

## Pragmatic Strategies in Simultaneous Interpreting of Satire from Arabic Political Speeches into English

Asst. Lecturer. Ali Yousif Mahmood

University of Mosul, College of Arts, Translation Dept.

[ali.y@uomosul.edu.iq](mailto:ali.y@uomosul.edu.iq)

### Abstract

The paper aims to assess one of the most challenging linguistic phenomena, satire, in UN political oral addresses. The difficulty in the processing is not traditionally related to cognitive load, as the speaker, the late president of Libya, Muammar al-Gaddafi, used satire as a rhetorical linguistic device to attack the global order, the United Nations, and the five permanent members of the Security Council. The paper is based on the extraction of two recorded interpretations of the address, and an assessment was conducted of cognitive load, reformulation strategies, and linguistic outcomes as well. It focuses on cognitive processing and outcomes based on the selected strategies. The research paper contributes to the interpreting studies in the context of UN sessions. Through the analysis, challenges of satire in that address were discussed via assessing two UN address interpreters and how they dealt with the challenge of satire in both verbal and para-segmental ways. The study adopted Gile's (2011) cognitive overload to analyze the two renderings. The UN interpreting protocol stipulates that the interpreter may be absent for 20 to 30 minutes and be covered by the backup interpreter later. The paper concludes that the analyses subjects focused their attention on linguistic outcome paying little heed to the tone and intonation of the speaker. It is also concluded that the longer the interpreters' stores, the better the outcome as this relatively prolonged pause helps give better and more accurate reformulation.

**Key Words:** Simultaneous interpreting, cognitive load, satire, political speeches, conference, reformulation, pragmatic strategies.

الاستراتيجيات التداولية في الترجمة الفورية لخطابات الامم المتحدة الساخرة باللغة العربية الى الانكليزية

م. م. علي يوسف محمود

جامعة الموصل كلية الآداب قسم الترجمة

المستخلص:

تعد الدراسة هذه دراسة تقييمية لإحدى أكبر الظواهر اللغوية تحدياً لقدرة المترجم، ألا وهي التهكم في خطاب الأمم المتحدة السياسية. ولا ترتبط هذه الصعوبة في المعالجة التقليدية لهذه الظاهرة اللغوية بالعبء الإدراكي، نظراً لأن المتحدث الذي اخترنا خطابه عينة لهذا البحث، وهو الرئيس الليبي الراحل معمر القذافي، قد وظف السخرية كأداة لغوية بلاغية للتهكم على النظام الدولي ومنظمة الأمم المتحدة والدول الخمس دائمي العضوية في مجلس الأمن. وقد عمد الباحث لاختيار عينتين ترجميتين فورييتين، إذ أجري تقييم شامل كل من العبء الإدراكي للمترجمين بالإضافة لاستراتيجيات إعادة الصياغة في اللغة الهدف، مع التركيز على المعالجة المعرفية والنتائج المترتبة على الاستراتيجيات المختارة. وتسهم هذه الدراسة في محاولة اثراء دراسات الترجمة الفورية في سياقات الأمم المتحدة، إذ ناقش البحث التحديات التي يمثلها التهكم في ذلك الخطاب عبر تقييم أداء مترجمين لخطابات جلسات الأمم المتحدة وكيف تعاملوا مع هذه الظاهرة باللغة التعقيد

على كلا المستويين اللغوي وما فوق اللفظي. وقد تبنت الدراسة نظرية غيل (2011) الخاص بالعبء الإدراكي لتحليل الأداءين. وإذ ينص بروتوكول الترجمة الفورية في الأمم المتحدة على إمكانية غياب المترجم الفوري لمدة تتراوح بين 20 إلى 30 دقيقة على أن يحل محله المترجم الاحتياطي لاحقاً، تخلص الورقة البحثية إلى أن خاضعي التحليل قد ركزا انتباههما على المخرج اللغوي مع إيلاء اهتمام ضئيل بنبرة المتحدث وإيقاعه الصوتي. كما استنتجت الدراسة أنه كلما اتسعت مخازن الذاكرة لدى المترجمين الفوريين، غدت المخرجات أفضل؛ إذ تُسهّم هذه الوقفة الطويلة نسبياً في تقديم إعادة صياغة أجود وأكثر دقة".

**الكلمات المفتاحية:** الترجمة الفورية, العبء الإدراكي, الهجاء السياسي, الخطابات السياسية, مؤتمر, إعادة الصياغة, الاستراتيجيات التداولية.

## 1. Introduction

Interpreting, the oral version of rendering, has always been a scarcely researched major within translation studies in the Iraqi translation academic institutions, compared to written translation. In the context of satire and political discourse, Simpson (2003) defines satire as a culturally situated discursive practice (p.76). This stylistic phenomenon has been studied by many scholars in the field of discourse analysis, and it is reflected in the political discourse. This can be seen as a transaction dilemma for interpreters. To delve deeper, satire can be examined in the field of linguistic realization.

### 1.1 Linguistic Realization of Satire in Political Discourse

According to Sperber and Wilson (1981: 239), satire is realized simply because the speaker "echoes" a thought or person's style, while actually showing mocking intention towards the listener. Consequently, Simpson (2003: 8) refers to satire as a linguistic phenomenon that requires a specific stylistic framework that could be reflected through the following functions:

**A- Irony and Antiphrasis:** The speaker usually means the opposite of what he or she says in casual speech, either verbally or nonverbally, or even resorts to changing tone, intonation, and word stress.

**B-Hyperbole vs. Litotes:** Stylistic devices by which a speaker resorts when they intend to exaggerate to make the case ridiculous or laughable.

**C-Parody of Register:** On the contrary, speakers utter highly formal bureaucratic stylistic functions to mock political differences.

### 1.2 Simpson's Types of Satirical Speech:

Satire is a genre of literature that aims to diminish or deride a subject by making it ridiculous and evoking attitudes of amusement, contempt, scorn, or indignation toward it. It differs from the comic in that comedy evokes laughter mainly as an end in itself, while satire uses laughter as a weapon, and against a goal that exists outside the work itself (Simpson, 2003, p. 90):



**Irony-Based Satire:** Irony-based satire constitutes the central mechanism through which satirical discourse achieves its critical and evaluative force. Rather than functioning as a single rhetorical device, irony in satire operates as a multi-layered pragmatic and cognitive process that structures meaning beyond the literal level of the text. In this respect, satire can be most accurately described as a form of *irony-driven discourse* in which the gap between what is said and what is meant becomes the primary site of interpretation and critique. At a foundational level, irony is understood as the divergence between asserted meaning and intended meaning, that is, the interpretive space in which readers or listeners must infer an unstated evaluative stance. However, within satire, this divergence is not isolated or incidental; it is systematically organized. Satirical discourse relies on what may be termed “irony within irony”, whereby multiple ironic layers interact to produce a complex interpretive effect. This layered structure distinguishes satire from other forms of humorous or figurative discourse, such as sarcasm or parody. The first layer of irony in satire is typically **echoic**. In this phase, the text reproduces or alludes to a prior discourse, viewpoint, or ideological position. Crucially, this echoed material is not presented as original or fully endorsed; instead, it is framed in such a way that signals distance or implicit critique. The echoic layer thus establishes a recognizable discursive frame, allowing the audience to identify the target or source of the satirical representation. This phase often generates what appears to be a *surface alignment* with the echoed perspective, thereby creating the initial conditions for irony. The second level introduces a dialectical or oppositional form of irony that disrupts and reconfigures the echoed discourse. This phase produces a form of incongruity, or “collision of ideas,” in which the initial frame is challenged through contradiction, exaggeration, or contextual reorientation. The effect is to reinterpret the original viewpoint, revealing its limitations, absurdities, or ideological tensions. This oppositional irony constitutes the critical core of satire, transforming mere imitation into evaluative commentary. Importantly, these two layers do not operate independently; rather, their interaction generates the full satirical effect. The echoic phase establishes expectations, while the oppositional phase violates or reshapes them. Meaning emerges from the dynamic interplay between alignment and disruption, requiring the audience to reconcile conflicting cues and construct an implicit critical stance. In this sense, irony-based satire is inherently inferential, relying on the reader's or listener's cognitive engagement to complete the interpretive process. From a cognitive-pragmatic perspective, irony-based satire activates multiple knowledge resources, including general world knowledge, familiarity with discourse conventions, and sensitivity to contextual cues. The processing of satire thus involves detecting incongruity, recognizing an echoed voice, and resolving the tension between competing interpretations. This process often culminates in the construction of a “new point of view,” whereby the



audience moves beyond the literal content of the text to grasp its underlying evaluative intent. In sum, irony-based satire can be defined as a discursive strategy that employs layered ironic structures to produce critique through inferential meaning-making. Its effectiveness depends not only on linguistic form but also on the audience's ability to navigate the complex relationship between what is expressed and what is implied. This makes irony-based satire particularly significant in translation and interpreting contexts, where preserving such layered meaning poses both cognitive and communicative challenges (Simpson, 2003, p. 94).

### **1. Ridicule/Attack Satire:**

Ridicule/attack satire represents a more overt and confrontational form of satirical discourse in which the critical intent is directed explicitly at a target, typically a political figure, institution, or ideology. Unlike irony-based satire, which relies heavily on indirectness and inferential processing, ridicule/attack satire foregrounds its evaluative stance through direct exposure, exaggeration, and mockery, thereby reducing the interpretive distance between expression and meaning. At its core, ridicule/attack satire functions by degrading or undermining the target's authority, credibility, or legitimacy (Ziv 1988: 225; Simpson, 2003, p. 195). This is achieved through a range of discursive techniques, including caricature, hyperbole, lexical intensification, and negative labeling. The satirical force emerges not from subtle incongruity alone, but from the deliberate amplification of the target's perceived flaws, often pushing them to absurd or extreme levels. In this sense, ridicule operates as a strategy of discursive aggression, where humor is mobilized as a tool of critique. From a structural perspective, ridicule/attack satire may still incorporate elements of irony; however, irony is not its defining mechanism. Instead, the emphasis lies on explicit evaluative positioning, where the speaker's stance is readily identifiable. The satirical message is typically less dependent on layered interpretation and more on immediate recognition of the attack, making it more accessible to a broader audience. This directness often results in a stronger emotional response, particularly in political contexts where the stakes of criticism are high (Draitser, 1994, pp. 47–100). Cognitively, ridicule/attack satire imposes a lower inferential burden compared to more implicit forms of satire. The audience is not required to reconstruct complex layers of meaning; rather, they are invited to align quickly with the speaker's negative evaluation. Nevertheless, effective interpretation still depends on background knowledge, especially regarding the target of the satire and the socio-political context in which the discourse is produced. Without such knowledge, the intensity or relevance of the ridicule may be diminished. In political discourse, ridicule/attack satire plays a significant role in shaping public perception. By framing political actors as incompetent, hypocritical,



or absurd, it contributes to the delegitimization of authority and the reinforcement of ideological positions. It also serves a persuasive function, as the use of humor can make criticism more engaging and memorable while simultaneously lowering resistance to the message. From the perspective of simultaneous interpreting, ridicule-and-attack satire presents distinct challenges and opportunities. On the one hand, its relative explicitness makes it easier to detect and transfer compared to highly implicit irony-based satire. On the other hand, the interpreter must carefully manage tone, intensity, and political sensitivity, as any shift in lexical choice or prosodic delivery may either attenuate or exaggerate the original satirical force. Strategies such as mitigation, preservation, or intensification may be employed depending on contextual constraints and communicative priorities (Barendt et al., 1997, pp. 40–41). In sum, ridicule/attack satire can be defined as a direct, evaluative form of satire that employs exaggeration and mockery to undermine a target, producing critique through explicit discursive aggression rather than primarily through inferential irony. Its prominence in political speech makes it a critical category for analyzing how satire is processed and strategically rendered in simultaneous interpreting.

## 2. Parodic Satire:

Parodic satire is a form of satirical discourse that operates by imitating and transforming an identifiable discourse, genre, or speaking style, with the aim of exposing its weaknesses, contradictions, or ideological assumptions. Unlike ridicule/attack satire, which relies on direct criticism, or irony-based satire, which depends on layered inferencing, parodic satire derives its effect from the recontextualization of an existing discourse in a new, evaluative frame. At its core, parody involves the reproduction of a prior text or discourse in such a way that it becomes recognizably similar yet functionally altered (Bex, 1996, p. 237). This resemblance is crucial: the audience must be able to identify the original source—whether it is political rhetoric, bureaucratic language, media discourse, or institutional speech. However, this imitation is not neutral. It is strategically manipulated through exaggeration, distortion, or contextual displacement, thereby generating a critical stance toward the original discourse. From a discursive perspective, parodic satire is closely aligned with what may be described as an echoic mechanism, in which the speaker reproduces another voice without fully endorsing it. The satirical force emerges when this echoed discourse is subtly or overtly destabilized. The result is a form of double-voiced discourse in which the



surface structure appears to align with the original, but the underlying intent signals distance, critique, or mockery. Meaning, therefore, is produced through the tension between imitation and evaluation. Parodic satire often targets not only individuals but also discursive systems and communicative conventions. For example, it may mimic the formal tone of political speeches to reveal their emptiness, or reproduce media narratives to highlight bias or manipulation. In this sense, parody operates at a meta-discursive level, turning discourse back upon itself and exposing its constructed nature. This makes it particularly powerful in political contexts, where institutional language often carries implicit authority (Marnette, 2001, p.246). Cognitively, parodic satire requires the audience to activate intertextual knowledge. Successful interpretation depends on recognizing the source discourse and detecting how it has been altered. This involves comparing two layers: the original discourse (implicitly present) and the parodic version (explicitly presented). The satirical meaning emerges from the discrepancy between these layers, which may manifest as exaggeration, incongruity, or contextual mismatch. In simultaneous interpreting, parodic satire presents significant challenges. Its effectiveness relies heavily on the preservation of discursive style, register, and intertextual reference, all of which must be processed and reproduced in real time. If the interpreter fails to maintain the stylistic features of the original discourse being parodied, the satirical effect may be lost entirely. Moreover, differences between source and target political cultures may obscure the intertextual reference, requiring the interpreter to make rapid decisions regarding preservation, adaptation, or explicitation. From a strategic perspective, interpreters may adopt different approaches depending on cognitive load and contextual constraints (Sperber & Wilson, 1995, p. 33). These include preserving the parodic structure through stylistic imitation, explicating the intended critique, or, in cases of high processing pressure, neutralizing the satirical effect. Each choice has implications for how the political message is ultimately received by the target audience. In sum, parodic satire can be defined as a discursive strategy that employs imitation of recognizable forms of language or discourse, combined with transformation, to generate critique through intertextual contrast and stylistic recontextualization. Its reliance on both form and context makes it a particularly complex and demanding category in the study of simultaneous interpreting of political satire.

### 3. Implicit Cultural Satire:

Implicit cultural satire represents a highly context-dependent form of satirical discourse in which critique is conveyed through culturally embedded references, shared assumptions, and indirect evaluative cues, rather than through overt mockery or explicit irony. In this type of satire, the critical meaning is not directly



stated but must be inferred from culturally specific knowledge, making it one of the most subtle and cognitively demanding forms of satire. At its core, implicit cultural satire operates by activating shared socio-cultural and political frames that are presumed to be accessible to the intended audience. These frames may include historical events, public figures, institutional practices, ideological narratives, or culturally specific stereotypes (Okada, 2001, pp. 148–164). The satirical effect arises when these elements are invoked in ways that create incongruity, tension, or reinterpretation, without explicitly signaling criticism. As a result, the satire remains implicit, embedded within the discourse's cultural fabric. Unlike irony-based satire, in which the gap between literal and intended meaning is often structurally marked, implicit cultural satire may not exhibit clear linguistic indicators of non-literal meaning. Instead, meaning emerges through contextual alignment and pragmatic inference, requiring the audience to recognize the relevance of the cultural reference and its evaluative implications. This makes interpretation highly dependent on background knowledge, and the absence of such knowledge may lead to partial understanding or complete loss of the satirical effect. From a discursive perspective, implicit cultural satire often intersects with other forms of satire, including parody and irony, but its defining feature is its reliance on cultural specificity rather than on formal structure (Attardo, 2000, p. 64). It may appear as a seemingly neutral or descriptive statement, which, when situated within the appropriate cultural context, reveals a critical or ironic stance. In this sense, the satire is latent rather than overt, and its recognition depends on the audience's ability to detect subtle cues embedded in the discourse. Cognitively, this form of satire imposes a high interpretive burden. The audience must (Morgan 2001: 77):

1. Activate relevant cultural schemas
2. Map the current discourse onto known socio-political realities, and infer the speaker's evaluative position

This process involves not only linguistic decoding but also contextual reasoning and cultural competence, making implicit cultural satire particularly sensitive to differences in audience background. In political discourse, implicit cultural satire serves as a strategic tool for indirect criticism, especially in contexts where direct attack may be constrained by social, institutional, or ideological pressures. By embedding critique within culturally recognizable references, speakers can communicate dissent or skepticism while maintaining deniability or ambiguity. This allows satire to function as a subtle form of political commentary, often accessible only to those who share the relevant cultural knowledge. For simultaneous interpreting, implicit cultural satire presents one of the greatest challenges. The interpreter must not only process the linguistic content in real time



but also identify and interpret culturally bound meanings that may not be explicitly marked (Attardo, 2000, p. 64). If the cultural reference is unfamiliar or lacks an equivalent in the target culture, the satirical effect may be significantly weakened or lost. Interpreters may resort to strategies such as explicitation, adaptation, or neutralization, depending on time constraints and communicative priorities. However, each of these strategies entails a shift in how the original political message is conveyed. In sum, implicit cultural satire can be defined as a context-dependent form of satire that conveys critique through culturally embedded references and indirect evaluative cues, requiring inferential interpretation grounded in shared socio-cultural knowledge (Timarova, 2008: p. 24). Its subtlety and reliance on background knowledge make it a critical category in analyzing the complexities of interpreting political satire across languages and cultures.

## **2. Satire in Political Discourse:**

The area of politics is not a mere domain of practice. It rather contains many phenomena that are reflected in other domains, such as language and translation. Politically speaking, speeches are utilized to convince, attack, and discredit the opponent. Holbert (2016: 172) argues that the satire triad (satirist, satirized, and the audience) is the main pillar connecting politics and linguistics. The satirist utilizes language to refute allegations, prove convictions, and impose counternarratives. From this perspective, satire is a hybrid infotainment genre that combines comedy, news, and the satirist's political opinions (Baym, 2005, p. 259). As satire is inherently offensive, the satirist tends to go further, attacking the face of the satirized, thereby invoking the Face Threatening Act to express intolerance or resistance (Simpson, 2003, p. 13). Chilton (2004) adds the in-group vs. out-group dichotomy to examine political irony and its use in political speeches. The us-vs-them is also used in political speeches to characterize moral conflicts where the speaker's side is "self-legitimizing," and the listener's side is "othered".

## **3. Satire and interpreting:**

Interpreting satire in a conference atmosphere is one of the most formidable challenges to the interpreter's linguistic and cognitive processing capacity. Unlike standard literal discourse, satire mainly depends on the "pragmatic" gap between what is said and what is intended. The other challenging issue is also related to the sensitivity of the situation, especially in highly formal settings like the UN meetings and congregations.

### **3.1 What is conference interpreting?**

Commonly, conference interpreting is a mode of simultaneous oral translation, in which the interpreter renders from language A to Language B on the spot, without an interval or stop, as in the consecutive mode. Pochhacker (2004, p. 15) defines it not in terms of the venue and devices, but rather through the professional standards by which the interpreter conducts their work. He identifies it as a synchronous activity in which the speech is interpreted into the target language while the speech of Language A is still being received. This three-step activity (listening – processing - delivering) is mentally challenging to humans as it is not part of our daily activities. Humans usually take turns when engaged in dialogue, whereas in conference interpreting, they do not.

### 3.1.1 Interpreting and Mental Load

As explained above, the three-step process is challenging as it is not a usual practice of the human brain. This takes the research interest to the next level and delve deeper into the details. The Cognitive Saturation Model, proposed by Gile (2009: p. 159), explains that the “non-automatic” cognitive efforts (listening, memory, and production) consume a portion of the interpreter's mental capacity. For Timarova (2008: p. 19), the challenge comes from shifting and updating functions of the interpreter's brain. However, the process is not merely a linguistic shift between language A and language B. Setton (2009: p. 222) argues about another type of load related to pragmatic shifting between the two languages. It is, for him, not a “word-swapping”; it is rather for the human brain to build a “mental model” of the speaker's intent. This model of “pragmatic load” takes us to the next level, satire, which is not a direct linguistic style.

### 3.1.2 Interpreting Satire:

Satire, as a linguistic and stylistic phenomenon, places a greater cognitive load on the interpreter, being an unmarked style that requires more processing and thinking. In case of satire, the interpreter must build a “mental map” and identify “pragmatic clues” such as parasegmental features of the utterance or logical contradictions to realize the speaker's intention as s/he may mean the opposite of what they say, Setton (1999, 64-65). For Gile (2009: 160-161), the cognitive load is a normal result of interpreting satire, as it increases the effort of listening and processing, as it is a type of “indirect speech”. This is why interpreters usually face a kind of “delay” when the speaker resorts to satire. In such situations, the interpreter may want to make a decision and build an interpreted version based on some convictions or a load-reducing strategy. This is what Hutcheon (1994) goes for, mirroring that edge or “neutralizing” the irony. This is what Hutcheon (1994) goes for, mirroring that edge or “neutralizing” the irony. Neutralizing the speaker's tone may make the speaker look “foolish” or “irrelevant”, while edging may make the



interpreter look unprofessional. Moreover, from a cognitive perspective, Gutt (2000: p. 98) notes that satire relies heavily on a “shared cognitive environment”. This indicates that the audience should experience the same satirical effect as the speaker intended, and how it would be received by another audience in language A. So, in the real conference interpreting booth, the interpreter would be pulled and magnetized by two contending forces: keeping the irony as it is abruptly, or taking the harder choice of finding a pragmatically effective satirical equivalence via building a “cultural bridge” between the two sides. Choosing either of them is not easy, as the process is quite consequential. The first may result in misunderstanding, while the second would take longer processing and may cause delay and hesitation.

### 3.1.3 Interpreting Parasegmental Features:

The parasegmental features add another difficulty to interpretation, as the meaning can be reversed depending on the speaker's tone and intonation. Shlesinger (1994: p. 226) claims that using a rising intonation, for instance, at the end of the sentence may turn a fact into “question” or “sneer”. He claims that an interpreter may follow an “intonational mimicry” in order to keep the intended meaning of the speaker. The same applies to hesitation, pauses, pitching, and tempos. All these parasegmental features require extra processing and mental effort. Ahrens (2005) also notes that a successful interpreter is the one who manages to “decouple” from the speaker's rhythm in order to keep their clear delivery while reflecting the speaker's illocutionary intent. A very famous example is the late Gaddafi's use of “scrap of paper” to describe the UN charter in a degrading way, as he was using a very high tone in anger and dispute.

### 3.1.4 Data Analysis

The researcher selected two interpretations of the same address; the speaker posted on YouTube. Four long cases of satire have been chosen for analysis and discussion. The two interpreters. One of the interpreters is UN-based, interpreting from the booth, while the other was interpreting for a media channel. They both worked on the whole address, interpreting for at least 1.5 hours, which is not normal under UN interpreting protocols. For reasons the researcher could not fathom, the two interpreters worked for over 1.5 hours under progressively increasing pressure and overload. The two interpreters' linguistic performance was relatively similar. However, one of them resorted to a long interval, which reached up to 5 seconds of storing and processing, which helped him come out with better target language; while the other one's storing and processing was abrupt, which caused a serious problem with reformulating the TL version of the address. Additionally, neither interpreter paid attention to reformulating parts of the para-

segmental features of the speech, and the focus was mainly on the linguistic elements. Hence, the research adopted Gile's (2011) cognitive load model to analyze the interpreted cases. It is based on the load generated by the interpreter's cognitive processes during their work. The model follows this formula:

$$\text{TOTAL EFFORT} = L + M + P + C$$

It starts with "L" listening, in which detecting satire happens in the human brain through the signals that trigger the shift of meaning, the opposite of what the speaker said. It is the most difficult part of satire, as the interpreter's pragmatic competence is at stake at this stage. "M" stands for memory, in which the interpreter stores the message in short-term memory, while long-term memory can help bring the cultural context of satire into play. "P" stands for production in which the interpreter utters the linguistically accurate TL equivalence that matches the SL one. The other layer of this stage I related to para-segmental features, specifically how the speaker uses non-linguistic elements to add satire to the linguistic layer. The last element, "M", which stands for "Coordination," could be considered the manager of the previously mentioned elements: "listening, memory, producing." In this part, the interpreter negotiates the double meaning of certain utterances, recalls the pragmatic or cultural context, and tries his best to reformulate the message "satirical element in specific" in a way that matches the meaning in the source language.

### 3.1.5 Setting Information:

UN General Assembly meetings are rich areas of research and investigation. They host the world's leaders, diplomatic missions, and state representatives who speak in a highly formal manner. According to UN regulations outlined on the organization's website, a speaker is given 15 minutes to conclude their remarks on an issue of their choice. However, no interruption is allowed to notify him/her of the time over. The only possible way to do so is to show the red light to do so, which is not an obligatory sign for the speaker to leave the rostrum. Historical instances prove this: Fidel Castro spoke for 290 minutes in 1960, and our case study, Muammar al-Gaddafi, spoke for over 90 minutes in 2009. As for simultaneous interpreting, it is also stipulated that an interpreter works for 20-30 minutes, then switches with the backup interpreter to ensure the utmost performance for the audience and for listeners or viewers around the world. With all that said, our case study could also be considered exceptional, as the two interpreters worked consecutively for over one hour without switching. First, it was characterized by theatricality and defiance of international norms. This was his first speech, although he had been in power in Libya for over 40 years. He spent all those decades as a pariah figure in the wake of international solitude due to the

West's embargo on Libya. His "grand entry" gave him a reason to attack the United Nations and other superpowers on many fronts and various issues. Simultaneous interpreting is built around cognitive load, processing capacity, and real-time constraints. The following are the structured patterns of data analysis.

**Table 1: Satire Shifts in the Interpreting Process**

Patterns	Processes	Satire shift
Input	Decode political speech	Irony may be missed
Processing	Interpret satirical meaning	High cognitive load
Output	Reformulate into English	Simplification likely
Control	Manage cognitive load	Strategy selection

**Table 2: Interpreting Model of Satire**

Stage	Process	Satirical Feature	Load level	Interpreting Strategy	Shifts	Risk with Satire
<b>Input</b>	Decode political speech	Irony / Parody / Cultural reference	Low-High (depends on type)	Initial recognition	Possible omission of satire	Irony may be missed
<b>Processing</b>	Interpret satirical meaning	Implicit vs explicit satire	High	Inferencing / Reformulation	Explicitation / Misinterpretation	High cognitive load
<b>Output</b>	Reformulate into English	Tone + stance transfer	Medium-High	Linguistic encoding	Simplification / Neutralization / Preservation	Simplification likely
<b>Control</b>	Manage cognitive load	Time pressure + EVS	Dynamic	Strategy selection (adaptive)	Mitigation / Intensification / Shift	Strategy selection

#### 4.3 Discussion & Analysis: the following:

##### Text No. 1

SL	وقد تكون انفلونزا "انف العنزة الخنازير" هي من ضمن الفايروسات التي لم تتم السيطرة عليها وهي مصنعة في المعامل كسلاح حربي
TLI1	<b>Influenza H1N1 was a virus created in laboratories that got out of control, originally meant as a military weapon.</b>
TLI2	<b>This is a swine virus, may be one of those viruses created in laboratories and got out of control, and it is used as a military weapon.</b>

The SLS ironically refutes the credibility of the world order, accusing it of creating malicious viruses to control the world. The phrase (أنف العنزة) (the goat nose) is such a chaotic style at both the pragmatic level. He seems to play with the sound of (انفلونزا), (flu), and connecting it to something completely irrelevant (عنزة), (goat). Satire lies in mocking the intent of the Western order as they manufactured it in labs and factories to eradicate the world, or even using it in military germ warfare. The case of ridicule and satire is evident in both the word choice and tone, which

attack the Western order, undermine its credibility, and strip it of the values it brags about.

As for TLI1, the interpreter pauses the speech for at least 3 seconds, reformulates the message in the highest-formal language, and delivers it clearly in native English. All basic information, such as “H1N1,” is interpreted. However, he uses a quite normal midtone in which all the satire elements are missing. The cognitive load made him sacrifice the satirical form to preserve the propositional content. The interpreter also failed to preserve the pun “انف العنزة” goat nose.” TLI2 shows a stable linguistic performance, as most linguistic elements are interpreted; however, his voice is shaky, hesitant, and unstable. He resorts to a direct prompt, starting without waiting or saving. The cognitive load is evident, and the satire is completely missing. His voice is fixed on a normal midtone, with no imitation of the SL speaker. What makes satire too challenging in this instance is the rhetorical devices employed to draw a very broad satirical line of punning “flu” with “goat nose” to create quite a challenging pun. Satire was deleted here as it created excessive cognitive overload.

### Text No. 2

SLS	وقد فصلت الأمم المتحدة عليها، وقد طلبوا منا أن نلبس هذا الثوب الذي فصلته الأمم الثلاث أو الأربع التي اتحدت ضد ألمانيا.
TLI1	The United Nations was shaped in line with these three countries and wanted us to step into the shoes originally designed against Germany.
TLI2	The United Nations was tailored according to these measures and wanted from us to wear clothes or the suit tailored against Germany.

SLS fulfilled a stylistic deviation; the irony of protection, to start with, as "ثوب garment" is something people use to cover, boast of, was metaphorically used to denote to the “UN charter” which was tailored by specific hands “the winning countries in WWII”, and shaped other countries to dress and deal with. De-sacralization is another strategy followed by Gaddafi stripping the UN of its “high statues” and degrading it into a tailorshop. He goes further to describe the relationship between the five permanent members “P5” and the rest of the countries as they “ask us to wear”, showing more mock-submission to the superpowers. TLI1 follows a patient strategy, holding back 3-5 seconds behind the speaker, during which cognitive processing produces very fine language, native-English delivery, with stress on certain elements to match the satire produced by Gaddafi. The metaphors are reformulated successfully, “shaped in line, step into the shoes,” which is a very accurate replica of the intended message. This pragmatic success is

an indicator that the satirical message is fully perceived and reformulated into the TL English. However, the satirical shift is obvious as the interpreter moves from “suit, into " shoes,” which softens the intended satire. Another failure lies in “shaped in line, instead of tailored,” which also messes with the gradability of mockery in this sense. The pragmatic dimension of this interpreting is clearly preserved as the interpreter increased the interval time to 4 seconds, thereby preserving more information and allowing more time to deliver a better TL, while maintaining efficient processing. TLI2 follows a completely different strategy, sticking to the formal SL message and resorting to a literal rendering of metaphors such as “tailor, suit,” and so on. He does not wait for the speaker and goes directly to the message. The metaphorical satire is preserved and chosen as formal language, as the speaker, unlike the first interpreter, who was more diplomatic than the speaker himself.

### Text No. 3

#### Minute 20:38

SLS	انتم عاملينكم ديكور، انتم هايديبارك، انتم لا قيمة لكم، منبر للخطابة فقط، مثلما تخطب في حديقة هايديبارك، تخطب وتمشي، هذا انتم.
TLI1	<b>We are like Hyde Park. Nobody is implementing our decisions. We are just like a décor; you are not of any real substance; you are just like a corner speaker of the Hyde Park Corner.</b>
TLI2	<b>We are like Speakers' Corner at Hyde Park: we just speak, and nobody implements our decisions; we are made into decoration, without any real substance. We are Speakers' Corner, no more.</b>

In SLS, Gaddafi’s voice rises in this case as the accusative tone increases, especially when he dehumanizes world leaders and dematerializes them into “ديكور, decoration” like any cheap piece of furniture or wallpaper. He goes further with his accusations, showing the worthlessness of most world leaders when he uses a very strong metaphor: “انتم هايديبارك, you are like Hyde Park,” which is so degrading and ironic, given the huge difference between heads of state and Hyde Park speakers. Heads of state must have a say, a decision on various global matters discussed in the United Nations and Security Council, compared to the Speakers' Corner of Hyde Park, in which speakers, normal people, shout freely into the wind, and eventually have no effect on those matters. TLI1: This interpreter sticks to the word order and reformulation, as he promptly starts with the speaker, using little processing and memory, making it too literal and archaic in general. As far as satire is concerned, “targeting leaders as things” has been successfully conveyed into the TL with a shivering, hesitant voice. TLI2 waits for a 3-second interval, then confidently starts, with a clear voice and native English, making the delivery to the audience clear, trying to imitate the tone and intonation, and even adding stress to

the stressed spots in Arabic. In this interpretation, we notice that the interpreter made some expansion, adding elements such as “speaker’s corner” to make it more fathomable to the English audience. The interpreter also preserved the satirical elements, such as “decoration.”

#### Text -4- minute 6:18

SLS	الديباجة تقول أن الأمم متساوية كبيرها وصغيرها, هل المقاعد الدائمة نحن متساون فيها؟ أبدا، غير متساوين والديباجة تقول أن الأمم المتحدة متساوية كبيرها وصغيرها في الحقوق، طيب، هل حق الفيتو نحن فيه سواسية؟
TLI1	<b>The preamble says that all nations, small or large, are equal. Are we equal when it comes to the permanent seats? No, we are not equal. The preamble states in writing that all nations are equal whether they are small or large, do we have the right of veto? Are we equal?</b>
TLI2	<b>The preamble says that all nations are equal, whether they are small or big, are we equal in the permanent seats? No, we are not equal. The preamble says that all nations are equal whether they are small nations or big nations, as far as the rights. Do we have the rights in the veto, are we equal?</b>

Ghaddafi mocks the preamble in a high-ironic style, raises some questions, then answers them to refute the UN charter's intention of equality between nations, big and small. His mockery continues with the preamble going to the “permanent set” controversy. In addition to more rhetorical questions with reference to the “veto” right, which is restricted to the five permanent Security Council members. His satire uses a highly confrontational tone and irony. The first interpreter waits 3 seconds, saves, processes carefully, and comes out with a straight, streamlined English version, a native-like language, and keeps the same tone of mockery, continuing without hesitation, stop, or even stuttering. The second interpreter, rather, goes directly, which causes some trouble, forcing him to be completely literal, without a speaker-identical tone or satire, and eventually leaving his voice absent.

#### Conclusions

The research paper came with some conclusions:

- 1- Satire is a linguistic phenomenon that is employed in political arena to attack foes, undermine an institution, and manipulate facts.
- 2- In the UN setting, satire could be more challenging for conference interpreters than other settings due to the sensitivity of the world events and their repercussions on the world arena.

3- Satire is more challenging when a speakers use rhetorical devices lie pun to mock a person or institution. The researcher noticed that in these cases the pun was deleted as there was no enough time for the two interpreters to manage it.

4- As far as para-segmental features is concerned, the researcher observed no reaction from the two interpreters as their attention was mainly focused on the linguistic elements only.

5- Satire in the tone and intonation adds another layer of cognitive overload for conference interpreters as it is something unmarked in the flow of speech.

### References

Abrams, M.H. (1985). A Glossary of literary terms. (6thed) Texas: Harcourt Brace College Publisher

Barendt, E., Lustgarten, L., Norrie, K., & Stephenson, H. (1997). Libel and the Media: The Chilling Effect. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ziv, A. (1988). Humor's role in married life. *Humor: The International Journal of Humor Research*, 1 (3), 223–229.

Draitser, E. (1994). Techniques of Satire: The Case of Saltykov-Scedrin. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bex, A. (1996). Parody, meaning and literary genre. *Journal of Literary Semantics*, 25 (3), 225–244.

Carstyn, R. (1981). Irony and parody and the use-mention distinction. *Nottingham Linguistic Circular*, 10 (1), 24–35.

Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (1995). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition* [Second edition]. Oxford: Blackwell.

Okada, N. (2001). *Linguistic Approaches to the Analysis of Humour in Modern English Dramatic Comedy*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Lancaster, UK.

Attardo, S. (2000c). On the pragmatic nature of irony and its rhetorical aspects. In E. Nemeth (Ed.), *Pragmatics in 2000: Selected Papers from the 7th International Pragmatics Conference* (pp. 52–66). Antwerp: IPrA.

Morgan, P. (2001). The semantics of an impeachment: Meanings and models in a political conflict. In R. Dirven, R. Frank, & C. Ilie (Eds.), *Language and Ideology Volume 2: Descriptive Cognitive Approaches* (pp. 77–105). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.