

# Cokely's Taxonomy of Interpreter Miscues

Cokely, Dennis. 1986. Effects of lag time on interpreter errors. *Sign Language Studies* 53.

## **“O-ASIA”**

**Omissions (Target text has fewer propositions than source)**

**Morphological**

**Lexical**

**Cohesive**

**Additions (Target text has more propositions than source)**

**Non-Manual**

**Lexical**

**Cohesive**

**Substitutions (Omission and Addition)**

**Expansive (part to whole)**

**Restrictive (whole to part)**

**Cohesive**

**Unrelated**

**Intrusions (from source language)**

**Lexical**

**Syntactic**

**Anomalies (Otherwise unexplainable errors)**

**Utterance – meaningless message**

**Interpretation – excessive or insufficient information**

**Target Language consumers have the greatest chance of recovering source text content (via closure) when Omission occurs. Otherwise, recovery requires significant insight/effort and is unlikely. Thus if some error must be made, omission can allow the consumer a means for pursuing a correction.**

There are five types of omission (as a linguistic coping strategy) – Cerney, 2003

***Accidental Omission*** (the interpreter is unaware that an element has been omitted) can be best corrected by working with a team interpreter.

***Editorial Omission*** (deciding to omit without informing the consumer) may be a coping strategy when the constraints of time prohibit the inclusion of all source text content in the target text.

***Informed Omission*** (letting the consumer know that an element is missing) is most preferred.

***Overt Omission*** (the consumer can see that Source Text elements are being produced but the interpreter is making no attempts to generate a Target Text) is culturally offensive.

***Unavoidable Omission*** (the interpreter reveals that it is not possible to generate a target text) is preferable to overt omission.