



Traduction et
Interprétation
EII

On the effects of the verbalisation of the Dialogue Interpreter's inferences: from local relevance to global discursive coherence

Anne Delizée

University of MONS

The Application of Relevance Theory

to Translation and Interpreting:

Perspectives on Practice and Research

9-10 February 2023, UNINT, Rome



Faculté
de Traduction
et d'Interprétation
Ecole d'Interprètes
Internationaux

Purpose of the study

Relevance Theory > meaning negotiation in Simultaneous, Consecutive and Dialogue Interpreting (Gallai 2022: 124-159)

Interpreter : inferential processing of the original utterance and (sometimes) verbalises her assumption about the Primary Speaker's intended meaning, as she perceives it (e.g. Gumul 2008; Setton 1999; Viana 2005)

🔗 Inferencing in Dialogue Interpreting

Interaction seen as an interplay of mutual influences (cf. Goffman 1967; Kerbrat-Orecchioni 1992)

➤ *Effects* of the verbalisation of DI's inferences on the participants and the interaction

Hypothesis

- The Interpreter verbalises inferences that specify the Primary Speaker's communicative intention at the level of the utterance, as she perceives it
= local level
- The Interpreter verbalises inferences that reinforce the coherence of a set of utterances, as she perceives it
= global level

Interdisciplinary analytical apparatus

Relevance Theory

Sperber & Wilson (1986)

Cognitive Pragmatics

+ Theory of Discourse Structure

Grosz & Sidner (1986)

Computational Linguistics

Theoretical framework: RT

Local level : Relevance Theory

< Mutual manifestness

Not based on prior mutual knowledge, but co-constructed in an inferential way during the interaction

=> interpreted interaction :

Interpreter: Addressee & Speaker (Wadensjö 1998)

I=A : assumptions about PS's intended meaning

I=S : assumptions about A's cognitive environment (Mason 2006b)

= position to build mutual knowledge

Theoretical framework: TDS

Global level : RT + Theory of Discourse Structure

- < investigates the meaning & the structure of discourse
- < conceptual tools for constructing a discourse-processing system

Discourse = a piece of language behaviour that involves multiple utterances and multiple participants (Grosz & Sidner 1986: 176)

Theoretical framework: TDS

Speaker : Global Discourse Purpose (GDP)

Discourse :

- Linguistic structure: discourse segments
a linguistic segment = a segment intention
Surface reflection of the intentional structure
- Intentional structure : GDP + Segment Intentions (SI)
+ relationships between SI
- Attentional structure : abstraction of the speaker's
focus of attention
Includes SI

(Grosz & Sidner 1986: 177-179)

Theoretical framework: TDS

The addressee

- analyses the linguistic structure = reflection of the speaker's Segment Intentions and of the relationships between SI
- determines the speaker's focus of attention

= constrains the inferential processing needed to give meaning to the utterances (Grosz et al. 1995: 205)

=> guides the process of recognising the speaker's intentional structure

Theoretical framework: TDS

=> interpreted interaction :

Analysis of the 3 structures = discursive coherence ?

A discourse is coherent

- only when its Global Discourse Purpose is shared by all the participants
- and when each Segment Intention contributes to the satisfaction of GDP

(Grosz & Sidner 1986: 202)

Data

Audio-recorded excerpt of an authentic Russian-French psychotherapeutic interaction (Delizée 2018)

Russian-French Interpreter:

- consecutive mode without note taking
- 600 hours of specific training in public service interpreting
- 11 years in Mental Health settings
- collaboration with the Therapist : 7 years

French-speaking Therapist:

- Collaboration with the Interpreter : 7 years

Russian-speaking Patient:

- Therapeutic follow-up
- In therapy with the Therapist and the Interpreter : 4 years

Excerpt EnTh6 / 03: 43 - 05: 13

T (French): I received an email from his law↑ye:r asking for **a- a new document**, for the: the:: as they had extended social assistance for him, they had asked for **a new docu↑ment** so that he could continue to receive the:: the: th- the the social assistance, (.) so that was done, >° um that's it, °<

I (French): and did you send the=

T (French): =>yes, I did<.

I (Russian): he ha- had contact with your lawyer. the lawyer asked that he send um again documents, **on your condition, that you come, >you continue to come here,<** so that the social assistance contun- uh continues to be paid to you. for that you need th- uh **a proof that you continue to go to the doctor.** °and he sent°.

P (Russian): °thank you°.

(complete excerpt & analysis in Delizée 2020)

Analysis at local level - RT

Verbalisation of I's mental representation:

document = « proof that the patient is still in therapy »

- I's assumption about T's intended meaning
- I contributes to creating a shared cognitive environment
- according to RT, the contextual effects of an inference change the context, which helps to facilitate the processing of the following utterance

⇒ reduces P's cognitive efforts

Context = co-constructed by the interactors & constantly changing during interaction (Pérez González 2006)

I actively co-participates in this recontextualisation process (Gallez 2014; Mason 2006a & b)

The verbalisation of I's inference is relevant at the local level

Analysis at global level - TDS

T's turn

Linguistic structure

I received an email from his lawyer
asking for a new document

for the/

as they had extended social assistance for him

they had asked for a new document

so that he could continue to receive social
assistance

so that was done

I : did you send the?
yes, I did

Intentional structure

SI 1 = contact with P's lawyer

SI 2 = request for a document, by the lawyer

SI 3/ = purpose/

SI 4 = because of the previous extension of
social assistance for P, by "they"

SI 2' = previous request for a document, by
"they"

SI 3 = for P to continue receiving social
assistance

SI 4 = what was requested was done

SI 4' = the document was sent

Analysis at global level - TDS

T's turn

The intentional structure, reflected in the linguistic structure, is turbulent and imprecise

⇒ Overloading of the attentional structure

= Weak guide for the inferential process of recognising
T's Global Discourse Purpose:

= to find out if the patient knows about the current administrative procedure?

= to explain the lawyer's request by focusing attention on the unfolding of this request?

Analysis at global level - TDS

I's rendition

Linguistic structure

he had contact with your lawyer

the lawyer asked for new documents to be sent

on the fact that you continue to come here

so that social assistance continues to be paid to you

for that you need proof that you are keeping going to the doctor

and he sent

P : thank you

Intentional structure

SI 1 = contact with P's lawyer

SI 2 = request for documents to be sent, by the lawyer

SI 3 = **explicit intentional relationship between SI 2 – SI 4**

= document on the continuation of the therapy

SI 4 = to continue social assistance

SI 5 = **reinforced intentional relationship between SI 2 – SI 4**

= need for proof of continued therapy

SI 6 = sending of the requested documents, by the therapist

Analysis at global level - TDS

I's rendition

Each utterance contributes to the satisfaction of each Segment Intention

I's inferences make explicit & reinforce the intentional relationship between two SI

Fluid intentional structure => Harmonious attentional structure

= Strong guide for the inferential process of recognising

T's Global Discourse Purpose, as I perceives it:

= «proof of continued therapy was sent
to extend social assistance»

I's inferences reinforce the *intra*-discursive coherence & make the GDP more manifest // Grosz & Sidner's definition of discourse coherence

The verbalisation of I's inferences is relevant at the global level

Analysis at global level – TDS

On other data

I's inferences reinforce the *inter*-discursive coherence:
= I produces a rendition

- that transmits the Speaker's intention
- and integrates the Addressee's intention,
as she perceives them

(Delizée & Michaux 2019, 2020)

Discussion

RT + TDS : from utterance-level to discourse-level
intentions & processing by I

➤ I tries to figure out

what is said & what is meant [local level]

why it is said [global level]

Verbalisation of I's inferences = trace of I's cooperative
stance in the process of meaning negotiation

« collaborative rendition », « collaborative coordination » ?

Conclusions

Through subtle negotiation of proposal contents and pragmatic aspects

I “collaboratively completes” the original utterances (cf. Sacks 1992)

- co-creates a shared cognitive environment
- underpins the Speaker’s GDP
- reduces the Addressee’s cognitive efforts
- facilitates mutual understanding
- supports their collaborative efforts to communicate by avoiding the risk of misunderstandings

< I’s meta-objective in mental health settings: sense of responsibility for the success of the communication (Semi-structured interview of 5 interpreters, Delizée 2018)



Thank you for your attention
and suggestions

anne.delizee@umons.ac.be

References

- Delizée, A. (2018). *Du rôle de l'interprète en santé mentale: Analyse socio-discursive de ses positions subjectives au sein de la triade thérapeute-patient-interprète* [Thèse de doctorat en langues, lettres et traductologie]. Université de Mons.
- Delizée, A., & Michaux, C. (2019). The Negotiation of Meaning in Dialogue Interpreting. On the effects of the verbalization of interpreters' inferences. *Translation, Cognition and Behavior*. 2(2), 263–282.
- Delizée, A., & Michaux, C. (2020). Les représentations mentales de l'interprète de dialogue. In S. Vogeleer & L. Beghin (Eds.), *Déverbaliser—Reverbaliser: La traduction comme acte de violence ou comme manipulation du sens ?* Presses de l'Université Saint-Louis, pp. 171–197.
- Gallai, F. (2022). *Relevance Theory in Translation and Interpreting. A Cognitive-Pragmatic Approach*. Routledge.
- Gallez, E. (2014). *Ethos et interprétation judiciaire. Une analyse ethnographique de l'interprétation dans une cour d'assises belge : Une étude de cas* [Thèse de doctorat en traductologie]. KU Leuven.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction Ritual*. Aldine Publishing Co.
- Grosz, B. J., Joshi, A. K., & Weinstein, S. (1995). Centering: A Framework for Modeling the Local Coherence of Discourse. *Computational Linguistics*, 21(2), 203–225.
- Grosz, B. J., & Sidner, C. L. (1986). Attention, Intentions, and the Structure of Discourse. *Computational Linguistics*, 12(3), 175–204.

References

- Kerbrat-Orecchioni, C. (1992). *Les interactions verbales. Tome II*. Armand Colin
- Gumul, E. (2008). Explicitation in Simultaneous Interpreting – the Quest for Optimal Relevance?. In E. Wałaszewska, M. Kisielewska-Krysiuk, A. Korzeniowska, & G. Grzegorzewska (Eds.), *Relevant Worlds: Current Perspectives on Language, Translation and Relevance Theory* (pp. 188–205). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Mason, I. (2006a). Ostension, inference and response: Analysing participant moves in Community Interpreting Dialogues. *Linguistica Antverpiensia*, 5, 103–120.
- Mason, I. (2006b). On mutual accessibility of contextual assumptions in dialogue interpreting. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38, 359–373.
- Pérez González, L. (2006). Interpreting strategic recontextualization cues in the courtroom: Corpus-based insights into the pragmatic force of non-restrictive relative clauses. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38(3), 390–417.
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on Conversation (1964-1972)*. Basil Blackwell.
- Setton, R. (1999). *Simultaneous Interpretation: A Cognitive and Pragmatic Analysis*. John Benjamins.
- Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Blackwell.
- Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1989). *La Pertinence. Communication et cognition* (Traduction par A. Gerschenfeld & D. Sperber). Editions de Minuit.

References

- Vianna, B. (2005). Simultaneous interpreting: A relevance-theoretic approach. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 2(2), 169–190.
- Wadensjö, C. (1998). *Interpreting as interaction*. Longman.