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Abstract

This chapter is on corpus-driven research on the relevance of repetition in interpreter-mediated Italian talkshows. It focuses more on other- (second-speaker) next-turn repetition than on self- (same-speaker) repetition occurring (within the same turn) immediately after the original. The aim of this study is to investigate repetition not so much as a disguised form of self-correction but as an interactional resource through which the interpreter (as the second speaker) ensures cohesion and coherence among turns (mainly made up of questions and answers) produced by speakers of two different languages. Using naturally-occurring data and a conversation analysis approach, the claim will be made that repetition – defined as any stretch of talk that has recognizably occurred before – is a salient feature of talkshow interpreting, being inextricably related to the sequential and interactional dimension of dialogue interpreting in terms of turn-taking organization, topic management and face-work, i.e. speakers’ concern for their face needs or “face wants” (Brown & Levinson 1987). The data are taken from a large subcorpus on talkshow interpreting, made up of 1,500 interpretations, which is part of CorIT (Italian Television Interpreting Corpus).
Repetition has been extensively investigated across different disciplines, from rhetoric to phonology, philosophy to psycholinguistics and literary studies, to discourse and conversation analysis. In fact, all discourse is structured by repetition (Johnstone 1987: 212), which lies “at the heart of language” (Tannen 1989: 46), not only in how a particular discourse is created, but also in how discourse itself is created (Bolinger 1961). According to Norrick “everyday face-to-face conversation thrives [...] on repetition. Conversationalists routinely repeat their own words and phrases [...] in addition they echo the wording, rhythm, and entire utterances of their interlocutors” (1987: 245-246). Similarly, Schegloff has noted that there are moments during conversation in which “speakers seem demonstrably oriented to producing talk that says ‘the same thing’ as was said before and does so by saying it ‘in the same words’ ” (2004: 120).

However, repetition does not amount simply to saying the same thing over again. Each time a word or phrase is repeated, its meaning is changed. As Cook put it, “even where repetition is exact, the self-same sequences of words take on new meaning in new circumstances, or in the light of what has been done or said before” (2000: 29). On a pragmatic level, “the speech act performed by the original utterance usually differs from the speech act performed by the repeated utterance” (Bazzanella 1996: ix).

In terms of style, repetition stands in opposition to linguistic variation, i.e. the use of synonyms for diversifying and/or enriching the expressing form, to achieve greater expressiveness. On the other hand, the repeated use of words, or word pattern (rhyme, alliteration, anaphora, parallelism etc.), is a powerful rhetorical device for producing emphasis, intensity, clarity, exaggeration and/or making a deeper impression on the audience. These functions have been extensively studied in literature and oral narratives (e.g. Labov 1972).

Repetition has been primarily associated with the physical and cognitive features of the spoken medium (Ochs 1979; Ong 1982; Bazzanella 1994). In oral communication “no invisible mending is possible” (Goffman 1981: 211) and you can explicitly modify what you have said only through self-correction.

Scholars have distinguished between “self-repetition” and “other-repetition” (Tannen 1989; Johnstone 1994; Murata 1994). Both these forms have a multiplicity of functions. Speakers reiterate a word or phrase to gain time (stalling), link the content of an utterance to that of preceding utterances (cohesion), ensure ‘they are talking about the same thing’ (coherence), indicate that they are simply...

---

1 Also referred to as “same-speaker repetition” (Norrick 1987: 246), and “monological repetition” (Bazzanella 1996: ix).

listening, show understanding or surprise, express agreement (affiliation) or disagreement (disaffiliation), ask for clarification or clarify a previous statement, self-correct or correct their interlocutor or imitate her/him (parody), take, hold or yield a turn, or for other purposes.

Moreover, repetitions can be distinguished along a cline or scale of fixity (Tannen 1989). First of all, there is lexical repetition which can be an “exact repetition” (ibid.: 54), also called “verbatim” (Merlini Barbaresi 1996: 105) or “full repetition” (Brody 1994: 5), when the original form and meaning is not changed at all. Secondly, there is “repetition with variation” (Tannen 1989: 54), also referred to as “non-exact repetition” (Johnstone 1994: 14), or “partial repetition” (Merlini Barbaresi 1996: 105), in which some of the original words may be used and others changed. The third type of repetition is “paraphrase” (Tannen 1989: 54) or “semantic repetition” (Johnstone 1994: 15), where what is reiterated is the idea or the concept of the original.

In the field of Interpreting Studies, repetition is most commonly described as a monologic and psycholinguistic phenomenon, i.e. one of the speech disfluencies typically occurring in interpreters’ output (de Boot 2000; Tissi 2000; Petite 2005; Bakti 2009). Self-repeats, together with restructurings, incomplete sentences or false starts are speech disfluencies falling within the category of ‘interruptions’. They serve an effective cohesion-restoring function both retrospectively (in self-repairs) and prospectively (in word-search repairs).

In her study on court interpreting, Jacobsen (2004) regards repetitions as additions which may have minimal or no impact on the semantic and/or pragmatic content of the source text. Additions with minimal impact also include fillers, paralinguistics, explicating additions and elaborating additions; whereas additions with no impact include silent pauses, voice-filled pauses and false starts.

However, repeats have been mainly investigated in the simultaneous interpretation of speeches delivered at conferences and other similar settings. On the one hand, they are taken as evidence of the on-line planning and self-monitoring process in simultaneous interpretation. On the other hand, backtracking, i.e. offering an alternative phrasing of the same segment is one of the criteria used to assess the quality of an interpreter’s performance both in professional and training situations. As a rule, trainees are encouraged to avoid not only hesitations, cutoffs and filled pauses but also ‘unnecessary repetitions’.

2. Objectives and data

This chapter discusses corpus-driven research on the relevance of repetition in interpreter-mediated Italian talkshows. Unlike most studies on what is known as Dialogue Interpreting (Wadensjö 1998; Mason 1999), the present research is concerned with both consecutive (face-to-face) interpretation (CI) and simultaneous interpretation (SI). The interactional import of the latter has been regret-
tably neglected in the Interpreting Studies literature with some notable exceptions (see e.g. Diriker 2004).

The present study focuses more on other- (second-speaker) next-turn repetition than on self- (same-speaker) repetition occurring (within the same turn) immediately after the original. The aim of this study is to investigate repetition not so much as a disguised form of self-correction, but rather as an interactional resource through which the interpreter (as the second speaker) ensures cohesion and coherence among turns (mainly made up of questions and answers) produced by speakers of two different languages.

Using naturally-occurring data and a conversation analysis approach, the claim will be made that repetition – defined as any stretch of talk that has recognizably occurred before – is a salient feature of Talkshow Interpreting (Katan & Straniero Sergio 2001; Straniero Sergio 1999, 2007, forthcoming), being inextricably related to the sequential and interactional dimension of dialogue interpreting in terms of turn-taking organization, topic management and face-work, i.e. speakers’ concern for their face needs or “face wants” (Brown & Levinson 1987).

The data are taken from a large subcorpus on talkshow interpreting, made up of 1,500 interpretations, which is part of CorIT (Italian Television Interpreting Corpus) (see Straniero Sergio 2007; Falbo 2012). What follows is an explanation of the transcription criteria adopted in the study:

H host;
G foreign guest;
I interpreter;
BT back translation;
( ) unfilled pauses of up to 3 seconds;
[...] three dots inside square brackets indicate stretches of talk which have been omitted (not transcribed) at the beginning, during or at the end of a turn;
= equal signs indicate latching, i.e. where the second utterance immediately follows the first with no discernible pause or overlap;
word- a single dash indicates that a word has been cut off either because of an interruption or self-repair;
word: two dots indicate long or lengthened vowel sounds. Additional dots indicate that the sound is stretched over a longer period;
[ square brackets between lines indicate simultaneous or overlapping speech.

---

3 It should be noted that in the CI mode, the translation of the host’s or a participant’s turn (into the foreign language) on the part of the interpreter, usually takes place in the chuchotage mode. In sequential terms, it can be considered a turn in its own right only when it does not take place parallel to one of the two primary speakers’ turns. Therefore, this type of turn can be transcribed only when it is audible, i.e. produced in the clear.
3. Referential vs. lexical cohesion

Anaphoric reference is one of the most commonly used means for creating cohesion in text. There are three strategies through which a speaker can refer back to the antecedent (i.e. a previously mentioned subject): lexical repetition of the preceding units, syntactic repetition (pronouns and demonstratives, ellipsis, substitution) and semantic repetition (synonyms, antonyms, hyperonyms, hyponyms, encapsulators). Hoey (1991) argues that lexical repetition is more important than any other type of lexical cohesion, especially when forming cohesive ties over large spans of text, because there is less room for ambiguity.

In question-answer sequences, the interpreter can omit the initial part of an answer, since it is implied in (and can be inferred from) the preceding question. The example below features a case of ellipsis, in which the presupposed anaphoric relation of *I was found not guilty* is *il motivo dell’assoluzione* (“the reason for acquittal”):

(1)
[Beato tra le donne, Canale 5, 9.7.1999]
H [... ] innanzitutto lei è stata assolta eh? (.) vero? è stata assolta dal: tribunale (.) americano
G that’s right
I [esatto] *il motivo dell’assoluzione?*
H [e-] *Why?*
G *I was found not guilty* because of reason of insanity [ (. ) and ] [... ]
I *in quanto è stata* invocata temporanea infermità di mente e [... ]

BT
H [... ] first of all you were acquitted eh? (.) is that true? you were acquitted by an American court
G that’s right
I [that’s right]
H [and-] *the reason for the acquittal?*
G *I was found not guilty* because of reason of insanity [ (. ) and ] [... ]
I *because of* temporary insanity and [... ]

In our corpus, however, cases like the one reported above are the exception rather than the norm, as interpreters overwhelmingly tend to fill out source text (ST) elliptical constructions:

(2)
[Quelli che il calcio, Rai Due, 12.9.2004]
H voi *avete avuto questo grande successo* anche in Norvegia?
G yes (.) a little bit
I *sì abbiamo avuto un po’ di successo* sì
In (3), the addition of the verb piacere (“to like”) necessarily calls for the repetition of the final segment of the question:

(3) [Unomattina, Rai Uno, 26.9.1990]

H [...] tu come ti sei trovato a lavorare con lui?
G ehm: very much very much
I mi è piaciuto molto lavorare con lui

BT

H [...] how did you find yourself working with him?
G ehm: very much very much
I I liked working with him very much

Repetition may be triggered by syntactic shifts such as, for example, the introduction of a “predicated theme” (Halliday 1985) with a cleft-structure:

(4) [Unomattina, Rai Uno, 1.12.1994]

H [...] da quanto tempo è allenatore di Ben Johnson?
G for the last fourteen years
I sono quattordici anni (.) che seguo Ben

BT

H how long have you been Ben Johnson’s trainer?
G for the last fourteen years
I it’s fourteen years (.) I have been coaching Ben

In (5), the guest’s answer is further made more explicit by the addition of a metalinguistic explanation:

(5) [Sanremo, Rai Uno, 4.3.2005]

H [...] dove si sta allenando al momento?
G Phoenix Arizona (.) United States
I sto allenandomi negli Stati Uniti per essere precisi a Phoenix nell’Arizona

BT

H where are you training at the moment?
G Phoenix Arizona (.) United States
I I’m training in the United States more precisely in Phoenix Arizona
Lexical repetition is largely preferred over syntactic repeats in the rendition of pro-verbs used in brief affirmative or negative replies to yes/no-questions, as in (6) and (7):

(6)
[Check up, Rai Uno, 18.5.2002]
H [... ] hai pensato a qualche regalino?
G yes I have
I si ho pensato a qualche regalino
BT
H [... ] have you thought of getting some little presents?
G yes I have
I yes I have thought of getting some little presents

(7)
[Unomattina, Rai Uno, 16.10.2002]
H è sposata?
G yes I am
I sono sposata ho tre bambini
BT
H are you married?
G yes I am
I yes I am married and I have three children

Such translational behaviour also characterises the rendition of ST pronouns (8) and demonstratives (9), which are regularly substituted with fuller definite descriptions:

(8)
[Alla ricerca dell’Arca, Rai Tre, 6.1.1989]
G [...] and that:(.) he:also: (.) was a dire [ctor at (.) one of the:: [...]
I [ e (.) Bergman (.) lavorava [...]
BT
G [...] and that:(.) he:also: (.) was a dire [ctor at (.) one of the:: [...]
I [ and Bergman (.) worked [...]

(9)
[I fatti vostri, Rai Due, 16.11.2000]
G and we were going to [ cook the meal together ]
I [ e (.) dovevamo andare a casa sua insieme e dovevo preparargli la cena
G but instead of that
I ma: invece di preparargli la cena
BT
G and we were going to [ cook the meal together ]
I [ and (.) we had to go to his place together and I had to cook the meal

REPETITION IN DIALOGUE INTERPRETING
but instead of that
but: instead of cooking the meal

In the two excerpts below, interpreters re-use – fully (10) and partially (11) – the lexical antecedent contained in the question:

(10)
[Porta a porta, Rai Uno, 9.3.2004]
H senta (...) si è detto che l’ultimo amore di Diana fosse un:: chirurgo pakistano (...) le risulta?
G I think you should ask him that question not me
I beh bisognerrebbe chiederlo al chirurgo pakistano non a me
BT H listen (...) Diana’s last love was reportedly a Pakistani surgeon (...) do you know anything about this?
G I think you should ask him that question not me
I well you should ask the Pakistani surgeon not me

(11)
[Che tempo che fa, Rai Tre, 13.10.2007]
H aveva capito che sarebbe diventato (...) un grande chitarrista (...) cioè che sarebbe diventato quello che era o (...) o no?
G well: I wanted it badly
I lo volevo [...]
G and: I wanted absolutely to become un grande
I I couldn’t [...]

H did you know you would become (...) a great guitar player (...) I mean become what you were or (...) or not?
G well: I wanted it badly
I I wanted [...]
G and: I wanted absolutely to become great
I I couldn’t [...]

The following excerpt (12) is emblematic of the marked preference for lexical over referential cohesion. The interpreter repeats her utterance to replace the pronominal form with the full lexical noun phrase:

(12)
[I fatti vostri, Rai Due, 16.11.2000]
G I had collected Niger from the hospital
I io avevo: ero: andata a prenderlo in ospedale ero andata a prendere Niger in ospedale
BT G I had collected Niger from the hospital
I I had: I was: I went to fetch him at the hospital I went to fetch Niger at the hospital

In some cases, the substitution of pronouns with full noun phrases is necessary in order to avoid referential ambiguity, as in (13):
In (14), the hyponym questi bambini (“these children”) is inferred not because it was mentioned in the previous turns, but on the basis of the interpreter's background knowledge (the entire show is devoted to raising funds in favour of Afghan children). Conversely, the prestigious appellative Maestro is a “pragmatic anaphora” (Conte 1999), mediated by the interpreter's encyclopaedia. Unlike semantic anaphora, pragmatic anaphora or “encyclopaedic synonymy” (Simone 1990) refers to the performative aspect of an utterance, specifying its illocutionary value (Gotti 1991):
I there are twenty-two million refugees we care for
G four million are Afghan re
I [fugitives] four million are Afghan
G Luciano Pavarotti and his friends gave visibility to them
I [Luciano Pavarotti and his friends] gave
G visibility to these children
I therefore he deserves
gives to receive these
to receive
G therefore it is: the Ma
I estro who deserves
G and he will get it
I he will get it

The following excerpt (15) is an example of repetition through the use of a general item. With the phrase *per far questa roba* (“to do all this stuff”) the interpreter refers anaphorically to the list of actions described in the host’s previous turn. Conte (1996) calls this type of anaphora “anaphoric encapsulation”, i.e. a cohesive device by which a noun phrase functions as a resumptive paraphrase for a preceding portion of a text. According to D’Addio Colosimo (1988: 145), the use of lexical encapsulators surreptitiously introduces the speaker’s personal assessment. Notice also the interactional value of the phatic expression *sai?* (you know?), with which the interpreter seeks the host’s confirmation:

(15) [*Che tempo che fa, Rai Tre, 12.4.2008*]

H perché quando torno a casa io a Celle Ligure (.) un posto fantastico in Liguria (.) ogni volta che arrivo il cancello non funziona l’allarme è saltato (.) c’è qualcuno che ti accende il riscaldamento quanto torni sì?
G I pay people
I ah pago gente *per far questa roba* sai?

4. Repetition and turn-taking

Both in SI and CI guests may at any given moment stop to listen to the translation, thereby compelling the interpreter to process syntactically incomplete utterances. In (16), *film makers* is produced in the turn next to the one in which the

---

4 Halliday and Hasan (1976) identify two major subclasses of lexical cohesion: *reiteration* and *collocation*. Reiteration is in turn divided into four subclasses, ranging from repetition of the same item to repetition through the use of a *synonym* or *near-synonym*, a *superordinate* item, or a *general* item.

5 See also the concept of “extended reference” in Halliday and Hasan (1976).
guest says *one of those lucky*. Hence, the need for the interpreter to repeat the final component of his prior turn and recast the guest’s utterance. The repetition is due to word order difference between English and Italian. In the latter, adjectives with a restrictive function occur in postnominal position:

(16)  
[Premio David di Donatello, Rai Due, 9.4.2003]  
G and: ehm: (. ) just (. ) I’m one of those lucky  
I io sono uno di quei *fortunati*  
G film makers [ (. ) who can make ] a picture [...]  
I [ registi *fortunati* ]  
BT  
G and: ehm: (. ) just (. ) I’m one of those *lucky*  
I I am one of those: *lucky*  
G film makers [ (. ) who can make ] a picture [...]  
I [ *lucky* directors ]

In (17), the anaphoric repeat combines with a rhetorical question, which the interpreter introduces to give cohesion to the guest’s syntactically incomplete turn:

(17)  
[Unomattina, Rai Uno, 20.11.2001]  
G I think that we get the message  
I e io penso che noi abbiamo ricevuto il messaggio qual è?  
G that they [ are a minority ] loro sono una minoranza  
I [ il messaggio è che ] the mes saggio  
BT  
G I think that we get the message  
I I think that we got the message [ sage ]  
G I what is the message?  
G that they [ are a minority ] the mes is that they are a minority  
I [ the message is that ]

In (18), the interpreter is apparently taken aback by the brevity of the guest’s turn. In the previous sequences (data not shown) the exchange was characterised by very long turns. Such a sudden change in the turn-taking system puzzles the interpreter who, besides delaying the translation, feels the need to recycle her prior utterance in the next turn, integrating it with the new information:

(18)  
[Maurizio Costanzo Show, Canale 5, 22.10.1998]  
G tears are (. ) not a punishment  
( . )  
I le (. ) *lacrime non sono una punizione*
not because we are (.) bad or we did something wrong
le lacrime non sono l- una giusta punizione per un nostro comportamento
tears are (.) not a punishment
the (. ) tears are not a punishment
not because we are (.) bad or we did something wrong
tears are not th- a right punishment for our behaviour

Anaphora is extensively used to ensure the cohesion of ST utterances which are split in two separate turns and, as such, are often grammatically or syntactically parasitic to the preceding turn, as in (19):

(19) [Maurizio Costanzo Show, Canale 5, 8.6.1992]
could help you (.) save your life
con questa ehm (.) analisi è possibile (.) in effetti s- salvare una vita
could help you (.) save your life
with this ehm (.) analysis it is possible (.) actually t- to save a life

In (20), a cohesive tie is provided by introducing the superordinate una donna (“a woman”) as an anaphoric repeat of suora (“nun”):

(20) [Maurizio Costanzo Show, Canale 5, 23.9.2002]
I based (.) the character (.) on a nun who would have been there for forty years
e ehm ho diciamo basato l'interpretazione del mio personaggio sulla figura di: una suora con diciamo quarant’anni di: esperienza in questo convento
I u:na: donna che non provava sentimenti nei confronti di nessuno
I and ehm let’s say I based the interpretation of my character on the figure of: a nun
with almost no feeling towards anyone
I u:na: donna who had no feeling towards anyone

In excerpt (21), the interpreter repeats the whole content of her previous turn, replacing abiti (“clothes”) with vestito (“dress”):

(21) [Maurizio Costanzo Show, Canale 5, 8.6.1992]
the dresses are getting too tight
e si accorge che i suoi abiti diventavano sempre più strettii
which is nothing for anyone to worry about
e questo di per sé naturalmente non significa che chi trova il vestito gli sta un po’ stretto debba preoccuparsi
Repetition may be realised through a “reverse paraphrase” (Persson 1974; Johnstone 1991), in which interpreters provide opposing perspectives while repeating the content of their utterances. In (22), the interpreter uses a verb (to earn) which stands in a conversive relationship with the verb selected in the previous turn (to pay)⁶:

(22) [Maurizio Costanzo Show, Canale 5, 5.6.2001]

G  the solution to child labour I believe is to pay parents well
I  io credo che per risolvere il problema del: sfruttamento del lavoro minorile si
dovrebbe **pagare in maniera equa le famiglie i genitori**
G  then the kids don’t have to work
I  **se i genitori guadagnano abbastanza** non ci sarà bisogno che i figli lavorino

In excerpt (23), in addition to the numerous repeats (in bold), what is noticeable is that the interpreter produces a very long turn in which she completely re-translates what the guest has said in his short three previous turns. Notice the temporary generalization of the guest’s final turn: the chances are one out of two → **questa probabilità aumenta** (“this likelihood increases”) and the displaced rephrasing of **parenti di primo grado** (“first degree relatives”) with **donne in famiglia consanguinee** (“women in families related by blood”):

(23) [Maurizio Costanzo Show, Canale 5, 8.6.1992]

G  ovary cancer in women is not very (.) often (.) one out of seventy
I  soltanto una donna su settanta in effetti sviluppa un tumore alle ovaie
G  but if you have (.) two or more (.) first degree (.) blood relatives
I  però (.) se **la donna in questione** ha (.) uno o due parenti di primo grado
G  who had ovary cancer
I  **donne** che avevano tumore alle ovaie
G  the chances are one (.) out of two

⁶ Prototypical conversive verbs are pairs such as to buy/to sell, to give/to take etc.
allora questa probabilità aumenta (.) una donna su due quando ha delle donne
in famiglia consanguinee che hanno avuto delle storie di tumore può sviluppare
questo tipo di tumore

ovary cancer in women is not very (.) often (.) one out of seventy
only one woman out of seventy actually develops ovary cancer
but if you have (.) two or more (.) first degree (.) blood relatives
but (.) if that woman has (.) one or two first degree relatives
who had ovary cancer
women who had ovary cancer
the chances are one (.) out of two
then this likelihood increases (.) one woman in two for women in families related
by blood who experienced ovary cancer can develop this type of cancer

Excerpt (24) gives further examples of how guests’ turns can have an impact on
the interpreter’s activity, including the CI mode. As it happens, the guest’s talk is
characterised by discontinuity, i.e. two units which are held together in terms of
content (the verb to attack and the adverbial complement sexually) are produced
in two different turns and not uttered after each other. By rendering attack with
violentare (“to rape”), the interpreter makes the guest’s next turn redundant.
Therefore, the interpreter’s second turn is semantically void and is produced
solely “to fill the slot”:

(24)
[I fatti vostri, Rai Due, 7.4.1998]
that Michael Jackson had attacked him
che Michael Jackson lo aveva violentato
sexually
lo aveva appunto violentato

that Michael Jackson had attacked him
that Michael Jackson had raped him
sexually
he had actually raped him

Similarly in (25), the interpreter’s turn is redundant, since the guest’s previous
turns have been already translated by the host. It is a repetition which does not
contribute either to the substance of the exchange or to the understanding of the
guest’s talk. Interactionally, however, it is a face-saving move, through which the
interpreter reappropriates his role by signalling his presence, despite the invis-
ibility of the SI:

[The interpreter comes up with this translation on the basis of prior turns and, more gen-
ernally, her knowledge of the topic of the interview.]
5. Context-recycling

In a dialogic environment, the notion of translation equivalence between the primary speakers’ and the interpreter’s turns is closely related to the principles of sequentiality, adjacency and relevance, whereby each current turn is built, directly or indirectly, on the previous ones (Goffman 1974; McLaughlin 1984; Nofsinger 1991; Linell 1998), in a constant alternation of “instances of initiative” and “instances of response” (Flander in Coulthard 1977: 95-96). The interpreter is responsible for “making the conversation appear to be planned and goal-oriented with regard to the thematic structure, i.e. for making the conversation appear as a joint and coherent activity” (Wadensjö 2000: 249). In this section, examples will be given of the use of lexical repetition as a recontextualisation device by which the interpreter recycles a word or a phrase of the host’s prior turn, thereby strengthening the topical continuity between the question and the answer.

Notice, in excerpts (26) and (27), how such an operation is preceded by the insertion of the affirmative reply sì (“yes”), through which the interpreter explicitly exhibits the guest’s agreement:

(26)
[Domenica in, Rai Uno, 7.4.2002]
H ma è iniziato un nuovo giorno anche per te?
G a new day has begun for me [ and (.) since I had- I took two years off (.)]=
I sì (.) anche per me è iniziato un nuovo=
G [ have met life for the first time and [...]]
I [ giorno io ho preso due (.) anni di pausa e [...]]
BT a new day has begun for you too?
G a new day has begun for me [ and (.) since I had- I took two years off (.)]=
I yes (.) a new day has begun for me too= 
have met life for the first time and […]

I took a two (.) years’ break and […]

(27)  
[Sottovoce, Rai Uno, 31.1.1999]

G and then (. ) my third novel was the one [ that you hold in your hand ]
I e poi il terzo è quello che lei ha in mano

H che fece tanto scalpore all’epoca

G it was a great shock

I sì fu:: un grande scalpore

BT

G and then (. ) my third novel was the one [ that you hold in your hand ]
I e poi il terzo è quello che lei ha in mano

H which at the time caused a great sensation

G it was a great shock

I yes it was:: a great sensation

In the following exchange (28), participants use different terms to refer to the same item: sacro fuoco (the host), holy fire (the interpreter), burning desire (the guest). In her next turn, however, the interpreter by repeating the host’s version, establishes coherence between the question and the answer:

(28)  
[Maurizio Costanzo Show, Canale 5, 27.3.1992]

H quindi lei non era ehm come dire (. ) preso dal sacro [ fuoco (.) del ]
I ((in chuchotage)) [ you weren’t ] =

((in chuchotage))

H volere fare l’attore

I driven by the holy fire of becoming an actor at all costs you didn’t have this: urge to act at all costs

G I had (.) a burning desire to eat and to stay alive

I io ero po- ero soprattutto animato da un sacro fuoco di poter mangiare e rimanere vivo

BT

H so you were not ehm how can I say? (. ) you had not the [ sacred fire (.) of ]
I ((in chuchotage)) [ you weren’t ] =

((in chuchotage))

H wanting to become an actor

I driven by the holy fire of becoming an actor at all costs you didn’t have this: urge to act at all costs

G I had (.) a burning desire to eat and to stay alive

I I was above all inspired by a sacred fire to eat and stay alive

Reference to items contained in the question may serve not only to open – as in (28) above – but especially to close the interpreter’s turn and make it more complete (29):
(29)  
[Quelli che il calcio, Rai Due, 15.9.2002]  
H [...] ma quanti uomini hai sempre intorno a te [...] ma anche nel video dappertutto ma: ne tiri fuori centinaia (.) lasciane qualcuno per le nostre schedine eh?  
G I like to surround myself with beautiful men always  
I certo devo circondarmi di uomini (.)  

Repetition may also consist in a synonym variation, as shown below:

(30)  
[Domenica in, Rai Uno, 9.2.1997]  
H e quale sensazione hai avuto quando tu hai letto il libro?  
G that it was a great book  
I era un libro straordinario è questa l’impressione  

The interpreter’s tendency to say more than what the guest has said and/or to be more explicit is due to the constant concern to ensure that answers meet the host’s expectations and/or confirm what s/he said in the question8. In excerpt (31), the host asks the guest whether he too (like the person previously inter-viewed) is a womaniser:

(31)  
[Porta a porta, Rai Uno, 22.1.2003]  
H Raz Degan (.) collezionismo  
G I’ m not the one to: ehm to hold the black book no (.) I finished with that game a lot of time ago  
I no: questo gioco del libro nero l’ho finito un sacco di tempo fa (.) di queste collezioni  

The interpreter’s tendency to say more than what the guest has said and/or to be more explicit is due to the constant concern to ensure that answers meet the host’s expectations and/or confirm what s/he said in the question8. In excerpt (31), the host asks the guest whether he too (like the person previously inter-viewed) is a womaniser:

8 This explains also the frequency with which the interpreter expresses agreement. See excerpts 46 and 47 in § 6.
The item recycled from the question may co-occur with the one selected by the interpreter, as in (32):

(32)
[I fatti vostri, Rai Due, 10.9.1998]
H [...] il film che abbiamo visto (.) alcuni pezzo- spezzoni ecco (.) le era: l’ha trovato verosimile?
G well (.) the movie was very accurate
I sì (.) il film era: molto accurato (.) verosimile
BT H [...] the movie we saw earlier (.) some clips well (.) do you think it was realistic?
G well (.) the movie was very accurate
I yes (.) the movie was: very accurate (.) realistic

These repetitions, or ‘double’ translations, besides being redundant re-elaborations, testify that the interpreter is aware of the relevance of the guest’s answer in relation to the question and/or the general speech context. In the following exchange (33), for example, the recourse to the disjunctive reveals the interpreter’s dilemma (notice the pauses and the search sounds), who first uses the actual expression contained in the question, but immediately thereafter feels obliged to provide the primary meaning of the English term as well, not to move too far from the ST:

(33)
[Parla con me, Rai Tre, 23.10.2005]
H [...] un consiglio a una donna che vorrebbe entrare nella politica in un paese (.) molto maschilista ancora
G the issue of patriarchy (.) is I think at [ the centre (.) of all the problems ]=
I = [ in the world [...] il problema del: () maschilismo ]=
G = [ o della società patriarcale [...] ]
I = [ in the world [...]]

The information coming directly from the context is easier to retrieve (cognitively speaking) than inferential and/or encyclopaedic information. Thus, besides being a textual coherence and referential disambiguation device, “context recycling” (Korolija 1998) or “format-tying” (Goodwin & Goodwin 1987; Goodwin 1990), is a sort of cognitive shortcut, since it limits the choice the interpreter must make (at a paradigmatic level) among the available TT equivalents. In (34), rimproverare (“to reproach”) automatically rules out all the other potential translations of to blame:
(34)

[Porta a porta, Rai Uno, 1998]

H  ecco mi scusi signor Koons ehm lei quando ha sposato la signora Staller () sapeva il lavoro che faceva la signora Staller come ha ricordato lei stessa che era la più nota pornostar del mondo () come fa adesso a rimproverarglielo?

G  I do not blame [ ()] my ex wife for being [ ()]

I  [ beh io non l’ho rimproverata ] non ho rimproverato =

G  = [ a pornostar ]

I  = [ la mia ex ]

moglie per essere una pornostar

BT

H  sorry Mr. Koons ehm but when you married Mrs. Staller () you knew the job Mrs. Staller was doing as she recalled herself that she was the most famous pornostar in the world () how can you now reproach her with that?

G  I do not blame [ ()] my ex wife for being [ ()]

I  [ well I have not reproached her ] I have not reproached =

G  = [ a pornostar ]

I  = [ my ex ]

wife for being a pornostar

This operation facilitates the rendition of ST expressions which otherwise would be more time-consuming in terms of processing costs, as in (35):

(35)

[Domenica in, Rai Uno, 14.2.1999]

H  [...] lei discute anche le offerte che le vengono fatte: i film che le vengono proposti cioè coinvolge un po’ la sua famiglia da questo punto di vista o:: ehm: ognuno fa le sue scelte insomma: ehm il lavoro riguarda soltanto lei?

G  no () it’s ehm they have everything to do with it I [ mean [...] ]

I  [ no loro sono molto coinvolti ]

BT

H  [...] do you discuss the offers that are made to you: the movies that are proposed to you that is to say do you somehow involve your family from this viewpoint or:: ehm: does everyone make their own choice: ehm does your work concern only you?

G  no () it’s ehm they have everything to do with it I [ mean [...] ]

I  [ no they are very involved ]

Lastly, context recycling may also be an emergency strategy. The interpreter in (36) recycles items contained in the previous question in order to compensate for ST comprehension and/or TT reformulation problems:

(36)

[Quelli che il calcio, Rai Due, 1.10.2000]

H  insomma è un impegno grosso perché in pochi minuti: è dovuto riuscire a raccontar- ad essere colonna sonora di una storia così importante () società industriale- società agricola società industriale società () postindustriale

G  yeah

H  in una volta sola non è facile
the entire history of man in thirty minutes

well it’s very exacting work because in a few minutes: you had to tell- to be the sound track of such important history industrial society agricultural society industrial society post-industrial

all at one time it’s not easy

mankind in a few minutes

6. Meta-textual glosses and repetition markers

Interpreters have been shown not only to reproduce the primary speakers’ words but also to make meta-communicative references, re-contextualising previously expressed concepts. This work may also be accomplished by meta-textual glosses, which are both explicitness-oriented and interaction-oriented, in that they display the interpreter’s alignment towards the primary speakers and the audience. Quoting may involve the repetition of both the self and the other, as in (37)-(39):

(37) [Maurizio Costanzo Show, Canale 5, 9.6.2000]

nobody in this room needs it any less than those children with cancer

what I was saying earlier I think is useful for all the people here present nor is it less useful for these children

(38) [Maurizio Costanzo Show, Canale 5, 30.3.2000]

he was free enough in his family to raise questions like that

but Luca clearly felt free enough in his family to raise problems like this one you have recalled

(39) [Speciale Coppie, Canale 5, 14.4.1999]

well I hope so one day I hope to get married and have a different name

spero che accada quello che lei diceva e intanto spero di potermi sposare e a quel punto avrò un nome diverso
Reference to prior talk may be accomplished by repetition markers which signal (40) that a piece of information has already been introduced:

(40)  
[Domenica in, Rai Uno, 15.12.1996]  
H [...] per presentare il tuo ultimo film che è un thriller (.) il titolo del film è Soluzione Estrema (.) l’altro protagonista è Gene Hackman [...]  
G yeah it’s:: it’s a thriller  
I si è un thriller come dicevi  
BT  
H [...] to present your latest film which is a thriller (.) the title of the film is Extreme Measures (.) the other main character is Gene Hackman [...]  
G yeah it’s:: it’s a thriller  
I yes it’s a thriller as you said

Repetition markers are also a face-saving strategy. In excerpt (41), the interpreter prefaces her translation by making it clear that the guest is repeating something she said earlier (data not shown):

(41)  
[Maurizio Costanzo Show, Canale 5, 23.4.2002]  
G that’s true (.) well you know I turned off my intelligence years ago ((laughs))  
I sì in effetti ho spento la mia intelligenza come si diceva prima l’ho interrotta parecchi anni fa  
BT  
G that’s true (.) well you know I turned off my intelligence years ago ((laughs))  
I yes actually I turned off my intelligence as we said earlier I switched it off many years ago

Meta-discourse ensures the topical continuity of the exchange, which – like any conversation – is characterised by the tension between topic maintenance and topic progression or topic renewal (Bergmann 1990; Linell & Korolija 1997; Linell 1998), as in (42):

(42)  
[Maurizio Costanzo Show, Canale 5, 5.6.2001]  
G but those like the Nike shoes are being made [...]  
I però quelle famose scarpe Nike che- di cui parlavamo o palloni Nike che vengono prodotte [...]  
BT  
G but those like the Nike shoes are being made [...]  
I but those famous Nike shoes which- we were talking about earlier or Nike footballs which are being made [...]
In (43), the repetition marker combines with the lexicalisation of the ST personal pronoun (see § 3) and the introduction of *per quanto riguarda* ("as regards"), which serves as a "topic refresher" (Setton 2001: 19). As a result, the guest’s turn is both more cohesive and more coherent:

(43)  
[I fatti vostri, Rai Due, 19.3.1996]  
G no (.) not at the time I thought that he was just (.) kissing me because he selected but after he kissed me (.) he’s gone  
I no non avevo nessuno e *per quanto riguarda questo marinaio come dicevo*: sono rimasta lusingata che ehm: mi avesse scelto però poi è sparito  

Meta-discourse may also be a translation strategy. In (44), the formula *as you were saying* enables the interpreter to omit the rendition of "anywhere":

(44)  
[Alla ricerca dell’Arca, Rai Tre, 10.3.1990]  
H diciamo che per tutti è traumatico crescere (.) ma forse per Roddy MacDowell è stato forse più traumatico (.) è vero?  
G well (.) you know (.) the thing is that growing up anywhere [ isn't simple (.) ] crescere:  
I appunto  
G = [ and you can [...]  
I = [ *come diceva* non è facile [...]  

Conversely in (45), instead of properly translating “factory made product”, the interpreter recycles *fabbrica dei sogni* (“dream factory”), a host’s prior expression (data not shown), attributing the responsibility for this operation to the guest who has not, in actual fact, used it:

(45)  
[Tg1, 26.10.2002]  
G [...] always having a very very critical view (.) of the: (.) factory  
I [...] sistema per (.) produrre dei film interessanti è vero sono sempre ]=
G = [made product (.) ehm where one expects to find art ] [...]
I = [stato critico di questa fabbrica (.) dei sogni come lei l’ha chiamata laddove non c’è dell’arte [...]

BT
G = [...] always having a very very critical view (.) of the: (.) factory =
I = [...] system for (.) producing interesting films it is true I have =
G = [made product (.) ehm where one expects to find art ] [...]
I = [always been critical of this dream (.) factory as you called it where there is no art [...]

Finally, quoting is also frequently used as a politeness strategy to enhance the host’s positive face (46):

(46)
[Maurizio Costanzo Show, Canale 5, 23.4.2002]
G but most of the US is small towns and open spaces
I ma (.) tra l’altro la maggior parte degli Stati Uniti assomiglia più a questa descrizione che ha appena fatto grandi spazi aperti (. ) piccole cittadine
BT
G but most of the US is small towns and open spaces
I but (.) by the way most of the United States resembles more the description you have just made big open spaces (. ) and small towns

Such affiliative orientation is similar to those moves which magnify the guest’s agreement with the host, as in (47):

(47)
[Maurizio Costanzo Show, Canale 5, 9.3.1995]
G yeah I did the whole layout and collected all the pictures [...]
I sì sì lei ha perfettamente ragione ho deciso io quali foto [...]
BT
G yeah I did the whole layout and collected all the pictures [...]
I yes yes you are perfectly right I decided which photos [...]

7. Conclusions

The excerpts reported in the previous sections contain numerous occurrences of exact repetition, repetition with variation and semantic repetition (see § 1). A repetition is exact when the original form and meaning is not changed at all: sensation → sensation (27), in a few minutes → in a few minutes (36). Exact repetitions may be characterised by word insertion: he had raped him → he had actually raped him (24). Repetition with variation involves partial self- or other-repeats, including the substitution of a pronoun with a full noun phrase: I have not reproached her I have not reproached my ex wife (34), him → the Pakistani surgeon (10); the transformation of a statement into a question: the message is... → what is the message? (17); deic-
tic and/or modality shifts: you always have many men around you → I have always to have them around me (29). Semantic repetition involves the use of synonyms: feeling → impression (30), near-synonyms: realistic → accurate realistic (32), hyperonyms: a nun → a woman (20), paraphrases: the parents should be adequately paid → if the parents earn fairly well (22), disjunctive pairs: male chauvinist → male chauvinism or patriarchal society (33), and anaphoric encapsulators: to do all this stuff (15).

Our data seem to confirm the validity of the explicitation hypothesis which, in Blum-Kulka’s words, “postulates an observed cohesive explicitness from source language to target language texts regardless of the increase traceable to differences between the two linguistic and textual systems involved” (1986: 19). Fludernik (1993) maintains that “the choice of repeating a lexeme rather than using the pronominal anaphor remains somewhat of a puzzle” (1993: 139), whereas Ferrara claims that such a choice is “quite possibly a discourse strategy”, just “because languages provide substitution, paraphrase, and ellipsis as alternatives to iteration” (1994: 68).

In the talkshow context, lexical repetition is indeed a way of making the guest’s turns more transparent and/or providing more explicit information (see excerpts 2-15 in § 3; 37-39, 43 in § 6). It prevents the fragmentation due to the particular turn-taking organization which characterises the talkshow as an interpreter-mediated interaction. In fact, the interpreter uses various forms of repetition to establish cohesion (relationships between words) and coherence (relationships between concepts and meanings) between turns produced by speakers of two different languages. Cohesion is also achieved by transforming the guest’s turns into syntactically autonomous turns, i.e. not parasitic to the preceding ones (see 16-23 in § 4). Compare, for example, in (18), the guest’s subordinate clause not because we are... with the stand-alone utterance produced by the interpreter le lacrime non sono... (“tears are not...”). Moreover, repetition is a mechanism which ensures topical continuity between questions and answers (see excerpts 26-33 in § 5). This function is also performed by the use of metadiscourse (§ 6), which highlights the coordinating rather than the relaying role of the dialogue interpreter (Wadensjö 1998), foregrounding her/his responsibility for both the progression and the substance of interaction.

The data analysed in the present study show that the original utterances and the interpreter’s renditions can be contrasted not only in terms of implicit vs. explicit, but also in terms of brevity vs. length. Evidence of this can be found in excerpt (4), where the interpreter, instead of rendering the ST adverbial phrase for the last fourteen years with the simple Italian equivalent da quattordici anni, decides to introduce a syntactically marked construction which makes the translation pointlessly longer than the original. The same is true for the emphasizing addition in (5). A further example of the interpreter’s tendency to produce a lengthy and often redundant speech is excerpt (21): which is nothing for anyone to worry about → and this in itself of course does not mean that if someone finds her dress a little bit tight she’s got to worry about it (see also excerpt (23) in § 4).
Dialogue interpreters’ repetitions, then, have to do with connection (textual level), in that they assure inter-turn cohesion and coherence. Repetitions are both comprehension-oriented, in that they serve to make utterances more intelligible for the audience and production-oriented, in that they facilitate the selection of translation equivalents, particularly in emergency situations, such as those reported in (36) and (45). At the same time, repeats are interaction-oriented, in that they favour mutual understanding and display the interpreter’s involvement and alignment towards primary speakers. In particular, some repeats may have a face-saving function (24) and (41), or a phatic function, related to the sequential expectations of the interpreter’s turn (25).
References


Gotti, M. 1991. I linguaggi specialisti...