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# Article summary:

1. The paper explores the role of metadiscourse in achieving coherence in interpreting, which refers to grammatical resources used to organize discourse and guide recipients towards an author/speaker's preferred interpretation while considering their needs and expectations.

2. The authors propose an adapted taxonomy for analyzing metadiscourse devices in interpretation and relate them to building coherence in interpreted events.

3. The study shows that successful communication in interpreting involves skillfully managing various metadiscoursal devices to reconstruct intertextual and intratextual coherences, both of which serve the same communicative goal with neither enjoying precedence over the other.

# Article rating:

Appears moderately imbalanced: The article provides some useful information, but is missing several important points or pieces of evidence that would be required to present the discussed topics in a balanced and reliable way. You are encouraged to seek a more balanced perspective on the presented issues by exploring the provided research topics and looking at different information sources.

# Article analysis:

The article "Metadiscourse and coherence in interpreting" by Ningbo University aims to explore the role of metadiscourse in achieving coherence in interpreting. The author proposes an adapted taxonomy for the analysis of metadiscourse devices in interpretation and relates them to the building of coherence in interpreted events.

Overall, the article provides a comprehensive overview of the theory of metadiscourse and its application in interpreting. However, there are some potential biases and limitations that need to be considered.

One potential bias is that the article focuses solely on qualitative analysis of instances from real-life situations, which may not provide a representative sample for generalization. Additionally, the author's perspective is limited to their own experiences and interpretations, which may not reflect other perspectives or interpretations.

Another limitation is that the article does not address potential challenges or limitations associated with using metadiscourse devices in interpreting. For example, it may be difficult for interpreters to accurately convey subtle nuances or cultural references through these devices.

Furthermore, while the article acknowledges that opinions vary on what falls under the umbrella term of metadiscourse, it does not provide a clear definition or criteria for what constitutes metadiscourse devices. This lack of clarity could lead to inconsistencies or inaccuracies in analysis.

Finally, there is a potential promotional aspect to this article as it suggests that understanding and utilizing metadiscourse can have pedagogical and practical implications. While this may be true, it is important to consider any potential conflicts of interest or biases that may influence these claims.

In conclusion, while this article provides valuable insights into the role of metadiscourse in achieving coherence in interpreting, it is important to consider its potential biases and limitations when evaluating its findings. Further research is needed to fully understand the effectiveness and limitations of using metadiscourse devices in interpreting.

# Topics for further research:

* Challenges of using metadiscourse in interpreting
* Cultural references in interpreting and metadiscourse
* Definition and criteria for metadiscourse devices
* Quantitative analysis of metadiscourse in interpreting
* Criticisms of metadiscourse theory in interpreting
* Pedagogical implications of metadiscourse in interpreting
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