

Repetition in Dialogue Interpreting

FRANCESCO STRANIERO SERGIO

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).

1. INTRODUCTION

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”¹ and “other-repetition”² (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).

2 Also called “second-speaker repetition” (Norrick 1987; Simpson 1994), “allo-repetition”, “dialogic repetition” (Bazzanella 1996: ix; Merlini Barbaresi 1996: 105), or “diaphonic” (Perrin et al. 2003: 1844).

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 study³:

- 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]
 H [e-] **il motivo dell'assoluzione?**
 G **I was found not guilty** because of reason of insanity [(.) and] [...] [in quanto è stata] [...]
 I 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] [...] [because of] [...] =
 I 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

BT

H did **you have such a big success** in Norway as well?

G yes (.) a little bit

I yes **we had some success** yes

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 meta-linguistic 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 **sì 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 have three children]
I sì **sono sposata** ho [] tre bambini

BT

H **are you married?**

G yes I am [I have three children]
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

G but instead of **that**
I 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 bisognerebbe 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 I wanted **it** badly

I lo volevo [volevo assolutamente diventare **un grande**] I I couldn't [...]

BT

H did you know you would become (.) **a great guitar player** (.) I mean become what you were or (.) or not?

G well: I I wanted **it** badly

I I wanted [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):

(13)

[Maurizio Costanzo Show, Canale 5, 28.11.2000]

G ok (.) would you do anything [for **her?**]
I [lei farebbe] qualunque cosa per **sua figlia?**

((turns omitted))

G so **she** wants you to help **him**

I quindi **sua figlia** vuole che lei aiuti **suo marito**

((turns omitted))

G and she says to **you** ((referring to P1)) be strong

I e dice al **papà** di essere forte

BT

G ok (.) would you do anything [for **her?**]
I [would you do] anything for **your daughter?**

((turns omitted))

G so **she** wants you to help **him**

I so **your daughter** wants you to help **your husband**

((turns omitted))

G and she says to **you** ((referring to P1)) be strong

I and she tells her **daddy** to be strong

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):

(14)

[Pavarotti and Friends, Rai Uno, 29.5.2001]

G today (.) I have twenty-two million refugees [to my] concern
I [oggi]

(.)

I ci sono venti due milioni di rifugiati di cui noi ci occupiamo

G four million are Afghan re [fugees]

I [quattro mi] lioni di loro sono afghani

G Luciano Pavarotti and his friends [gave visibility to **them**]

I [Luciano Pavarotti e i suoi amici] hanno dato
visibilità a **questi bambini**

G therefore **he** deserve [es to receive]

I [ed è quindi: **il Ma**] **estro** che merita

G and he will get **it**

I di ricevere **questo premio** e lo riceverà

BT

G today (.) I have twenty-two million refugees [to my] concern
I [today]

(.)

I there are twenty-two million refugees we care for
 G four million are Afghan re [fugees]
 I [four mil] lion are Afghan
 G Luciano Pavarotti and his friends [gave visibility to **them**]
 I [Luciano Pavarotti and his friends] gave
 visibility to **these children**
 G therefore **he** deserv [es to receive]
 I [therefore it is: **the Ma**] **estro** who deserves
 G and he will get **it**
 I to receive **this prize** and he'll get it

The following excerpt (15) is an example of repetition through the use of a general item⁴. 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”⁵, 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?
BT
 H because when I go home to Celle Ligure (.) a fantastic place in Liguria (.) every time I get there the gate does not work the alarm is broken (.) you do have someone who switches on the heating when you are back don't you?
 G I pay people
 I ah I pay people **to do all this stuff** you know?

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 Haliday 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 mes [saggio]
 G [the mes] sage is
 I **il messaggio qual è?**
 G that they [are a minority]
 I [**il messaggio è che**] loro sono una minoranza
- BT**
- G I think that we get the message
 I I think that we got the mes [sage]
 G [the mes] sage is
 I **what is the message?**
 G that they [are a minority]
 I [**the message is that**] they are a minority

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**

G not because we are (.) bad or we did something wrong
 I **le lacrime non sono l- una giusta punizione** per un nostro comportamento
BT
 G tears are (.) not a punishment
 (.)
 I **the (.) tears are not a punishment**
 G not because we are (.) bad or we did something wrong
 I **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]
 G could help you (.) save your life
 I **con questa ehm (.) analisi** è possibile (.) in effetti s- salvare una vita
BT
 G could help you (.) save your life
 I **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]
 G I based (.) the character (.) on a nun who would have been there for forty years
 I e ehm ho diciamo basato l’interpretazione del mio personaggio sulla figura di:
una suora con diciamo quarant’anni di: esperienza in questo convento
 G with almost no feeling towards anyone
 I **u:na: donna** che non provava sentimenti nei confronti di nessuno
BT
 G I based (.) the character (.) on a nun who would have been there for forty years
 I and ehm let’s say I based the interpretation of my character on the figure of: **a nun**
 with let’s say forty years of: experience in this convent
 G with almost no feeling towards anyone
 I **a: woman** 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]
 G the dresses are getting too tight
 I e si accorge che **i suoi abiti diventavano sempre più stretti**
 G which is nothing for anyone to worry about
 I e questo di per sé naturalmente non significa che **chi trova il vestito gli sta un po’ stretto** debba preoccuparsi

BT

- G the dresses are getting too tight
I and she realises that **her clothes were getting tighter and tighter**
G which is nothing for anyone to worry about
I 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

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

BT

- G the solution to child labour I believe is to pay parents well
I I think that in order to solve the problem of:: child labour **the families the parents should be adequately paid**
G then the kids don't have to work
I **if the parents earn fairly well** there's no need for the kids to work

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.

I 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**

BT

G ovary cancer in women is not very (.) often (.) one out of seventy

I only one woman out of seventy actually develops ovary cancer

G but if you have (.) two or more (.) first degree (.) blood relatives

I but (.) if **that woman** has (.) one or two first degree relatives

G who had ovary cancer

I **women** who had ovary cancer

G the chances are one (.) out of two

I 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")⁷, 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*]

G that Michael Jackson had attacked him

I che Michael Jackson **lo aveva violentato**

G sexually

I **lo aveva appunto violentato**

BT

G that Michael Jackson had attacked him

I that Michael Jackson **had raped him**

G sexually

I **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 invisibility of the SI:

7 The interpreter comes up with this translation on the basis of prior turns and, more generally, her knowledge of the topic of the interview.

(25)

[*Che tempo che fa, Rai Tre, 30.4.2005*]

G I have two suitcases

H hai due valigie

G I travel

H viaggia con le valigie

((*applause*))

I **ho due valigie e viaggio**

BT

G I have two suitcases

H you have two suitcases

G I travel

H he travels with suitcases

((*applause*))

I **I have two suitcases and travel**

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=

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

H 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=

I [**yes (.) a new day has begun for me too=**

G = [have met life for the first time and [...]]
 I = [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 and then the third is the one] you

hold in your hand

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] =

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] =

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 (.)

molto belli e sempre **devo averli sempre intorno a me**

BT

H [...] **you always have** many men **around you** [...] even in the video everywhere: there are hundreds of them (.) please spare some of them for our girls eh?

G I like to surround myself with beautiful [men always
I [of course I have to surround myself]

with very beautiful men and always **I have always to have them around me**

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**

BT

H **how did you feel** when you read the book?

G that it was a great book

I it was an extraordinary book **that was my impression**

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 interviewed) 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: del libro nero l'ho finito un sacco di tempo fa (.) **di queste collezioni**

BT

H Raz Degan (.) **butterfly collection**

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: I finished with] this black book game a long time ago (.) **no more butterfly collections**

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 prima (.) alcuni pezzo- spezzoni ecco (.) le era: l'ha trovato **verosimile**?

G well (.) the movie was very accurate

I sì (.) il film era: mo:lto **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: ve:ry **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 [il problema del:: (.) **maschilismo**]=

G = [in the world [...]

I = [**o del:la società patriarcale** [...]

BT

H [...] advice to a woman who wishes to go into politics in a country (.) which is still very **male chauvinist**

G the issue of **patriarchy** (.) is I think at [the centre (.) of all the problems]=
I [the problem of:: (.) **male**]=

G = [in the world [...]

I = [**chauvinism or patriarchal society** [...]

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 pornstar 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 pornstar]
I = [la mia ex] moglie per essere una pornstar

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 pornstar 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 pornstar]
I = [my ex] wife for being a pornstar

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

G the (.) the entire history of man in **thirty** [**minutes**]
I [sì è] veramente la storia
dell'umanità in **pochi minuti**

BT

H 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

G yeah

H all at one time it's not easy

G the (.) the entire history of man in **thirty** [**minutes**]
I [yes it] really is the history of
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]

G nobody in this room (.) needs **it** any less (.) than those children with cancer
I **questo che dicevo** credo che serva a tutte le persone qui presenti non meno di
quanto non serva a questi bambini

BT

G nobody in this room (.) needs **it** any less (.) than those children with cancer
I **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]

G **he** was free enough in his family (.) to raise questions like **that**
I ma **Luca** evidentemente si sentiva abbastanza libero nella sua famiglia da
sollevare (.) problematiche come **questa che ha ricordato**

BT

G **he** was free enough in his family (.) to raise questions like **that**
I 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]

G well (.) I hope **so** (.) one day I hope to get married and have a different name
I spero che accada **quello che lei diceva** e intanto spero di potermi sposare e a quel
punto avrò un nome diverso

BT

G well (.) I hope **so** (.) one day I hope to get married and have a different name
 I I hope that **what you were saying** will happen in the meantime I hope to get married and at that point I will have a different name

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 sì 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

BT

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 I didn’t have anybody and **as regards this sailor as I said**: I was flattered that ehm: he selected me but then he vanished

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 (.)]

I appunto

G = [an:d you can [...]

I = [**come diceva** non è facile [...]

BT

H basically growing is traumatic for everybody (.) but maybe for Roddy MacDowell ((referring to G)) it was more traumatic (.) wasn’t it?

G well (.) you know (.) the thing is that growing up anywhere [isn’t simple (.)]

I actually

G = [an:d you can [...]

I = [**as you were saying** is not easy [...]

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).

- Bakti, M. 2009. Speech disfluencies in simultaneous and retrospection in simultaneous interpreting. In Váradi, T. (ed.) *Selected Papers from the 1st Applied Linguistics PhD Conference*. Budapest: MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézet, 12-21.
- Bazzanella, C. 1994. *Le facce del parlare*. Firenze: La Nuova Italia.
- Bazzanella, C. (ed.) 1996. *Repetition in Dialogue*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Bergmann, J. 1990. On the local sensitivity of conversation. In Marková, I. and Foa, K. (eds) *The Dynamics of Dialogue*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 201-226.
- Blum-Kulka, S. 1986. Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation. In Blum-Kulka, S. and House, J. (eds) *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication: Discourse and Cognition in Translation and Second Language Acquisition Studies*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 17-35.
- Bolinger, D. L. 1961. Syntactic blends and other matters. *Language* 37/3, 366-81.
- Brody, J. 1994. Multiple repetitions in Tojola'b'al conversation. In Johnstone, B. (ed.) *Repetition in Discourse. Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Norwood (NJ): Ablex Publishing Corporation, vol. 2, 3-14.
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. C. 1987. *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Conte, M-E. 1996. Anaphoric encapsulation. In de Mulder, W. and Tasmowski, L. (eds) *Coherence and Anaphora. Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 10, 1-10.
- Conte, M-E. 1999. *Condizioni di coerenza. Ricerche di linguistica testuale*. Alessandria: Edizioni Dell'Orso.
- Cook, Guy W.D. 2000. *Language Play, Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Coulthard, M. 1977. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. London, Longman.
- D'Addio Colosimo, W. 1988. Nominali anaforici incapsulatori: un aspetto della coesione testuale. In De Mauro, T., Gensini, S. and Piemontese, M. E. (eds) *Dalla parte del Ricevente. Percezione, Comprensione, Interpretazione*. Roma: Bulzoni, 143-151.
- de Boot, K. 2000. Simultaneous interpreting as language production. In Englund Dimitrova, B. and Hyltenstam, K. (eds) *Language Processing and Simultaneous Interpreting*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 65-88.
- Diriker, E. 2004. *De-/Re-Contextualizing Conference Interpreting*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Falbo, C. 2012. CorIT (Italian Television Interpreting Corpus): Classification criteria. In Straniero Sergio, F. and Falbo, C. (eds) *Breaking Ground in Corpus-based Interpreting Studies*, Bern: Peter Lang, 157-185.
- Ferrara, K. 1994. Repetition as rejoinder in therapeutic discourse. Echoing and mirroring. In Johnstone, B. (ed.) *Repetition in Discourse. Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Norwood (NJ): Ablex Publishing Corporation, vol. 2, 66-83.
- Fludernik, M. 1993. *The Fictions of Language and the Languages of Fiction*. London, Routledge.
- Goffman, E. 1974. *Frame Analysis*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Goffman, E. 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goodwin, M. H. 1990. *He-Said-She-Said. Talk as Social Organization among Black Children*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Goodwin, M. and Goodwin, C. 1987. Children's arguing. In Philips, S. U., Steele, S. and Tanz, C. (eds) *Language, Gender and Sex in Comparative Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 200-248.
- Gotti, M. 1991. *I linguaggi specialisti-*

- ci. *Caratteristiche linguistiche e criteri pragmatici*. Firenze: La Nuova Italia.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1985. *Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K and Hasan, R. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hoey, M. 1991. *Patterns of Lexis in Text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jacobsen, B. 2004. Pragmatic meaning in court interpreting: an empirical study of additions in consecutively interpreted question-answer dialogues. *Hermes* 32, 237-249.
- Johnstone, B. 1987. Perspectives on repetition. *Text* 7/3, 205-214.
- Johnstone, B. 1991. *Repetition in Arabic Discourse: Paradigms, Syntagms and the Ecology of Language*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Johnstone, B. 1994. Repetition in discourse: a dialogue. In Johnstone, B. (ed.) *Repetition in Discourse. Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, vol. 1. Norwood (NJ): Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1-22.
- Katan, D. and Straniero Sergio, F. 2001. Look who's talking: the ethics of entertainment and talkshow interpreting. In Pym, A. (ed.) *The Return to Ethics*. Special issue of *The Translator* 7/2, 213-227.
- Korolija, N. 1998. Recycling context: the impact of prior conversation on the emergence of episodes in a multiparty radio talk show. *Discourse Processes* 25/1, 99-125.
- Labov, W. 1972. The transformation of experience in narrative syntax. In Labov, W. (ed.) *Language in the Inner City. Studies in the Black English Vernacular*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 354-396.
- Linell, P. 1998. *Approaching Dialogue. Talk, Interaction and Contexts in Dialogical Perspectives*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Linell, P. and Korolija, N. 1997. Coherence in multiparty Conversation: episodes and contexts in interaction. In Givón, T. (ed.) *Conversation: Cognitive, Communicative and Social Perspectives*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 167-205.
- Mason, I. 1999. Introduction. In Mason, I. (ed.) *Dialogue Interpreting*. Special issue of *The Translator* 5/2, 147-160.
- McLaughlin, M. L. 1984. *Conversation*. Beverly Hill: Sage.
- Merlini Barbaresi, L. 1996. Markedness reversal in dialogic repetition. In Bazzanella, C. (ed.) *Repetition in Dialogue*, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 104-118.
- Murata, K. 1994. Intrusive or cooperative? A cross-cultural study of interruption. *Journal of Pragmatics* 21, 385-400.
- Nofsinger, R. E. 1991. *Everyday Conversation*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Norricks, N. N. 1987. Functions of repetition in conversation. *Text* 7/3, 245-64.
- Ochs, E. 1979. Planned and unplanned speech. In Givón, T. (ed.) *Discourse and Syntax and Semantics*. Vol.12. New York: Academic Press, 51-80.
- Ong, W. J. 1982. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. London/New York: Methuen.
- Perrin, L., Deshaies, D. and Paradis, C. 2003. Pragmatic functions of local diaphonic repetitions in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35, 1843-1860.
- Persson, G. 1974. *Repetition in English*. Uppsala: University of Uppsala.
- Petite, C. 2005. Evidence of repair mechanisms in simultaneous interpreting: a corpus-based analysis. *Interpreting* 7, 27-49.
- Schegloff, E. A. 2004. On dispensability. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 37/2, 95-140.
- Setton, R. 2001. Deconstructing SI: a contribution to the debate on component processes. *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 11, 1-23.
- Simone, R. 1990. *Fondamenti di Linguistica*. Bari/Roma: Laterza.
- Simpson, J. M. 1994. Regularised intonation in conversational repetition. In Johnstone, B. (ed.) *Repetition in Discourse. Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Norwood (N.J.): Ablex Publishing Corporation, vol. 2, 41-49.
- Straniero Sergio, F. 1999. The Interpreter on the (talk) show: interaction and participation frameworks. In Mason, I. (ed.) *Dialogue Interpreting*. Special issue of *The Translator* 5/2, 303-326.
- Straniero Sergio, F. 2007. *Talkshow Interpreting. La mediazione linguistica nella conversazione-spettacolo*. Trieste: Edizioni Università di Trieste.
- Straniero Sergio, F. forthcoming. You are not too funny: challenging the role of interpreters on Italian talkshows. In Baraldi, C. and Gavioli, L. (eds) *Coordinating Participation in Dialogue Interpreting*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Tannen, D. 1989. *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tissi, B. 2000. Silent pauses and disfluencies in simultaneous interpretation. *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 10, 103-127.
- Wadensjö, C. 1998. *Interpreting as Interaction*. London/New York: Longman.
- Wadensjö, C. 2000. Co-constructing Yeltsin: explorations of an interpreter-mediated political interview. In Olohan, M. (ed.) *Intercultural Faultiness. Research Models in Translation Studies I, Textual and Cognitive Aspects*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 233-252.