THE ISSUE OF COHERENCE IN INTERPRETATION

Raximboyeva Iroda Xamdam qizi
Master student, Uzbekistan State World Languages University

This given publication work aims at revealing the role of coherence and its development in the process of interpretation. The features of coherence and the development of coherence are discussed and analysed in the thesis.

Some regard coherence as an internal mental phenomenon in both text production and comprehension), while others see coherence as the result of the interaction between texts and text users. Gernsbacher and Givon see coherence as 'a property of what emerges during speech production and comprehension – the mentally represented text, and in particular the mental processes that partake in constructing that mental representation. Sanford and Moxey suggest that coherence is the 'result of the interpretation and integration of interpreted text elements by the listener (reader) in relation to the intentions of a speaker and psychologically, people tend to produce a 'coherent mental representation' of the text when they try to comprehend it. On the other hand, de Beaugrande and Dressler claim that coherence concerns how the concepts and the relations underlying a text are 'mutually accessible and relevant. They also address that to understand a text, people make inferences based on their knowledge and expectations. However, without language features, these cognitive representations would not be communicable. Lexical, semantic and syntactic features are therefore needed, so that the interaction between knowledge can take place. Gernsbacher & Givon suggest that, to construct coherence, lexical knowledge and 'grammatical processing cues' are vital in achieving both 'local and global coherence links. Hobbs suggests that coherence markers such as anaphora are normally considered as clues to coherence. Sanders and Noordman also suggest that coherence relations can be made explicit by the use of linguistic markers.

In other words, coherence, no matter whether it comes from cognitive representation of a text or the interaction between text and text users, relies on linguistic features to display in a text. Coherence plays an important role in making text comprehensible. Comprehending interpreted texts is no exception: the more structured the text is, the easier it will be for the listener to follow it. Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) propose cohesion and coherence as the two most significant of seven standards by which the communicative value of a text can be measured. Similarly, Scott and Souza explain that, `the more structured the input is, the easier it will be for the reader to derive its underlying message' (1990: 53). Sanders and Noordman also believe that people need coherence to understand a text (2000: 37). Just as successful comprehension is necessary for a coherent representation of the input text, it is reasonable to claim that a coherent underlying representation of the evolving output text is a condition of successful production.

As an interpreter he has to know a great contribution of the term "coherence" in the process of interpretation since without coherence listeners can not comprehend the speech and may lead to another problem related to

misunderstanding. Due to the fact that the role of coherence in the interpreter speech is very valuable up to day it is the most discussed topic among interpreters since the more strategies to develop the coherence the more clear, understandable interpretation can be listened. Above mentioned ideas, facts show that in order to get perfect coherence interpreter has to practice more and more.

As Sawyer states, 'professional judgment alone is an insufficient basis for decision-making' (2004: 104). As Ficchi suggests, it might be that `their teaching lacks a theoretic or systematic basis' (Ficchi, 1999: 202). There are two ways in particular in which such a lack might affect the effectiveness of expert trainers. Firstly, expert trainers may find themselves 'at a loss to account for student performance and to explain students' difficulties' (Moser-Mercer, 200: 339). They may not have the 'appropriate meta-language to describe students' performance' (ibid). A lack of the necessary meta-language can lead to impressionistic or unhelpfully vague criticism, perhaps claiming, for instance, that an interpretation failed to carry the message, despite the presence of most of the original information. Of course, even when the expert trainer has access to such a meta-language, it is essential that this is effectively shared with the trainees in order to allow them to benefit from comments.

Secondly, expert trainers often evaluate student performances and diagnose problems from the 'vantage point of their own interpreting practice' (ibid.; Ficchi,

1999: 202 makes a similar observation). The comparisons which are likely to come from such a vantage point may not be very fair to trainees, as they are not yet fully fledged professional interpreters and their performance is not ready to be evaluated by professional standards.

It can be concluded that coherence is a rather complex phenomenon, which concerns with every aspect of the communication process, both verbal and non-verbal. Studies cannot embrace only one of the approaches and ignores the other in that both of them reveal the nature of discourse coherence from different perspectives. From the coherence-as-linguistic phenomenon point of view, it can be learned that what linguistic devices are functioning and how they are used to organize sentences into a coherent discourse. Simultaneously, it is quiet not enough to investigate discourse coherence as a static product of communication since communication is a dynamic process of interaction between communicator and audience, during which language serves as a medium. Therefore, in order to explore the nature of discourse coherence, these two aspects must be combined together. It should not be the case of either/or, but the complementation of each other. It is both a static and dynamic process. A coherent discourse can not only be achieved by linguistic device, but also by mutual efforts of participants in communication. So attention must also be paid to the function of non-verbal factors in the dynamic process of communication.

REFERENCES:

1. Agrifoglio M. (2004). Sight translation and interpreting: A comparative analysis of constraints and failures. Interpreting, 6(1), 43-67.

2. Ahn I.K. (2005). Pedagogical Considerations of Perspective Coherence Problems in Simultaneous Interpreting as a Result of Linguistic Structure. Illustrated by German-Korean Examples. Meta, 50(2), 696-712.

3. AIIC. (2004). Setting up a Conference Interpreting Training Programme. AIIC.

4. Aktins M.J., Beattie J., & Dockrell W.B. (1993). Assessment issues in higher education. London: Employment Department, Future & Higher Education Branch.

5. M. Pickering, H.P. Branigan, A.A. Cleland, and A.J. Stewart. Activiation of syntactic information during language production. Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 29:205–216, 2000.

6. Michael J. Reddy. The conduit metaphor: A case of frame conflict in our language about language. In Andrew Ortony, editor, Metaphor and Thought, pages 164–201. Cambridge, 1993

7. The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations https://doi.org/10.37547/tajssei/Volume03Issue

8. The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations https://doi.org/10.37547/tajssei/Volume03Issue

9. English-language Dictionary– http://en.wiktionary.org/wiki