

# Coordinating Participation in Dialogue Interpreting

*Edited by*

Claudio Baraldi

Laura Gavioli

Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia

John Benjamins Publishing Company

Amsterdam / Philadelphia

Inv. 2124 del 24/12/2013



The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of the American National Standard for Information Sciences - Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

!

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Coordinating participation in dialogue interpreting / edited by Claudio Baraldi, Laura Gavioli.

p. cm. (Benjamins Translation Library, ISSN 0929-7316 ; v. 102)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Translating and interpreting. 2. Dialogue. 3. Social interaction. I. Baraldi, Claudio. II. Gavioli, Laura.

P306.2.C67 2012

418'.02--dc23

2012031480

ISBN 978 90 272 2452 1 (Hb ; alk. paper)

ISBN 978 90 272 7307 9 (Eb)

© 2012 - John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

John Benjamins Publishing Co. · P.O. Box 36224 · 1020 ME Amsterdam · The Netherlands  
John Benjamins North America · P.O. Box 27519 · Philadelphia PA 19118-0519 · USA

*To the memory of Francesco Straniero Sergio*

!

## CHAPTER 3

### **“You are not too funny”**

#### **Challenging the role of the interpreter on Italian talkshows\***

Francesco Straniero Sergio  
University of Trieste

Drawing on conversation analysis and politeness theory, this chapter deals with repair, face-work and participation (footing) shifts in interpreter-mediated talkshows. In order to account for the specific features of this form of dialogue interpreting, the notion of ‘controlling participation’ is suggested as a more relevant alternative to that of ‘coordinating participation’. The chapter discusses several types of other-correction and other-initiation as employed by primary speakers (usually the host) to address various aspects of the interpreter’s turn. Repairing actions, as well as other conversational moves (formulations, competitive interruptions, anticipatory completions) are described and characterized according to their face-threatening and role-challenging potential, as well the role they play as ‘part of the show’.

#### **1. Introduction**

As I have shown elsewhere (e.g. Katan and Straniero Sergio 2001, 2003; Straniero Sergio 1999, 2007), talkshows are an entertainment-oriented and host-controlled type of interaction which feature a greater visibility and involvement of the interpreter compared to other institutional contexts. Being literally in the limelight, interpreters are expected not just to have the relevant linguistic skills but also to be good performers. One of the ways in which host-control and audience-entertainment are achieved in interpreter-mediated talkshow

---

\* [Editors’ note] Francesco Straniero Sergio died in July 2011, after a sudden severe illness. This chapter is published posthumously. The editors wish to thank Caterina Falbo for her invaluable help in the final phase of editing.

interaction is by making the interpreter the object of explicit scrutiny and teasing. Her/his presence (both in the consecutive and the simultaneous modes) is a contextual resource utilized for introducing new topics and providing vignettes, with ad-libbed sketches often playing on elements of farce, all of which exploit the fact that the event is 'live'.

In the talkshow setting, perhaps it would be more appropriate to speak of controlling rather than coordinating participation. Following a classification by Linell and Luckmann (1991), the talkshow host exerts at least three types of dominance: *quantitative dominance* (the amount of speech produced), *topical dominance* (introduction of new content words, i.e. referents and concepts), and *interactional dominance* (dominant behaviour in directing interaction). Itakura (2001) has shown how instances of "successful controlling actions" (i.e. followed by complying actions) and "attempted controlling actions" (i.e. followed by non-complying actions) can be identified on the dimensions of sequential and participatory dominance. Sequential dominance "refers to an overall pattern where one speaker tends to control the direction of conversation, measured by the way in which the speakers share initiating and responding moves when creating sequences of utterances" (2001:72). Participatory dominance "refers to patterns of asymmetry where one speaker's holding on to the turn until completion following on interruption or overlap leads to the other speaker's leaving the turn incomplete and therefore losing the chance to participate in the conversation" (2001:79).

In this chapter, then, the concept of "coordinating participation" will be understood mainly as sequential and participatory dominance. I will investigate those sequential contexts in which the host (and sometimes the guest or other participants) comments, corrects, questions, rejects the interpreter's act of translating. In short, s/he initiates a repair on the interpreter's turn. More generally, I will be concerned with the moves accomplished by primary speakers through which the interpreter's role (discourse identity) is interactionally made relevant and how these moves are responded to by the interpreter.

Repair can be defined as "a mechanism that operates in conversation to deal with problems in speaking, hearing and understanding talk in conversation" (Schegloff et al. 1977:361). Such a broad term does not refer solely to *correction*, i.e. the replacement of a word by another, but rather to a series of practices through which a turn is modified in subsequent turns (Schegloff 1979, 1982, 2000). It appears that anything in talk can be a source of trouble and therefore everything is, in principle, "repairable" (Schegloff 1987:210). Schegloff et al. (1977:363-365) have distinguished between the initiation of a repair, which consists in locating 'a problem' (trouble-source or repairable) and the result of this process, that is the action of repairing and the subsequent modifications. As Schegloff (2000:19) puts it "next turns are a strategic position in which parties to talk-in-interaction

may 'react' to what another has said/done". The third turn is crucially important, because if the second turn does not correspond to what the first speaker expects, then the third turn becomes available to the first speaker to correct or repair any misunderstanding in the second turn (Heritage 1984: 257). From this perspective, repair is an important interactional resource for maintaining and restoring participants' common ground. It is an aligning mechanism which makes it possible to monitor, on a turn-by-turn basis, the state of mutual understanding among participants.

In this chapter, different repair trajectories will be described, distinguishing among different types of *other-correction* and *other-initiation*, such as *requests for clarification*. Examples will also be given of implicit *corrections* and *formulations*, through which hosts enact repair by producing alternative translations of the guest's turn, which are sequentially (and topically) antagonistic to those produced by the interpreter. These moves may also take the form of *competitive interruptions*, i.e. turn taking violations. A further category concerns *acceptability repairs*, in which what is at issue (the 'repairable') is not correctness but the (social) appropriateness of the interpreter's turn and/or role.

Following Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory, repairing actions will be considered as *face-threatening acts*, i.e. acts that may endanger the interpreter's positive and/or negative faces. Therefore, repair types will be analysed in terms of face-work, that is to say the strategies (if any) used by primary speakers which display an orientation to the positive and/or negative 'face wants' of the interpreter. At the same time, interpreters' concern for their face needs will also be analysed.

The aim of this study is also to describe how repair is managed by the interpreter in terms of participation shifts, and how the different footings (Goffman 1981) or roles (Wandensjö 1998) s/he takes on during interaction may be the result of an autonomous choice or may be explicitly (or implicitly) attributed (imposed) by the host and by the presence of an overhearing audience. As interpreting is often not necessary for host/guest reciprocal understanding (there are many occasions where understanding of the other language is shown by hosts or guests),<sup>1</sup> this may make this type of interpreting available as a target of entertainment.

The data are taken from CorIT (Television Interpreting Corpus), and, in particular, from the sub-corpus on talkshow interpreting, made up of 1500 interpretations (cf. Straniero Sergio 2007). Transcription symbols adopted here are those used in this volume and illustrated in the Introduction (see Note on transcripts and transcript notation).

---

1. See also the chapters by Meyer and Anderson, this volume, for considerations on partially transparent language barriers

## 2. Other-correction

With Jefferson (1987), we will distinguish between *exposed corrections*, "with utterances now occupied by the doing of correcting" and *embedded corrections*, "as a by-the-way occurrence in some ongoing course of talk" (1987:95). Embedded corrections are done in a way that does not overtly display the repair operation. In Extract (1), the host does not mention the perseveration error (i.e. a slip of tongue in which one word is repeated in the one that follows), but simply replaces *popolo* ("people") with *potere* ("power"). The continuity of the ongoing talk is maintained through the use of a discourse marker *appunto* ("actually"), which presents the host's turn as merely occurring routinely next in sequence:

(1) [Unomattina, Rai Uno, 18.5.1988]

- 01 G [...] la deuxième manche [est la prise du pouvoir [par la  
volonté [du peuple  
[... ] the second stage [is the seizure of power [by the  
will [of the people
- 02 I [la seconda manche [ehm::  
[è: la presa del popolo (.) da parte del popolo  
[the second stage [ehm:  
[is: the seizure of people (.) by the people
- 02 H è la presa appunto del potere da parte del popolo[...]  
it's actually the seizure of power by the people[...]

Likewise, in Extract (2), the action of correcting is not interactionally 'highlighted':

(2) [I fatti vostri, Rai Due, 20.3.1998]

- 01 G ehm well no I ehm I like to be chased
- 02 I mi piace essere inseguita  
I like to be followed
- 03 H essere cacciata e lui non si è fatto pregare insomma  
diciamo ha preso l'iniziativa ehm come l'ha corteggiata?  
to be chased and he didn't lose much time I mean he  
actually took the initiative ehm how did he court you?

In contrast, the occurrence of an error may be explicitly indicated by overt rejection and the host may apologise for the disruption of the ongoing talk:

(3) [L'infedele, La7, 17.4.2004]

- 01 G aujourd'hui la fatwa de l'Ayatollah Sistani  
today Ayatollah Sistani's fatwa
- 02 I oggi (.) ehm il fatto dell'Ayatollah Sistani  
today (.) ehm the fact of Ayatollah Sistani
- 03 H la fatwa non il fatto ((turning to G)) mi scusi (.) la  
correzione (.) prego

- fatwa not fact* ((turning to G)) *sorry* (.) *it was a correction* (.) *please*
- 04 G *qui était publié*  
*which has been published*
- 05 I *che è stata appunto pubblicata*  
*which has actually been published*

Or the interpreter may ratify the correction by repeating it in the next turn:

(4) [Domenica in, Rai Uno, 24.11.1996]

- 01 G *oui c'est ça la force des comédiens*  
*yes that's the good thing about actors*
- 02 I *questa è la forza dei comici*  
*that's the good thing about comedians*
- 03 P *no degli attori degli attori non dei comici*  
*no actors actors not comedians*
- 04 I *degli attori*  
*about actors*

The following extract is an example of other-initiated other-repair with a negative evaluation. Error correction becomes the actual business at hand. The host questions the interpreter's rendition of *like a duck to water* and does so prefacing the initiation with a performative verb *ti devo riprendere* (I have to reproach you). The interpreter aligns with other initiation and then interjects to produce a self-repair, in an attempt, it would seem, to make the host discourse her own. The interpreter fleshes out the repair by mentioning *anatroccolo* (duckling), thereby displaying that she knows the exact Italian equivalent of *duck* and that her prior rendition was a deliberate strategy of neutralisation of the ST metaphor. Notice how the host abandons his version (*paperella* → little goose) and ratifies that of the interpreter (*anatroccolo* → duckling):

(5) [Alla ricerca dell'arca, Rai Tre, 10.12.1988]

- 01 G *he got a skateboard for Christmas as a Christmas gift and he jumped on it and took to it like a duck to water*
- 02 I *ecco ha ricevuto uno skateboard come regalo di Natale è: salito e è partito come se non avesse mai fatto altro nella vita*  
*he got a skateboard as a Christmas gift he jumped on it and took to it as if he had done nothing else all his life*
- 03 H *[ecco ha detto un:: una cosa ((smiling and pointing to I)) ti devo ripren{dere che è molto [bella come una [paperella-*  
*[well he said a:: something ((smiling and pointing to I)) I have to re [proach you which is very [nice [like a [a little goose-*

- 04 I [come- [come  
[anatroccolo [che va=  
[like- [like  
[duckling [that goes=  
05 H [come un=  
[like a=  
06 I [=nell'acqua  
[=on the water  
07 H [=anatroccolo che va verso l'acqua come se questa cosa  
l'avesse:: [...]  
[=duckling that nears the water's edge as if this had::  
[...]

The most face-threatening of all exposed corrections is what we might define *error magnifying*. This is a television-specific practice whereby hosts exploit an error committed by the interpreter for entertainment purposes. In Extract (6), ridiculing becomes a way of correcting the interpreter's turn:

(6) [Domenica in, Rai Uno, 9.5.2004]

- 01 G he could be on American Idol  
02 I potrebbe essere un idolo americano  
he could be an American idol  
03 H NO: NO: CHE HAI CAPITO TRADUTTORE SIMULTANEO (.) NON HAI  
CA- ((approaching the camera and slapping on the  
interpreter's back who is off-screen)) NON HAI CAPITO UN  
CIUFOLO (.) HA DETTO CHE POTREBBE PARTECIPARE AD AMERICAN  
IDOL IL PRO- IL PROGRAMMA AMERICANO QUELLO DEI DISPERATI  
CHE CANTANO ((going back to the centre of the studio))  
prego prego  
NO NO WHAT HAVE YOU UNDERSTOOD SIMULTANEOUS TRANSLATOR  
(.) YOU HAVE NOT- ((approaching the camera and slapping  
on the interpreter's back who is off-screen)) YOU HAVE  
NOT UNDERSTOOD A DAMN THING (.) HE SAID THAT HE COULD  
PARTICIPATE IN AMERICAN IDOL THE SH- THE AMERICAN SHOW  
THE ONE FOR DESPERATE PEOPLE WHO SING ((going back to the  
centre of the studio towards G)) please go on.

Correction may also be performed through "sarcastic repetition with variation" (Norrick 1996: 130). In Extract (7), the host mockingly repeats the expression *sulla strada* (on the road) in order to comment humorously on it, highlighting at the same time the inappropriateness of the interpreter's translation:

(7) [Quelli che il calcio, Rai Due, 1998]

- 01 H adesso so che partite dove andate?  
I know that now you are leaving where are you going?  
02 G I'm on my way to Germa[ny]

- 03 I [siamo sulla strada per andare in  
Germania  
[we are on the road to go to  
Germany  
04 G and {then-  
05 H [si sulla strada si fa per dire (.) {di- dipende  
[well on the road not exactly (.) {it- it depends  
06 G [back to New York

In detecting a trouble-source in the interpreter's prior turn, hosts may reinforce their repairing actions by adding metadiscursive comments as in Extract (8), in which the host produces the correct Italian translation equivalent of the English word "watchdogs":

(8) [Alla ricerca dell'arca, Rai Tre, 28.2.1988]

- 01 G Frando and I will remain will be as watchdogs [...]  
02 I [...] resteremo come controllori saremo sul chi vive  
[...]  
[...] we will remain as controllers and be on the lookout  
03 H ecco (.) ha adoperato proprio questo termine cani da  
guardia [...]  
well (.) he used exactly this term watchdogs[...]

As Jefferson (1987:93) put it "when a next speaker produces [...] an alternative term, *correction* may be underway" (emphasis in the original).<sup>2</sup> In our corpus, some implicit corrections can be framed in terms of "instances of consecutive reference" (Jefferson 1987:94) between the interpreter and the host. A case in point is provided below, where the interpreter introduces the item *ragionevole* (reasonable) and the host uses an alternate *sensato* (sensible) from the same syntactic class:

(9) [Parla con me, Rai Tre, 6.3.2005]

- 01 G mi padre era muy sensato [se levantó a las tres de la  
mañana  
my father was very sensible {he woke up at three o'clock  
in the morning  
02 I [e mio padre era (.) molto  
ragionevole si è alzato alle tre della [mattina  
[and my father was (.) very  
reasonable he got up at three o'clock in the [morning

2. This is related to notions of "grounding" and "lexical entrainment" (Brennan and Clark 1996; Clark and Brennan 1991; Clark and Wilkies-Gibbs 1986), i.e. when participants in a dialogue refer to specific objects on successive occasions, they typically converge towards using the same terms in their referential expressions. The second speaker, by re-using a term previously used by the first speaker, implicitly acknowledges the interlocutor's contribution.

- 03 G [bajamosa la sala  
[we go down into the hall  
04 H [mio padre alle  
tre della mattina non sarebbe stato **sensato**  
[my father at  
three o'clock in the morning would not have been **sensible**

The extracts above show that host repair initiations are not necessarily covered or mitigated; rather they may be highlighted or even boosted. When correcting is done by guests, instead, we can notice a different type of practice, that is, interpreters try (whenever possible) to disguise the correction as new information by adding textual elements:

(10) [Maurizio Costanzo Show, Canale 5, 23.10.1997]

- 01 G en el libro cuento que mas tarde él me dijo (.) sufri  
mucho  
in the book I say that later on in time my son (.)  
suffered a lot  
02 I e nel libro proprio parlo di mio figlio come mi ha fatto  
soffrire più tardi negli anni  
and in the book I talk exactly about my son how he made  
me suffer later on in time  
03 G ((turning to I)) él (.) él **suffrí**  
((turning to I)) **he (.) he suffered**  
04 I e e come ha sofferto anche lui  
and and how he suffered too

(11) [Maurizio Costanzo Show, Canale 5, 17.11.1998]

- 01 H [...] e la sera cosa mangia?  
[...] and in the evening what do you eat?  
02 I how about the evening what do you eat?  
03 G fish but not only fish (.) fish but also seafood  
04 I non solo pesce ma anche altre: frutti di ma:re  
not only fish but also some: seafood  
05 G no (.) there is many ehm herbs from the sea  
06 I e poi usiamo anche moltissime delle delle piante marine  
and then we also use many:: sea plants

(12) [Maurizio Costanzo Show, Canale 5, 3.5.1991]

- 01 G il y a une scène que je vous recommande  
there is one scene which I recommend to you  
02 I vorrei:: ricordare una scena particolarmente  
interessante nel libro  
I would like to:: recall a particularly interesting  
scene in the book  
03 G ((turning to I)) et que[je lui recommande  
((turning to I)) and which [I recommend to him

- 04 I [e che addirittura le consiglia  
 (.) le raccomanda  
 [and which he even advises you  
 to read (.) he recommends it to you

Face-work can be accomplished non-verbally. In Extract (13), the guest's repairing action is responded to with a repetition of the previous term, but such a move is accompanied by an irritated tone and face display, through which the interpreter signals that the guest's action was not justified:

(13) [Maurizio Costanzo Show, Canale 5, 16.7.1999]

- 01 G avec un espace aérien démilitarisé  
 'with a demilitarized air space  
 02 I deve esserci uno spazio aereo smilitarizzato  
 there must be a demilitarized air space  
 03 G ((turning to I)) démilitarise  
 ((turning to I)) demilitarized  
 04 I ((in a irritated tone) smilitarizzato  
 ((in a irritated tone) demilitarized

### 3. Formulations and competitive interruptions

A recurrent feature in talkshow interpreting is a sequence made up of a first translation produced by the interpreter and, subsequent to that, a second (antagonistic) translation produced by the host in the next turn:

(14) [Scommettiamo che, Rai Uno, 28.3.1992]

- 01 G I think he's a great actor  
 02 I è un grosso attore  
 he is a big actor  
 03 H è un grande attore  
 he is a great actor

Very frequently the host's alternative version appears to be a "repair formulation" and the interpreter's ratification is a "repair-formulation repeat" (Nofsinger 1994:93-94), in that the interpreter repeats a host's formulation that suggests something the interpreter should have said. As it happens, a repair-formulation repeat: "may serve to portray its speaker as deserving the presumption of expertise implied by his or her discourse identity" (Nofsinger 1994:94). Since the discourse identity of the interpreter is that of translating, the host's repair formulations potentially question her/his linguistic competence. The extract below is a case in point:

## (15) [Tappeto volante, Tmc, 7.5.1996]

- 01 G il a bien mérité  
he deserved it
- 02 I però se l'è meritata  
but he deserved it
- 03 G il a trompé sa femme  
he wronged his wife
- 04 I perché ha tradito sua moglie in moltissime occasioni  
because he was unfaithful to his wife on many occasions
- 05 G et ça pend au nez (.) en France on dit ça pend au nez  
to have it coming (.) in France we say to have it coming
- 06 I e praticamente gliela se lo doveva aspettare  
and actually he had to expect it
- 07 G voilà  
there you are
- 08 H se l'è cercata come si dice  
he asked for it as they say
- 09 I se l'è cercata  
he asked for it

Formulations of previous turns are a specific host action – closely related to the notion of interactional control – and might be heard as displaying understanding for, or on behalf of, the overhearing audience. In institutionalized interactions, this device displays power relations, and therefore is a prerogative of dominant participants (teachers, doctors, judges, police officers etc.) who make use of this resource to obtain certain answers, summarize and assess what is being said by the person who holds a subordinate position, e.g. pupils, patients, defendants, witnesses etc. (cf. Heritage 1985; Heritage and Watson 1979).

In Extract (16), the host considerably expands the guest's simple statement, drawing an implication which is totally absent in the latter's prior turn, notably that teachers should be paid more "because they play a social role with respect to young people". The turn is produced with an assertive tone and contains a reporting verb both in initial position ("he said") and in final position ("he said this"). While these meta-comments serve the purpose of supporting the truthfulness of the host's claim, they are particularly face-threatening because they overshadow the interpreter's turn, making his contribution to the exchange irrelevant:

## (16) [Numero Uno, Rai Uno, 1994]

- 01 G money is not very good
- 02 I non si guadagna molto bene  
you don't earn very much
- 03 G and the money should be better
- 04 I secondo me gli insegnanti dovrebbe essere pagati di più  
to me teachers should be paid more
- 05 G because teaching is one of the most important  
professions

- 06 I perché reputo che insegnare fare l'insegnante è una delle  
professioni più importanti che esist[ano]  
*because I believe that teaching to be a teacher is one of*  
*the most important professions that [exist*
- 07 H [sta dicendo una  
cosa molto importante forse voi ammaliati dal fascino  
di Sting non avete capito oppure fatto attenzione (.) ha  
detto che gli insegnanti dovrebbero essere pagati molto  
di più perché hanno un compito sociale nei confronti dei  
giovani (.) ha detto questo  
*[he is saying a very*  
*important thing maybe bewitched by Sting you didn't*  
*understand or maybe you didn't pay attention (.) he said*  
*that teachers should be paid much more because they play*  
*a social role with respect to young people (.) that's*  
*what he said*

The extract below is an example of "anticipatory completion" (Lerner 2002). The sequential placement of these devices is similar to that of competitive interruptions in that they challenge the interpreters' right to complete their turns and/or aim at usurping their role. The host takes over the interpreter's turn, in order "to continue as the explainer of record" (Lerner 2002: 241). Notice that the reporting verb is followed by an assessment ("rightly"):

(17) [Alla ricerca dell'arca, Rai Tre, 10.12.1988]

- 01 G well I haven't lived very much alone I {must say  
02 I [devo dire che non  
è che abbia passato {molto tempo da sola  
*[I must say that I*  
*haven't spent [much time alone*  
03 H [non ha avuto grandi occasioni per  
vivere da sola ha detto: giustamente  
*[she hasn't had much chance to live*  
*on her own she: rightly said*

In Extract (18), the host rather abruptly pre-empts the interpreter's utterance before completion. Notice that the host's completion of the translational turn ("to the young ladies") is ratified by the interpreter and further repeated by the host in his next turn. Once again, the host's move is marked by a reporting verb ("as they used to say"):

(18) [Domenica in, Rai Uno, 10.1.1982]

- 01 G mon premier métier quand j'étais en France était  
d'attendre les soldats américains et de les amener au  
bordel  
*my first job when I was in France was to wait for the*  
*American soldiers and accompany them to the brothel*  
*(.)*

- 02 H dunque e [l'avete capito  
well I *[guess you have understood*
- 03 I [il suo primo mestiere era di aspettare i  
soldati americani *[e di accompagnarli:*  
*[his first job was to wait for the*  
American=soldiers *[and accompany them:*
- 04 H *[accompagnarli dalle signorine*  
*((raising his index finger))*  
*[accompany them to the young ladies*  
*((raising his index finger))*
- 05 I dalle signorine  
to the young ladies
- 06 H dalle signorine come *|* si diceva  
to the young ladies *as they used to say*

In terms of participatory dominance, Extract (18) above is an instance of *successful controlling action*, because the host completes the turn while the interpreter withdraws. Conversely, Extract (17) is an instance of *attempted controlling action* because the interpreter manages to complete her turn.

The host can claim the right to the floor at any moment, deciding when, how and even whether the guest's turn is to be translated. The extract below is a further illustration of participatory dominance, where the host interrupts the consecutive interpreter declaring that translation is useless because the guest's words are self-explanatory. However, after the round of applause, he changes his mind and asks the interpreter to "stage" her version for the benefit of the audience:

(19) [Controcampo, Italia 1, 14.9.1998]

- 01 G es cierto que yo llegué allí y lo llamé hijo de puta  
for sure I got there and called him son of a bitch
- 02 H ((laughs))
- 03 I e io (.) quando siamo an [dati lì-  
and I- (.) once we [got there
- 04 H *[questo si è capito*  
*[we understood that*  
*((laughs and applause))*
- 05 H no (.) sentiamo (.) sentiamo come traduce  
no (.) let's see (.) let's see how she translates
- 06 I e quando siamo lì gli ho dato del figlio di puttana  
eccetera  
and once we get there I told him that he was a son of a  
bitch and so on and so forth

As noted by Wadensjö (1993: 108), "the products of Dialogue Interpreter-activity are (or rather, should be) provided in between each and every original utterance". This means that every utterance of the guest is sequentially implicative of the translating act of the interpreter. However, in our corpus there are cases in which

the host co-opts the interpreter's role altogether. Interpreters may reject the host's pre-emptive attempts and they may do so non-verbally:

(20) [Tappeto volante, Tmc, 7.5.1996]

- 01 G quand j'avais quinze ans  
when I was thirteen years old  
(.)
- 02 H aveva quindici anni  
she was thirteen years old
- 03 I ((she makes a hand gesture as if to tell H to wait))
- 04 G quand j'avais quinze ans je dansais cette chanson  
when I was fifteen years old I danced this song
- 05 I quando avevo quindici anni ballavo quando c'era questa  
canzone  
when I was fifteen years old I danced when there was  
this song

#### 4. Requests for clarification

Repair initiation may take the form of a request for clarification. In Extract (21), Italian actor Arnaldo Foà (P) wonders whether the French guest meant something else with the term *baiser*. The interpreter's version is cast into some doubt, rather than being marked as definitely incorrect. Nevertheless, clarification requests implicitly provide interpreters with a negative feedback. The analysis of the non-verbal behaviour reveals the annoyed reaction of the interpreter, who performs the repair by confirming her prior version, against the one implicitly offered by the participant.<sup>3</sup> The host aligns with the interpreter's response to the repair initiated by the participant:

(21) [Maurizio Costanzo Show, Canale 5, 3.5.1991]

- 01 G vous savez que le moment du baiser c'est finalement le  
début de la catastrophe bien souvent  
you know that the kiss moment is finally the beginning of  
the disaster very often
- 02 I lei sa allora che spesso il momento del bacio è l'inizio  
della fine della catastrofe molto spesso  
you know that often the kiss moment is the beginning of  
the end of the disaster very often
- 03 P ma è il bacio o vuol dire un'altra cosa?  
is it the kiss or something else?

3. Clearly the participant's implicit candidate understanding of 'baiser' is 'to fuck'.

- 04 I no credo che voglia dire {bacio  
no I think he means {kiss
- 05 H {no bacio bacio  
{no kiss kiss

A common glossing practice in the talkshow setting consists in wondering how a certain item has been translated, as in the extract below, in which the host is checking how the simultaneous interpreter has rendered an item she previously introduced into the exchange with an Italian participant (data not shown). Such a request is also directly addressed to the guest, who produces an assessment which is then acknowledged by the host:

(22) [Harem, Rai Tre, 26.3.1994]

- 01 H io non so come è stato tradotto(.) in francese(.)poi  
me lo- ehm ((turning to G))comment est-ce qu'il a été  
traduit [tardona?  
*I don't know how this was translated (.) in French (.)*  
you will- ehm ((turning to G)) how was passée woman  
[translated
- 02 G [c'est bien c'est bien  
[it's okay it's okay
- 03 H ah c'est ça  
right
- 04 G très bien  
very well

whereas in Extract (23), the interpreter is explicitly asked to make public the rendition he has provided to the guest in the simultaneous mode:

(23) [Domenica in, Rai Uno, 22.1.1996]

- 01 H [...] vorrei sapere il traduttore come ha tradotto quando  
io ho detto che a volte incontriamo dei grandi attori che  
un po' se la tirano is possibile sapere come hai tradotto  
loro in inglese?  
[...] *I would like to know how the translator translated*  
*when I said that sometimes we meet great actors who give*  
*themselves airs is it possible to know how you translated*  
*in English for them?*
- 02 I gli ho detto che sono un po' snob  
*I told them that they are a bit snobbish*
- 03 H ((laughs)) grazie ((applausi)) allora parliamo di [...] ((laughs))  
thank you ((applause in the studio)) so let's  
talk now about [...]

These moves may be accomplished not only retrospectively but also prospectively, like in Extract (24), where the host's metalinguistic gloss is embeddedly (and half-jokingly) produced, and is not responded to by the interpreter:

(24) [Scherzi a parte, Canale 5, 1998]

- 01 H [...] c'è un po' di scombussolamento ((turning to I)) non  
 so come puoi tradurlo  
 [...] there is some shake-up ((turning to I)) I don't  
 know how you could translate it
- 02 I ((turning to G)) there's some confusion  
 ((turning to G)) there's some confusion
- 03 H nel mondo del calcio  
 in the world of soccer
- 04 I in the world of soccer

In Extract (25), instead of uttering the American equivalent of the Italian term right away, the interpreter provides a metalinguistic explanation (account) reminding the host that he had already asked her this question on previous occasions and she had already explained that "sfigato" is a dialectal term which cannot be properly translated. The interpreter's answer to the host's question is "disagreement implicative" (Pomerantz 1975:72–73) and can be seen as an attempt to restore her face:

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

- 01 H [...] come si traduce in americano sfigato?  
 [...] how do you translate sfigato in American?
- 02 I avevamo già avevamo già mi ricordo fatto questo discorso  
 [e:  
 we had already I remember we had already raised this  
 issue [and
- 03 H [uno che c'ha una-  
 [someone who has a- all
- 04 I unlucky ((looking at G)) there's no ehm other possibility  
 in Italian there is a dialectal term [sfigato it means  
 unlucky out of luck
- 05 H [vabè  
 [okay

The actions described above are hardly aimed at monitoring the ongoing process of mutual understanding. They are, rather, amused appreciations of the translation process, which has become an integral part of the performance. Being framed in a playful context, these moves are jokingly but insistently face-threatening, because they highlight the presence of the interpreter (making her/him the object of discourse), generate expectations about her/his performance and question her/his ability to translate.

## 5. Other-initiation and footing shifts

A guest-initiated repair may threaten both the interpreter's face (who may fear s/he has translated the question incorrectly) and the host's (who is obliged to explain better). Hence the decision, as in the extract below, to reproduce the guest's request in a less face-threatening manner. In so doing, the interpreter causes the repair to shift from a hearing to an understanding problem:

(26) [La ferita aperta, Canale 5, 10.11.2002]

- 01 H John (.) *che cos'è la paura?*  
*John (.) what is fear?*
- 02 I John (.) *what is fear?*  
 (0.5)
- 03 G *ehm: (.) can you re-peat (.) that?*  
*I (.) was[n't-*
- 04 I *[in che senso?*  
*(in which sense?*

The two extracts below provide paradigmatic examples of the shift from relaying to coordinating (Wadensjö 1998). The host's requests are made not only more explicit but also more polite. Interpreters recycle material from previous turns and contribute to advancing the guests' talk, thereby acting in the role of *principal* (Goffman 1981), i.e. taking autonomous initiatives:

(27) [Maurizio Costanzo Show, Canale 5, 7.5.1999]

- 01 H Megan (.) *lei mangia molto?*  
*Megan (.) do you eat a lot?*
- 02 I *you a big eater?*
- 03 G *ehm: moderately*
- 04 I *mangio: in modo moderato*  
*I eat: moderately*
- 05 H *ad esempio?*  
*for example?*
- 06 I *for example (.) what would you eat in the course of the day?*

(28) [Maurizio Costanzo Show, Canale 5, 14.12.2001]

- 01 G *but my rights (.) has been neglected by those we think we are to protect us*
- 02 I *ma i miei diritti sono stati violati proprio da coloro che invece avrebbero dovuto proteggere me (.) come bambino*  
*but my rights have been violated by the very people who instead should have protected me (.) as a child*
- 03 H *e cioè?*  
*that is to say?*
- 04 I *which rights? (.) tell us more (.) what do they do?*

The two following extracts embody two different ways of managing guest-initiated repair. In Extract (29), the sequence is made up of three turns: the guest's understanding check, the interpreter's repetition (in Italian) of the repair initiator and the host's response. Conversely, in Extract (30), the sequence is made up of only two turns: the guest's understanding check and the interpreter's response (in English). In the first case, the interpreter is 'speaking for another'; in the second, she is 'speaking as herself'.

To use Wadensjö's (1998) terminology, the difference between the two extracts below is that in Extract (29) the interpreter is acting as *reporter*, i.e. listening in order to repeat words without assuming any responsibility for them, whereas in Extract (30), the role is that of *responder*, i.e. the interpreter acts as an addressed recipient of the guest's utterance:

(29) [I fatti vostri, Rai Due, 1995]

- 01 H come sono andate (.) per voi che avete seguito da vicino  
quella vicenda le cose?  
*how did it turn out for who have been through all this?*
- 02 G **the real story?**
- 03 I la storia vera?  
*the true story?*
- 04 H la vera storia  
*the true story*
- 05 G the real story is [the little boy
- 06 I [la sto- la storia vera è che il bambino  
*[the tru-- the true story is that the*  
*little boy*
- 07 G started having trouble
- 08 I ha cominciato ad avere dei problemi  
*started having trouble*

(30) [Maurizio Costanzo Show, Canale 5, 1.6.1993]

- 01 H e dopo cosa è successo? È scattato un rapporto mi sembra  
che lei definisce (.) di libero rapporto d'amore fra lei  
e Sheila (.) quindi come è proseguito poi il discorso (.)  
il rapporto  
*and then what happened? a relationship which you call*  
*free love started between you and Sheila (.) how did it*  
*continue?*
- 02 G **how did it come on?**
- 03 I **yeah**
- 04 G yes well (.) when I'm in the classroom and I'm with the  
children [...]

Footings shifts may be an autonomous strategy on the part of the interpreter – as in Extracts (29) and (30) above – or may be occasioned by the different alignments that primary speakers assume towards the interpreter. In Extract (31), the

host addresses the interpreter as "mister translator" and jokingly assigns him the role of a bank clerk. This move causes the interpreter to shift to the footing of *responder* (see also Extracts (21), (23), (25) in Section 4):

(31) [Ore 12, Canale 5, 17.12.1992]

- 01 G yes I would say that I have actually gone through about  
[maybe twenty million=  
02 I [si  
[yes  
03 G =pounds in my life  
04 I potrei dire che circa per le mie mani sono passati ventun  
milioni di sterline  
*I could say that about twenty one million pounds have  
passed through my hands*  
05 H accidenti (.) possiamo fare il calcolo signor traduttore  
lei è anche bancario?  
*(.) oh goodness mister translator can you work that out?  
are you a bank clerk as well?*  
(0.3)  
06 H [sta facendo-  
[he's..  
07 I [sono circa cinquanta miliardi  
[it's about fifty billion

## 6. Acceptability repairs

Some repairs concern problems of acceptability, rather than problems of understanding. As noted by Svennevig:

problems of acceptability concern the contribution not just as a linguistic utterance, but also as a social action. To accept a conversational action can involve such different things as the truth of the claims made, the speaker's right to perform the action in question, the relevance of the utterance to the current situation, etc. (2008: 337)

In this section examples will be provided of host-initiated repairs which address the acceptability of the interpreter's turn.

In Extract (32), the interpreter translates the guest's question, acting as a *reporter*.<sup>4</sup> However, in the next turn, the host – using the same term of address

4. "Italians" is replaced with the second person plural ("voi") plus the addition of "in Italiano". However, these shifts in the mode of address do not change the interpreter's footing.

as his colleague in Extract (31) – claims that the interpreter should have acted in the role of responder in order to provide the Italian equivalent of “shipwrecked” right away:

(32) [Domenica in, Rai Uno, 15.2.1998]

- 01 H bellissima canzone anche questa complimenti ((applausi))  
oh s'intitola?  
*this song is very beautiful as well congratulations*  
((applause)) what's the title?
- 02 G shipwrecked
- 03 I shipwrecked
- 04 H no no I understand but it is difficult to pronounce è  
difficile da pronunciare (.) ((stumbling)) ship-wre-cked
- 05 G how do Italians say?
- 06 I e voi in italiano come dite?  
*and you how do you say it in Italian?*
- 07 H eh no lo deve dire lei signor traduttore è inutile che mi  
fa fare sta' figura da-  
*no it's up to you to say it mister translator don't make*  
*me look a monkey*
- 08 I naufrago  
*shipwrecked*

The following extract illustrates exactly the opposite situation. The repair focuses on the very act of translating, i.e. the host claims that the interpreter should have limited himself to reproducing the title of the song in English. The location of a *double entendre* in the interpreter's words is a form of joking repair which, besides threatening the interpreter's positive face, “present[s] the additional challenge of discovering the unintended meaning, correlating with joking's test function” (Norricks 1989:1).

(33) [Numero Uno, Rai Uno, 31.10.1995]

- 01 H [...] il titolo è un po' ehm ((in an allusive tone)) come  
s'intitola? qual è il titolo della canzone?  
*[...] the title is ehm ((in a allusive tone)) what is the*  
*title? what is the title of the song?*
- 02 G Can I touch you there
- 03 H lecco  
*[You see?*
- 04 I [can I touch you there posso toccarti lì
- 05 H ecco non volevo dirlo io l'ha detto lui ((alzando il dito  
verso l'alto)) cioè ((laughs)) posso toccarti lì  
*well I haven't said it he said it ((pointing upwards))*  
*that is ((laughing)) posso toccarti lì*

The two extracts above reveal how the (potentially precarious) boundary between the interpreter's speaking for another and speaking as her/himself can be deliberately exploited for entertainment purposes. In Extract (32), the host is apparently playing with the interpreter's separation of "speaking I and meaning the other" (Wadensjö 1998) or "the vulnerability and tension inherent in the interpreters' sharing the same I" (Diriker 2004: 138). In Extract (33), by uttering "well I haven't said it he said it", the host questions the interpreter's "incumbency" (Aston 1988), which is, of course, that of translating.

Guests too may incur in such a role (con)fusion. For example, in Extract (34), the guest is listening to the simultaneous interpretation (not transcribed), though she shows some competence in Italian. In answering the host's question she jokingly comments on the translation, attributing the authorship of the utterance "I don't think so" not to the host but to the interpreter (casting him in the role of principal). Curiously enough, the host bursts into laughter, apparently unaware of the fact that the interpreter has done nothing else but translate her "credo di no" into English ("I don't think so").<sup>5</sup>

(34) [Medicine a confronto, Retequattro, 6.3.1999]

- 01 H eh sei- ti trovo splendida (.) in grande forma (.) senti  
hai: hai mai avuto problemi di peso? **credo di no**  
eh you're- you look wonderful (.) in great shape (.) have  
you ever had weight problems? **I don't think so**
- 02 G sì certo ((ridacchiando)) mio traduttore dice non  
**penso** [però sì quando ero giovane [...]  
well no ((chuckling)) **my translator says I don't think**  
**so** [but when I was young [...]
- 03 H ((laughs))

What follows are two examples in which the interpreter's utterances are evaluated in terms of "allowable contribution" (Levinson 1992). In Extract (35), the host rebukes (with fake astonishment) the interpreter for having faithfully rendered a guest's vulgar word:

(35) [Che tempo che fa, Rai Tre, 13.1.2007]

- 01 G je fais mon concert  
*I do my concert*
- 02 I e poi [vado al concerto e mi:: esibisco  
*and then [I go to the concert and I:: perform*

---

5. Such a phenomenon is similar to that of ownership of meaning, whereby "a particular lexical choice selected by the interpreter to relay one interlocutor's meaning may be taken up or challenged by the other interlocutor as if emanated not from the interpreter but from the other speaker" (Mason 1999: 153–154).

- 03 G [et après (.) après le concert je retourne: a : a  
l'hotel  
[and then (.) after the concert I go back: to my  
hotel
- 04 I e dopo il concerto torno ancora: all'hotel  
and after the concert once again I go back to my hotel
- 05 G et je baise  
and I fuck
- 06 I e poi scopo  
and then I fuck
- 07 G ((laughs))
- 08 H ((portandosi le mani alla testa)) SIGNORA ((con le  
mani giunte e rivolto verso l'alto)) MA ANCHE LEI  
(.) CON TUTTI I SINONIMI (.) MA EH EH CON TUTTI I  
SINONIMI ((laughs))  
((raising his hands in surprise)) MADAM INTERPRETER  
((with his hands joint in prayer)) COME ON (.) WITH  
ALL THE POSSIBLE SYNONYMS (.) WELL WITH ALL THE SYNONYMS  
((laughs))

Conversely, in Extract (36), another interpreter is criticized (by the same host) exactly for the opposite reason, i.e. for *not* having faithfully reproduced a guest's vulgar word. Notice how the host's potentially face-threatening act is mitigated by the turn-initial expression of compliment:

(36) [Che tempo che fa, Rai tre, 26.4.2008]

- 01 G [...] après ça je me suis [dit merde (.) je le prendrai  
que que j'ai le courage de le faire  
[...] after that I said to [myself shit (.) I will take  
the courage to do it
- 02 I [allora dopo (.) dopo che lui  
mi ha detto questa cosa mi sono detto ma CASPITA  
(.) allora DEVO dimostrargli di avere il coraggio di  
riuscirci: a farlo  
[so then (.) after he told me  
this I said to myself GOODNESS (.) I HAVE to show him I  
have the courage to do it  
((turns omitted))
- 03 H [...] voglio dire complimenti alla traduzione ((indicando  
verso l'alto)) ha soltanto tradotto caspita (.) eh una::  
insomma è stato gentile perché la signora non ha detto  
caspita  
[...] well I mean congratulations to the translation  
((pointing upwards) he said goodness (.) eh it's- well I  
mean he has been polite because the lady actually didn't  
say goodness  
((laughter and applause))

In the extract below, repair does not concern the choice of translation equivalents nor is the host addressing the interpreter's ability to understand what the guest

has said, as in Extract (6). What is at issue is the interpreter's failure to reproduce the prosodic and paralinguistic traits of the guest ("The Incredible Hulk"). In his next turn, the interpreter self-repairs his previous performance<sup>6</sup> (making his voice gruff and swinging his arms Hulk-style) and the sequence closes with the host's positive evaluation.

(37) [Anima mia, Rai Due, 1997]

- 01 H [...] se si (.) può accomodare se vuole eh  
 [...] you can seat if you like  
 02 I do you mind sitting down please?  
 03 H if you want  
 04 I if [you  
 05 G [NO  
 06 H [no eh allo-  
 [no eh well-  
 07 I [NO  
 08 G I DO NOT SIT DOWN  
 09 I non si siede  
 he won't sit down  
 10 H no ma lei deve farlo come fa lui scusi che traduzione è  
 no you've got to do it like him otherwise what sort of  
 translation is it?  
 11 I NON MI SIEDO  
 I DO NOT SIT DOWN  
 12 H ok adesso va bene  
 now that's okay  
 ((laughter and applause))

A few turns later, the interpreter immediately and gamely responds with the same gestures and voice as The Hulk, but his performance becomes, once again, the object of teasing:

(38) [Anima mia, Rai Due, 1997]

- 01 G EVERYTHING IS GONNA BE GREEN HERE BECAUSE I'M GREEN HERE  
 TONIGHT  
 02 H sì  
 yes  
 03 I TUTTO VERDE PERCHE' IO SO [NO VERDE  
 ALL GREEN BECAUSE I [AM GREEN  
 04 H ((turning to I)) [MA LA SMETTA LEI CHE HA  
 FAMIGLIA COSA FA?  
 [STOP IT THINK ABOUT YOUR  
 CHILDREN WHAT ARE YOU DOING?!  
 ((laughter and applause))

6. Notice the shift from third person (he won't sit down) to the first person (I do not sit down).

Acceptability repairs apparently put interpreters in a sort of double-bind situation: Whatever the footing, the translation strategy and the non-verbal behaviour they may decide to adopt, they nevertheless run the risk of falling foul of the host.

These actions threaten both the interpreter's positive face, in that they convey criticism and disapproval, and the negative face, in that they oblige the interpreter to modify her/his behaviour. There are, however, cases in which interpreters may not be prepared to comply with the host's requests.

In Extract (39), the interpreter and the host engage in face-work in an attempt to clear up a misunderstanding concerning the interpreter's invoked interactional identity. The episode is drawn from an interview of a homosexual who has donated his semen to two lesbians. The guest produces mixed-language turns, alternating between English and an almost unintelligible Italian. In the sequence below, the host has evident trouble in understanding (and explaining to the audience) what the guest has just said in Italian (data not shown). Thus, he gazes at the interpreter with the hope of getting some help. However, the interpreter perceives the host's request as a threat to his negative face, not so much because he is addressed as a responder, but because he is asked to do something which has nothing to do with his role, i.e. to provide an 'endolinguistic' translation of the guest's words and act as a *helper*. Hence the face-saving claim of no involvement (I don't know exactly what went on). In his next turn, the host mistakes the interpreter's response for a role attribution problem and makes it clear that his request was actually addressed to his professional identity (I was looking at you as an interpreter) and not to his personal identity (I was not expecting you to testify), and therefore no personal involvement was meant. The implication is that, from the host's perspective, the role of linguistic expert (*helper*) is part and parcel of the role of the interpreter:

(39) [I fatti vostri, Rai Due, 12.3.1996]

- ((turns omitted))
- 01 H sì lei ha fatto la sua parte per conto suo e poi ehm  
la la amica a quanto ho capito con questa siringa ha  
provveduto ((turning to I))  
*you played your part alone and then your friend from what  
I understood did the rest with a syringe ((turning to I))*
- 02 I io non so esattamente [quello che abbiano fatto loro  
*I don't know exactly [what went on*
- 03 H ((si lo so De Mico (nome di I)) lei  
fa l'interprete non è che stava là no io la guardavo  
in quanto interprete non è che ((risate e applausi))  
pretendevo una testimonianza  
*[well I know De Mico ((name of  
I)) you are an interpreter it's not that you were there  
I was looking at you as an interpreter ((laughter and  
applause)) I was not expecting you to testify*

## 7. Concluding remarks

All the extracts analysed in this chapter show that the third turn is the place where the host – instead of proceeding with the next question or responding to the actual (propositional) content of the guest's turn – may comment, correct, reject, formulate the interpreter's turn or even threaten or change her/his role.

Third-turn usage is a device which has been associated with institutional asymmetric interactions (ten Have 1991). From this viewpoint, talkshow interpreting appears to share some features of classroom interaction, in which the third turn is part of a recurrent tripartite discourse sequence, known as IRF (initiation-response-feedback; Sinclair and Coulthard 1975) or IRE (Initiation-reply-evaluation; Johnson 1995). McHoul (1990) describes these interactional sequences as question-answer adjacency pairs which are formulated as Q-A-C adjacency triads, where C is a comment on, acceptance of, or rejection of the content of the previous turn's answer. The third turn may also be used for producing "appraisals", i.e. overt and direct positive evaluation (e.g., "yes", "ok", "good"). In talkshow interaction, an example of this usage is the utterance "now that's okay" (Extract (37)), with which the host accepts the interpreter's self-repaired performance.

The analysis has shown that the face-threatening potential of primary speakers' other-repair can be placed along a continuum, with embedded (implicit) corrections at the one end (Extracts (1)–(2), (7), (9)) and exposed (explicit) corrections at the other (Extracts (3)–(6), (8), (10)–(12)). In politeness strategies terms, the two ends of this continuum correspond to Brown and Levinson's (1987) distinction between "off-record" (the face-threatening act is performed in an indirect way) and "bald-on-record" (no effort is made to reduce the impact of the face-threatening act).

We have seen that exposed corrections permit not only correction but also "attendant activities (accountings)" (Jefferson 1987:88), such as for example, reproaching, ridiculing, challenging which are consistent with the entertaining function of talkshows. It is surely not by chance that repair is mostly initiated for humorous purposes rather than for clarification and that it tends to take the form of teases. In our corpus there are many examples in which the host pretends to misunderstand the guest's turn (as translated by the interpreter) in order to amuse the audience, or cases of scapegoating, in which the interpreter is held responsible for a misunderstanding.

In doing repair and 're-doing' translation, the host displays his orientation towards the audience, acting both as the elicitor of talk for overhearers (Heritage and Greatbatch 1991) and as a gatekeeper of translation. He has the authority to prevent the interpreter, for example, from rendering "bordel" with "brothel" (Extract (18)), or may reject the interpreter's domesticating version of the guest's

words in favour of a foreignizing one, as shown in the duck Extract (5). Through aligning or disaligning moves, the host establishes the interpreter's degrees of participation, that is the extent to which s/he may or may not contribute to the exchange, up to the point that the host may even decide that the task of translating, or at least 'translating for the audience', belongs more to him than to the interpreter.

On the other hand, interpreters' concern for their face needs has clearly emerged in a number of defensive counter-moves: pre-emption of other-repair by co-opting the host's turn completion (Extract (5)), turn (and) role re-appropriation moves (Extract (20)), ignoring the face-threatening act (Extract (24)), offering an account (Extract (25)), involvement disclaimers (Extract (39)), as well as in those instances of other-initiation in which self-repair is disguised (Extracts (10)–(12)) or reluctantly performed (Extracts (13)–(21)). In other cases, interpreters' mitigated (less blunt) renditions can be understood as face-saving acts with respect to the host (Extract (26)) or the guest (Extracts (27)–(28)).

Interpreters working on Italian television are usually conference interpreters and their training does not envisage visibility and involvement. Therefore, in order to comply with "the ethics of entertainment" (Katan and Straniero Sergio 2001), they are required to take on a multifarious mediation role, which includes a certain acting ability to get into the part, played by the host or the guest.

We conclude with an excellent example of role management (within an ethics of entertainment) provided by Olga Fernando<sup>7</sup> (a popular Italian media interpreter), when interpreting the comedian Jerry Lewis. Lewis had made a joke about the prize he had received, which was adequately translated by Fernando. Lewis, realizing the timid audience reaction, turned to Fernando, and said "You are not too funny". Her reply (in English only) was "I am not Jerry Lewis" – at which point the audience laughed.

## References

- Aston, G. 1988. *Learning Comity*. Bologna: Clueb.
- Brennan, S. E. and Clark, H. H. 1996. "Conceptual pacts and lexical choice in conversation." *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition* 22(6): 1482–1493.
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. C. 1987. *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clark, H. H. and Brennan, S. E. 1991. "Grounding in communication". In *Perspectives on Socially Shared Cognition*, L. B. Resnick, J. M. Levine and S. D. Teasley (eds.), 127–149. Washington DC: APA Books.

---

7. Olga Fernando personally reported this episode, which took place during 56th Venice International Film Festival (September 1999), to the author [note of the editors].

- Clark, H. H. and Willies-Gibbs, D. 1986. "Referring as a collaborative process." *Cognition* 22: 1-39.
- Diriker, E. 2004. *De-/Re-Contextualizing Conference Interpreting*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Goffman, E. 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Ten Have, P. 1991. "Talk and institution: a reconsideration of the 'asymmetry' of doctor-patient interaction." In *Talk and Social Structure*, D. Boden and D. H. Zimmerman (eds.), 138-163. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Heritage, J. 1984. *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Heritage, J. 1984. "Analyzing news interviews: Aspects of the production of talk for an over-hearing audience." In *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, vol. 3. *Discourse and Dialogue*, T. A. van Dijk (ed.), 95-117. London: Academic Press.
- Heritage, J. 1985. "Analysing News Interviews: Aspects of the Production of Talk for an Overhearing Audience." In *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Vol. 3. *Discourse and Dialogue*, T. Van Dijk (ed.), 95-117. London: Academic Press.
- Heritage, J. and Greatbatch, D. 1991. "On the institutional character of institutional talk. The case of news interviews." In *Talk and Social Structure: Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversational Analysis*, D. Boden and D. H. Zimmerman (eds.), 93-137. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Heritage, J. and Watson, R. C. 1979. "Formulations as conversational objects." In *Everyday Language. Studies in Ethnomethodology*, G. Psathas (ed.), 123-162. New York: Irvington.
- Itakura, H. 2001. *Conversational Dominance and Gender: A Study of Japanese Speakers in First and Second Language Contexts*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jefferson, G. 1987. "On exposed and embedded correction." In *Talk and Social Organization*, G. Button and J. R. E. Lee (eds.), 86-100. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Johnson, K. 1995. *Understanding communication in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Katan, D. and Straniero Sergio, F. 2001. "Look who's talking. The ethics of entertainment and talkshow interpreting." *The Translator* 7(2): 213-227.
- Katan, D. and Straniero Sergio, F. 2003. "Submerged ideologies in media interpreting." In *Apropos of Ideology*, M. Calzada Pérez (ed.), 131-144. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Lerner, G. H. 2002. "Turn-sharing: The choral co-production of talk-in-interaction." In *The Language of Turn and Sequence*, C. E. Ford, B. A. Fox and S. A. Thompson (eds.), 225-256. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Levinson, S. C. 1992. "Activity types and language." In *Talk at Work*, P. Drew and J. Heritage (eds.), 66-100. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Linell, P. and Luckmann, T. 1991. "Asymmetries in dialogue: Some conceptual preliminaries." In *The Dynamics of Dialogue*, I. Marková and K. Foppa (eds.), 1-20. Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire: Harvester and Wheatsheaf.
- Mason, I. 1999. "Introduction." In *The Translator* 5(2), *Special issue on Dialogue Interpreting*, I. Mason (ed.), 147-160.
- McHoul, A. W. 1990. "The organization of repair in classroom talk." *Language in Society* 19: 349-377.
- Nofsinger, R. E. 1994. "Repeating the host: An interactional use of repetition by guests on televised episodes of *Computer Chronicles*." In *Repetition in Discourse Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, vol. 2, B. Johnstone (ed.), 84-95. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

- Norrick, N. 1989. "Joking repair and the organization of repair." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America. Washington D.C., December 27–30, 1–16. Available at URL: <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED317042.pdf>
- Norrick, N. 1996. "Repetition in conversational joking." In *Repetition in Dialogue*, C. Bazzanella (ed.), 129–139. Tübingen: Niemeyer Verlag.
- Pomerantz, A. 1975. *Second Assessments: A study of some features of agreements/disagreements*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of California, Irvine.
- Sinclair, J. and Coulthard, M. R. 1975. *Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English Used by Teachers and Pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. 1979. "The relevance of repair to syntax-for-conversation." In *Syntax and Semantics. Discourse and Syntax*, T. Givón (ed.), 261–288. New York: Academic Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. 1982. "Discourse as an interactional achievement. Some uses of 'uh huh' and other things that come between sentences." In *Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk*, D. Tannen (ed.), 71–93. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. 1987. "Between micro and macro. Contexts and other connections." In *The Micro-macro Link*, J. C. Alexander, B. Giesen, R. Münchand and N. J. Smeiser (eds.), 207–236. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. 2000. "Overlapping talk and the organization of turn taking." *Language in Society* 29(1): 1–63.
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G. and Sacks, H. 1977. "The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation." *Language* 53: 361–82.
- Straniero Sergio, F. 1999. "The Interpreter on the (talk) show: Interaction and participation frameworks." In *The Translator* 5(2), *Special issue on Dialogue Interpreting*, I. Mason (ed.), 303–326.
- Straniero Sergio, F. 2007. *Talkshow Interpreting: La mediazione linguistica nella conversazione-spettacolo*. Trieste: EUT.
- Svennevig, J. 2008. "Trying the easiest solution first in other-initiation of repair." *Journal of Pragmatics* 40: 333–348.
- Wadensjö, C. 1993. "The double role of a dialogue interpreter." *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 1: 105–121.
- Wadensjö, C. *Interpreting as Interaction*. London/New York: Longman.