

## SECOND-HAND EMOTION: INTERPRETING ATTITUDES

Anne Marie Bülow-Møller  
Copenhagen Business School, Denmark

One of the reasons politicians are loath to make speeches through interpreters is that they are afraid to lose their emotional impact. Evidently effects like credibility and conviction are *also* carried by the semantic contents, but in political communication in particular the speaker's tone and whole attitude are inextricably linked with the message. One member of the European Parliament is on record as saying that she speaks her mother tongue with interpretation if she wants to make sure of her facts, and her best English if she needs to "get across" as a person (Lone Dybkjær, personal communication). The feeling is probably widespread; whether this is actually a good idea is of course a completely different issue.

The need to "get across" is clearly felt in exchanges with question-answer sequences in front of an audience, where information is not necessarily the prime consideration. Where duels are lost and won in terms of credible and convincing suasion, the demonstration of an attitude is an important supplement to the demonstration of competence.

This poses a problem for conference interpreters: they are drilled to convey the speaker's information smoothly, but they cannot possibly play-act each speaker's complete set of voice-reflected attitudes. What they do, if their temperament allows it, is produce some sort of *gesture* towards the affect they perceive, as if to let their voice slip in a cue for the audience to indicate that the speaker is making use of emotive features.

This study sets out to examine possible patterns and hierarchies in the selection of features that are passed on to the audience to reflect affect. It will be argued that, contrary to expectation, blatant demonstrations of affect do not necessarily receive priority treatment in transfer, possibly because of social norms that hold some types of affect to be more acceptable than others. Thus injured dignity seems to stand a better chance than arrogant impatience.

### 1. Emotion in discourse

Communication has both an informational and a relational component. Thus even the most neutral and purely informational utterance will be characterized in context precisely because, for this particular utterance, the relational content is impersonal, and many tasks for simultaneous interpreters will involve nothing but impersonality. However, when the relational component in a meeting grows

to significant proportions it will be carried partly by substance (like peace offerings or threats), partly by affect.

In the following the term 'affect' will be used (following Fiske & Taylor 1991) to cover the whole area of personal involvement; 'emotion' will cover feelings such as anger, pleasure or frustration; and 'attitude' will cover a demonstrated stance such as a positive or negative attitude to an event or a proposal under review. The adjective 'emotive' has a history in the prosody literature, where it is used for segments that register a feeling such as surprise, whereas 'emotional' is reserved for the characterization of segments that reflect deeper feelings such as sorrow or anger (cf. Selting 1994). In the corpus that was used for this study, taken from a professional exchange, the range may be said to run from near-impersonal to emotive.

#### *Previous work on affect*

The literature on the expression and recognition of emotion is, for our purposes, rather thin. It is generally recognized that "affect also influences the *content* of thinking, that is *what* kind of information people recall, attend to, select, interpret, and learn as a function of their affective state when dealing with ambiguous social situations" (Forgas 2001: 8), and that in the case of a conflict between the verbal content of a message and the prosodically expressed emotion, hearers tend to assume that the verbal content refers to the subject matter and the prosody signals how the speaker feels about the hearer or the situation (cf. Frick 1985). However, in the field of communicative functions of emotion there are also two notable observations that highlight the importance of transfer.

Firstly, emotion in discourse calls for 'alignment', i.e. for a response that is sympathetic to the emotive part of the message, and this is normally reflected in the prosody of the second part of the exchange (Selting 1994). Thus there is something amiss in an interchange where the first speaker's evident affect goes unmet and unacknowledged; compare:

- "Hey, I PASSED my driving tests!!! Whooopee!! Isn't it GREAT??!!!"

- "Oh. Really."

and:

- "Oh really??!!"

For a response to be judged (in)appropriate, it is evidently important that the audience has access to the emotion that was carried by the first utterance.

Secondly, and following on from this, emotion is 'accountable' in discourse: it is normal to hear an interlocutor ask, "Why are you sad/happy/angry?" (Potter 1996, Potter & Wetherell 1987). It is also normal to orient to an underlying feeling; Edwards's work on mediation discourse shows how successive speakers refer back to previous utterances not for their words but for the feeling they

carried (Edwards 1997, 1999). This sort of metadiscourse is used to name and thus construct an event, and it therefore influences the trajectory of the interaction.

For example, in the following material Commissioner Neil Kinnock characterizes the previous speaker's utterance as a *sneer*. This description orients to the normative/moral order, i.e. it assumes intentionality and assigns blame: this feeling should not have been shown in public. For such a comment to work, obviously the audience must be able to hear the sneering aspect of the utterance in question.

However, it is extremely hard to pin down emotive values linguistically.

Textual analysis will normally focus on semantic value and pick out evaluative adjectives ("awful") or noun phrases with strong connotations ("like a pig-sty") and intensifiers ("totally"), and end up with a broad characterization of positive or negative affect cues (thus Biber & Finegan 1989, Drescher 2001, Ochs & Schieffelin 1989). The more sophisticated version isolates emotive communication in such categories as valence (positive/negative), immediacy (near/far expressions), specificity (clear/vague), modality (confident/doubtful), assertiveness, and intensity (Janney 2002: 459).

But for one thing emotive contrasts are always more-or-less, never absolutely there or not there (Caffi & Janney 1994). Secondly, spoken language is obviously richer than writing and the intonation contour is heard e.g. as an intensity cue; the trouble is that prosodic cues can only be heard relative to the speaker's own speech patterns over time, and, "in any event, the attribution of positive and negative feelings or communicative intentions to choices of pitch nucleus prominence is an after-the-fact inference, a response not to pitch prominence itself, but to pitch prominence in relation to other behavior" (Arndt & Janney 1987: 256).

This is why the literature that attempts to classify linguistic expression of emotion has a stereotypical air; thus Scherer (1986) contrasts for example high pitch and high speed (joyous excitement) with low pitch and high speed (hot anger) and low pitch and slow speed (cold anger, irritation). Albeit recognizable in a general way, this is too blunt to describe the quick, transient shades of emotive colour that are easily picked up by a listener.

Finally, prosodic patterns are language-specific and therefore not necessarily available to the interpreter in transfer. Two patterns of British English lend themselves particularly well to emotive marking: glides and rhythmic scansion.

It has been noted several times that steep contours are confrontational, used by speakers to stake a claim for dominance (e.g. Knowles 1984); an example is found in the following passage where a member of the EU Parliament, Mr Elles, virtually spits the sentence *I am the author of the 96 DIS↓charge* (where capitals mark extra emphasis, and the arrow a steep shift of pitch). This is only

secondarily information: thanks to the steep fall at the end, the primary speech act here is 'laying claim to authority'. (We can also note in passing that flashes of controlled anger are audible in both the speakers in the corpus, and that anger seems primarily to be expressed when the speaker wants to appear dominant, cf. Canary et al. 1998).

As for scansion, Selting (1994) notes that an increase of rhythmic beats per breathgroup marks heightened involvement. An example in the corpus discussed below is Mr Kinnock defending his honour against an accusation of ineptitude, which he finishes with a cadence consisting of a long even fall across the breathgroup with close, evenly spaced accents ("I did have that response" etc), so that the last focus ("point") achieves a beautifully controlled finality:

I am NOT (.) 'carping, I would NOT respond with 'carping, but since he mentioned it, I thought I had in ALL honesty to say, while accepting and therefore responding to the comité des sages's report, I 'did 'have 'that re'sponse to 'that 'very spe'cific 'point.

There is no doubt at all that the speaker makes his injured dignity salient by the prosody here.

Obviously both scansion and pitch movement exist in other languages. However, with Danish, the target language of the study, the unmarked pattern is considerably flatter, so that a direct transfer would sound so histrionic as to defeat its purpose.

#### *Previous work in representing another speaker*

Given the immense literature on the representation of speech as direct speech, indirect speech and *style indirect libre* in novels and in story-telling, it is surprising that so little exists on the representations that people perform in daily life when they quote other speakers. Among the exceptions are Chafe (1994) and Gumperz (1992) who both note how speakers foreground a segment of narrative by introducing polyphony, a second voice play-acted and set apart by prosody and register shifts. Klewitz & Couper-Kuhlen (1999) mention prosodic quotation marks, which enable hearers to detect another voice in utterances like *Talks were 'frank but helpful', according to the minister*; the normal signals are higher pitch and rhythmic accents. Günthner (1996) describes the special case of complaints, where the target is often represented with a sort of generalized 'whining' or 'scolding' or 'affected' voice rather than with an attempt to model a particular utterance accurately. Thus there seems to be a recognized set of prosodic or register features which serve the purpose of general-purpose attributed quotation.

Most importantly, Clark & Gerrig (1990) note that quotations normally serve as demonstrations that "depict the referent non-seriously". This is at the heart of

the interpreter's problem: anything too close to the original will be taken as mimicking that serves the *second* speaker's own communicative purpose.

This mechanism works even in print – an example appeared recently in a Danish newspaper which carried a story about a Swedish tv-programme debating immigration. The populist Danish politician Pia Kjærsgaard was portrayed in a picture manipulated to sport a pig's snout. The article described the incident and the reaction from Mrs Kjærsgaard, who was reported to consider the stunt 'childish' without being angry about it. Here the reporter switched to direct quotation: "*Hahahaha, oohh, I can hardly bear it, haha*", she says and hangs up. (Politiken, 8.08.02, my translation). Obviously, a norm was broken when Mrs Kjærsgaard's blithe unconcern was transferred in close quotation: she was depicted non-seriously.

## 2. Interpreting affect

### *Previous work on prosody and attitude in interpretation*

Scholars of conference interpreting have certainly been concerned both with voice quality and with the transfer of speakers' meaning, but overwhelmingly in the interest of information.

For voice quality, studies of end users' satisfaction note that interpreters' voices should be heard as pleasant and varied, and they should flow as close to normal sentence intonation as possible to avoid fits and starts and filled pauses (Kurz 2001, Moser 1996, Pöchhacker 2001, Shlesinger 1994). In the hierarchy, 'sense' comes first and 'pleasantness' second; the communication of attitude is not mentioned here (which may be due to the form of meetings in question.)

Accent/stress and prosody play a role for information processing, which is well discussed in studies that are aware of the cognitive processes of the transfer; thus Shlesinger (1995) and Setton (1998, 1999) both draw attention to the focus markers in the clause that distinguish between old or 'given' and new information, and the pitch movements which may be used to foreground salient elements. These elements are part of the speaker's 'ostension' (Setton uses the term from Relevance theory) and crucial for the audience in drawing inferences from an utterance. Any variation in the target string that keeps the semantic elements but shifts the focus (or does away with the focus in continuous tentative chunking) may lead to serious problems.

Most importantly, where contrast is involved, the focus assignment has repercussions for the argument structure. A banal example like "WE have behaved responsibly" carries an inference for the audience (i.e. that somebody else did not) and this is easily lost in interpretation if it is unclear what the current line of argument is (Bülow-Møller 2001). But the emphasis could also be emotional: in the corpus, one of the speakers raises his voice considerably

when he claims that  $\uparrow$ *WE have not been circulated as parlia'mentary colleagues with that document*. No contrast is forthcoming, for the salient point is the self-assertive emphasis on the group on whose behalf the complaint is made. The vulnerability of stress patterns in simultaneous interpreting is noticed by Williams (1995), who seeks the explanation for anomalous stress patterns in immediately preceding stressed input.

In terms of semantic content, it is generally accepted that interpreters explicate if they get a chance (thus Blum-Kulka 1986, Englund Dimitrova 1993). On the other hand, and rather more worryingly, this does not seem to go for discourse markers and conjunctions. Thus Dam (1993) notes that phatic and attitude-carrying items like *unfortunately* have low priority, and DuFon (1993) finds that in long academic sentences 'sweeteners' get lost. Conjunctions seem to have their own hierarchy, with a high survival rate for causals and additives but much less for the types that Shlesinger calls 'dismissive, temporal and emphatic conjunctions' (Shlesinger 1995).

#### *The hypothesis*

It was hypothesised from the outset that there would be some sort of affect hierarchy, such that a tendency would be noticeable when a number of interpreters worked from the same stretch of talk into the same target language. If most of the interpreters represented a given emotive feature in their transfer, it would indicate a high priority.

Attitude in itself does not need translation, and cognitive effort can therefore be expected to go into the semantic contents and textual arrangement. However, it is actually a decision to let one's voice reflect relational information, like "the Commissioner sounds as if he is thoroughly fed up now, so I shall let my voice go tired in this sentence". If attitude is to be represented, it has to battle for cognitive space. This leads to the following expectations:

- 1) consideration number one is semantic content: words of strong connotations will have high priority.
- 2) consideration number two is information structure: stress patterns will be dominated by the distribution of new and old information in the clause, to secure coherence.
- 3) consideration number three is emphasis: emotive emphasis highlighting specific words will be reproduced if the language structures are sufficiently similar.
- 4) prosody: intonation patterns are language specific and will not be reproduced except in a specific effort to model the speaker.
- 5) speed: features like artful micropauses will not be reproduced, as the available time will be allocated according to the interpreter's needs.

- 6) individual voice features like a yelping timbre, and disfluencies like sniffs are deemed to be *not* part of the message and are not attended to, whether or not e.g. a contemptuous snort could be deemed to work on a par with a dismissive gesture.

### 3. The study

To test this assumption, ten active and experienced interpreters from a major political/administrative framework were persuaded to take part in a study that involved conference interpreting from English into Danish, and which was recorded in separate booths at the Copenhagen Business School. For the affect study, only a small portion of the corpus is used. This involved ten interpretations from a videotape of a hearing in the European Parliament, broadcast earlier in the same year (1999) from Strasbourg, with an interchange between two British speakers, Mr Kinnock and Mr Elles.

The interpreters may be assumed to have general knowledge of the situation, but they were not briefed on the task beforehand and had only a few minutes' lead-in before the section that figures as corpus for the present study. There were five men and five women.

#### *The situation*

The extract is taken from the hearing on the day that the new commissioners-elect submitted themselves to questioning by various committee chairmen. Neil Kinnock had already represented Britain in the commission that was forced to resign, but was put forward again as the candidate of the Labour-led British government. Mr Elles represents the British Conservatives, and it is thus a party-political necessity for him to discredit Kinnock in front of his colleagues. Kinnock for his part needs to deflect the attacks on his period of office, and to stamp them as out of order when they are chalked up to him personally, while showing a positive spirit of cooperation. It is characteristic of this exchange that there is very little new information, in the sense of one speaker telling the other something he did not know. The whole audience is very well briefed on the facts relating to the resignation of the previous commission, and the real message is therefore in the attitude of the combatants: it is pure 'credibility work'.

Public debates of this kind are a spectator sport, where rhetoric is expected and attacks can be prepared for. Both speakers need to tread a careful balance between displaying appropriate feeling, even passion, to demonstrate their conviction, and on the other hand to display control, since unprofessional emotion makes the audience uncomfortable.

*Mr Elles's contribution*

Elles asks his questions as the chairman of the Budget Committee, and his contribution is marked by an unusual amount of affect for debates of this type, with a range of features that express frustration and indignation. His questions are strictly rhetorical: his errand is to enumerate Kinnock's sins of omission and thereby draw attention to his inadequacy. The Chair of the hearing introduces the section as *Round Two* and admonishes the speakers to be brief. Elles thanks her and opens with a main question of 2.2 mins; after Kinnock's reply he adds a supplementary of 1.0 min, here transcribed in full. (For transcription conventions, see appendix).

I have significant doubts: (.) ↘frankly that anyone who has served in the previous commission should come 'back as our previous speaker (.) speaker, said.

We recall what the (..) the (.) rePORT said: eh it said, [[reads aloud]] It is be'coming difficult to find anyone who has even the ↑SLIGHtest sense of responsibility ↓>I frankly find it repellent that anyone wishes (.) to come ↑'back ↘again.<

Secondly, I would re'mind you, erh mister Kinnock, that your own political colleagues FOUGHT the 96 discharge TOOTH and 'nail in this committee, so re'ferring to this particular committee I would think you should be a little (..) less ↘stressful=↓I should know I am the author of the 96 ↑DIS↓charge.

Lastly, in terms of QUESTions for you, in this 96 discharge, the 'real emphasis was on the re'fo:rm of the commission as well as on the political responsibility of commissioners.

Do you think in your replies to question number 21,

Do you believe that >parliament=you >have been erh eulogizing about the need to cooperate with parliament that we should be<< con↗sulted on the codes of ↗conduct before they come into ope↗ration for commissioners and officials?

Secondly, do you believe that the code of conduct for 'high ↑LEvel officials should be implemented as it's been proposed in this document which we were circulated, where there's nothing in terms of ↑MERit, or 'MANagement, mana'gerial ca'pacity, which you have also been talking about this morning, there's ↑NOTHING in those codes of ↓conduct=LASTly,

Do you think that as the 'WISE 'men have said in their 'second report, we should have a committee of 'standards in 'public 'life which would monitor the 'general (.) standard (.) of the ↓'codes.

And after Kinnock's reply, the supplementary:



Mister Kinnock, in the reply that you have given, (.) it is helpful to see eh that you are beginning to under'stand the need to take parliament's views into ac'count in the shaping of codes of 'conduct.

In the last commission everything was the hallmark of ↑too little, 'too late. Nothing was followed up with any ∇REAL diligence or ∇speed.

How can ↑we as parliamentarians, ↓this is the 'question, have 'confidence (.) that ↑you will now take in- our views into account in 'shaping the E U reforms when ↑this document, designing the com'mission's future, has only been circulated to us because we 'asked for this last week, and that therefore, 'we have only been circulat- >↑WE have not been circulated as parlia'mentary colleagues< with that document=∇HOW can 'we have 'confidence that you will take our ∇views into account.

Rhetorically speaking, Elles's questions are remarkable for the following emotive features:

- a) strong semantic choice: *I find it repellent*; (from quotation of his own text:) *anyone with even the slightest sense of responsibility; you've been eulogizing about the need to consult; your own people fought tooth and nail*
- b) rhythmic stress with parallels or contrast: *nothing in terms of 'merit, or 'management, mana'gerial capacity... there's NOTHING in these codes; too little too late; WE as parliamentarians ... WE as parliamentary colleagues*
- c) an intonation pattern with a low fall and sustained low passages, normally associated with disgust: ↓*I frankly find it repellent that anyone wishes (.) to come ↑back ∇again; ↓I should know, I am the author of the 96 ↑DIS↓charge; Nothing was followed up with any ∇REAL diligence or ∇speed; ∇HOW can we have 'confidence that you will take our ∇views into account*
- d) so-called 'bad faith' presupposition: *it is helpful to see that you are beginning to understand the need to take parliament's view into account*

In terms of delivery, Elles's speed is such that his metatextual asides, such as *and this is the question*, are intonationally indistinguishable from more deadly mid-sentence interruptions like *do you believe that parliament you've been eulogizing about the need to cooperate with parliament that we should be consulted* (in the official transcript the two sentences have been tidied up). Since he has a great deal of ground to cover in his allotted two minutes, the speaker sometimes latches, so that his intonation shows closure but there is no perceptible break (*there's ↑NOTHING in those codes of ↓conduct=LASTly*).

Of these features, according to the hypothesis, we should expect the interpreters to secure the semantic and pragmatic categories, i.e. a) and d), and pay rather less attention to b) and c).

*Mr Kinnock's contribution*

Throughout the hearing Kinnock seeks to cajole his audience with a brief humorous or even affectionate introduction as he takes on each new speaker, and a more business-like approach to the criticism or the questions raised. He thus makes a point of treating each questioner as a long-standing colleague with legitimate concerns. His use of irony in his first answer to Elles is the only occurrence at the hearing of humour turned *against* an opponent.

The transcription below covers the first half of his two answers, where most of the relational information is concentrated:

Madam president [[overlap: danke schön – bitte]] madam president, I think these are rounds 'two, three, 'four, >five, six, seven, 'eight, nine, ten, eleven and ↑twelve<.

I 'am, however, 'grateful to mister Elles, for his question, ↑if I can take issue with this FIR:ST 'sentence, that he has 'seVE:RE DOUBTS about eh allowing any member of the 'previous commission to return, >I think it's actually 'stronger< than that (.) I 'do believe I'm correct in saying that ↑mister Elles 'fought the European e'lection (.) on a pledge not to al'LO:W any previous commissioner to come back, and that the 'leader of his group made a 'statement be'fore (.) hardly ANY commissioners had been √heard (.) in this parliament last week, to the effect that they were 'going to op'pose the reTURN.

There are 'some members of the European parliament (.) NOT of eh of >political affiliation to 'me< (.) who've offered me the question 'why √should any of the British conservatives turn up (.) to any of the 'hearings when their minds have already been made 'up , but I 'know mister Elles is 'broadminded (.) and 'doubtlessly, that is why he's here, asking sensible questions (.) this morning. [[pauses for audience who are knocking on tables]]

ehm (.) I (.) 'acCEPT (.) the recommen↗dations 'in (.) 'their (.) 'breadth, of the comité des sages, and (.) eh I recognize (.) the force (.) of the points (.) that they 'put.

In'deed as I said earlier this morning, if that had not been the case, I would not have ac'cepted col'lective responsi'bility, and resigned, and ALso 'counselled (.) the sa:me course of action (.) for my colleagues. So I 'ac'cept √that collective responsibility.

I 'have to say, however, since mister Elles refers to a phrase from the ↑last (.) PAGE of that report, that is was difficult to find anyone with 'even the 'slightest sense of responsibility, that I together with a lot of (.) decent and hardworking people IN the commission, found that a little bit difficult to ↗take, especially when, in every day of our working lives, we were seeking to exercise (.) a 'full 'sense (.) of responsibility.

And ANY examination (.) of MY directorate general, OR my activities, will I think ↓manifest that. ↑BUT (.) I am NOT (.) 'carping, I would NOT respond with 'carping, but since he mentioned it, I thought I had in ALL honesty to say, while accepting and therefore responding to the comité des sages's report, I 'did 'have 'that re'sponse to 'that 'very spe'cific 'point.

I'm 'sorry he feels 'rePELL:ed, ↓to use his word, by erh my presence be↗fore you madam president, and that of three of my colleagues, of the current commission, I DO recall that mister Elles WAS the author of the discharge report, 'I certainly took it seriously, I believe that other colleagues ↘did.

And 'I think, that, as I said earlier, it is the ↑contents of discharge reports and 'similar documents that pro'vide us with the 'levers for CHANGe. [...]

Response to the supplementary question:

Well, 'one thing that could happen is that mister Elles could break his election pledge and actually 'vote for my confirmation which would give me the chance to ↑be in office to proceed in the manner in which I have erh indicated. But that's up to ↘him.

I'm not ↘be'ginning (..) to understand these ↗things, and I think that mister Elles 'will discover, that if he 'doesn't want to invite a sneering response, he 'shouldn't (.) offer (.) one (.) in ↘question.

As far as diligence and 'speed is concerned, I can only say that I will 'go on, as (.) I (.) have e'stablished a pattern over the last four and a half years.

And if 'he asks his colleagues, of ANY political complexion, on the ↑transport committee, whether there 'has (.) 'been, without exception, 'diligence 'and (.) 'all (.) POSsible speed, they will answer (.) yes (.) to 'both 'questions. Now I intend to proCEED ↘like that. [...]

Kinnock takes a controlled more-in-sorrow-than-in-anger attitude; in deflecting the attack, he is at pains to diminish his own political stake, with interjections like *of no political affiliation to me or ask his colleagues, of any political complexion*.

Rhetorically, his speech is characterized by the following features:

- a) address: he addresses his response to the chair (*Madam President*), not Elles
- b) metacomments: he jokes about the complexity of the question (*I think these are rounds two, three, four* (etc)); he highlights his own (unwilling) comment on an attack that is thereby branded as tasteless (*I have to say, however, since mister Elles refers* (etc), *I thought I had in all honesty to*

say... *I did have that response to that very specific point*); he names the rhetorical value of the supplementary (*sneering response*); he is ironical about the motivation behind the question (*I know mister Elles is broadminded, that's why he is here asking sensible questions*) and he denies a possible (unflattering) imputation of speech act value to himself (*I'm not carping*). The strong semantic choices are all found in this category.

- c) quotation: he quotes or echoes a range of salient phrases from the question before responding, i.e. rebutting or qualifying (*this first sentence, that he has "severe doubts", I'm sorry he feels "repelled", I DO recall he WAS the author, I'm not "beginning" to understand these things*), plus the phrase that is also quoted by Elles from the report, *that it was "difficult to find anyone with even the slightest sense of responsibility"*
- d) a recurring intonation pattern with less pronounced final falls, but with internal accents, associated with patiently stating the obvious (*I 'do recall he 'was the author, 'I took it seriously, I believe other colleagues did; I think mister Elles 'will discover, if he 'doesn't want a sneering response, he shouldn't offer one*).

From this range it can be expected that the interpreters, again, will make a priority of the semantic material that draws attention to itself, such as *carping* or *sneering* (both likely to be remote from the interpreter's normal register), and that they will seek to maintain Kinnock's contrast between the original Elles wording and the rebuttal. However, Kinnock's sorely-tried-but-patient de-emphasis may turn out to be a problem, as the normal emphasis serves as pointers in the old-new information structure of the clause.

#### 4. Results

The transcripts of the ten interpreters were scrutinized, and it was decided to compare their transfers in the following categories:

- a) the transfer of some semantically strong items, viz. *repellent, (he feels) repelled, tooth and nail, eulogizing, sneering, broadminded*
- b) the transfer of the rhythmically marked negative intensifiers, viz. *not the slightest sense, too little too late, nothing on merit...nothing*
- c) the transfer of characteristic prosodic patterns, viz. low falls and scansion (*I should know... I frankly find it repellent; I did have that response...*)
- d) the transfer of internal quotations.

In the following, the Danish segments will be grouped according to noteworthy features; this means that the individual interpreter will not figure under a fixed number and thus cannot be identified.

The indication of prosody is, of course, relative to the unmarked Danish choice. The standard intonation is an even fall over the course of a breathgroup, often a clause; steep shifts are rare, and when they occur they are marked (Grønnum 1998). Accent is also a feature of some involvement; the relatively high incidence in the extracts below shows that the interpreters are at pains to reflect the high number of accents in the input. Individual differences are noticeable: there is a spectrum of mirroring from high involvement, with changing voice timbre, to low involvement, with an almost completely smooth and unaccented rendering.

In addition to the indications of prosody, certain segments have been shaded where a distinct mimicking tone can be detected. In all cases, it is a sort of homoeopathic gesture towards affect, rather than an attempt to sound authentically outraged, hurt etc.

A: the strong words

*Example 1: (ELL) I frankly find it repellent / (KIN) I am sorry he feels "repelled"*

[the interpreter repeats an adjective in the semantic field of *repellent* to render Kinnock's repetition]

1. så finder jeg det ærlig talt øh [knirk] (.) af'skyeligt  
so frankly I find it [creek] disgusting

2. [knirk] jeg beklager at han synes at det er af'skyeligt  
[creek] I am sorry he thinks it is disgusting

1. jeg synes faktisk at det er forkasteligt  
actually I think it is objectionable

2. og je:g beKLager at han finder det for'kasteligt  
and I'm sorry he finds it objectionable

1. så synes jeg egentlig det er 'frastødende  
actually I think it is repellent

2. så sagde herr elles at han var 'fra:stødt (.) af min til'stedeværelse her  
then mister Elles said he was repelled by my presence here

1. så synes jeg faktisk det er nærmest 'afskyvækkende  
so I think it is close to odious actually

2. je:g er meget ked af at han synes det er afskyvækkende  
I'm very sorry he thinks it is odious

1. jeg synes det er uhyggeligt  
I think it is scary
2. og så er jeg 'ked af at han (...) synes det er uhyggelig at jeg sidder 'her  
and I'm sorry he thinks it is scary that I am sitting here

[downtoning: "it is unimaginable that", "I'm sorry it bothers him"]

1. i lyset af det synes jeg det faktisk er uTROLigt  
in that light I actually find it unbelievable
2. jeg er 'ked af at han øh at (.) han er ked at han er 'utilfreds med min  
tilstedeværelse her  
I am sorry that he is sorry, that he is displeased by my presence here

1. jeg ka ikke rigtig forstå at nogen ønsker at vende tilbage  
I just cannot understand that anyone wishes to return
2. og jeg ved ikke om det ge'nerer Dem  
and I don't know if it bothers you

1. <og så KA ↓man jo ikke forestille sig at [...]  
and so one really can't imagine that
2. jeg er ↑sandelig 'ked af at det ge'nerer ham ↓som han siger (.) at JEG 'sidder  
'her.  
I am so very sorry that it bothers him, as he says, that I'm sitting here

[downtoning in first round, full semantic value in second round]

1. og >sådan nogen synes jeg ikke skulle komme tilbage<  
and I think people like that should not come back
2. jeg er ked at han øh føler sig 'FRA'stødt af min tilstedeværelse  
I am sorry he feels repelled by my presence
1. så <ka jeg ikke se hvordan> folk ka ↗komme tilba:ge=  
so I can't see how people can come back
2. Jeg er ↑ked af [knirk] at øh han (...) øh føler ↑afsky ve:d min tilstedeværelse  
her  
I am sorry he feels disgust at my presence here

Result:

- 5 tone down the first item (Elles), 2 of which retain an indignant voice colouring;  
3 tone down the second item (Kinnock), while 2 join the *repellent* group;

5 upgrade *sorry* to "very sorry" or give it emphasis (not in the source, whereas a 'new-topic' high onset is heard). The upgrade is part of a stronger ironic twist in the interpreters than in the source.

*Example 2: (ELL) your own political colleagues FOUGHT the 96 discharge TOOTH and 'nail' in this committee*

[full semantic weight]

i: 96 der sloges man jo med næb og 'klør her  
in 96 they fought tooth and nail here

Deres egne politiske kolleger de øh bekæmpede det der blev lavet i det udvalg  
øh med næb og klør  
your own political colleagues they fought what was done in that committee  
tooth and nail

>Deres egne politiske kolleger< har bekæmpet dechargen fra 96 med næb og  
klør  
your own political colleagues fought the discharge from 96 tooth and nail

[fought + intensifier]

Deres egne politiske kolle:ger de kæmpede jo øh e'nergisk IMOD det her i sin  
tid  
your own political colleagues they fought this energetically back then

Deres (...) kolleger har kæmpet 'hårdt her i ud valget tidligere  
your colleagues fought hard in this committee earlier on

[weaker coverage]

Deres egne politiske øh øh kolleger [trails off]  
your own political colleagues

Deres egne politiske kolleger øh bekæmpede det her  
your own political colleagues fought this

De har jo også selv forsvaret (...) den tidligere kommission, ikke sandt  
you yourself defended the previous commission, didn't you

de alvorlige kontroverser der var i den forbindelse, >i forbindelse med< 1996  
the serious controversies that took place in that connection, in connection  
with 1996

Result:

- 3 employ the corresponding idiom "with beak and claws", i.e. "tooth and nail";  
of these 2 get the correct argumentative coherence so that it transpires what  
the fight was about;
- 2 qualify "fought" with "hard" or "energetically", 1 of these mimicks  
'pugnaciousness';
- 5 omit the item or miss the sense.

*Example 3: (ELL) you have been erh eulogizing about the need to cooperate  
with parliament*

Result:

all 10 omit this interjection, which is admittedly very fast.

*Example 4: (KIN) I think that mister Elles 'will discover, that if he 'doesn't want  
to invite a sneering response, he 'shouldn't (.) offer (.) one (.) in  $\nabla$ question.*

hvis De ikke vil ha et skarpt svar tilbage, så skal De lade være at stille sådan  
nogle 'skarpe 'spørgsmål  
If you don't want a sharp answer back, you shouldn't ask such sharp  
questions

hvis han ikke (...) ønsker (.) et øh skrapt svar så skal han heller ikke selv komme  
med skrappe  $\nabla$ bemærkninger  
if he doesn't want a sharp-tempered answer he shouldn't make sharp-  
tempered comments himself

hvis herr Elles øh øh ikke vil ha et øh et 'ube'hageligt svar så ska han ikke stille  
sine spørgsmål så ubehageligt som han gør  
if mister Elles doesn't want an unpleasant answer then he shouldn't ask his  
questions in that unpleasant fashion

hvis han IKKE vil ha (...) hvis han ikke vil ha at mit s:var er ubehageligt så ska  
han også 'stille nogle lidt mere behagelige spørgsmål  
if he doesn't want my answer to be unpleasant he can ask some rather more  
pleasant questions



hvis ikke han ønsker (.) at (.) få et grimt svar så ska han ikke stille et grimt spørgsmål  
 if he doesn't want a nasty answer he shouldn't ask a nasty question

hvis han IKKE (...) vil ha et frækt svar så skal han heller ikke komme med et frækt spørgsmål  
 if he doesn't want an impudent answer then he shouldn't put an impudent question

hvis han ikke vil ha sådan et et 'vrisst svar så ska han så ska han heller ikke give et 'vrisst spørgsmål.  
 if he doesn't want such a grumpy answer he shouldn't ask such a grumpy question

hvis han ikke ønsker (.) øh >be'stemte svar skal han ikke lægge op til dem i sine spørgsmål<  
 if he doesn't want decisive answers he should not provoke them in his questions

hvis ikke han vil ha snerrende svar så ska han ikke: øh snerre sine spørgsmål  
 if he doesn't want growling answers he should not growl his questions

Altså hvis herr elles ikk vil ha et 'frækt ↑svar så ska han la vær med at stille et øh (knirk) 'frækt ↑spørgsmål  
 I mean, if mister Elles doesn't want an impudent answer, he should leave off asking impudent questions

Result:

all 10 seek an adjective in the semantic field round "unpleasant", with variations like "sharp, grumpy, impudent";

9 repeat the adjective to transfer the anaphor *he shouldn't offer one*.

2 mimick 'reprove'.

The really unpleasant element of scorn and insult in *sneer* is not represented, and the general result is therefore downtoning.

*Example 5: (KIN) but I 'know mister Elles is 'broadminded (.) and 'doubtlessly, that is why he's here, asking sensible questions (.) this morning*

men jeg ved at herr Elles han er så han er så 'åbensindet  
 but I know that mister Elles he is he is so openminded

men jeg ved at herr Elles han øh er så øh øh så så vidtskuende og så tole'rant  
 but I know that mister Elles he is so farsighted and so tolerant

men altså ↑så snæversynet er herr Elles selvfølgelig ikke  
 but of course mister Elles is not so narrowminded

<men jeg ved at herr Elles har jo et åbent sind  
 but I know that mister Elles has an open mind

men jeg ved at herr Elles øh han øh han er øh åbent indstillet overfor nye  
 påvirkninger  
 but I know that mister Elles is open to new influences

det er formentlig fordi han øh har er 'storsindet  
 that's probably because he is generous

men øh nu ka vi jo se at øh de alligevel kommer ligesom herr Elles i dag og  
 stiller fornuftige spørgsmål [= omission]  
 but we can see that they come all the same like mister Elles and ask  
 sensible questions

men jeg ved at øh han er ↓large  
 but I know that he is broadminded

<men nu er han jo nok meget 'åben ham herr Elles  
 but of course he is probably very open, our mister Elles

<men nu har herr Elles været så rar at komme og stille en masse fornuftige  
 spørgsmål, ↑det er jo ↗dejligt>  
 but now mister Elles has been so kind as to come and ask a lot of sensible  
 questions, that is so nice

Result:

all 10 express praise;

8 use adjectives from the field of "open, openminded, tolerant, generous";

6 intensify with discourse particles of assumed assent, *så* and *jo* and *nok* "so  
 open, so farsighted", which add to the ironic flavour;

4 have a distinguishable mocking tone;

2 make the irony explicit: "he's [...] very open, our Mr Elles", "he's been so kind  
 [...], that's so nice" (last two in the list).

B: stressed negative intensifiers

*Example 6: (ELL) it is be'coming difficult to find 'anyone who has even the SLIGHtest sense of responsibility*

nogen som havde den 'mindste ↑SM:ULE ansvarlighed tilbage  
anyone who had the least bit of conscientiousness left

nogen der over↑hovedet har de 'mindste i'deer hva ansvar 'er  
anyone at all who has the slightest idea what responsibility is

'nogen der blot har en ANtydning af ansvar  
anyone with just a hint of responsibility

NOGen . overhovedet som har den allermindste ↑skær af ansvarsøhbevidsthed  
anyone at all who has the least little suggestion of a sense of responsibility

'nogen som helst som har den 'mindste ansvarsfølelse  
anyone at all who has the least bit of responsibility

nogen som har den MINDste fornemmelse af sit 'eget '↘ansvar  
anyone who has the slightest feeling of his own responsibility

nogen der har . den . 'mindste form for ansvarlighed  
anyone who has slightest form of conscientiousness

nogen i kommissionen som har den ↑mindste 'ansvarsfølelse  
anyone in the commission who has the slightest sense of responsibility

no:gen der har den 'mindste 'ansvars' ↑fø:lelse  
anyone with the slightest sense of responsibility

nogen der havde bare den mindste 'smule ansvar  
anyone with the least little bit of responsibility

Result:

all 10 include emphasis;

8 include extra material ("the slightest idea", "the least little bit");

7 have extra loudness and/or marked prosody shifts, over and above the accents;

2 mimick 'indignation'

*Example 7: (ELL) everything was the hallmark of ↑too little, 'too late*

der var det alt sammen alt for sent og alt for 'lidt  
everything was much too late and much too little

der var det altsammen for 'lidt og for 'sent  
everything was too little and too late

det var altsammen for 'lidt og for 'se:nt  
everything was too little and too late

>der var det alt sammen< for 'sent og for 'lidt  
there everything was too late and too little

det var noget med too lit- for 'lidt og for 'sent  
it was about too lit- too little and too late

der var det hele tiden too little too late  
it was all the time too little too late

der var det altid for 'lidt og det var altid for 'sent  
it was always too little and always too late

der har været for 'lidt og det er kommet for 'sent  
there has been too little and it has been too late

>der var det alt sammen noget der kom< for 'sent og der var ikke 'nok af det  
everything came too late and there wasn't enough of it

de:r var der simpelthen øh alt for for 'få reaktioner som kom alt for 'sent på  
alting  
there were simply much too few reactions which came too late for  
everything

Result:

all 10 have the parallel, 9 have a repeat construction;

8 have two rhythmic accents.

*Example 8: (ELL) in this document which we were circulated, where there's  
'nothing in terms of ↑MERit, or 'MANagement, mana'gerial ca'pacity, which*

you have 'also been talking about this morning, there's >NOTHING in those codes of ↓conduct<

[more emphatic second 'nothing']

hvor der 'intet står om øh at man har øh 'lederkapacitet eller har gjort sig fortjent som De også taler om <det står der INTET om i Deres øh forslag her>

where there is 'nothing about having managerial capacity or merit as you mention too, there is NOTHING in your suggestion here

der er jo ikke rigtig noget med om 'merits eller ommm (knirk) ledelseskvalifikationer og så videre, det står der ikke NOGet ↓som 'helst om her

there doesn't seem to be anything really about merits or about managerial capacity and so on, there is NOTHING at all about that

hvor der ikke står noget >der står faktisk 'ikke noget om merit der står ikke noget om 'ledelseevne<, det er også noget De har været inde på som øhm det er IKKE med i disse adfærdskodeks

where there is nothing, actually there isn't anything about merit, there is 'nothing about managerial capacity which you were talking about which-, it is NOT included in these codes of conduct

hvor der ikke tales om fortjenester og 'leder'evner som De jo også har været inde på her til formiddag der er INTet i her

where there is no talk of merit or managerial capacity which you also touched upon this morning, there is NOTHING in here

hvor der 'ikke står noget om øh for'tjeneste eller øh 'ledelseevner som De 'også har talt om her til formiddag='ingen 'ingenting i disse adfærdskodeks

where there 'isn't anything about merit or managerial capacity which you were talking about this morning, 'no- 'nothing in these codes of conduct

der står 'ikk noget om øh 'evne 'managementevne som De også har nævnt, der står 'ikke 'noget i codes of conduct herom

there is 'nothing about capacity, management capacity which you also mentioned, there is 'no'thing in the codes of conduct about that

[equal or stronger first version]

hvor der ikke står no:get om øh managementevner og øh og så videre= det står der ikke noget om i adfærdskodeksen

where there is nothing about managerial capacity and so on, there is nothing about it in the codes of conduct

hvor der ikke siges 'noget som 'helst om< om 'merit øh 'ledelsesevner øh du De har også selv >talt om ledelsesevner her til formiddag<, der står intet om det i adfærdskodeks

where there is 'nothing whatsoever about merit or managerial capacity, you yourself talked about managerial capacity this morning, there is nothing about it in the codes of conduct

der står overHOvedet ikke noget om lederevner som De var inde på her til formiddag, det står der ikke noget om i adfærdskodeksen

there is nothing whatsoever about managerial capacity as you were talking about this morning, there is nothing about it in the codes of conduct

Result:

all 10 repeat *nothing*, despite the fact that second time around it is informationally empty;

7 have a more emphatic second version, mirroring the original;

5 bolster the emphasis with an intensifier ("nothing at all, nothing whatever").

One person only, the interpreter with the least accents of all in the corpus, has no accent on either *nothing*. One case, the last one quoted above, has the main emphasis in the first round, but it is spoken immediately after the speaker's second emphasis, possibly reflecting the sort of effect noted by Williams, where incoming emphasis produces an immediate emphasis even though the interpreter has got to a different place in the utterance.

### C: prosodic attitude markers

*Example 9: (ELL) ↓>I frankly find it repellent that anyone wishes (.) to come ↗back ↘again<.*

[drop]

>og så KA ↓man jo ikke forestille sig at der er nogen af dem der vil fortsætte i den nye: kommission<

so one really CAN't imagine that any of them wishes to continue in the new commission

[emphasis]

i lyset af det synes jeg det faktisk er uTROLig at der over'hovedet er nogen der har LYST til at sidde i den nye kommission  
 in that light I actually find it unbelIEVable that there should be anyone at all who WISHES to sit on the new commission

så synes jeg egentlig det er 'frastødende at nogen overhovedet har et 'ønske om at komme tilbage  
 actually I think it is re'pellent that anyone should have a 'wish to come back

så finder jeg det ærlig talt øh [knirk] (.) af'skyeligt at nogen overhovedet øh har 'lyst til at komme tilbage  
 so frankly I find it [creek] dis'gusting that anyone should even 'want to come back

og så synes jeg faktisk det er nærmest 'afskyvækkende at nogen ku finde på at komme tilbage igen.  
 so I think it is close to 'odious actually that anyone could think of coming back again

så >ka jeg ikke se hvordan< folk ka 7komme tilba:ge  
 so I can't see how people can 'come back

og jeg synes faktisk at det er forkasteligt at nogen ønsker at komme til'bage igen  
 and actually I think it is objectionable for anyone to wish to come 'back again

[neutral]

jeg ka ikke rigtig forstå at nogen ønsker at vende tilbage på den baggrund  
 I just cannot understand that anyone wishes to come back on that background

og jeg synes det er uhyggeligt at nogen så vil vende tilbage i den situation.  
 and I think it's alarming that anyone wants to return in that situation

og >sådan nogen synes jeg ikke skulle komme tilbage<.  
 and I think people like that shouldn't come back

The speaker's low drop contour leaves the heavy semantic item *repellent* unstressed (but very distinctly pronounced). The voice climbs back to its base rate from about *anyone*, so that *back* serves as the sentence focus.

## Result:

1 uses a drop contour, mirroring the speaker;  
 6 mark some involvement by accents; 3 have accents on both the *repellent*-  
 adjective and the *wish*-noun;  
 3 sound 'repelled'.

*Example 10: (KIN) I thought I had in ALL honesty to say, while accepting and therefore responding to the comité des sages's report, I 'did 'have 'that re'sponse to 'that 'very spe'cific 'point.*

og ↑det var et specifikt spørgsmål det har jeg nu ↓svaret på.  
 and that was a specific question, which I have now dealt with

og der kan jeg altså svare på denne måde til dette specifikke punkt.=  
 so I can answer in this way on that specific point

og (..) det var altså min reaktion på det specifikke punkt  
 and that was my reaction to that specific point

så der må jeg altså påpege dette specifikke punkt.  
 so I must point out this specific point here

det er 'mit svar til dette meget specifikke ↑spørgsmål.  
 that is my answer to this very specific question

så er det altså mit svar.  
 so that is my answer

det var mit svar til det specifikke punkt.  
 that was my answer to that specific point

men lige præcis 'den sætning der har jeg IKKE lyst til at reagere på.=  
 just precisely that sentence I DON'T want to react to

[omitted metatext]

jeg mener jeg har handlet ansvarsbevidst.

I think I have conducted myself responsibly  
 og det synes jeg også at jeg 'selv per'sonligt har 'gjort.  
 and I think that 'I 'personally have 'done that



Result:

all 10 retain the element of closure, with marked sentence-final intonation, despite two latches that hurry to the next chunk;

8 further mark closure either through intonation that picks out the *specific point* as an irregular question that has been dealt with, or through the discourse particle *altså*, which is used for summing up and re-stating. Nobody imitates the speaker's set of accents, but the last segment in the list retains three rhythmic beats, despite the fact that the semantic material deals with Kinnock's "in all honesty."

D: internal quotations: crediting the source

*Example 11: (ELL) we recall what the(.) the (.) rePORT said: eh it said, [[reads aloud]] it is be'coming difficult to find 'anyone who has even the SLIGHtest sense of responsibility*

i rapporten (.) stod der at det er svært at finde nogen i kommissionen som har den ↑mindste 'ansvarsfølelse  
in the report it said that it was difficult to find anyone in the commission who has the slightest sense of responsibility

hvis vi lige prøver at se på hvad der står i rapporten ja så står der der at det er vanskeligt at finde nogen som har den MINDste fornemmelse af sit 'eget 'ansvar  
if we just have a look at what it says in the report, well it says that it was difficult to find anyone who has the slightest feeling of their own responsibility

hvis vi prøver at se på hva der stod i den gamle rapport så (.) stod der jo at man ikke ku finde nogen som havde den 'mindste ↑SM:ULE ansvarlighed tilbage  
if we take a look at what it said in the old report, it said that it was impossible to find anyone who had the least bit of conscientiousness left

ka De huske hva: rapporten sagde=den sagde det er ved at blive vanskeligt at finde 'nogen der blot har en ANtydning af ansvar  
do you remember what it said in the report, it said it was becoming difficult to find anyone with just a hint of responsibility

som der stod i rapporten fra vismandsgruppen så var det svært at finde nogen der havde bare den mindste 'smule ansvar

as it said in the report from the Wise Men it was difficult to find anyone with the least little bit of responsibility

hvis vi noterer os hva: rapporten siger så ka vi høre eller se at den siger det blir 'svæ:rt at finde no:gen der har den 'mindste 'ansvars' ↑fø:lelse  
if we note what it said in the report we can hear, or see that it says it will be difficult to find anyone with the slightest sense of responsibility

domstolen sagde at det blir vanskelig at finde nogen der har (.) den (.) 'mindste form for ansvarlighed  
the court said that it will be difficult to find anyone who has the slightest sense of conscientiousness

De vil kunne huske: hva rapporten siger? (...) det er svært at finde nogen der over↑hovedet har de 'mindste i'deer hva ansvar 'er.  
you will remember what the report says? it is difficult to find anyone at all who has the slightest idea what responsibility is

>vi ka huske hva der står i rapporten der blev sagt i rapporten at det blir vanskeligt at finde< NOGen (.) overhovedet som har den allermindste ↑skær af ansvarsøhbevidsthed  
we must remember what it says in the report, it was stated in the report that it will be difficult to find anyone at all who has the least little suggestion of a sense of responsibility

med hensyn til rapporten (.) så står der jo >i den< det er svært at finde 'nogen som helst som har den 'mindste ansvarsfølelse  
as for the resport it says there that it is difficult to find anyone at all who has the least bit of responsibility

Result:

all 10 explicitly mention the source of the quotation; there is no problem about attribution here.

*Example 12: (KIN) I 'have to say, however, since mister Elles refers to a phrase from the ↑last (.) PAGE of that report, that is was difficult to find anyone with 'even the 'slightest sense of responsibility. that I together with a lot of (.) decent and hardworking people*

[correct attribution]

men jeg må 'også sige at eftersom herr Elles henviser til noget der står på allersidste side i ↗rapporten at det var meget v:anskeligt at finde nogen der havde den mindste smule ansvarlighed ↗tilbage, >det var også det der stod på sidste side<

but I must add that as mister Elles refers to something on the very last page of the report, that it was very difficult to find anyone who had the slightest sense of responsibility left, as it said on the last page

men samtidig så må jeg 'sige at nu refererer herr Elles til en sætning fra den 'sidste 'side i den ↘rapport , ↓det var 'vanskeligt at finde 'nogen der havde det 'mindst den 'mindste ff:or'nemmelse af 'ansvar,

but at the same time I must say that now mister Elles refers to a sentence from the last page of that report, that it was difficult to find anyone who had the least sense of responsibility

jeg må men jeg må sige at øh eftersom herr Elles refererer til en sætning fra 'sidste 'side i den rapport at ↓det var vanskeligt at finde NOGen med blot en SMULE ansvarsfølelse –

but I must I must say that since mister Elles refers to a sentence from the last page of the report, that it was difficult to find anyone with the slightest sense of responsibility

men nu s- men nu henviser herr Elles til noget som står på den 'sidste 'side af denne rapport at det var vanskeligt at finde en 'eneste med den MIndste følelse af ansvar

but now mister Elles refers to something it says on the last page of this report, that it was difficult to find a single person with the least sense of responsibility

så henviser herr Elles til en sætning på den sidste side i rapporten hvor der 'står at det var svært at finde en embedsmand der havde det den 'mindste ansvarsfølelse.

then mister Elles refers to a sentence on the last page of the report where it says that it was difficult to find an official who had the slightest sense of responsibility

Jeg må ↗imidlertid sige da nu herr Elles henviser til en sætning fra: den 'sidste 'side i: rapporten at det var 'vanskeligt at finde nogen med bare den mindste ansvarsfølelse

I must say however, since mister Elles refers to a sentence from the last page in the report, that it was difficult to find anyone with just the least sense of responsibility

men når nu herr Elles henviser til en sætning fra den sidste side fra rapporten den der siger at det var 'svært at 'finde 'nogen med bare den 'mindste s- [knirk] fornemmelse for ansvar

but now that mister Elles refers to a sentence from the last page of the report where it says that it was difficult to find anyone with just the slightest sense of responsibility

[problems with the attribution of source]

MEN alligevel må jeg sige at når nu herr Elles henviser til noget der står SIDST i rapporten ja så er det svært at finde nogen selv med den mindste form for ansvarlighed ... siger de.

but all the same I must say that when mister Elles refers to something that it says at the end of the report, well then it is difficult to find anyone with just the slightest sense of responsibility ... they say

men jeg må dog sige at når herr Elles nu omtaler en sætning fra sidste 'side i den rapport øh så vil jeg sige at det var 'vanskeligt at finde 'nogen øh med politisk ansvar ↓stod der dør.

but I must say however that when mister Elles refers to a sentence from the last page of that report, then I must say that it was difficult to find anyone with political responsibility, it said there

men som herr Elles refererer til en sætning fra den 'sidste SIDE af denne rapport så vil jeg sige at det var s- at det skulle have været svært at finde ↑nogen der overhovedet har en 'ide om hvad ansvar er

but as mister Elles refers to a sentence from the last page of this report then I must say that it was diff- that it was supposed to have been difficult to find anyone at all with any idea of responsibility

Result:

7 attribute correctly;

3 catch a misunderstanding, 2 by an incoherent addition. These interpreters translate as if the coherence had been "I have to say (since Mr Elles refers to a phrase from the last page of that report), that it was difficult to find...". The two corrections add "- they say", and one catches the modal: "I must say that it was diff- that it was supposed to have been difficult".

*Example 13: (KIN) I'm not beginning .. to understand these things, and I think that mister Elles 'will discover, that if he doesn't want to invite a sneering response, he 'shouldn't (.) offer (.) one (.) in question.*

[correct attribution]

det er ikke noget jeg bare er be'gyndt 'på NU at forstå de her ting  
it isn't something that I have only begun now to understand these things

det er ikke fordi jeg bare be'gynder at forstå de her ting  
it is not that I am only be'ginning to understand these things

JEG 'be ↑gynder ikke . at forstå disse ting .  
'I am not be'ginning to understand these things

[mistake]

↑nu begynder jeg at for'stå det ↓her lidt bedre,  
I'm beginning to understand this a little better

< men øh ↑je:g . begynder at se på tingene nu  
but I'll begin to look into things now

jamen øh jeg forstår [knirk] [trails off]  
well, I understand

Result:

3 retain the correct denial of Elles's presupposition, that the understanding was recent, 2 by adding explicit material ("it isn't something I'm just beginning to understand now"), while 1 relies on the speaker's quotation intonation with a high reset;

4 omit the segment;

3 miss the quotation *and* the negation ("I'm beginning to understand a little better", "I'll start to look into things now")

*Example 14: (KIN) I'm 'sorry he feels 'rePEll:ed, ↓to use his word, by erh my presence be7fore you madam president, and that of three of my collegues, of the current commission, I DO recall that mister Elles WAS the author of the discharge report, 'I certainly took it seriously, I believe that other colleagues ↘did.*

[correctly heard as already available information]

>altså jeg ved godt herr Elles var< forfatter til dischargerapporten  
I know very well that mister Elles was the author of the discharge report

jeg [knirk] ka også godt huske at herr Elles havde ansvaret for dechargerapporten den 7gang

I remember very well that mister Elles was responsible for the discharge report at the time

jeg ka 'godt 'huske herr Elleses andel i rapporten fra 1996.

I remember mister Elles' part in the report from 1996 very well

[neutral or weakened]

>jeg ka godt se herr Elles< er ophavsmand til dischargerapporten ...

I realize that mister Elles is the author of the discharge report

= jeg husker hvad De gjorde med dechargerapporten i 96

I remember what you did with the discharge report of 96

jeg ka huske at herr Elles øh 'stod for dechargerapporten

I remember that mister Elles was in charge of the discharge report

[mistakenly heard as new information]

jeg vil 'lige ↑minde om at herr Elles var med til at øh gi os decharge

I will just remind you the mister Elles was one of the people who gave us décharge

men jeg ka da 'huske at herr Elles var for'fatter 'til en rapport der gav kommissionen 7decharge

well, but I remember that mister Elles was the 'author of a report that gave the commission décharge

men jeg 'husker at herr Elles han også var med til at udarbejde de'chargerapporten

but I remember that mister Elles, he was also one of the authors of the discharge report

jeg ↑husker jeg at herr 'Elles 'selv var med til at udarbejde 'budgetgodkendelsesrapporten, >sammen med andre kolleger selvfølgelig.<

I remember that mister 'Elles him'self was one of the authors of the budget discharge report, together with other colleagues of course

Result:

- 3 explicitly mark the segment as as part of the refutation of Elles's implication that Kinnock must have forgotten Elles's authority ("I'd remind you, Mr Kinnock... I should know, I am the author"). *Jeg kan godt huske* and *jeg ved godt* retain the element of "I remember perfectly well";
- 4 hear Kinnock's emphasis as a contrast, as if the cohesion was "I'm sorry he feels repelled [old, 'rehearsed' information], but I remember that he was the author of the report that gave us *décharge* [new information]". This has repercussions for the argument: it changes the rest of the passage to "so I and other colleagues took the *décharge* seriously", rather than "I and other colleagues took the criticism in the report seriously".

## 5. Discussion

Section A, the 'strong words', is not as clearly a priority as our hypothesis led us to believe; *repellent* was down to 5 representations, *tooth and nail* to 3, *eulogizing* to 0, and *sneering* somewhat toned down all round.

There might be several reasons for this: *tooth and nail* is an adverbial of manner, and *eulogizing* a metatextual speech act verb that figured in an interjection; both can be dropped without disturbing the main message. As for *repellent* and *sneering*, they were central and had to be represented; it may be offered as a guess that both items were too far away from the interpreters' main vocabulary for them to present semantically adequate candidates, but it could also be the case that there is an inbuilt tendency to smooth over unnecessary unpleasantness, just as the interpreters do not reproduce a sneering tone of voice.

*Broadminded* fared much better, with a high representation and several attempts to boost the irony, (which was also the case with *sorry*); similar reasoning suggests that *broadminded* is easier to get at as a semantic item and/or that there is no internal censorship against humour, even of the more combative kind.

Section B, the stressed negatives, with the rhetorical trope of parallel emphasis, had a very strong score.

The emphasis on *SLIGHtest sense of responsibility* was not only reproduced, it was boosted with intensifiers; the parallism of *too little, too late* was intact; and the *nothing... NOTHING* was massively retained, despite a chance to gain time by omitting an empty repetition.

This section seems to document a positive priority for rhetorical features. It is fair to mention that the constructions have not been seriously challenging for the interpreters in terms of cognitive effort, but on the other hand, there is much

more pitch movement and accent in this section than would come naturally to speakers of Danish unless they were conscious of a rhetorical effort. We must conclude that the hypothesis holds in so far that it states that emphasis will be retained if the constructions are similar, but that the amount rather outstrips the expectations.

For section C, the prosodic attitude markers, the expectations were low. Both the prosodic patterns in question exist in Danish (low, level voice for contempt or 'cold' anger and repeated accents for involvement of many varieties), but due to the generally flatter intonation structure they are more marked when they do occur than the British counterpart. Also, the patterns are not part of the generalized, stereotypical register of 'voices' that people use for everyday mimicking of a second voice.

What we find is transfer that is clearly marked for affect, with emphasis and prosodic shifts, but not in the same places as the source. It seems that a majority of the interpreters react to the emotive content and substitute some sort of 'normal' emphasis. This is particularly apparent with the low, emphasis-free stretch  $\downarrow > I \text{ frankly find it repellent that anyone wishes } (.) \text{ to come } \nearrow \text{back } \searrow \text{again} <$ , where one person actually drops her voice, while six include both prosodic shifts and emphasis that would have been there if the speaker had been normally involved (i.e., stressed *repellent* and *wish*). Again, it is possible that the normalizing effect screens out relational unpleasantness: contemptuousness is not in the reproducible range.

Section D, the internal quotations, is clearly the most problematic.

The hypothesis predicted that argumentative coherence would have a high priority, and that the information structure of the utterances would therefore be carefully scrutinized for the distribution of new and old information. In all probability this is still the case, but in this section we see actual mistakes that derail the argumentation structure for several interpreters, much as if they had not paid a great deal of attention.

One likely explanation is that Kinnock's emotive intonation, with its de-emphasis, leads the interpreters astray. A phrase like *I DO recall that mister Elles WAS the author of the discharge report*, which in context merely confirms a piece of information that is available from the previous utterance, can be misheard as intensifying emphasis, as in "Oh, I DO like to be beside the seaside", and if it has been categorized as such, it is possible that it transfers to *I*, so that we get a contrast of "him versus me" (for possibly misleading de-emphasis, see review in Yeager-Dror 2002).

Similarly, if the stereotypical marker for internal quotation is a high reset, as in "talks were  $\uparrow$ 'frank', according to the minister", then Kinnock's low-drop *I'm*



*not*  $\sphericalangle$ *be'ginning* (..) *to understand* is misleading. In terms of prosody, he holds out the word in two fingers and pauses briefly in distaste, to let the audience understand that he dissociates himself from the underlying presupposition. But if this cue is missed, it is cognitively hard to make sense of a phrase like "I'm not beginning to understand this"; negatives like *not* are notoriously difficult to hear (Kaufmann 2002) and may be missed in interpretation (Bülow-Møller 2000), and in this case, it makes sense to discard the negative and hear "However, I'm beginning to understand".

### Conclusion

The tentative conclusions from these observations must be

- a) that the speaker's tone is an important part of the message, and that emotive prosody can be misleading when it runs counter to a normal informational pattern,
- b) that interpreters in the experiment note the relational content of the speeches they hear, and reproduce as much as they can in terms of semantic content and rhetorical tropes,
- c) that they may adopt an emotive tone of voice briefly and in audible quotation marks, depending on personal inclination,
- d) but that they tend to normalize, so that less frequently heard emotive patterns are substituted by an expected one,
- e) and that the whole operation may be subject to a norm of decency, whereby unpleasant negative affect is screened out more frequently than a positive counterpart.

Before the experiment the interpreters were asked a long list of questions about their preferences and priorities and strategies. One of the questions – the target question for this part of the corpus – related to the importance they attached to rendering the 'mood' and 'attitude' of the speaker. Everyone answered with variations on the theme that basically that was they were there *for*. It is interesting to note that in practice some interpreters produce something that could have been a written version of the speech read aloud in a stop-and-go pattern, and others add dramatic touches, while the whole group believe they are transferring the same amount of message.

## References

- Arnt H. and Janney R.W. (1987): *InterGrammar. Toward an Integrative Model of Verbal, Prosodic and Kinesic Choices in Speech*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Biber D. and Finegan E. (1989): "Styles of stance in English: Lexical and grammatical marking of evidentiality and affect", *Text* 9.1, pp. 93-124.
- Blum-Kulka S. (1986): "Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation", in *Interlingual and intercultural communication*. Ed. by J. House and S. Blum-Kulka, Tübingen, Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik, nr. 272, pp. 17-35.
- Bülow-Møller A.M. (1999): "Existential problems: On the processing of irrealis in simultaneous interpreting", *Interpreting* 4.2, pp. 145-168.
- Bülow-Møller A.M. (2001): "Using textlinguistic methodologies for analysing processing in simultaneous interpretation", in *New Directions in Nordic Text linguistics and Discourse Analysis: Methodological Issues*. Ed. by W. Wagle and K. Wikberg, Oslo, Novus, pp. 101-112.
- Caffi C. and Janney R.W. (1994): "Toward a pragmatics of emotive communication", *Journal of Pragmatics* 22, pp. 325-373.
- Canary D.J., Spitzberg B.H. and Semic B.A. (1998): "The experience and expression of anger in interpersonal settings", *Handbook of Communication and Emotion: Research, Theory, Applications and Contexts*, Academic Press, pp. 189-213.
- Chafe W. (1994): *Discourse, Consciousness, and Time. The flow and displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Clark H.H. and Gerrig R.J. (1990): "Quotations as demonstrations", *Language* 66, pp. 764-805.
- Couper-Kuhlen E. (1986): *An Introduction to English Prosody*, London, Arnold.
- Dam H.V. (1993): "Text condensing in consecutive interpreting", in Y. Gambier and J. Tømmola (eds.), pp. 297-313.
- Drescher M. (2001): "The negotiation of affect in natural conversation", in *Negotiation and Power in Dialogic Interaction*. Ed. by E. Weigand and M. Dascal, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, John Benjamins, pp. 183-196.
- DuFon M.A. (1993): "Referential and relational meaning in interpreted discourse", *Journal of Pragmatics* 20, pp. 533-558.
- Edwards D. (1997): *Discourse and Cognition*, London, Sage.
- Edwards D. (1999): "Emotion discourse", *Culture and Psychology* 5.3, pp. 271-291.
- Englund Dimitrova B. (1993): "Semantic change in translation – a cognitive perspective", in Gambier and Tømmola (eds.), pp. 285-296.

- Fiske S.T. and Taylor S.E. (1991): *Social Cognition*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, New York, McGraw-Hill.
- Forgas J.P. and George J.M. (2001): "Affective influence on judgments and behavior in organizations: an information processing perspective", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 86.1: pp. 3-34.
- Frick R.W. (1985): "Communicating emotion. The role of prosodic features", *Psychological Bulletin* 97.3, pp. 412-429.
- Gambier Y. and Tømmola J. (eds.) (1993): *Translation and Knowledge*, Scandinavian Symposium on Translation Theory IV, Turku, Centre for Translation and Interpreting, University of Turku.
- Grønnum N. (1998): *Fonetik og fonologi. Almen og dansk*, København, Akademisk Forlag.
- Gumperz J.J. (1992): "Contextualization and understanding", in *Rethinking Context*. Ed. by A. Duranti and C. Goodwin, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 229-52.
- Günthner S. (1996): "The prosodic contextualization of moral work: an analysis of reproaches in 'why'formats", in *Prosody in conversation*. Ed. by E. Couper-Kuhlen and M. Selting, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 271-302.
- Janney R.W. (1999): "Words as gestures", *Journal of Pragmatics* 31, pp. 953-972.
- Janney R.W. (2002): "Context as context", *Language & Communication* 22, pp. 457-475.
- Klewitz G. and Couper-Kuhlen E. (1999): "Quote – Unquote? The role of prosody in the contextualization of reported speech sequences", *Pragmatics* 9.4, pp. 459-85.
- Knowles G. (1984): "Variable strategies in intonation", in *Intonation, accent and rhythm*. Ed. by D. Gibbon and H. Richter, Berlin, de Gruyter, pp. 226-242.
- Kurz I. (2001): "Conference interpreting: Quality in the ears of the user", *Meta* 46:2, pp. 394-409.
- Moser P. (1996): "Expectations of users of conference interpretation", *Interpreting* 1.2, pp. 145-78.
- Ochs E. and Schieffelin B. (1989): "Language has a heart", *Text* 9.1, pp.7-25.
- Potter J. (1996): *Representing Reality. Discourse, rhetoric and social construction*, London, Sage.
- Potter J. and Wetherell M. (1987): *Discourse and Social Psychology*, London, Sage.
- Pöschhacker F. (2001): "Quality assessment in conference and community interpreting", *Meta* 46:2, pp. 410-425.

- Scherer K.R. (1986): "Vocal Affect Expression: A review and a model for future research", *Psychological Bulletin* 99.2, pp. 143-165.
- Selting M. (1994): "Emphatic speech style - with special focus on the prosodic signalling of heightened emotive involvement in conversation", *Journal of Pragmatics* 22, pp. 375-408.
- Setton R. (1998): "Meaning Assembly in simultaneous interpretation", *Interpreting* 3.2, pp. 163-199.
- Setton R. (1999): *Simultaneous Interpretation: a cognitive-pragmatic analysis*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
- Shlesinger M. (1994): "Intonation in the production and perception of simultaneous interpretation", in *Bridging the Gap. Empirical research in simultaneous interpretation*. Ed. by S. Lambert and B. Moser-Mercer, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, John Benjamins, pp. 225-236.
- Shlesinger M. (1995): "Shifts in cohesion in simultaneous interpretation", *The Translator* 1.2, pp. 193-214.
- Williams S. (1995): "Observations on anomalous stress in interpreting", *The Translator* 1.1, pp. 47-64.
- Yaeger-Dror M. (2002): "Register and prosodic variation, a cross language comparison", *Journal of Pragmatics* 34, pp. 1495-1536.

#### Appendix: transcription conventions

- CAP Capitals indicate extra loudness; for ease of reading, proper names and the pronoun *I* have also been spelt with a capital, which is strictly speaking incorrect
- ' An accent in front of a syllable indicates emphasis
- (.) Micropauses are marked with one or (rarely) two dots in brackets
- > < Accelerated speech is put between arrows, as in >if I may say so<
- . Full stops indicate final intonation
- , Commas indicate normal 'unfinished' intonation
- : Colons indicate a lengthened sound, both vowels and consonants, as in *significant doubts: frankly*.
- ↓↑ arrows indicate a marked shift in pitch, up, down, or marked glides
- = equation signs indicate latching, i.e. no perceptible break in the flow of sound where a pause was to be expected, as in *there's ↑NOTHING in those codes of ↓conduct=LASTly, do you think that as the 'WISE 'men have said in their 'second report [...]*
- shade shaded areas in the interpreted text indicate a voice quality that mimicks an emotion, as in *så synes jeg egentlig det er 'frastødende*, ('I think it is repellent'), which sounds 'disgusted'