



An Analysis of the Underspecifications of “AND” in Parallel Corpora: A Case Study in Simultaneous Translation in Iranian Context



Ali-Mohammad Mohammadi*
Assistant professor of applied linguistics, Arak University,
Arak, Iran
Email: a-mohammadi@araku.ac.ir

ABSTRACT

The present exploratory research intended to investigate the coherence relations in intercultural communications in the process of translation. As a result, the manifestations of underspecification in translation strategies of the most frequent, complex, common, and apparently simple discourse marker “and” were investigated. Research methodologies in discourse analysis and translation studies were combined through the data derived from parallel corpora in simultaneous translation. Instances of DMs were determined and sorted based on Mohammadi and Dehghan (2020) inventory of DMs. The results revealed that in 73% of the cases discourse marker “and” was underspecified. Two manifestations of underspecification were discovered in the process of analysis: change and omission. The translator changed this DM into different DMs in 35% of the instances. And the instances of AND were deleted in 38% of the cases. However, in 28% the instances of “and” were not underspecified. The bases and sources were discussed and different educational, research, and administrative implications were suggested.

DOI: 10.22059/JFLR.2021.321993.828

Mohammadi, Ali Mohammad (2021). An Analysis of the Underspecifications of “AND” in Parallel Corpora: A Case Study in Simultaneous Translation in Iranian Context. *Journal of Foreign Language Research*, 11 (1), 67-80.
DOI: 10.22059/JFLR.2021.321993.828

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received:
13th, April, 2021
Accepted:
7th, June, 2021
Available online:
Spring 2021

Keywords:
*underspecification,
discourse marker, and,
simultaneous translation*

* Mohammad Mohammadi is an assistant professor of Arak University. His area of interest is the application of discourse analysis in translation, TEFL, and text analysis and has published 18 articles.

1. Introduction

The first step in natural processing of language in the society is a sort of processing in which the structures, images, and mental pictures have not yet been shaped in the audience's mind in terms of the meaning and the purpose behind using linguistic elements in discourse. That might be due to the fact that the writer's or speaker's intention in the employment of linguistic elements is not perfectly clear and the audience hasn't discovered and explored that purpose yet. Therefore, in order to comprehend and discover the message, the audience needs to substantiate different types of semantic and pragmatic enrichments in order to disambiguate the message and facilitate the process interpretation of discourse (Frisson, 2009). Therefore, by resorting to clues in the context and applying pragmatic inferences in the process of interpretation, the audience tries to perceive meanings for these vague elements in discourse so that he would be able to discover writer's/speaker's intention and message in discourse. Consequently, in this creative, collaborative, and communicative interaction with text there is some sort of incongruity and divergence between lexical/semantic meaning and pragmatic interpretation of the meanings, functions and behaviors of words and phrases and as a result the coherence relations established in the process of interpretation of discourse. This creative and interactive process of discursal manipulation of text is referred to as underspecification (Spooren, 1997; Egg and Redeker, 2007; Frisson and Pickering, 2001). Underspecification is a multidimensional discourse theory investigating the mismatch between lexical meaning of linguistics elements and their different pragmatic functions in social contexts. The result of such a study would be the introduction of the different methods of creation of discourse in different aspects of using language in the society (Aijmer, 2002).

Combination of discourse analysis, particularly discourse monitoring, and translation studies through the analysis of data in parallel corpora in the area of translation will provide comprehensive information regarding the

comprehensive process of underspecification in using language in the society and as a result these studies will provide more comprehensive analysis and discovery of coherence relations in cultural communicative environments (Spooren, 1997; Crible and Dangand, 2018; Forku, 2014). These researchers believe that the analysis of data in parallel texts will provide an ideal method for comparative discourse studies among languages in the processes of decoding and encoding in simultaneous translation. As the interpreter imagines himself in the position of the audience in this context, consequently, he would naturally apply the strategies of natural language processing and interpretive use of this pragmatic, discourse **construction**, and discourse analytic theory of underspecification in the process of encoding the message in simultaneous translation. This manipulative use of language can be investigated by discourse and pragmatic analysts. Since the translator has to adapt the application of metalinguistic elements such as discourse markers (DMs henceforth) in another the discourse, language, and Culture with different pragmatic strategies in the process of rendering source language message in the target language and therefore the issue of mismatch between lexical meaning of words and expressions and their pragmatic behaviors and functions of DMs in the process of creating intercultural coherence relations can be realized (Spooren, 1997; Steel, 2015; Zufferey and Dagand, 2013).

Coherence relations signal the semantic and pragmatic links, relations, and associations between units of discourse. They also specify and characterize the nature of existing relationships between discourse components, and consequently facilitate the process of creating and interpreting the units of discourse in a text. These semantic and pragmatic links and relations consist of the following four types of coherence relations: elaboration, contrast, inference, and sequence. These relations are mostly expressed through the use of DMs (Das and Taboada, 2018).

In the process of creating text and discourse the writer/speaker tries to establish different semantic and pragmatic relations and

associations between units of discourse through using different linguistic and metalinguistic devices. Moreover, the audience should try to use linguistic elements in order to discover different semantic and pragmatic relations in the process of comprehension and interpretation of discourse. These metalinguistic elements are referred to as DMs and they include verbs, adverbs, coordinators, conjunctions, and preposition phrases such as *and*, *therefore*, *but*, and other words and phrases which establish the most frequent, effective, and useful variables in the process of production, comprehension, and interpretation of discourse (Crible and Dagand, 2019; Mohammadi and Radjaie, 2020). The process of discovering DMs-use and non-use was substantiated through using DMs inventory developed by Mohammadi and Dehghan (2020).

This researcher intended to investigate the different manifestations and characterizations of underspecification in the simultaneous translation and interpretation of the most frequent, dynamic, complex, and apparently simple DM "and" within the framework of a theory in discourse analysis known as underspecification. The researcher's assumption is that the simultaneous translator and interpreter would apply different strategies of underspecification in the process of construction of discourse in simultaneous translation and interpretation. The following questions are addressed by the present research: 1. To what extent underspecification is applied in the process of encoding the DM and in simultaneous translation? 2. What are the different manifestations of underspecification in the process of simultaneous translation? 3. What are the different translations of *and* as a result of the application of underspecification in simultaneous translation? 4. What are the different sources and causes of deletion of the DM and in the process of simultaneous translation? 5. What are the different sources and causes of not applying underspecification in the process of translating the DM and in the process of simultaneous translation?

2. Review of literature

The first section of literature review will cover

theoretical studies and in the second part the experimental researches will be analyzed.

2-1. Theoretical studies

DMs are metadiscursive elements applied for establishing relationship between units of discourse through coherence relations such as contrast, consequence, simile, description and so on. Moreover, they possess other functions such as turn exchange, topic switch, and establishing a discursal relationship between speaker/writer and audience (Schiffrin, 1987; Frank-job, 2006; Fisher, 2006). DMs are metalinguistic elements which are made up of coordinators such as *and*, *but*, and *or*; conjunctions such as *because* and *although*; adverbs such as *well* and *really*; sentences such as *I mean*, prepositional phrases such as *in fact* and *in other words* (Fraser, 2006).

The discussion of DMs is a very important topic and fundamental issue in areas of pragmatics and discourse analysis. And as a result, for several decades researchers have tried their best to analyze and explore their structure, meaning, and functional spectrum in human communications and interactions. The philosophy behind researchers' focus on DMs analysis is due to the fact that establishing coherence in discourse and creation of relationship between units of discourse are DMs' basic and fundamental functions investigated within the two theoretical perspectives of coherence (Schiffrin and Mushler, 2015) and relevance (Blakemore, 1993). The rationale behind the researchers' great emphasis on DMs is their widest spread meaning, and substantial spectrums of functions in monitoring human discourse (Fisher, 2006). That is to say, DMs such as *and* and *therefore* are interpreted differently in different contexts. This is dependent on the meaning, structural configuration, and general knowledge of languages speakers (Spooren, 1997).

Redeker (1990) discovers three domains of discourse construction and explanation in the functional spectrum of DMs: ideational structure establishing the relationship between real world

events, rhetorical structure creating relationship between assumptions and speech acts, temporal structure setting up a relationship between extended units of discourse such as turns, topics, and themes. According to Redeker (1990) the common ground between all these approaches is giving rise to distinctions between special meaning or special discourse relationship which is established by a DM from one outlook and another level of discourse or writer/speaker intention from the other viewpoint which is established by DMs. In other words, a DM can indicate and signal special meaning such as conclusion in more than one domain such as real conclusion, argumentative conclusion, and textual conclusion in different domains.

Researchers have conducted investigations in the areas of DMs and discursal relationships in parallel data in translation applying underspecification theory in the analysis of DMs and their translation in target language. Hoek et al (2017) investigated different discursal relationships which were translated implicitly in the process of translation. They assumed that simple cognitive and mental relationships are generally expressed implicitly in a text. This is not the case about complex mental and cognitive relationships expressed in a text. Researchers believe that the discussion of underspecification in the process of translation is mostly substantiated on DMs (Egg, 2010). According to Spooren (1997) in the area of underspecification, researchers study the mismatch between lexical meaning and interpretation of DMs in the expression of relationship between units of discourse. This researcher believes that implicit interpretation of a DM is dependent on implicit issues in the context of text. Analyzing the most frequent DM, i.e. *and*. This researcher supports the idea that the expression of causal and contrastive relationships is added to the core meaning of this DM.

2-2. Experimental studies

The structural configuration of DMs is under the influence of their multifunctional nature. According to Schiffrin (1987, 2006) the most frequent DM in English language is *and*. This

DM has limited lexical meanings functioning as a coordinator and continuity. However, it possesses different pragmatic applications such as contrast, argument, establishing relationship between topics, supporting an idea, and as an introduction to an argument. Crible et al (2018) investigated the functions and translation equivalence of three groups of the most frequent DMs, that is, *and*, *but*, and *and therefore* and their translation within the framework of underspecification- the mismatch between their lexical meaning and pragmatic interpretations. The results revealed that the translation of these DMs has undergone different procedures of underspecification in their corpora. These procedures are parallel, but all other DMs and their functions were not underspecified equally.

Buysse (2012) investigated the DMs in the following three domains: ideational domain such as indicating conclusion, interpersonal domain such as argument and turn keeping, and textual domain including introduction and beginning of discourse, returning back to the former part of discourse and self-correction. He came to the conclusion that so is a DM with 10 different functions. Aijmer (2002) analyzed the DM really and his analysis resulted in different pragmatic functions such as contrast and description. This variety in functional spectrum includes different domains and establishes discourse construction and configuration in the process of communication. They include different semantic domains such as objective and external uses from one point of view and pragmatic domains such as cognitive and mental applications from another perspective.

Dupont and Zufferey (2017) investigated translation corpora in order to analyze the effect of text type, translation direction, and translators experience in the modification of meaning and deletion of contrastive DMs in English and French. Their study revealed that these variables influence the process of translation of DMs and their translation strategies should be investigated on the basis of the type of corpus. Moreover, the results revealed that new studies and investigations found out different types of translation strategies. Also, these researchers

realized that most translators approach the source text faithfully. Moreover, deletion of DMs in their corpus had the lowest frequency. And that is due to the fact that in argumentative language it is necessary to explicitly transfer the relationship between different units of discourse. The interesting point in their finding was that the basis for deletion, maintenance, and change of DMs in the process of translation was based on functional explanation and pragmatic interpretation in the process of using DMs in social contexts.

Moreover, Crible et al (2018) analyzed parallel corpora and discovered that the patterns of deletions of DMs in translation into four languages were very similar. In addition, they found out that the patterns of deletion are dependent on strategy and it was not related to the similarity in the family languages concerned. For example, the DM *and* was deleted in some parts, i.e. it was deleted in 6 out of 10 cases in rhetorical texts. This finding showed that when the DM *and* has got a function different from the core meaning of addition, it is not deleted in the process of translation. Their analysis revealed that in all four languages in parallel corpora and was translated into a different DM. Underspecified uses of *and* such as conclusion or contrast mostly are not deleted and as a result, they are replaced with more explicit DMs in the process of translation. Also Forku (2014) comes to the conclusion that symmetric equivalence or one-to-one correspondence for DMs in their target text is impossible and in various cases we cannot replace the same DM in the target text. In the analysis of parallel corpora in Chinese and Russian languages, Jiang and Tao (2017) discovered different types of translation universals such as simplification, implicitation, explicitation, and normalization. Therefore, the analysis of the literature in this area revealed that the only investigation carried out about the DM *and* was done on Hafez and Goute poetry by Mohammed and Dehghan (2020). As a result, no study is carried out in the area of combining translation studies and establishing coherence relations in discourse construction based on underspecification theory in analyzing simultaneous translators' strategies in Iran and the present research intends to fill this scientific and research gap.

3. Methodology Research

In this comparative, descriptive and qualitative research, discourse construction and pragmatic behaviors of simultaneous translator in the process of translation were investigated. In this comparative study two Persian and English spoken corpora were compared to analyze the establishment of discourse relations through applying the DM *and*. It is descriptive and qualitative due to the fact that firstly it analyzed parallel data from a natural context of language use. And secondly it benefited from research questions and a research analysis model (Seliger and Shohamy 1989).

3-1. The corpus

The corpus consisted of three lectures by the leader of Islamic Revolution of Iran Ayatollah Khamenei in Persian language and their simultaneous translation into English in Iranian TV broadcasting channel Press TV. This corpus consisted of 2115 sentences and 34484 words. There were 945 instances of DMs in Persian corpus and 219 examples out of 945 were the instances of the DM *and*. 121 instances of this DM were selected randomly for the analysis, consisting of more than 50 percent of the corpus. First English translations of the lectures were listen carefully for three times. Then, it was transcribed. And finally, they were classified and organized in the form of written text for the purpose of analysis. After that, the instances of the DM *and* in the target text, that is English, were determined and analyzed and finally they were compared with the source text, Persian text.

3-2. Theoretical framework

In pragmatics and discourse studies, there is a theory known as underspecification. It was applied as the theoretical foundation to support the practical aspects of the study. On the basis of this theory, in the earlier stages of natural processing of language in human mind, still structures, images, and mental pictures relevant to the meaning, concepts, and speaker writer intention behind using linguistic elements in the mind of audience are not formed and especially their pragmatic functions are not distinguished. As a

result, in order to understand and disambiguate the text, the audience or readership needs to apply different types of semantic pragmatic enrichments in order to facilitate the analysis and interpretation of discourse. To meet this objective, the audience would appeal to clues in the context and resort to pragmatic inferences in the process of interpretation of discourse and as a result come up with a meaning for some ambiguous linguistic elements in discourse in order to discover and explore speaker/ writer intention. In this communicative interaction with text, there is some sort of mismatch between the primary lexical meaning of the linguistic elements and their pragmatic interpretation of the implicit pragmatic functions and behaviors of words and statements. The outcome would be the interpretation of discursal relationship established by applying linguistic elements in discourse analysis. This process of creative interaction with text and discourse construction is referred to as underspecification theory. Therefore, underspecification theory is a multivariate discourse analysis premise investigating different aspects of mismatch between lexical meaning of linguistic elements and their different pragmatic functions in social context. That is to say, changes in the application of language in social context are based on pragmatic manipulation of language elements. Analysis of these pragmatic manipulations and changes is the major purpose of discourse analysis framework known as underspecification. And the researchers' purpose working within this theoretical perspective is introducing discourse construction system in different aspects of language use in the society. These researchers try discover discourse production and comprehension system first and then to facilitate the cooperation between people in discourse (Spoorn, 1997; Egg and Redecker, 2008; Frisson, 2009; Frisson and Pickering 2001). For example, a DM such as *and* in social communications such as the translation, might be rendered into to DMs such as *but*, *because*, *therefore*, and so on.

3-3. Scientific basis and reliability

In order to accomplish, realize and support the scientific value and reliability of this

comparative analysis between source and target texts, the following steps were pursued. First the target text was listened carefully. Then the instances of discourse markers in source and target texts were determined and sorted applying discourse marker inventory designed by Mohammadi and Dehghan (2020) manually. And finally, the comparative and contrastive analysis of the instances of the DM *and* in the source text, i.e. Persian and target text, i.e. English were carried out on within the framework of the theory of underspecification.

3-4. The model

The DM inventory designed by Mohammadi and Dehghan (2020) was employed in the classification of DMs. The reason behind the selection of this model was the fact that theoretically it was based on coherence theory introduced by Schiffrin (1987, 2006). Moreover, it was substantiated by scientific and experimental corpus-based studies in the analysis of translation criticisms. This model categorized DMs into the following four groups: elaborative, contrastive, inferential, and temporal DMs. The instances of elaborative DMs (EDMs) include *and*, *moreover*, *also*, etc. The instances of contrastive DMs (CDMs) include words and phrases such as *but*, *in spite of*, *however*, etc. The examples of inferential DMs (IDMs) include *therefore*, *then*, *as a result*, *so*, etc. And temporal DMs (TDMs) include *first*, *second*, *finally*, and so on.

4. Results and discussion

The present researcher analyzed the various instances of underspecifications of the most frequent, effective, and complex DM *and* in the process of translation. The research questions addressed the degree of application of underspecification in the construction of discourse in simultaneous translation, deletion, and substitution of this DM with other DMs. Moreover, we analyzed the cases in which underspecification is not put into practice in the process of translation of this DM. Table 1 shows the results of the parallel corpora of the study. According to Table 1, there are 219 instances of the DM *and* in Persian corpus. The sample

analyzed in the research consisted of 121 instances of this DM comprising 55% of all examples in the corpus. Underspecified instances of the DM *and* included 89 instances including 73% (first question). And different manifestations of underspecification included substitution of this DM in the framework of the

context with 43 instances containing for 35% and its deletion consisting of 46 instances and explaining 38% of the distribution (the subject of second, third, and fourth questions). And finally in 32 instances, i.e. 26% of the cases the DM *and* was not underspecified (question number 5).

Table 1. The results of underspecified instances of the DM *and* in the process of simultaneous translation

total instances/percent	selected instances /percent	underspecified instances /percent	changed instances /percent	instances of deletion /percent	Non- underspecified instances /percent
219 /100	121 /55	89 /73	43 /35.5	121 /55	32 /26

4-1. Underspecifications of *and*

This part of findings revealed that in 73% of the cases, instances of the DM *and* were underspecified by the simultaneous interpreter. The underspecifications included substitution and deletion. 73% shows a high index of application of underspecification in the process of translating this DM in simultaneous translation. The importance of this finding lies in the fact that it shows different manifestations of this fundamental approach in the construction of the discourse and it is a dynamic and complex source of human application of different strategies in the process of discourse construction and manipulation. These strategies contribute to the creation of a context sensitive approach in discourse construction which is comprehensible for the audience. Employment and application of underspecification theory is reported in other researches such as Crible et al (2018). In the analysis of the translation of different discourse markers, Hoek et al (2017) discovered that many translators applied explicitation in the process of translation. In the analysis of parallel corpora these researchers discovered that unpredictable, complex, and compound mental relationships in multilingual corpora in European parliamentary debates were totally translated explicitly. Moreover, their results revealed that in the context in which the DM *and* expressed an unpredictable meaning such as contrast, it was underspecified and as a result, it was translated into another discourse marker such as “but” and in some other situations and conditions it was deleted.

Discussing the philosophy behind substitution

and deletion of DMs in the process of human communication, Spoorren (1997) focuses on the cooperation between speaker/writer and audience and concludes that underspecification is an effective variable in the process of facilitating the cooperation between participants in discourse. As a result, in many situations underspecification strategies were applied in discourse in order to facilitate mutual understanding. In the analysis of the philosophy behind substituting DMs in the process of communication, Egg (2010) raises the question of ambiguity and concludes that that in natural processing of language the listener possesses all the different meanings of a word, phrase, sentence in his or her mind. Through the process of monitoring his discourse and following a complicated approach, the audience tries to analyze, discover and explore the possible pragmatic functions and behaviors of the words and phrases and then selects the most applicable and suitable function in processing and constructing of discourse relations. The analysis of these studies revealed that typically underspecification functions as a translation strategy within which a DM is substituted with another DM with different meanings and pragmatic functions in the process of translation. In some other contexts deletion and implicitation of DMs is reported by Crible et al (2018) through application of underspecification in the process of translation.

4-2. Underspecifications of the DM *and*: substitution

According to Table 1 in 43 cases out of 121 instances, accounting for more than 35%, the DM

and is substituted with other discourse markers. This substitution included all four different types of DMs covered in Mohammadi and Dehghan (2020) inventory including elaborative, contrasting, inferential, and temporal DMs. Figure 1 displays different aspects of this substitution. The first rank with more than 60%

belongs to elaborative DMs (EDMs). Inferential DMs (IDMs) stay in the second rank explaining 27% of the cases. Temporal DMs (TDMs) take the third rank making up for 9% of the instances. And the lowest frequency of substitution belongs to contrastive DMs (CDMs) explaining 2% of the data (Figure 1).




Figure 1. Underspecifications of the DM and

Table 2. Underspecifications of the DM and

					و	و	و	و	Total
Simple EDMs					Also 2	And of course 2	I mean 2	And also 6	12
Compound EDMs	وهم	والبته	وهم	ودرواقع	وبعد	وهنوزهم	وبعد	و...هم	14
	Also 2	Of course	Let me also	And 2	And also	And I mean	And 2	And 4	
IDMs				واما	وبه هرحال	و	و	و	12
				So 2	so	Well and	Well	So 7	
TDMs					و	واما	و	و	6
					And when	Now as for	And then	Just	
CDMs								و	1
								But	
Total	۲	۱	۱	۴	۵	۵	۶	۱۹	43

According to table 2 the most frequent substitution belongs to elaborative DMs, including simple and compound DMs. These two features function symmetrically. That is to say, in some cases the Persian DM is a simple DM but its English equivalent is a compound DM, i.e. translating single Persian DM into two DMs in the target language (extracts 3, 6, 13, 14). And in some cases in Persian language there is a compound DM but its English equivalent is a simple one (extracts 11, 16). And a third form of replacement in this corpus consisted of compound discourse markers in both Persian and English versions (extract 8).

In sum, this DM is replaced with 8 different types of EDMs. Another form of replacement of the DM *and* is replacing it with inferential DM and it includes three different DMs with simple and compound forms (extracts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 15, 16). The third type of substitution is replacing this DM with TDMs and it includes four different simple and compound DMs (extracts 6, 7, 9, 1, 3, 14). And finally, it is replaced with CDMs, that is but with only a single instance in the corpus (extract 17). This part of the findings of this research is in line with researches reported by Crible et al (2018) and Egg and Redeker (2008).

Table 3. Underspecification of the DM and: substitution

Number	Extracts
1	<p>مشتاق هدایت بشر است و به معنای واقعی کلمه مثل پدر مهربان به دنبال این است که بشر خوشبخت بشود.</p> <p>He wants to see the humanity guided the right way, <u>well</u> the prophet was a kind father, who wants to see humanity moving on the right destiny.</p>
2	<p>مسئله سیاست دولتی است که از این کار غلط دارد حمایت می‌کند و یک مقام سیاسی می‌آید صریحاً پشتیبانی خودش را ذکر می‌کند.</p> <p>It is the policy of an establishment that is backing this wrong deed. <u>So</u> the political figure goes there and expressly announces his support for this.</p>
3	<p>آحاد متعددی از نمایندگان و اجزای دولت و قوه قضائیه را به شهادت رساندند و طبق آماري که در اختیار است، هفده هزار [نفر] از مردم عادی را، مردم کوچه و بازار را، به شهادت رساندند؛</p> <p>Lots of members of parliament, members of judiciary were martyred <u>and also</u> on the top 17000 people on the streets, they martyred them all.</p>
4	<p>و اما راجع به هفته وحدت بنده گمان می‌کنم امروز بیش از همیشه اهمیت این ابتکار بزرگ امام راحل آشکار شده است.</p> <p><u>So</u> let's go to the second point, the unity week. Well, I believe that today more than any time, the significance of this great initiative of the late Imam Khomeini is being evident to us.</p>
5	<p>البته مسئله فلسطین تمام‌شدنی نیست و این‌ها نمی‌توانند و کوچک‌تر از آن هستند که این مسئله را به پایان برسانند.</p> <p>Of course, this is not going to come to an end. <u>I mean</u>, they cannot dare to be able to put an end to the cause of Palestine.</p>
6	<p>شما ناگهان می‌بینید که مثلاً فرض کنید در فلان کشور همسایه ما یک [شخص] منبری، می‌رود روی منبر و به مقدسات آن فرقه دیگر اهانت می‌کند، بعد پایین می‌آید، می‌رود در سفارت انگلیس پناهنده می‌شود؛</p> <p>And all of a sudden you see that in a country in our neighborhood a scholar goes to poly om <u>and then</u> insults the other denomination. <u>And then</u> he goes to British embassy and takes shelter</p>
7	<p>و اما مسئله سیزدهم آبان. جالب است که امسال سیزدهم آبان که روز مبارزه با استکبار است، مصادف شده است با ولادت پیامبر اعظم؛</p> <p><u>Now as for</u> the 13th of Aban, November 3rd, interestingly 13th of Aban that is the day of fighting the global arrogance is concurrent with the birth anniversary of the prophet of Islam.</p>
8	<p>و این را هم عرض بکنیم که تصور بعضی‌ها از دولت آمریکا و رژیم آمریکایی یک تصور غلطی است؛ خیال می‌کنند اگر چنانچه دولتی خودش را تسلیم کرد به آن رژیم، بهره خواهد برد از او؛ نخیر</p> <p><u>Let me also</u> mention the fact that some people would, well, they have the assumption about the US establishment was a wrong one. They believe if such a government surrenders to that regim, then they would benefit from that. No that is not the case.</p>
9	<p>نمونه‌اش رژیم پهلوی در کشور خودمان است که کشور را واقعاً عقب‌افتاده کردند با تسلیم در مقابل سیاست‌های آمریکا. و روزبه‌روز هم هر چه بگذرد، این جور رژیم‌ها وابسته‌تر و گرفتارتر می‌شوند.</p> <p>We have also an instance Pahlavi regime in our own country. The country was really moving backward and surrendering to American policies. <u>Just day after day</u>, those regimes will be more dependent.</p>
10	<p>این را من بارها عرض کرده‌ام به ملت عزیزمان و به مسئولین هم در جلسات کاری، در جلسات خصوصی، در نگاه عمومی، مکرراً مطرح کرده‌ام</p> <p>I have repeatedly told our people <u>also</u> the officials in the meetings that we have working meetings, private meetings that we had with the authorities.</p>
11	<p>امام در یک چنین شرایطی توانست آغاز جنگ را و بعد تداوم این حرکت را در زیر چشم خود و اراده خود به پیش ببرد و اداره کند.</p> <p>But the late Imam in such a situation managed the beginning of the war <u>and</u> the continuation of the war by having every thing under his controle.</p>
12	<p>اینکه گاهی گفته می‌شود و درست هم هست که «دفاع مقدس بخشی از هویت ملی است»، به خاطر این است که دفاع مقدس، مظهر بروز هویت والا و برجسته ملت ایران بود که توانستند جنگ را به پیروزی برسانند.</p> <p>And this is part of our national identity, when it is said <u>and of course</u> it is true, due to the fact that that the sacred defense has led to the manifestation of this glorious identity of the Iranian nation. He managed to win the war.</p>
13	<p>... و بنی صدر فرار کرد و فرماندهی جنگ را خود امام بزرگوار به عهده گرفتند.</p> <p>... <u>and when</u> Banisadr had fled and Imam actually led the war and was acting as the commander in chief.</p>
14	<p>... پس اینکه می‌گوییم ایشان به جوان‌ها اعتماد می‌کردند — و امروز هم ما همین عقیده را داریم که باید به جوان‌ها اعتماد کرد.</p> <p>So when you say that Imam has stressed on the youth, and then we are in the same belief that we need to trust the youth.</p>
15	<p>به معنای واقعی کلمه تحقیر کردند ابرقدرت‌ها را؛ اراده این‌ها را شکستند و این‌ها را از میدان خارج کردند.</p> <p>That really humiliated the world powers and they shuttled them, <u>well and</u> they kicked them out.</p>
16	<p>و به هر حال به توفیق الهی، به لطف الهی، آمریکایی‌ها با رفتارهای خودشان رسوا شدند؛ آن، مدیرتشان در قضیه کرونا، که آنها را در دنیا رسوا کرده و الان هم این رسوایی ادامه دارد؛</p> <p><u>So</u> hopefully Americans face scandal in the way that they acted. You know that how they managed the coronavirous <u>and</u> the scandal is still going on</p>
17	<p>می‌توانستند از تجربه‌های دیگران استفاده کنند و می‌توانستند آمادگی‌های لازم را به وجود بیاورند،</p> <p>They could not use other people's experiences. <u>But</u> they could have made preparations.</p>

What is the philosophy behind these substitutions? On the basis of different interpretations for DMs in the process of translation, researchers provide different justifications for this phenomenon. These justifications include broad variety of meanings, pragmatic functions, structural configurations, and world knowledge of languages speakers. The employment of DMs in different contexts and different inferences for more comprehensive interpretation for DMs on the basis of meaning, implicit, and pragmatic behaviors of DMs (Aijmer, 2002; Egg and Redeker, 2008; Buysse, 2012; Frisson and Pickering, 2001). These different interpretations are manifested more clearly and comprehensively in the process of translation and resulted in many differences in the translation of DMs. Moreover, the analysis of parallel data in investigations revealed that *and* is substituted with different DMs by the translators (Crible et al 2018). Other researchers (Redeker 1990; Schiffrin, 1987) believe that their functions in text construction is the source of different interpretation of DMs. These researchers concluded that DMs different functions such as contrast, argumentation, and conclusion, i.e. they preface different argumentations in different domains of ideation, rhetoric, and sequence in the process of construction of discourse and as a result, they assume different functions and manifestations in translators' discourse. Other researchers (Spooren, 1997; Hoek et al, 2017) focus on the nature of the DM "*and*" and then came to the conclusion that as this DM is strictly general and is used for indicating different types of discourse relations; therefore, in the process of human communication the person generally will come up with different meanings for this DM and as a result, this phenomenon is manifested

through substituting it with order discourse markers in translation.

4-3. Underspecifications of the DM and: deletion

In this part of the discussion, the focus is on the second manifestation of underspecification in the process of translating DM, i.e. deletion of the marker in the process of construction of discourse and encoding. According to Table 1, this kind of underspecification includes 46 instances, explaining 38% of distribution in the corpus. It is a reliable and high index and exceeds its substitution with other the DMs. There are various justifications for the deletion of this DM. This analysis is based on 21% of the cases of the deletion of this DM in the target text. According to Figure 2 and Table 4, one of the instances is using pronoun instead of *and*. It took place 15 times accounting for 32% of distribution in the corpus (Extracts 9 and 11). The second approach for the realization of this type of underspecification is dividing the sentence in question into two separate sentences. This approach was appealed to in 13 instances explaining 28% of the data (extracts 1,2, 3). The further strategy for deletion of *and* is applying paraphrase occurring 7 times and accounting for 13% of the distribution (Extracts 5 and 13). Fifth procedure for deletion of this DM is summarizing with 4 instances justifying 9% of distribution. Another system for deletion of this DM is changing a phrase into clause with 3 instances and describing 6.5% of the distribution (extract 4). The other methods include using "ing" form of English verbs (extract 6), utilizing adverbs (extract 10), and applying infinitive phrase (extract 8) in the process of translation.




Figure 2. underspecifications of the DM *and*

Table 4. Underspecifications of the DM and

Number	Extracts
1	اینها هم نخواهند توانست و اینها به پیغمبر صدمه نمی زنند. They cannot do anything. <u>They</u> cannot harm the prophet of Islam in any way.
2	البته بایستی امنیت ارامنه‌ای که در این سرزمین‌ها هستند محفوظ باشد و مرزهای بین‌المللی هم باید رعایت بشود؛ Of course, the Armenians who are residing in those territories need to be provided with security. International should also be respected.
3	ایران، هم در جنگ بین‌الملل اول، هم در جنگ بین‌الملل دوم اعلام بی‌طرفی کرد و کشور در هر دو جنگ اشغال شد. Iran announced it was impartial in both first and second world wars. In both wars the country was occupied.
4	نکته پنجم؛ دفاع مقدس برای کشور سرمایه‌سازی کرد و سرمایه‌های ارزشمندی را برای کشور به‌وجود آورد. The fifth point is that the sacred defense delivered assets for this country, provided the country with valuable assets
5	ادبیات دفاع مقدس یک سرچشمه است، انواع و اقسام ادبیات را می‌شود از آن انتزاع کرد و استفاده کرد و از آن می‌جوشد؛ The literature of the sacred defense can be considered as the source literature. You can just derive other type of literature from that source.
6	... شیکوه کنند پیش امام حسین (علیه‌السلام) و بگویند یا سیدالشهدا، ما دلمان می‌خواست بیایم... ... complain to Imam Hossein, <u>telling</u> Imam Hossein we were eager to take part in the rally...
7 به نظر من حوزه‌ها باید از این خیلی قدردانی کنند و استفاده کنند، استقبال کنند.... that is what seminal schools need to favour it.
8	پس بنابراین تحویل یعنی میل به شتاب گرفتن و سرعت داشتن در حرکت و جهش در حرکت Therefore, by change we mean you have this inclination and willingness to excellerate, <u>to move</u> forward fast
9	یعنی وضع این جور است و کاری که امروز طواغیت با استفاده از دانش بشری و پیشرفت دانش می‌کنند، So that is what the situation is like, <u>they</u> are taking advantage of human knowledge.....
10	هم جریان‌های تروریستی را به‌وجود آوردند، هم عناصری را که نمی‌دانستند و نمی‌خواستند وارد این بازی بشوند.... They also created terrorist groups and elements. And also those elements who did not know, <u>actually</u> did not want to enter this game.
11	اما آنهایی که خودشان را تسلیم آمریکا کردند و سیاست‌های آمریکایی را پذیرفتند But those who have surrendered to the America, <u>they</u> have accepted and adapted the US policy,
12	آن وقت معلوم می‌شود اینهایی که رفتند در این میدان کار کردند چه ارزشی دارند. Then that is the time we can also understand and comprehend those who had been fighting at the battle front, how valuable they have been.
13	یعنی تعرض و خطابش به آن کسانی بود که شناخته بود که اینها عاملان اصلی هستند و پشت صحنه جنگ در واقع اینها هستند. I mean he was addresssing those states that he knew that they were the main ones behind waging that war against us.

What are the reasons, sources, and patterns of deletion of DMs in the process of translation? According to Baker (2011) the wide variety and the high frequency of distribution of the DM and in languages are the sources which explain the reasons for or applying deletion as a strategy in the process of translating DMs. Other researchers (Hoek et al, 2017; Crible et al, 2018) come to the conclusion that the justification for deletion of DMs in translation process depends on their semantic, pragmatic, functional behaviors, and functions in human discourse. In this regard Hoek et al (2017) analyzed parallel corpora in the process of translation and came to the conclusion that some relations such as a speech act relations and positive causal relations are always expressed implicitly in the process of translation and as a result underspecification in the form of deletion

is demonstrated. Moreover, the analysis of parallel corpora in four languages revealed that two most frequent DMs, that is *now* and *therefore* were not translated in all four languages. Their analysis revealed that the strategy of deletion enclosed two different types of DMs: a. speech specific DMs which function as turn givers such as ok, now, and so, b. conjunctions expressing a large number of discourse relations such as and, so, etc. Moreover, their analysis revealed that discourse monitoring functions of DMs such as well, therefore, and now were never translated by translators. In addition, Zufferey (2017) maintains that frequent application of deletion as a translation strategy exposed the low degree of informational value of the DM in question and as a result the translator deleted that DM in target language. This researcher concludes that there is

a correspondence between the deletion of DMs and their functional spectrum and mainly deletion is concerned with additive functions and usages of the DM in a text. It shows that this DM does not express any coherence function.

4-4. Instances not underspecified

Another part of the findings is related to instances in which underspecification is not applied in the process of construction of discourse in translation process. According to Table 1 in 32 instances explaining 26% of the cases in the translation of the DM *and*, there is no substitution and deletion. How can it be justified? On the basis of Figure 3 and Table 5 the analysis of examples

and cases in which no substitutions of the DM *and* are displayed, it is revealed that the following four factors provide the justification for this finding: approving point of view in discourse with 7 examples representing 22% of the distribution (extracts 2 and 6), completing the meaning of a unit of discourse with 11 instances and constituting 34% of the data (extracts 1 and 5). And discourse relation of sequence as well as emphasis include 7 examples justifying 22% of the distribution (extracts 4, 3, 7). Resorting to these strategies in discourse construction in the process of encoding in translation does not result in any substitution or deletion of DMs.




Figure 3. Instances of the DM and not underspecified

Table 5 Instances of the DM and not underspecified

Number	Extracts
1	آن برهه قبل هم که این قضیه پیش آمد همین اتفاق افتاد؛ آنجا هم دیدیم که عناصر دولتی و شخصیت های سیاسی پشت قضیه درآمدند و دفاع کردند Last time when the same thing happened we saw the same story. There were some political figures who came for and supported that movement.
2	منتها یک نکته فهمیده می شود و آن، این است که این کارها نشانه ذات ظلمانی تمدن غرب است... But there is only one point that we should notice and that this is an indication of the brutal nature if the western civilization.
3	از این اتفاقاتی که در اینجاها افتاد انسان می فهمد که چقدر اتحاد دنیای اسلام مهم بود و چقدر یکپارچگی امت اسلامی عنصر ذی قیمتی بود که امام آن را اعلام کردند، ... Now what is happening in these countries reveals how significant unity week was among the Islamic countries <u>and</u> how valuable blessing that has been.....
4	اینها چقدر از آحاد فلسطینی را از بین برده اند و چه جنایتی مرتکب شده اند- و خوشحال بودن و به این افتخار کردن و برایش توجیه درست کردن... How many Palestinians you see they have killed <u>and</u> how many sort of different crimes they have committed <u>and</u> they are pleased, <u>and</u> they are proved of this, <u>and</u> they simply have come up with justifications for doing so.
5	این جماعتی که امروز به عنوان رزمندگان، به عنوان پیشکسوتان در این جلسه سراسری کشوری حضور دارند، جزو این کسانی هستند که این افتخار را داشتند که رفتند و این توفیق را داشتند که کار را به پایان رسانند. Now the people that today we call them war veterans, they are present at this national meeting. They are among those people who had been there. <u>And</u> they had the opportunity to finish the job.
6	منتها از اینکه یک عنصر جدیدی، یک هویت جدیدی در این منطقه حساس به وجود بیاید، بر اساس دین، بر اساس اسلام، با خصوصیتی که می دانستند و می شناختند، نگران بودند و مایل نبودند؛ لذا مقابل جمهوری اسلامی ایستادند. But because they would see a new entity that emerged in the region, on the basis of Islam with the idiosyncrasies that they knew of. They were concern about this <u>and</u> they did not want to see that. So they stood against the Islamic republic.
7	رهبری امام و هدایت امام و فرماندهی امام، اینها بود؛ و متأسفانه نقش امام در نوشته های مربوطه به جنگ، در بحث های مربوط به جنگ، مورد غفلت واقع شده! This is how he led the country, how he actually acted his commander in chief. <u>And</u> unfortunately the role of Imam in the literature related to the war, in the discourses and the discussions related to the war, we have neglected.

What are the justifications and patterns for preserving these DMs in the process of translation in relevant studies? In a report of the research provided by Dupont and Zufferey (2017) it was discovered that deletion as a translation strategy possessed the lowest frequency of occurrence in the process of translation. They justified that the reason for preserving these DMs was the text type. They proved that in argumentative texts, the discourse relations should be indicated explicitly. Because a speaker/writer tries to argue and prove their claims. Moreover, in a research reported by Crible et al (2018) it was revealed that DMs such as "but and because" were mostly not deleted and as a result, possessed the lowest frequency of deletion. And DMs such as *once, while, and when* had the second lowest rank of frequency in translators' discourse construction process. And other researchers such as Zuferi and Jigox (2015) provide the justification that a special meaning of contrast, conditional, and negative relations necessitate a change of point of view and as a result, they are not translated implicitly. Consequently, in these conditions and with such functions DMs such as *and* are not generally deleted in the process of translation.

5. Conclusions, pedagogical and research implication

The present investigator analyzed the translation of the most frequent, effective, complex, and apparently simple DM *and* within the framework of underspecification as a theory in discourse analysis. The study resulted in two different manifestations of underspecification in the process of translation: deletion and substitution. According to the Zufferey and Gygax (2015) translators' challenge in the process of translating DMs is that they have to encode them within the framework of another language and culture. This is due to the fact that text strategies in the employment of DMs in source and target languages are different. Moreover, the present investigation proved that combining studies in the area of underspecification and translation studies will function as a methodological approach and introduce more strategies and universals of translation and escalate

the reliability and validity of scientific investigations in the areas of discourse and pragmatics. Consequently, the discourse oriented theory of underspecification will result in different scientific, educational, research implications and applications in various areas and domains such as planning, material development, teacher training and curriculum development in translation study and education. Moreover, it functions as a discourse construction strategy and can create a framework for the analysis and construction of discourse in this area and the outcome would be explanation, justification, and expression of the changes, additions, and deletions in the process of translation.

In educational, research, and administrative systems in various sciences and walks of life generally different strategies are analyzed, discovered, and applied. Applying this discourse theoretical perspective in the analysis of parallel corpora in translation, the present researcher had the intention of examining the applicability of this theory in translation analysis and comprehensive investigation of discourse universals suggested by Aijmer and Simon-Vanderbergen (2006). Of course, the present study is among the first studies carried out in this area and other studies applying broader corpora, other procedures, strategies and practical approaches are needed to be carried out on other translators' works and analyzing other texts. The rationale is that simultaneous translator fulfils two different functions simultaneously as an audience and a creative speaker. Moreover, he applies translation strategies in encoding and production of discourse on the basis of conditions of context. The conditions of context include former information, social position of speaker/writer, audience, and assessment of people's cognitive situation in discourse (Richard, 2015). On the basis of the above resources, the simultaneous translator tries to discover the intentions in the source text and encode a text with different discursual features in a different context. And different aspects of translators' discourse construction procedures have not yet been investigated and other researchers should analyze different strategies, procedures, and systems applied in the process of translation and interpretation.

References

- Aijmer, K. & Simon-Vanderbergen, A. (2006). Pragmatic Markers in Contrast, Amsterdam: Elsevier
- Aijmer, K. (2002). English Discourse Particles. Evidence from a Corpus. John Benjamins

- Publishing Company,
Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Baker, M. & Francis, G. Tognini-Bonelli, E. (eds.) Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair, (233–250) Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Baker, M. 1993. Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies: Implications and Applications. In:
- Buysse, L. (2012). So as a multifunctional discourse marker in native and learner speech, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(13), 1764–1782.
- Crible, L. & A. Abuczki, N. Burksaitiene, P. Furko, A. Nedoluzhko. (2019). Functions and translations of discourse markers in TED Talks: A parallel corpus study of underspecification in five languages, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 4(142), 139–155.
- Crible, L. & Degand, L. (2019). Domains and functions: a two-dimensional account of discourse markers, *Discours*, 4(5), pp. 15–30.
- Das, D. & Taboada, M. (2018). Signaling of coherence relations in discourse, beyond discourse markers, Retrieved from: https://www.sfu.ca/~mtaboada/docs/publications/Das_.pdf
- Dupont, M. & Zufferey, S. (2016). Methodological issues in the use of directional parallel corpora: A case study of English and French concessive connectives, *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 22(2), 270–297.
- Egg, M. (2010). Semantic Underspecification, *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 4(3), 166–181.
- Egg, M. & Redeker, G. (2008). Underspecified Discourse Representation. Retrieved from: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/>
- Fisher, K. (2006). Approaches to discourse particles. Amstersam: Elsevier.
- Frank-Job, B. (2006). A dynamic-interactional approach to discourse markers. In K. Fischer, Approaches to discourse particles (pp. 359–375). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Fraser, B. (2006). Towards a theory of discourse markers. In K. Fischer, Approaches to discourse particles (pp. 240–256). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Frisson, S. (2009). Semantic Underspecification in Language Processing, *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 3(1), 111–127.
- Frisson, S. & Pickering, M. (2001). Obtaining a Figurative Interpretation of a Word: Support for Underspecification, *Metaphor and Symbol*, 16(4), 149–171.
- Furko, P. (2014). Perspectives on the Translation of Discourse Markers. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica*, 6(2), 181–196.
- Hoek, J. & Zufferey, S. (2015). Factors Influencing the Implication of Discourse Relations across Languages. Retrieved from: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269105580>.
- Hoek, J., Zufferey, S., Evers-Vermeul, J., & Sanders, T. (2017). Cognitive complexity and the linguistic marking of coherence relations: A parallel corpus study. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 121, 113–131.
- Mohammadi, A. M. & Dehghan, R. (2020). An Analysis of Discourse Markers in Translation Criticism: Introducing a Discourse Monitoring Model in the Iranian Context. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 18(69), 7–24.
- Mohammadi, A. M. & Radjaie, A. (2020). An analysis of the discursual uses and functions of ‘AND’ as a discourse marker in Hafiz and Goethe poetry: educational and research implications. *Journal of Foreign Language Research*, 10 (2), 406–421.
- Richards, J. C. (2015). Key Issues in Language Teaching, Cambridge: CUP.
- Schiffrin, D. (2006). Discourse marker research and theory: revisiting and. In K. Fischer, Approaches to discourse particles (pp. 315–339). Amstersam: Elsevier.
- Seliger, H. & Shohamy, E. (1989). Second Language Research, Oxford: OUP.
- Spooren, W. (1997). The processing of underspecified coherence relations. *Discourse Processes*, 24, 149–168.
- Steele, D. (2015). Improving the Translation of Discourse Markers for Chinese into English, Proceedings of NAACL-HLT Student Research Workshop (SRW), pages 110–117. Retrieved from: <https://www.google.com/search?>
- Zufferey, S. (2017). Discourse connectives across languages: factors influencing their explicit or implicit translation, *Languages in Contrast*, 16(2), 264–279.
- Zufferey, S. & Gygax, M. (2015). The Role of Perspective Shifts for Processing and Translating Discourse Relations, *Discourse Processes*, 4(7), 1–24.