Context and the Translation of Contrastive/Concessive Connectives in the European Commission’s Press Releases from a Relevance-theoretic Viewpoint – an English-Greek Case Study
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This paper examines a sample corpus of five pairs of English - Greek press releases issued by the European Commission, within a Relevance-Theoretic framework. Two levels of analysis are followed, one involves context resulting in contextual differences between the two language versions seen through translator’s choices; the other involves analysis of the role of contrastive/concessive markers/connectives in both language versions again through translator’s choices. Relevance Theory, with its divide between procedural and conceptual meaning, provides a framework for (re)constructing the context of EU press releases, assumptions and/or expectations on the part of the author, speaker and reader, and the role of contrastive/concessive connectives

1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to look into a sample corpus of five pairs of English - Greek press releases on the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) issued by the European Commission, for the purpose of looking into the translation of contrastive/concessive markers and the role of context. This sample corpus is part of a larger corpus of European Commission press releases. The larger corpus was
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drawn from the electronic text library\(^1\) of all EU press releases (RAPID) http://europa.eu/rapid/searchAction.do. The criteria for text selection of that corpus were the availability of a Greek version and the currency of topics.

2. Production conditions and structure of EC press releases

EU press releases are one of the types of documents produced in the framework of the European Union and are distinct from non-EU press releases. The reason is that if we accept that the European Union has a culture of its own, as Koskinen (2001, 2004) argues, then it is only normal to expect the production of EU culture-specific texts and genres. As Lindholm claims about the Commission press releases, «[t]hey are part of a communicative sequence and are not to be seen as an isolated communicative event» (2008, 35). There is a press conference every day in Brussels where the Midday briefing takes place referring to the main topics to be announced. Lindholm conducted a field study on the production and characteristics of such texts (2008, 39). Her findings support that EC press releases are produced under the same EU-specific conditions as most EU documents are, i.e. multiple versions drafted and translated at the same time, non-native

---

1. According to Atkins et al. (1992, 1), there are four types of electronic text collections: Archives – a repository of electronic texts not necessarily connected to each other; Electronic text library – a comprehensively standardised collection but without a selection limitation; Electronic text corpus – a subset of the text library collected under particular specifications and purpose; Text subcorpus – a subset of an electronic text corpus. The electronic corpus of IP texts, i.e. press releases of the European Commission, is arranged based on topic e.g. Agriculture and rural development, Competition policy etc. The larger corpus used for this research constitutes a subcorpus of the IP corpus. The main characteristics of electronic corpora are (Μικρός: 2004, 142-3): the time span covered – a specific moment in time or a specific time period; the purpose of their design; the range of text types and genres included, how representative of a language the corpus is (reference corpus/special corpus); and the number of languages included (monolingual/multilingual). The subcorpus of this research covers the period 1/1/2007 – 1/1/2009, is a special corpus of press releases of the European Commission under three major thematic categories, Agriculture, the Environment, Presidency Conclusions; each major thematic category is further divided into separate thematic categories, i.e. agreements or approval of decisions, approval of EU countries’ plans, proposals-policies, etc. It is bilingual comprising of parallel texts, and also monodirectional (Μικρός: 2004, 144-5) since there are only source texts in English and their target texts in Greek without source texts in Greek and their target texts in English.
speakers drafting the documents etc. In Tsoumari (2006; 2008), it has been argued, based on the intention of the European Union and the production conditions of EU-produced documents, that the translation of EU texts falls within the category of covert translation as defined by Gutt (2000), but adapted to the particularities of EU translation.

One important issue in respect of press releases involves their purpose. In general, they have an informative purpose. Interestingly, the European Commission in its internal style guide urges drafters of press releases to present EU «added value» and actually states that «[e]ach press release should demonstrate how the EU delivers benefits to citizens which only EU action could achieve» (2003, 1 qtd. in Lindholm: 2008, 38). A means to achieve the goal of presenting information in the framework of the Commission’s political aims (European Commission: 2003, 2f qtd. in Lindholm: 2008, 41) is the structure of the press release itself, which Lindholm calls the «Commission press release text pattern» (2008, 47). These documents start with an introductory paragraph before the main body. The introduction may have a clear political tone (see phrase in bold) e.g. «...the Health Check represents a perfect opportunity to take the policy review further.» (filename: IP/07/1720), where the Commission attempts to direct the readers as to how to approach and interpret («perfect opportunity») the Health Check of the Common Agricultural Policy; or a more moderate one («improved») e.g. «The reforms... thus contribute to improved public health, and enhance environmental protection». (filename:IP/07/810); or rather neutral, as for instance in press releases whose focus is on presenting mainly data/figures (filename: IP/07/1543, filename: IP/07/1329).

After the introductory paragraph, a quotation usually follows, which is the most fruitful occasion to make a political point. The reason is, as the European Commission reports in the internal style guide, that a quotation «is the only part of the press release that a journalist cannot change or rewrite» (2003, 3 qtd. in Lindholm: 2008, 48). For instance, we can see in (3) the strong assertive language, the personal subjective voice used by the Commissioner for Agriculture and Rural Development – the relevant phrases are in bold type.

(3) Direct speech – statement by the Commissioner
IP/07/810 Brussels, 12 June 2007
CAP reform: Fruit and Vegetable reform will raise competitiveness, promote consumption, ease market crises and improve environmental protection

«I am delighted with the outcome, which will make the sector more
competitive and market-orientated and hopefully encourage people to eat more fruit and vegetables,» said Mariann Fischer Boel, Commissioner for Agriculture and Rural Development. «I am particularly pleased that all Member States gave the reform their backing. The old-fashioned production-linked payments will be replaced with decoupled payments. There will be incentives for producers to club together and thus become stronger. There will be specific schemes to help in times of crisis and much greater emphasis on protecting the environment. We have also introduced a number of measures to boost consumption, and will now propose a fruit and vegetable scheme for schools based on a detailed impact assessment.»

The Commissioner clearly gives the framework within which CAP reforms should be processed. It is explicitly stated that all member states agreed on that reform so it weakens the reader’s access to any assumptions questioning the suitability or effectiveness of CAP decisions. In addition, the Commissioner makes lexical choices, as shown in bold type, that emphasise the active and pioneering role of the Commission to tackle current problems, thus increasing positive inferencing about the effectiveness of the reforms, and elevate the Commission’s profile as a righteous organisation caring for society, not only for economy.

3. Contextual differences – Differences in viewpoints in the English and Greek versions

Based on the examination of the file pairs used in this paper, some conclusions can be reached about the context. The English version of the press releases seems to have been used as an original in the translation process. A distinction has been made between author and speaker. The working hypothesis is that the author is the authority issuing the press release, namely the Commission, and the speaker is considered the Commissioner whose statements are included. Although the Commissioner represents the Commission, it was deemed necessary to make a distinction between the two since the former is a person and the latter an organisation. Also, because the translator’s choices and decisions – affected to an extent by TL linguistic conventions (Goutsos: 1992, 144) and considerations about target readership – may influence author and speaker discourse, the following points of view are distinguished: EN author, EN speaker, EL (Greek) author, EL speaker, and, naturally, EN readers and EL readers. These points of view reflect the intentions, assumptions and expectations the European Commission is seen to have, based on the sample corpus examined.
Taking the English versions as a point of reference, the Greek versions at points are close to the English ones, as in (4):

(4) Excerpt from press release IP/07/1543

EN
The total levy to be paid is substantially (38%) lower in 2006/07 than in 2005/06 despite total adjusted deliveries decreasing by only 0.15%.

EL
Το συνολικό ύψος των εισφορών που θα καταβληθούν για την περίοδο 2006/07 είναι πολύ χαμηλότερο (κατά 38%) σείραν της περίοδου 2005/06, μολονότι οι διορθωμένες παραδόσεις μειώθηκαν συνολικά μόνο κατά 0,15%.

Gloss
The total amount of levies to be paid in the period 2006/07 is much lower (by 38%) than that in the period 2005/06, although adjusted deliveries decreased in total only by 0.15%.

But at other points they depart towards the other extreme. The English author tends to exhibit more elements of determination and certainty compared to the Greek author who has a lower profile keeping more distance and occasionally giving rise to inferences of uncertain and possible results of the estimates, actions or initiatives presented by the EC. Such instances are found in (5a) EN compared with (5a) EL where the EN phrase «bring this sector into closer line» describing an action becomes in the EL segment an effort to perform the action described in the EL segment. Also in (5b) EN the definitive, assertive and willful «There will be additional support...» is conveyed as a regulatory provision for additional support in (5b) EL, thus turning a declaration into the description of a legal/regulatory matter, perhaps with room for legal holes threatening its implementation.

(5) (a) Excerpt from press release IP/07/75

EN
The European Commission today proposed wide-ranging reforms to the Common Market Organisation for fruit and vegetables to bring this sector into closer line with the rest of the reformed Common Agricultural Policy.

EL
Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή πρότεινε σήμερα μια ευρεία σειρά μεταρρυθμίσεων της κοινής οργάνωσης αγοράς στον τομέα των οπωροκηπευτικών σε μια προσπάθεια εναρμόνισης του τομέα με την υπόλοιπη αναμορφωμένη κοινή γεωργική πολιτική.
Gloss
The European Commission proposed today a wide range of reforms to the Common Market Organisation in the field of fruit and vegetables in an effort to align the sector with the rest of the reformed Common Agricultural Policy.

(b) Excerpt from press release IP/07/75

EN
There will be additional support (60 percent Community co-financing rather than of 50 percent) in areas where production marketed via POs is less than 20 percent, and in the new Member States, to encourage the creation of POs.

EL
Συμπληρωματική στήριξη προβλέπεται (κοινοτική συγχρηματοδότηση 60% αντί για 50%) για τις περιοχές στις οποίες η παραγωγή που διατίθεται στην αγορά μέσω ΟΠ αντιπροσωπεύει ποσοστό μικρότερο του 20%, καθώς και για τα νέα κράτη μέλη, προκειμένου να ενθαρρυνθεί η δημιουργία ΟΠ.

Gloss
There is provision for additional support (Community co-financing 60% instead of 50%) for the areas where production marketed via POs accounts for less than 20%, as well as for the new member states, in order to encourage the creation of POs.

Within the same version, the English author either identifies with or, more often, is more moderate than the English speaker. The English speaker is usually emotional and attempts to be persuasive, allowing inferences of the Commissioner being an everyday person who experiences the same feelings of insecurity or joy as any other EU citizen, although she/he is partly responsible for the EU citizens’ life. See in example 3 previously the Commissioner’s words «I am delighted with the outcome...», «[the outcome will] hopefully encourage people...», «I am particularly pleased that all Member States gave the reform their backing», «[we] will now propose a...scheme». Thus, the Commissioner allows greater reader participation or involvement in the interpretation of her speech since the reader’s emotional stance is targeted rather than the intellectual, and thus the interpersonal element is stronger.

In the Greek version, both the author and the speaker are more distant from the content of the text compared to the English author and speaker. Interestingly, the Greek author either explicitly or less explicitly presents the European Commission as an integral part of the European Union edi-
fice and allows inferences of greater alignment within or closer cooperation among the EU institutions. In (6), in EN the Commission «hopes» the Council and the Parliament will back the reform, whereas in EL the Commission expects «αναμένει» the Council and the Parliament to back the reform. Also, the Council and the Parliament’s approval allows the reform to enter into force in EN, whereas in EL their approval leads to an immediate result, the enforcement of the reform.

(6) Excerpt from press release IP/07/75

EN
The Commission hopes that the Council and Parliament will approve the reform, which will be budget neutral, before the middle of 2007, allowing it to enter into force in 2008.

EL
Η Επιτροπή αναμένει ότι το Συμβούλιο και το Κοινοβούλιο θα εγκρίνουν τη μεταρρύθμιση, η οποία δεν θα έχει επιπτώσεις για τον προϋπολογισμό, πριν από τα μέσα του 2007, ώστε να τεθεί σε ισχύ εντός του 2008.

Gloss
The Commission expects that the Council and Parliament will approve the reform, which will have no consequences for the budget, before the middle of 2007, so as to enforce it within 2008.

The Greek speaker appears less emotional than the English speaker, and seems to appeal to the intellect rather than the emotion of the reader. The translation of «hopes» with «αναμένει» «expects» in (6) is such an example. In (7a) EN, the personal structure «we need to replace [the schemes]…», expressing the need «we» – the Commission – feel is conveyed in EL with the passive structure «[τα καθεστώτα] θα πρέπει να αντικατασταθούν…» «[the schemes] should be replaced…». The need to do something becomes an obligation to do something and, thus, changes the perspective. In (7b) EN, a personal structure «We have also introduced…to boost» including a dynamic verb (introduced) and a very positive in meaning infinitive (boost) emphasises both the action and the significance of the predicate along with the subject (agent) who performed the action, as if the EC almost congratulates itself for the initiative. In EL, the translation follows (5b) EL, a human-controlled action («We have also introduced») becomes a case of law/regulation enforcement («There has also been a provision for») with debatable implementation, depending on the readers’ assumptions on the trustworthiness and reliability of the legal/regulations system.
(7) (a) Excerpt from press release IP/07/75

EN
«Some of the aid schemes in the current scheme don’t belong in the CAP of 2007, so we need to replace them with decoupled direct aid payments.»

EL
Ορισμένα από τα ισχύοντα καθεστώτα ενισχύσεων δεν συνάδουν με την ΚΓΠ τον 2007 και, για το λόγο αυτό, θα πρέπει να αντικατασταθούν από άμεσες ενισχύσεις αποσυνδεδεμένες από την παραγωγή.»

Gloss
Some of the current aid schemes are not consistent with the CAP of 2007 and, for that reason, should be replaced with decoupled direct aid payments.

(b) Excerpt from press release IP/07/810

EN
«We have also introduced a number of measures to boost consumption, and will now propose a fruit and vegetable scheme for schools based on a detailed impact assessment.»

EL
«Προβλέφθηκε επίσης μία σειρά μέτρων για την τόνωση της κατανάλωσης και θα προτείνουμε την εφαρμογή ενός προγράμματος για τα φρούτα και τα λαχανικά στα σχολεία, βάσει διεξοδικής εκτίμησης αντικτύπου.»

Gloss
There has also been a provision for a series of measures for boosting consumption and we will propose the implementation of a scheme of fruit and vegetables at schools, based on a detailed impact assessment.

(8a) moves along similar lines with (7a) keeping the shift in perspective, i.e. the need in the source text becomes an obligation in the target text. The difference between (8a) EL and (7a) EL is the active voice of the predicate. Preference over translating necessity as obligation can be partly justified by linguistic restrictions in Greek. There is no syntactical structure in Greek to render exactly the English syntactical structure, so the options are usually:

EN: subject + need + infinitive + object
EL:1) (impersonal) χρειάζεται «needs» + passive infinitive + object, or + active person-inflected infinitive.
2) (impersonal) (θα) πρέπει «should/must/have to»+ passive infinitive [optional + object] (see (8b)), or + active person-inflected infinitive (see (8a)).
Between the two options, the first is closer in meaning to the predicate of the English structure, but not opted, as is observed in the examples. In contrast, the most directive predicate is preferred. So it can be argued that the Commissioner in EL is presented as the medium through which the citizens are told what they should do, more or less deprived of the freedom of choice. By using such stronger-in-effect predicates, the sense of both (the Commission’s) responsibility (citizens’) choice fades away – as if the Commission presents what it thinks is good for the European citizens as an obligation for them, whether they like it or not.

(8) (a) Excerpts from press release IP/07/75

EN
«We need to bring the fruit and vegetable sector into line with our other reforms, which were all about making European agriculture more competitive and market-orientated», said Mariann Fischer Boel, Commissioner for Agriculture and Rural Development.

EL
«Πρέπει να ευθυγραμμίσουμε τον τομέα των οπωροκηπευτικών με τις λουτές μεταρρυθμίσεις μας, που είχαν όλες ως στόχο τη βελτίωση της ανταγωνιστικότητας της ευρωπαϊκής γεωργίας και τον μεγαλύτερο προσανατολισμό της προς την αγορά», δήλωσε η Mariann Fischer Boel, Επίτροπος αρμόδιος για τη γεωργία και την αγροτική ανάπτυξη.

Gloss
«It is imperative that we/We have to align the fruit and vegetable sector with the rest of our reforms, which all had as a target the improvement of competitiveness of the European agriculture and its greater orientation to the market», said Mariann Fischer Boel Commissioner responsible for agriculture and rural development.

(8) (b)

EN
«Some of the aid schemes in the current scheme don’t belong in the CAP of 2007, so we need to replace them with decoupled direct aid payments».

EL
«Ορισμένα από τα ισχύοντα καθεστώτα ενισχύσεων δεν συνάδουν με την ΚΤΠ του 2007 και, για το λόγο αυτό, θα πρέπει να αντικατασταθούν από άμεσες ενισχύσεις αποσυνδεδεμένες από την παραγωγή».

Gloss
Some of the current aid schemes are not consistent with the CAP of 2007 and, for this reason, should be replaced by decoupled direct aid payments.
This pattern of strong directive perspective in the target text is also observed in (8c) where the EN act of stating the important part fruit and vegetables have to play in people’s health is conveyed by a directive act in EL demanding and obliging that important role.

(8)  (c)

EN
«Fruit and vegetables have a crucial role to play in improving people’s diets».

EL
«Τα φρούτα και τα λαχανικά πρέπει να διαδραματίζουν σημαντικό ρόλο στη βελτίωση της διατροφής μας».

Gloss
Fruit and vegetables must play an important role in the improvement of our diet.

(8)  (d)

EN
«Finally, it’s extremely important that farming does all it can to protect the environment».

EL
«Τέλος, έχει ιδιαίτερη σημασία να καταβληθεί στο γεωργικό τομέα κάθε δυνατή προσπάθεια για την προστασία του περιβάλλοντος».

Gloss
Finally, it is of particular significance to make every possible effort in the agricultural sector for the protection of the environment.

The Commission is presented objective and as trying to do what needs to be done in the best possible way – actually the Greek text reduces emotive elements to strengthen that, e.g. through the abovementioned shift in perspective. This generates inferences that the Commission cares for the good of the public and may undertake the «awkward» role of telling people what to do acting for their own good (see (8a/b/c)). On the other hand, it is contextually implied that the Commission is only «human», it is not flawless (see (8d)). (8d) EN segment contains the adjectival predicate «important» modified by the amplifier «extremely». The

2. The gloss of the verb is weaker and of lower register than the Greek utterance due to frequency and register limitations.
3. «Awkward» is used here to characterise the role of the Commission because telling people what to do does not usually make you popular or likeable, characteristics which the Commission would certainly pursue.
amplifier that intensifies the meaning of the predicate, reflecting once again the great need for the action expressed by the predicate in the extraposed *that*-clause. The interesting choice of words in the utterance «(farming) does all it can to protect» generates the implicature that doing all one can does not guarantee the positive result of the effort, i.e. the protection of the environment. Having «extremely» in the first clause draws attention to the great necessity to take the action, not to the result of the action. Therefore, the proposition of the complement *that*-clause allows the assumptions only of the benevolent intentions of the Commission and its policy based on its acting-for-the-European-citizens'-good profile; the active voice of the clause also adds to that.

In the Greek version, the viewpoint of insecurity and doubt is even more intense. In the EL segment, the EN «extremely» is diminished into «διάφερη» «particular», thus emphasis is transferred from the need to take the action to the action itself, especially after adding the certainty adjective «κάθε δυνατή προσπάθεια» «every possible effort». But the shift into passive voice distances the action from both the agent and the result inferring assumptions of uncertain effectiveness and suitability of the measures and policies, and the responsibilities (and possible claim of ineffectiveness) from the European Commission. Moreover, the translator’s choice of the formal verb «καταβληθεί» whose sense in the active voice is «pay, weaken, spend energy» (Τεμπόπουλος Φυτράκης: 1997, 357) and connotes strain/discomfort/repression, can be associated with the deontic perspective discussed previously.

The above analysis shows that the EL author assumes the audience might be cautious about the proposals of the Commission or even the effectiveness of the Commission’s role. That is why by highlighting through translator’s choices the impartial status of the Commission and its dedication to do the right thing, potential inferences of reduced effectiveness of the Commission’s proposals and actions are expected to weaken. In addition, there has been a build-up of a sense of sympathy towards the Commission’s efforts vis-a-vis its implied «awkward» role to inform and, to a degree, pressure people about the necessity of certain actions and acknowledge the uncertainty of the actions described (8a, b, c, d).

4. Relevance theory – The role of connectives

Now we will examine the contrastive/concessive connectives found in the sample corpus in the light of Relevance Theory. We will look into the way they operate in the inferencing process in both languages, their role
as facilitators, and finally if the assumptions and inferences produced reflect the same profile about EL readership as the context analysis performed in the previous section.

According to Relevance Theory (Wilson and Sperber: 2002), the author produces his/her speech in such a way so that the reader will reach the speaker-intended interpretation with the least processing effort. The speaker, in order to achieve this, makes certain assumptions about the reader’s background knowledge and, thus, expectations, and based on these assumptions formulates his/her discourse. From a relevance-theoretic perspective (Wilson and Sperber: 1993, Blakemore: 1987), connectives are not linking items, but devices whose meaning plays a part in the interpretation of an utterance. Among the different interpretations available, the hearer will decide which the speaker-intended one is, and connectives can facilitate the elimination of some of the available interpretations in order to achieve optimal relevance (Rouchota: 1998, 13), i.e. the best possible interpretation for the hearer in terms of processing effort and effect. As Sperber and Wilson (1986/1995; Wilson and Sperber: 1993) argue, practically, in interpreting an utterance, we put linguistic forms through inferential processes aiming to reach a conclusion about their intended meaning or their corresponding conceptual representation. So, there are two types of meaning, conceptual meaning relating to concepts which are truth-evaluable, and procedural meaning relating to semantic constraints on the hearer’s inferential processes in interpreting an utterance (Rouchota: 1998, 32). This in turn leads to two types of markers/connectives, those with conceptual use and those with procedural use. According to Wilson and Sperber (1993), concepts enter into logical relations. In this sense, a connective with conceptual use can be expected to conjoin 2 propositions by virtue of its meaning. Markers/connectives with conceptual use provide a concept which forms part of the proposition expressed by an utterance or of other propositions communicated explicitly by the utterance (Rouchota: 1998, 40), and thus contribute to the truth conditions of the propositions of the utterance (Bardzokas 2009, 101). Rouchota (1998, 35), also, indicates another dimension related to truth conditions, «[i]f a connective encodes conceptual meaning, then a speaker using it can easily lay herself open to charges of untruthfulness in its use...».

On the other hand, markers/connectives with procedural use highlight certain contextual aspects intended on the part of the speaker for the hearer to rely on in deriving his/her interpretation, and therefore reduce the hearer’s processing effort to reach an optimally relevant interpretation.
(Blakemore: 1987, 77). Procedural markers do not involve the encoding of components of conceptual representations; they guide inferencing in a way that leads to the creation of a conceptual representation (Blakemore: 2002, 90-91). The procedural use of markers contributes to cognitive effects by way of strengthening or eliminating an existing assumption, or through the generation of contextual implications. In short, «procedural expressions achieve relevance by means of constraining or manipulating the deductive process implemented in deriving an implicature» (Bardzokas 2009, 98). Bardzokas (2009, 98) further elaborates on that and argues that connectives with procedural function supply «contextual information as pragmatic input required for determining the interpretation of the main clause utterance». Looking into the Greek causal connective γιατί «because», he distinguishes among types of procedural operation with respect to the way the connective contributes to the proposition of the main clause, i.e. decipher an encoded concept of the logical form of the utterance; enriches the proposition by providing an unencoded concept; or motivates higher-order explicature descriptions (Bardzokas 2009, 99). Since connectives with procedural use are not normally taken to affect the truth conditions of the utterance, then the speakers using them are not easily exposed «...to charges of untruthfulness in [their] use» (Rouchota: 1998, 35).

4.1. Data presentation

In the sample corpus where the English versions constitute the point of reference (source text), focus has been on contrastive/concessive connectives. On table 1, all the connectives found in the source texts under this category are presented with their Greek translations found in the target texts along with their frequency in each pair of texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUT (13 instances):</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Filename</strong></td>
<td><strong>ΕΝΩ</strong> «while/whereas»</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP/07/1543</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP/07/1329</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP/07/1720</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP/07/810</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP/07/75</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are 13 instances of but, 3 instances of however, 1 instance of although and 1 instance of despite. But is one of the most discussed connectives. As Rouchota argues, but contradicts or eliminates «some other contextually manifest assumption» (1998, 42) and is used procedurally. But does not affect the truth conditions of the utterance (Grice: 1975/1989) but only its implicatures⁴ (Blakemore: 1987). Although is also used procedurally and expresses denial of expectation (Rouchota: 1998, 16), and however, procedural too, points to contradiction and elimination, like but, and has additional restrictions concerning context (Blakemore: 2002, 128). In the Greek versions of the five pairs of press releases, there are 4 more instances of concessive/contrasting connectives, 1 instance of ἐνώ «while/ whereas», 2 instances of ἀλλά «but» and 1 instance of δυσώς «but/h owever» (see table 2). In half the cases, the Greek concessive/concessive connective translates the English and which is classified as conceptual in meaning⁵ (Rouchota: 1998, 31).

---

4. Grice argues that but is a conventional implicature, that is, the conventional meaning of but will determine what is implicated, besides what is said. The conventional meaning of but generates the implicature of some contrast. For instance in the utterance «production is small-scale but of particular economic or environmental importance», it is implied that small-scale production is not compatible with particular economic or environmental importance. However, the use of but does not affect the truth conditions of the utterance, i.e. production is small-scale, small-scale production is of particular economic or environmental importance. Blakemore argues that but motivates an implicature that affects the contextual effects of the utterance. In the above example, assumption 1 is that production is small-scale, and assumption 2 is that normally small-scale production is not important economically or environmentally. The implicature produced by but eliminates assumption 2 without affecting the truth conditions of the utterance, i.e. production is small-scale, small-scale production is of particular economic or environmental importance.

Sidiropoulou's research in English and Greek newspaper reporting found that «Greek exhibits a stronger tendency for an explicit contrastive/concessive network» (1994, 111) which can be noticed by the additional instances of contrast in the target text (Sidiropoulou: 1994, 111; 2004, 33-34). When the translator makes implicit contrasts explicit, we may infer «that the translator is addressing a reader who is more willing to identify contrasts in the world she/he lives in» (Sidiropoulou: 1994, 114) and thus (the reader) appears to be «willing to take up the role of the denier and contradicter more directly» (Sidiropoulou: 1994, 116; 2004, 33). If this is also presumed in the context of the translation of EC press releases, we may have an explanation of the author's and speaker's stance in the Greek version. As we have previously argued, the Greek translator's choices appear to reflect inferences about the Greek reader being cautious regarding the actions of the Commission (see examples 5-8).

### TABLE 2.

**Additions of Greek contrastive/concessive connectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Filename</th>
<th>ΕΝΩ «while/whereas»</th>
<th>ΑΛΛΑ «but»</th>
<th>ΟΜΩΣ «but/however»</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IP/07/1329</td>
<td>1 (corresponds to AND)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP/07/1543</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP/07/75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (corresponds to AND)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP/07/810</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (corresponds to WHO)</td>
<td>1 (corresponds to SO THAT)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. **Analysis of omission and addition cases**

We will focus on the instance of an omission of *but* in the Greek version, and on one of the additional instances of contrastive/concessive connectives in a Greek version. The omission of the contrastive connective is interesting because on the surface it seems to contradict the argument of the Greek readers' profile discussed in section 4.1.
4.2.1 Omission of but

In the case of the omission (9) in the English version, we can see that the but-initiating phrase is predicated of production whereas in the Greek version the connective και «and», selected to render but, connects to regions; there is a shift in assigning the attribute of economic/environmental importance to a different nominal, which affects the wider/weaker inferences produced by the utterance. The Greek και is used conceptually because it introduces a relative clause which cannot precede the nominal head (regions) it qualifies.

Omission of but - Excerpt from press release IP/07/75

(9) (a) EN
increasing the rate of decoupling in those countries which opted in a number of farm sectors to maintain the link between subsidy and production, although coupled support may still play a role in regions where production is small-scale but of particular economic or environmental importance.

(b) EL
αύξηση τού ποσοστού αποσύνδεσης στις χώρες εκείνες οι οποίες επέλεξαν σε ορισμένες γεωργικές τομείς να διατηρήσουν τον δεσμό μεταξύ επιδοτήσεων και παραγωγής, παρόλο που η συνδεσμένη στήριξη μπορεί να διαδραματίσει ακόμη ένα ρόλο σε περιφέρειες όπου η παραγωγή είναι μικρής κλίμακας και οι οποίες παρουσιάζουν ιδιαίτερο οικονομικό ή περιβαλλοντικό ενδιαφέρον,

Gloss
Increase in the rate of decoupling in those countries which opted in certain farm sectors to maintain the link between subsidy and production, although coupled support may still play a role in regions where production is small-scale, and which present particular economic or environmental interest.

Taking the phrase «...(regions where) production is small-scale but of particular economic or environmental importance», the truth conditional content of the utterance is the following:

| Assumption 1: | Production is small-scale. |
| Assumption 2: | Small-scale production is of particular economic or environmental importance. |
In the course of comprehension these propositions (1 and 2) can combine with contextual information to yield a number of inferences on the part of the audience, such as the generalisation below. Actually the generalisation is a sort of restatement of assumption 2. It should be noted, at this point, that the attribute of normality is motivated purely by the truth conditional content of the utterance:

| Inference A: | Small-scale production is normally (considered to be) of particular economic or environmental importance. |

The use of *but* triggers a modification of inference A by using again the truth conditional content,

| Assumption 1: | Production is small-scale. |
| Assumption 2: | Small-scale production is of particular economic or environmental importance. |

along with a third assumption from background knowledge:

| Assumption 3: | Small-scale production usually leads to little profit, poor lifestyle, and little potential for development. |

Thus the inference produced is:

| Inference B triggered by *but*: | Not (Inference A) = Small-scale production is not normally (considered to be) of particular economic or environmental importance. |

The attribute of *not normal* to inference A relies on, let’s say, some kind of rational thinking/common sense, an assumption from background knowledge i.e. small-scale production usually leads to little profit, little profit to poor lifestyle and little potential for development; also has little impact on the environment (if good practices are applied, they cannot affect significantly positively the environment due to small-scale implementation).

Therefore, the assumptions used eventually in *but* inferencing process are:
Assumption 1: Production is small-scale.

Assumption 2: Not (Inference A) = Small-scale production is not normally (considered to be) of particular economic or environmental importance.

Ultimately, the inference, motivated by but, differs from that of inference A in replacing normal practice (is normally) with possibility (can be):

| Inference C | Possible (Inference A) = Small-scale production can be (considered to be) of particular economic or environmental importance. |

Inference C provides an element of surprise by pinpointing the possibility, not the normality, of inference A, arguing for exceptions to rational thinking. The phrase rational thinking is used non-technically here, mainly involving very basic patterns of thought or common sense, like those mentioned above, which have a logical basis at an elementary level.

From a relevance-theoretic perspective, but limits the available interpretations and leads to contextual effects by eliminating an assumption. Based on the example analysed, the assumption eliminated is actually the modified inference (inference B) under the light of but intervention. Following the analysis, but not only eliminates an assumption but also replaces it with another, which is actually an inference (inference C) similar to the inference generated from the truth conditional content of the utterance (inference A). The normality of a proposition (inference A) is eliminated and replaced by the possibility of that proposition (inference C).

What is worth noting is a concern raised in relation to the processing effort the reader makes to reach cognitive effects when it comes to contrastive/concessive connectives. In order to reach the conceptual representation incorporating the inference communicated by the contrastive connective but, the processing effort might be argued to increase, because more sets of assumptions-inference are required (see analysis of but above) than in the case of other connectives, for instance and. It is presumed that a marker/connective is considered a facilitator because it guides the hearer/reader as to the interpretation of an utterance, achieving maximum effects with the least processing effort, i.e. the marker/connective achieves
optimal relevance. In terms of optimal relevance, the presence of *but* satisfies the part of maximum effects since it limits the interpretation of the utterance and, thus, specifies meaning; but the part of processing effort might be compromised, i.e. the least processing effort may not seem enough to reach maximum effects, more mental effort may seem to be necessary compared with other connectives. Certainly, more research is necessary on this issue. The difference in question becomes easier to spot in the case of the Greek version where there is the Greek *and* instead of *but*.

(9) (b) **EL**
- αύξηση του ποσοστού αποσύνδεσης στις χώρες εκείνες οι οποίες επέλεξαν σε ορισμένους γεωργικούς τομείς να διαπροκύψουν τον δεσμό μεταξύ επιστημών και παραγωγής, παρόλο που η συνδεδεμένη στήριξη μπορεί να διαδραματίσει ακόμη ένα ρόλο σε περιφέρειες όπου η παραγωγή είναι μικρής κλίμακας και οι οποίες παρουσιάζουν ιδιαίτερα οικονομικό ή περιβαλλοντικό ενδιαφέρον.

_Gloss_
Increase in the rate of decoupling in those countries which opted in certain farm sectors to maintain the link between subsidy and production, although coupled support may still play a role in _regions where_ production is small-scale, and _which_ present particular economic or environmental interest,

The truth conditional content of the utterance «…περιφέρειες όπου η παραγωγή είναι μικρής κλίμακας και οι οποίες παρουσιάζουν ιδιαίτερο οικονομικό ή περιβαλλοντικό ενδιαφέρον» is:

| Assumption 1: | There are regions with small-scale production. |
| Assumption 2: | Regions with small-scale production present particular economic or environmental interest. |

In proportion to the process of *but*, the inference that could be produced in this case is more or less a restatement of assumption 2 in a generalised context, as inference A of the respective assumption 2:

| Inference D | Regions with small-scale production (are) normally (considered to) present particular economic or environmental interest. |
It is evident that the process leading to an inference is much shorter using the Greek connective και «and» acting non-procedurally than in the case of but where the contrast expressed might be argued to increase the processing effort of the EN reader, and disturb optimal relevance.

In the EL segment we notice the shift mentioned earlier where the EL connective used to convey EN but predicates a different nominal, i.e. regions not production. This difference between source and target texts allows a correlation between the wider/weaker inferences of the two language versions. A comparison can be made between the wider/weaker inferences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wider/weaker inferences in ST EN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Along with the assumptions connected to the truth conditional content of the ST EN segment if we take into account the assumption drawn from background knowledge that the production of a region is associated directly with the economic sector and indirectly with society, i.e. the human/social and cultural factor in that region, the but-initiating phrase predicating of production rather than regions may infer that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. EU focus is on economics and the environment, i.e. production, leaving aside the social, human aspect of a region, which could influence money-related decisions concerning the farmer’s job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Importance within the EU is assigned based primarily on economic or environmental criteria, possibly leaving out social factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Commission, as the farm policy-proposing authority, is more distanced from less privileged regions, i.e. regions with small-scale production, or prefers a more technocratic profile.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wider/weaker inferences in TT EL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Along with the assumptions connected to the truth conditional content of the TT EL segment if we take into account the assumption drawn from background knowledge that the meaning of region is much broader than and inclusive of production, society, environment, and culture of that region, the και-initiating phrase qualifying regions where production is small-scale rather than production may infer that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. EU focus is on the human and social factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Commission is aware of the variety of characteristics inherent in a region and the policies can adapt to those characteristics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Commission, as the farm policy-proposing authority, is closer to the idiosyncrasy of national geographical areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Looking into the wider inferences drawn in the two versions, there is a difference in focus. In the English version, focus is on production, a characteristic of the economy of an area, presented more dissociated from geographical and demographic considerations, and subsequently from cultural and national considerations; whereas in the Greek version, focus is on geographical areas with specific characteristics, such as small-scale production, high economic or environmental importance, perhaps specific cultural features etc. This also reflects a certain difference in perceptions of the relation the central authority has with the region (see wider inference 3 in both ST and TT). Therefore, in the Greek text, the Commission is presented by the Greek author as more aware of national particularities, and this attitude aligns with what has been previously argued about how the Commission is presented in the Greek versions, as caring and striving for the common good, being close to the EU citizens. So TT inferences seem to be more lenient towards the EU and the Commission, since the latter are presented more aware of possible regional peculiarities and by inference may exhibit some flexibility in decision-making.

It should be noted that although this example is an instance of contrast eliminated in the Greek version, it does not seem to affect the assumption of the reader’s role as a denier or cautious reader, because inferences in the Greek text are more positive for the European Commission, and consequently the European Union, than in the English text. The reason could be that, at this point, the text serves the aim of creating or maintaining the political profile of an EU-citizen-friendly European Commission. Such a profile may be intensified in the Greek versions due to assumptions that the Greek reader may be hesitant or even a denier.

4.2.2 Addition of \( ev\omega \)

We will examine indicatively an instance of \( ev\omega \), a contrastive/concessive connective added to the TT, and whose typical English translation is «while/whereas» (cf. Kitis and Zafiriadou 2001). Koutoupi-Kitis (2000) in examining occurrences of \( ev\omega \) in the Greek language has argued that \( ev\omega \) can also be used as a variant of the Greek conjunction \( k\alpha i \) «and», without any contrastive or concessive meaning. However, in this study it is argued that there is always some kind of contrastive/concessive meaning when using \( ev\omega \). In the example examined, \( ev\omega \) translates and in the English text, and relates to how estimates of EU cereals output affect the prices of EU cereals. (10) presents the source and target segments where the connective is found.
Addition of ενώ - Excerpt from press release IP/07/1329
(10) (a) EN
Since then the estimate for the EU cereals crop has been revised down and prices [of goods] have kept rising.

(b) EL
Η εκτίμηση για την εσοδεία δημητριακών στην ΕΕ έχει έκτοτε αναθεωρηθεί προς τα κάτω ενώ οι τιμές συνέχισαν να αυξάνονται.

Gloss
The estimate for the cereals crop in the EU has since been revised down «while/whereas» prices kept rising.

In (10a), and can be said to be used non-procedurally to the extent that it does not seem to affect the derivation of implicatures but rather it appears to constrain the derivation of explicatures, i.e. the inferential meaning of as a result. More specifically, a decrease in the production of goods results in an increase in the price of those goods based on the way the market operates, provided the demand for these goods remains the same or increases. This aligns with the Commissioner’s statements in this press release (see next page).

A key element in the English sentence is the aspectual verb kept which controls the post-predicate ing-clause rising. According to Biber (1999/2007, 746), keep acts as «a kind of progressive marker, emphasizing that the action described in the ing-clause is continuous or recurrent». So, here kept seems to function as a mere aspectual operator, extending the time span of the denoted action of the ing-clause.

Based on the truth conditional content of the utterance, the assumptions and the inference generated are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumption 1:</th>
<th>Less EU-area cereals have been estimated to be produced.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assumption 2:</td>
<td>The prices of cereals have kept rising.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inference E:</td>
<td>It is normal for prices of cereals to keep rising when less cereal is produced and estimated to be produced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the inferencing path of (9b), the inference produced is again a reaffirmation of assumption 2 at a more generalised level. The attribute of normality here is motivated not only by the truth conditional content but
also by some sort of rational thinking in the economics sector explaining the relation of production and prices of goods\textsuperscript{6}.

The structure \textit{kept rising} intensifies the meaning of the \textit{and}-clause. The continuity of the action expressed by \textit{kept} can indicate persistence (Biber: 1999/2007, 741). Kept can be considered evaluative in terms of expressing annoyance from the persistence of price rising and thus express some kind of contrast to price rising – rising prices of goods are not generally seen as something positive (assumption drawn from background knowledge). So, the notion of normality in the inference could be challenged to some degree. However, the position of the sentence in the text along with the context of that part of the text play an important role as to how strong or weak the possibility of challenging the notion of normality is. Below is the section of the press release where the sentence is placed.

To facilitate understanding, the title of the press release is «Cereals: Commission proposes to set at zero the set-aside rate for autumn 2007 and spring 2008 sowings» «Δημητριακά: Η Επιτροπή προτείνει να μηνανείται το ποσοστό της υποχρεωτικής παύσης καλλιέργειας για τις σπορές του φθινοπώρου 2007 και της άνοιξης 2008». The section is:

\textit{Background}

Set-aside was introduced to limit production of cereals in the EU and applied on a voluntary basis from 1988/89. After the 1992 reform, it became obligatory i.e. producers under the general scheme were required to set-aside a defined percentage of their declared areas in order to be eligible to direct payments. With the 2003 reform, they received set-aside entitlements, which give the right to a payment if they are accompanied by eligible land put into set-aside.

The rate of obligatory set-aside was initially decided every year but in 1999/2000 it was set permanently at 10 % for simplification purposes. In the new Member States that opted for the Single Area Payment Scheme (SAPS), farmers are exempted from the obligation of set-aside (Poland, Czech Republic, Slovak Republic, Hungary, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Cyprus, Bulgaria and Romania).

Commissioner Fischer Boel already announced to the Council on 16 July her intention to submit the present proposal. \textit{Since then the estimate for the EU cereals crop has been revised down and prices have kept rising.}

\textsuperscript{6} According to market rules, a decrease in supply leads to an increase in prices when demand remains the same or increases.
As we see, the sentence in question is part of the section explaining the background that led to that proposal, which mainly presents data. Also, it is the final sentence of the entire text. It is evident that the section has a strong informative tone, along with the majority of the text. The only part of the text that becomes more expressive is the statement of the Commissioner:

Mariann Fischer Boel, Commissioner for Agriculture and Rural Development, said: «Cereals prices have hit historically high levels as the supply situation has grown increasingly tight. A poor 2008 harvest combined with 10% set-aside would expose the internal market to potentially serious risks. Setting the rate at zero should add at least 10 million tonnes to EU output and help to ease the market situation. Looking further ahead, in the “Health Check”, I want to take a good look at whether set-aside is still an appropriate tool. But I also want to ensure that we retain the environmental benefits it has brought.»

However, the Commissioner’s statement is spatially distanced from the Background section, and the rest of the text seems to align in tone with the Background. Therefore, there is little motivation to challenge the notion of normality of the inference, i.e. price-rising is normal. The fact that there is no other sentence after the one in question, which could provide support towards the direction of annoyance, lowers even more such possibility.

In the EL segment with ἐνώ as «while/whereas», we will attempt to follow the inferencing path of but to see how it evolves:

(9) (b)

EL
Η εκτίμηση για την εσοδεία δημητριακών στην ΕΕ έχει έκτοτε αναθεωρηθεί προς τα κάτω ενώ οι τιμές συνέχισαν να αυξάνονται.

Gloss
The estimate for the cereals crop in the EU has since been revised down while/whereas prices kept rising.

The comprehension process based on the truth conditional content of the utterance with ἐνώ «while/whereas» is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumption 1:</th>
<th>Less EU-area cereals have been estimated to be produced.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assumption 2:</td>
<td>The prices of cereals have kept rising.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inference G:</td>
<td>It is normal for prices of cereals to keep rising when less cereal is produced and estimated to be produced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inference G is strengthened by another assumption from background knowledge that involves some sort of rational thinking, as we have seen earlier in the EN segment (see footnote 5). So, the attribute of normality can be said to have its roots to some common sense in economics.

*While/whereas* have the meaning *on the one hand X, on the other hand Y*. Expressing two things X, Y that apply for opposite directions involves some sort of contrast between X and Y. So the use of *ενώ* «while/whereas» triggers a modification of inference G by using the same assumptions of the truth conditional content:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumption 1:</th>
<th>Less EU-area cereals will be produced.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assumption 2:</td>
<td>The prices of cereals have kept rising.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inference H triggered by <em>while/whereas</em>:</td>
<td>Not (Inference G) = It is <em>not</em> normal for prices of cereals to keep rising when less cereal is produced and estimated to be produced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The attribute of *not normal* to inference G does not rely on some sort of rational thinking, as in the case of *but*. Actually, it seems to contradict it; the assumption from background knowledge that according to market rules, a decrease in supply leads to an increase in prices when demand remains the same or increases, i.e. a rational thought, justifies to say that it is normal for prices to rise. Thus, something else stimulates the attribute of *not normal* to inference G. That could be another assumption from background knowledge, i.e. rising prices of goods are not generally seen as something positive.

| Assumption 3: | Rising prices of goods are not generally seen as something positive. |

Therefore, the motivation does not emerge from rational thinking/common sense but from an evaluative like/dislike, positive/negative viewpoint, also an assumption drawn from background knowledge about what is considered pleasant or not. Perhaps, this is why the translator chooses *ενώ* «while/whereas» instead of a clearly contrastive connective like *αλλά* «but», ὅμως «however».

Now, the assumptions used eventually in *ενώ* ‘while/whereas’ inferencing process are still connected to the truth-conditional meaning of the text.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumption 1:</th>
<th>Less EU-area cereals have been estimated to be produced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assumption 2:</td>
<td>The prices of cereals have kept rising.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But the inference, motivated by ευό «while/whereas», produced by the above assumptions is based on discontent for assumption 2:

| Inference I | Discontent (Inference G): Speaker feels discontent that it is normal for prices of cereals to keep rising when less cereal is produced and estimated to be produced. |

In the case of ευό, contrast is mild and instead of eliminating an assumption (inference G), focus is on providing a new assumption (inference I), that of discontent. The level of contrast is expressed through the discontent of the speaker.

The difference between and in the ST and ευό «while/whereas» in the TT becomes impressively evident when comparing the wider/weaker inferences generated in each case:

### Wider/weaker inferences in ST EN and

Along with the assumptions connected to the truth conditions of the ST EN segment if we take into account the assumption drawn from background knowledge that according to market rules, a decrease in supply leads to an increase in prices when demand remains the same or increases, then the wider/weaker inferences generated are:

1. Rising prices of commodities are a fact of life, nothing of surprise, following market conditions every time.
2. The rise in prices of EU cereals is an expected situation based on market operation in the EU-area.
3. Rising prices are not related to the effectiveness of an EU farming policy.

### Wider/weaker inferences in TT EL ευό ‘while/whereas’

Along with the assumptions connected to the truth conditions of the TT EL segment if we take into account the assumption drawn from background knowledge that rising prices of goods are not generally seen as something positive, then the wider/weaker inferences generated are:
1. Living standards are negatively affected both from lack of basic food and from high cost of goods.
2. Serious changes in the nutrition of EU citizens may be required in the future.
3. EU citizens may not be satisfied with the Commission’s actions.
4. The Commission has failed to anticipate the problem since it is responsible for the policy in the farming sector.

In the case of *ένω* as «while/whereas», feelings of pessimism and frustration emerge to the surface in contrast to the English version. In the Greek version, the meaning of *ένω* «while/whereas» focuses on the unpleasantness of the two events, and may feed into a feeling of discontent regarding a decrease in cereals supply to the citizens and an increase in prices. Frustration can also emerge from inferences about a future lack of basic food and/or the EU’s lack of initiative to restrain prices e.g. higher intervention stocks, and keep living costs at a reasonable level or anticipate the decrease in cereals production e.g. better policy planning. Opting for *ένω* (whose nuclear meaning is «while/whereas») as a translation of *and* results in a further enhancement of the aspectual character of *kept* expressing the persistence of the denoted action of the following verb (prices rising). The overall impact on the reader is of intensifying feelings of discontent. This comes in contrast to the smooth perspective expressed by *and* in the ST.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, two cases of contrastive/concessive have been examined, a procedural connective (*but*) omitted in the Greek version in (9), and a procedural connective (*ένω*) added in the Greek version in (10). In example (9), the English version used a procedural connective (*but*) whereas the Greek version used a non-procedural one (*κατά*) to render it. As has been mentioned in previous sections, procedural connectives do not allow a truth evaluation of what is stated. Therefore, the speaker could be more favoured in a way in using them. The processing could lead to reader’s interpretations intended by the speaker, and the speaker would not normally expect interpretations harmful for him/her. However, looking into the inferences produced in the first example, it seems that although there is the procedural connective *but* in the English text, the inferences are not as favourable to the EC/EU as in the Greek text where *ένω* is used. In
example (10), where a contrastive/concessive connective is added, the same applies. Inferences from the sentence with the non-procedural connective are more favourable, or at least less damaging, to the EC/EU than those from the sentence with the procedural connective.

Two elements are worth noticing: one is syntactic change. In the first example, in Greek there are two subordinate relative clauses connected by and rather than one subordinate relative clause where but is part of the predicate of the relative clause in the English version. Also the nominal head is different in the two versions thus affecting the role of the connectives in the proposition. In the second example, there is no syntactic change. Still, inferences from the sentence with the non-procedural connective are more positive for the Commission than those from the sentence with the procedural connective. In addition, the procedural connectives are found each in a different language version. Thus whatever plays a role in identifying the contribution of such connectives to the status of the speaker is probably independent of language.

The other element is that perhaps connectives that limit interpretations during processing through a contrastive net – i.e. by contradicting other assumptions – do not affect the interpretations finally reached necessarily in a positive way for the speaker. Perhaps the fact that the content of the utterances is directly or indirectly connected to the speaker and not to a third party/situation irrelevant to the speaker is a noteworthy factor. Also, it seems that the process of first using assumptions to be contradicted or partly contrasted later in the process on a topic related to the speaker is not actually as favourable to the speaker as it might seem on the surface. Indeed, on the surface, a contrastive/concessive connective is eye-catching and seems to lay emphasis. But as the analysis has indicated, the outcome may not be as beneficial for the speaker who constructed the utterance.

The examination of context presents differences between the two language versions which are due to the process of translation and, more specifically, mainly translator’s choices. The Greek version has a deontic tone and is more distanced from and doubtful of the outcome of EC/EU policies compared with the English version, despite strengthening the good intentions of the European Commission. This testifies to the expectation of the Greek reader being cautious or a contradictor. The omission and the addition of contrastive/concessive connectives discussed here support this finding, too, along with the inferences produced from the analysis of connectives.
Finally, the role of connectives as facilitators in the relevance-theoretic framework by limiting the available interpretations of an utterance raises a concern in the case of contrastive/concessive connectives. The more complex inferencing process required for this type of connectives due to elimination and replacement, or addition of assumptions might seem to distort the optimal relevance aimed at. There are still maximum effects but whether these are achieved with the least processing effort is a concern that requires further research.
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