the employment and linguistic (and often diplomatic) training of the states' own professionals. This shift in the tendency has also been detailed dealt with by Lewis who discussed the translating issues of the Middle East in his work. (Lewis 2004: 24-28)

The function of the employment of interpreters during the multilateral talks and international conferences significantly differs from that during bilateral negotiations. While in the first case the use of interpreters ensure the complete understanding of the speeches, i.e. it is dedicated to avoid the eventual lack of linguistic competence, interpretation in a bilateral situation, especially in diplomatic negotiations, is a much more complex issue with a much wider scale of functions.

One of the advantages of using interpreters during bilateral meetings is that the negotiating parties gain some time for thinking over what they wish to reply, while the interpreter is doing his job. On the other hand, it is possible to observe and analyze the non-verbal elements of communication of the other party, which also might provide information of great importance to the listener. (Hidasi 2004: 65-66)

Of course, the employment of translators and interpreters also might have their disadvantages, such as their time consuming character, their cost, and the eventual inadequate or even incorrect way of translation or interpretation. The danger of this latter cannot be avoided even in that case when the translator has a high linguistic competence of both the main language and of the target language, because at the same time he might not be an expert of the specific linguistic register of the issue in question, as we shouldn't forget that the themes of the negotiations can cover the most various fields of issues. A mistakenly or intentionally incorrect translation or interpretation can cause serious harms in diplomatic relations, no wonder that as early as in the medieval Italy a slogan spread to draw a parallel between the translators and the traitors (traduttore – traditore). (Nick 2001: 40)

Also the memoir of the former Hungarian minister of foreign affairs, Miklos Banffy includes a similar idea about the role of interpreters. The politician mentions concerning the grey eminent of Italian diplomacy of his times, Contarini, that he was only willing to use Italian language in his communications, so that he can blame his interpreter in any case of misunderstanding. (Banffy 2000: 270)

The competence of diplomatic translators and interpreters

The aim of translation and interpretation is not the semantic and syntactic transmission of the sentences from one language to another, but to achieve the same effect with the translation as what the original version is supposed to achieve. Communication can be called successful, if we know when, what, to whom and how to say in order to reach a certain goal or effect. For this success in communication, however, an interpreter needs to be aware of the cultural features of the other party.

These cultural features include both linguistic and non-linguistic elements. The above mentioned former Hungarian foreign minister, Miklos Banffy mentions a situation in his memoir, when the Hungarian delegation tried to convince the French president about their cause. The head of the delegation spoke first in a very factual way without using any rhetoric phrases, however, his recommendations had immediately been denied. Then the foreign minister himself started to talk, and being aware of the French spirit, of the way how French people use to argue for their right, and of the linguistic register they use to employ he reformulated the same content of the former speech. When he said '*France*' or '*gloire*', he used the same spirited tone as the French usually do. The attitude of the counterpart has gradually changed, and finally he agreed with what was requested, although he had heard the same request twice, only "served in a more French sauce" in the second case. (Banffy 2000: 273)

The different way of thinking, and the different means of expression that characterize the various cultures can also influence the negotiations. When Chairman Mao drew a parallel between Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and the busy swallows who are preparing for the storm, the American politician didn't quite understand the metaphor and the Chinese leader had to explain his meaning. (Burr 1998: 395) The proper linguistic awareness of cultures, i.e. the significance of the correct approach of the various cultures is also underlined in Hortobagyi's study. (Hortobagyi 2008)

The common knowledge shared by the counterparts forms a basic precondition of the successful negotiations. The verbatim records of Kissinger's talks with the Chinese and Russian leaders give an account of not only covering the actual (and historical) events of the international politics, geopolitical competences, the awareness of the systems of alliances and that of the possible conflicts, the knowledge concerning internal political issues of other states, and the topics of the actual meeting (e.g. questions of disarmament, economic issues), completed by diplomatic protocol issues. It seems that it is also essential for the negotiating parties to know their homologue's background, life and works. Apart from these, the Kissinger records mention conversations regarding historical, philosophical and even linguistic themes.

We have to admit that not all of the participants of the conversations had an equally wide knowledge concerning the above-mentioned topics. However, it was essential that the interpreters could convey the meaning of the speaker in each case. Thus for the sake of success, interpreters need to possess both a wide knowledge of the world in general, and the linguistic register expressing the details of the most various fields. Sometimes it is the interpreter who needs to help out the speaker (even a head of state) in expressing his thoughts in a more exact way.

Mathieu summarizes the qualifications and qualities of a good interpreter as follows: He's required to have "*a knowledge* [sic] *of languages and of as many technical subjects as possible.*" (Mathieu 1951: 31) As Mathieu underlines, interpreters can requested to participate in a succession of meetings related to a very wide variety of subjects, such as atomic energy, technical or legal issues, statistics, demographic issues, the regulation of whale hunting, human rights issues etc. For all such issues, it is not even enough the detailed knowledge of the terminology, but the interpreter is also required to be mentally fit to deal with the individual questions, since during the talks he has to face the real experts of these fields. (ibid)

Of course, the interpreter has to be able to speak in public without the trace of fright or shyness. How large ever the audience is or what important and well-known personality ever his employer is, he has to disregard all these and concentrate on his task without any stage fright. Another required quality towards interpreters is discretion. The people they are working for need to feel safe even at (and after) the most confidential meetings. It's important that they can immediately grasp the meaning of the spoken words. A great presence of mind, a good measure of psychological understanding, a long-lasting ability of concentration etc., these are all essential qualities for a good interpreter. And we already have mentioned the cultural awareness of the counterpart, which is also a basic prerequisite. As Hortobagyi explains it: „*La conscience langagière et la conscience culturelle constituent également deux facteurs très importants d'un discours diplomatique.*", i.e. the linguistic conscience and the cultural conscience are two equally important factors of a diplomatic discourse. (Hortobágyi 2009)

The difficulties of interpretations

The difficulties of interpreting might be the result of various factors. The speaker might not be a talented orator and in case he's not well prepared for his speech, he might struggle with the ways of expression himself, which also might cause hardships for the interpreter. Especially when the speaker has a tendency of accumulating negatives used within the same sentence, the interpreter might lose count on these and finally he won't know whether it should be expressed in the negative or in the positive. It's quite awkward and not always possible to ask a question to the speaker to clarify his meaning.

Sometimes the obscure way of expressing the thoughts gives hard times to the diplomatic interpreters, as in this case they need to decide within a moment, whether it was the speaker's intention to formulate his thoughts in such an obscure way, in which case the translation should reflect the same obscure character, or whether it was accidental, when the interpreter shall make a clear expression of what the speaker wished to share with his audience.

Some of the speakers might have a heavy accent, especially if they deliver their speeches in a second language. But even if we consider the various accents of English spoken in India, Pakistan, in the Arabic countries or by French speakers, we can realize that interpreters can have a lot of hardships when they are not used to these language variations.

It's another difficult moment when the interpreter finds a mistake in the content of the speech, as he has to decide immediately, whether it is to be corrected which might mean losing face of the speaker or not. When Hungarian political leader, Pal Losonczi was ceremonially welcomed in Sierra Leone as the president of Bulgaria, the interpreter corrected the mistake without hesitation in his interpretation. (Erdos 2004: 39-40)

In the history of diplomacy, many intentional mistranslations are also well-known. The reason behind these had varied from provocation to the correction of the text in order to avoid diplomatic conflicts. An instance where the effect of the original text has been modified in order to moderate and to make it acceptable for the receiver was the diplomatic correspondence between the Sultan of the Turkish Empire and Queen Elizabeth I of England which gives account of the fact that the Turkish emperor didn't consider the queen as equal in rank; however, the Italian translation of the sultan's letters reflects the required relationship of a vassal as a true friendship. (Lewis 2001: 22)

When speakers use quotations and references during their speech – especially in simultaneous interpretation –, it is always a source of difficulty for interpreters, all the more so if they haven't been provided with the required reference material in advance, so that they can find the documents from which the orators draw their quotations. (Mathieu 1951: 32)

The translation of culturally unique phenomena is also something which might be a source of difficulty when they turn up during a speech. This was a case some years ago when Hungarian head of government Ferenc Gyurcsany mentioned a Hungarian invention in his speech in Beijing. The name of the invention – just as creative as the invention itself – comes from an old Hungarian word which is mostly known from a fairy tale. However, the word *gömböc* has no equivalent probably in any language. Also the interpreter had a hard time when he had to translate it. The politician getting a little upset by his interpreter's lack of linguistic competence repeated the word in Hungarian. The interpreter, however, awkward as it was, replied that he also knows the Hungarian name of the invention.

Although according to Mathieu it is "a general rule that the higher the delegate in rank and reputation, the kinder and more understandable he is in his dealings with interpreters" (Mathieu 1951: 31), this seems to be a reference to the past times. E.g. due to the widespread use of the English language in diplomatic context, George Bush, then President of the United States, even questioned the necessity of his speech's interpretation into German, and interrupted the interpreter saying "*Everyone speaks English, right?*" It was Chancellor Merkel who asked his patience so that his speech can also be heard in German translation.

It can also be a nightmare for interpreters, when speakers read out their speeches, as in this case they don't need to think what they say, thus they speak faster, time their pauses in a different way, and usually use a more formal, more bureaucratic way of expression.

Summary

The various languages spoken in the different countries necessitate solutions to bridge the linguistic gap during the interstate exchanges, which challenge had been addressed by the actual political elites in numerous ways throughout the history. Although the requirements of the multilateral communicative situations cannot be compared to those of the bilateral meetings; however, as a rule, the most commonly used method in both cases is the employment of interpreters and translators.

This paper hasn't dealt with certain questions related to translation and interpretation in diplomatic context, such as the difference between consecutive and simultaneous interpretation, the role and necessity of taking notes during interpretation, from which language to which language to translate etc.; however, we have covered the most important qualities and qualifications of a good interpreter, as well as the difficulties that an interpreter might have to face during his work.

We haven't mentioned the main differences between the job of the interpreters, who work closely together with the speaker, and the translators, who work alone by recreating a text as its second authors. Also haven't dealt with the issue of interpreting certain emotions, such as anger, humor, and confidence; nevertheless, dealt with the advantages and disadvantages of employing interpreters, and also covered the theme of heteronymous and autonomous interpreters.

References:

BÁNFFY, Miklós. 2000. *Emlékeimből. Huszonöt év*. Kolozsvár: Polis, 2000.

BURR William (ed.) 1998. *The Kissinger Transcripts: The Top Secret Talks With Beijing and Moscow*. New York: New Press, 1998.

CREMONA, Vicky Ann., MALLIA, Helena. 2001. Interpretation and Diplomacy. In: KURBALIJA, Jovan., SLAVIK, Hannah. (ed.): *Language and Diplomacy*. Malta: DiploProjects, 2001, pp. 301-305.

CRONIN, Michael. 2002. The Empire Talks Back: Orality, Heteronomy, and the Cultural Turn in Interpretation Studies. In: TYMOCZKO, Maria., GENTZLER, Edwin. (eds.) *Translation and Power*. Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002, pp. 45-62.

CRONIN, Michael. 2006. *Translation and Identity*. London and New York: Routledge, 2006.

ERDŐS, André. 2004. *Sorsfordító esztendők*. Budapest: Korona, 2004

HIDASI, Judit. 2004. *Interkulturális kommunikáció*. Budapest: Scolar, 2004

HORTOBÁGYI, Ildikó. 2007. *Plurilinguisme et Compétence Interculturelle*. Études françaises 4. Veszprém: Pannon Egyetemi Kiadó, 2007

HORTOBÁGYI, Ildikó. 2008. Gateways to successful intercultural communication. In: *Bulletin of the Transilvania* University of Brasov. Vol. 1 (50), 2008. Series IV: Philology and Cultural Studies

HORTOBÁGYI, Ildikó. 2009. *R.S.V.P. Discours et lexique de la diplomatie*. Conference presentation. 2009

LEWIS Bernard. 2001. *What Went Wrong? Western Impact and Middle Eastern Response*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2001.

LEWIS, Bernard. 2004. *From Babel to Dragomans: Interpreting the Middle East*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2004.

MATHIEU, George J. 1951. Language problems in diplomatic intercourse. In: *The Diplomatic Year Book*. New York: U.N. World-Funk Co., 1951, pp. 28-33

NICK, Stanko. 2001. Use of Language in Diplomacy. In: Kurbila, J. – Slavik, H. (ed.): *Language and Diplomacy*. Malta: DiploProjects. 2001, pp. 39-48.

PITTI-FERRANDI, F. 2003. *Le français, langue diplomatique.* Paris: L'Amopa et la Francophonie. 2003.

TAKEDA, Kayoko. 2009. War and Interpreters. In: *Across Languages and Cultures* 10 (1) (2009). Budapest, 2009.

Author's address: H-8200 Veszprem, Haszkovo u. 2/B
Author's e-mail: tamas.baranyai@gmail.com

In *SKASE Journal of Translation and Interpretation* [online]. 2011, vol. 5, no. 2 [cit. 2011-11-21]. Available on web page <http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTI06/pdf_doc/01.pdf>. ISSN 1336-7811.