
Exploring the interplay between discourse connectives and non-connective cues in simultaneous interpreting

Christina Pollkläsener

Universität des Saarlandes

christina.pollklaesener@uni-saarland.de

Studies on interpreting have found that interpreters both add and omit a considerable amount of discourse connectives (e.g. Gumul, 2006; Defrancq, Plevoets, K. & Magnifico, 2015), thus reshaping the discourse structure of the source speeches (Defrancq et al., 2015). These studies did not include non-connective cues in their analyses and only looked at the presence of connectives in both source and target speeches.

This study wants to contribute to a more complex understanding of how discourse relations are marked in interpreting. From the perspective of the source speech, I look at how compensatory non-connective cues additional to discourse connectives affect the target. Building upon Lapshinova-Koltunski, Pollkläsener and Przybyl (2022) I focus on contrastive and concessive connectives, assuming that the presence of additional cues reduces cognitive load for the interpreter.

For my analyses, I use the sentence-aligned EPIC-UdS-Corpus, which contains original speeches in English and their simultaneous interpretations into German. I query the source texts for all instances of the connectives *but/however*, remove all non-connective uses and manually annotate the presence of non-connective cues in the source. The annotation of non-connective cues is based on Crible (2022). She identified antonymy and parallelism as predictive signals for contrast and found a relative tendency between negative and different polarity and contrast and concession. The matches will be classified into groups depending on the translation option used by the interpreter (explicit connective, equivalent connective, implicit connective, total deletion of connective in target). In the analysis, I check if the presence of non-connective cues have an influence on the use of translation strategy. In my presentation, I will report on the results of this work-in progress.

References: • Crible, L. (2022). The syntax and semantics of coherence relations. From relative configurations to predictive signals. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 27(1), 59-92. • Defrancq, B., Plevoets, K. & Magnifico, C. (2015). Connective Items in Interpreting and Translation: Where Do They Come From? In: J. Romero-Trillo (ed.), *Yearbook of Corpus Linguistics and Pragmatics 2015*, Cham: Springer, 195-222. • Gumul, E. (2006). Explicitation in Simultaneous Interpreting: a Strategy or a By-Product of Language Mediation? *Across Languages and Cultures* 7(2), 171–190. • Lapshinova-Koltunski, E., Pollkläsener, C. & Przybyl, H. (2022). Exploring Explicitation and Implication in Parallel Interpreting and Translation Corpora. *The Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics* [TT2022 special issue], 119.