Orality, easy-to-read language intralingual translation and accessibility of cultural heritage for persons with cognitive and learning disabilities: the case of Greek oral history testimonies

Olaf Immanuel Seel
Ionian University, Greece
seel@ionio.gr

Abstract

As language is the main instrument of communication in all domains of human interaction, it goes without saying that establishing inclusion and accessibility of the cultural and creative industries for persons with disabilities is foremost a linguistic endeavour. Language, however, can manifest itself either in written or in oral discourse, while both of these manifestations have specific traits and characteristics in a given communicative situation.

This article deals with oral language in easy-to-read intralingual translation that enables access to oral history testimonies in museums for persons with cognitive and learning disabilities. The central aim of this article is to ascertain the dominant translational techniques that an intralingual easy-to-read oral history testimonies language translator has to apply in order to enable effective communication and, as such, to contribute to ensuring accessibility for persons with cognitive and learning disabilities to museum environments using oral history testimonies. To this end, oral history testimonies of three different sources in Greek language will be used and the overarching theoretical and methodological reference is thereby functional translation theory. The main conclusions drawn from the findings of this article are that the easy-to-read intralingual translator of oral history testimonies has to adopt a series of heterogeneous translation techniques, such as syntactical restructuring and reformulation, lexical addition or omission of unusual or difficult to understand lexis, repetition of central information, explanatory reformulation, substitution of lexical peculiarities, short explanations in order to achieve ideal target-text comprehension by persons with cognitive and learning disabilities, whereby the emotional load has to be softened as much as possible.

1. Introduction

Since the adoption of the Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) in 2006 by the United Nations,[1] the legal premises

---

[1] The CRPD was adopted at the United Nations headquarters in New York and entered into force 2008. Following decades of work, according to article 1 of the CRPD, its main purposes are to change attitudes and

have been set to facilitate the equal participation of persons with disabilities in all modern society manifestations. This also includes the cultural and creative industries (CCI). The keyword for the participation of persons with disabilities in society on equal terms is "accessibility" and constitutes an essential human right (cf. Greco 2016; Greco 2018).[2]Thus far, the main efforts to secure accessibility for persons with disabilities in CCI focus on people with sensory or physical disabilities and concentrate on audiovisual translation (AVT) (cf. Orero 2006; Díaz-Cintas, Orero, and Remael 2007; Díaz-Cintas and Remael 2007; Vercauteren 2007; Matamala and Orero 2017). Another field of research where the past and recent research output is more than satisfactory, is social inclusion in CCI and universal accessibility of museums (cf. Sandell 1998; Hurtado, Seibel and Gallego 2012; Martins 2012; Hurtado and Gallego 2013; Hurtado and Gallego 2015; Szarkowska, Jankowska, Krejtz, and Kowalski 2016; Eardley, Fryer, Hutchinson, Cock, Ride, and Neves 2017; Randaccio 2018; Spinzi 2019). The central research emphasis is again set on accessibility for people with sensory impairments, as can be seen in Αργυρόπουλος (2015), Πίσπα (2018) and Αργυρόπουλος and Κατσαντώνη (2020) where numerous research items can be found on this particular issue. Finally, the intensive interest in establishing accessibility of CCI for sensory impaired persons is underlined by the creation of a talking guide for blind and partially sighted people by the UK's Department for Culture, Media and Sport (cf. RNIB and VocalEyes 2003).

However, persons with sensory or mobility impairments are only two out of several more categories of persons with disabilities in our society. According to UK's *Disability Directory for Museums and Galleries* (2000, 6), persons with specific kinds of impairment include children, mental health service users, older people and people with cognitive and learning difficulties. It is these categories, and especially the latter, where research on CCI accessibility has still a great deal to cover. While, as we shall see later on (cf. 2.2.), the creation of easy-to-read language[3] (ERL)

---

behaviour towards persons with any kind of long-term disabilities, such as sensory, mental, physical or intellectual handicaps, and to ensure that they will be treated as human beings with equal rights, opportunities and fundamental freedoms (Cf. https://www.un.org/devERLopment/desa/disabilities/convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities.html).

[2]The CRPD (article 3) is grounded on eight principles, out of which the third is "[f]ull and effective participation and inclusion in society" and the sixth "accessibility". The latter, i.e., accessibility, manifests a decisive principle on which most of the other principles are based (cf. Article 3 of CRPD).

[3] "Easy-to-read language" is the English semantic equivalent of the German term "Leichte Sprache" (cf. Maaß 2015; Maaß 2018; Bredel and Maaß 2016). For the same concept other languages (e.g., Finnish, Swedish) use different terms (cf. *ibid*., 14-15). Cf. Vollenwyder *et al.*

as a special linguistic variety of natural languages has already been realized in some European societies as an instrument that offers accessibility and, as such, equal opportunities to persons with cognitive and learning disabilities (cf. Bredel and Maaß 2016), its fields of application include CCI mainly restricted to LSP-communication (e.g., legal text), teaching in school classrooms, second/foreign language teaching (Bock, Fix, and Lange 2017) or political news translation (Belde 2016). Thus, to my knowledge, to date, limited intellectual purvey has been attempted regarding the special methods and methodologies that have to be followed in order to achieve cognitive accessibility for persons with cognitive and learning disabilities in CCI, and, in particular, for museums.[4] Consequently, in the context of museums, it is obvious that the accessibility of persons with cognitive and learning disabilities via language is central. This is all the more the case as, despite the multimodal approach in CCI prevalent in recent years, museums still rely on texts for the presentation of their exhibitions and, therefore, have to be the focus of relevant research.

In this context, one special textual category that has been identified by museologists in the USA and in the UK in the mid-20th century are oral history testimonies (OHT). According to the Oral History Association, oral history can be defined as follows:

> Oral history is a field of study and a method of gathering, preserving and interpreting the voices and memories of people, communities, and participants in past events. Oral history is both the oldest type of historical inquiry, predating the written word, and one of the most modern, initiated with tape recorders in the 1940s and now using 21st-century digital technologies. [...] Oral History collects memories and

---

(2018) for the difference between "easy-to-read language" and "plain language" with regard to websites.

[4] In Scheele's (2017) postgraduate thesis, on the application of easy-to-read language on multimodal texts in museums, one can found a section on "barrier-free museums" (*ibid*., 10-21) and a one-page-long reference to "cognitive barriers" (*ibid*., 21), as well as an interesting analysis of a multimodal text, i.e., museum audio-guide, on the basis of a specific case study. Another postgraduate research thesis (Πίσπα 2018) examines universal museum accessibility via a case study of an ecclesiastic museum on the island of Rhodes. The author devotes time to CCI accessibility, and a chapter to "cognitive barriers" (*ibid*., 48-54). However, the focus lies more on the interactive as well as multimodal adjustment, rather than on the linguistic one (with one reference to "materials based on the method of 'Easy-to-Read'", referencing Τσιβινίκου (2015, 115-116)). Finally, one can also find a short empirical report on the use of ERL in museums entitled "1975/2015 – Schiffe erzählen Museumsgeschichten" (Siegert 2017).

personal commentaries of historical significance through recorded interviews. An oral history interview generally consists of a well-prepared interviewer questioning an interviewee and recording their exchange in audio or video format. Recordings of the interview are transcribed, summarized, or indexed and then placed in a library or archives. These interviews may be used for research or excerpted in a publication, radio or video documentary, museum exhibition, dramatization or other form of public presentation.[5]

As museums have re-conceptualised their ideological, educational and social roles, identity and scopes since the 1980's, striving for a more essential and systematic contribution to the enrichment and amelioration of social life, OHT become central for exhibition use. This is due to the fact that OHT reflect the plurality of ideas, opinions and interpretations, comply with the cultivation of educational aims that better align with heterogeneous needs and ways of thinking and with the activation of the people not only through cognitive channels but also through emotional and social ones, enabling the inclusion of all social groups in the museum experience. Given that OHT offer new experiences and knowledge based upon a plurality of voices, thus they may also lead to new approaches and values through the emotions they convey, as well as cultivate skills in all parties involved in the utilization of OHT. Furthermore, they offer opportunities for inspiration, personal participation, amusement and intellectual pursuit, and, finally, OHT can serve as guidelines for substantive engagement (cf. Hellenic National Committee 2006, 13). Hence, it goes without saying that the salience of OHT for the modern museum is undeniable.

In view of the above and given the importance of ensuring accessibility of CCI to persons with cognitive and learning disabilities, it is necessary that research endeavours focus on how to make OHT accessible to persons with cognitive and learning disabilities. It is to this discourse that the present article wishes to contribute. Its central research questions in this regard are the three following ones:

- Which are the characteristics of oral speech in OHT that pose particular cognitive barriers for persons with cognitive and learning disabilities?
- How and to what extent can ERL principles and rules be applied in order to deal with these cognitive barriers of OHT?
- Which are the techniques a translator must adopt in order to apply ERL when delivering intralingual translations of OHT of museum exhibitions for persons with cognitive and learning disabilities?

---

[5]https://www.oralhistory.org/about/do-oral-history/.

Thus, the purposes of this article are multiple: first, to raise awareness of the fact that persons with cognitive and learning disabilities demands the intralingual translator implement very specific techniques, second, to investigate, delineate and determine the factors that play a decisive role when implementing ERL as intralingual translation (easy-to-read INTRT) in oral history material of museum exhibitions, third, to ascertain the best techniques to follow in order to accomplish the translational task of establishing successful communication and accessibility for persons with cognitive and learning disabilities in museum environments using OHT. In view of this, the overarching aim of this article is to present a comprehensive overview of the techniques that have to be used in easy-to-read INTRT for persons with cognitive and learning disabilities, as the target-group, when encountering specific characteristics of orality in OHT.

To this end, this article is divided into a theoretical and an empirical part. The theoretical part provides the conceptual background on which the empirical part builds on, such as the central premises of easy-to-read INTRT for persons with cognitive and learning disabilities and the main characteristics of orality. In the empirical part which follows, a selection of OHT excerpts from a very difficult period of Modern Greek history, i.e., the 1941-1944 German occupation of Greece, will receive linguistic and translational scrutiny on the basis of the preceding theoretical premises. These OHT excerpts are taken from three different sources, all of which contain vivid oral testimonies and, as such, not only may constitute potential sources for forthcoming OHT exhibitions but also offer paradigmatic material for this article: **Source 1** is the recently published book by Βιολέττα Χιονίδου (Violetta Chionidou): *Η κατοχική πείνα μέσα από προφορικές μαρτυρίες. Η περίπτωση της Χίου, Σύρου και της Μυκόνου [The Occupation Hunger* [viewed] *through Oral testimonies. The cases of Chios, Syros and Mykonos]*, (2020),in which the few survivors of this difficult time give oral testimony of their remembrances of experienced famine.[6] The OHT of **source 2** belong to Greek Jews of Thessaloniki and they address the Holocaust they experienced during the German occupation. As is the case with source 1, they have also been carefully compiled in the 2002 book entitled *Προφορικές μαρτυρίες Εβραίων της Θεσσαλονίκης για το ολοκαύτωμα [Oral Testimonies of Thessalonikian Jews on the Holocaust]* by Κούνιο-Αμαρίλιο (Kounio-Amarillo) and Αλμπέρτο Ναρ (Alberto Nar). Finally, the OHT excerpts of **source 3** are taken from the ongoing exhibition of the Jewish Museum of Greece (JMG 2020) website in Athens entitled "Σαν πρόκες καρφώνονται οι λέξεις" ["Like nails must the words be hammered"].[7] By using three different

---

[6] In order to ensure the reader's comprehension of all bibliographical references and empirical excerpts and their intralingual translational renderings in Greek language (cf. 3.), an English translation of each will follow and be offered in brackets.

[7] https://www.jewishmuseum.gr/san-prokes-karfonontai-oi-lexeis/.

sources for the linguistic and translational analysis of the research material, I wish to widen the empirical spectrum and, thus, to strengthen the validity of the findings.

Thereafter, the findings of the empirical part will be evaluated. As will be shown, appropriate comprehension of easy-to-read INTRT for persons with cognitive and learning disabilities is jeopardized by specific orality elements, as, for example, by redundancy, interjections and omissions, potential emotional load, etc. The findings section will conclude with a presentation table of recommended techniques for the easy-to-read INTRT of oral testimonies for persons with cognitive and learning disabilities. Thereby, the overarching theoretical and methodological point of reference is functional translation theory (cf. Reiß and Vermeer, 1991; Nord, 2011). This will be followed by the final conclusions.

2. Conceptual background

2.1. Main determinants of oral language

Oral language or spoken language and written language are manifestations of the same linguistic system. However, they are realized under different conditions. Oral language, as opposed to the written word, can be defined as the spontaneous production of language by the human vocal speech mechanism in the form of articulate sounds. It is bound to a specific communicative situation with two or more communication partners who interact with each other, while the processing time of communicative utterances is usually restricted. This is also true for the possibility of the communication partners to rethink their utterances and/or to autocorrect them. All the above are equally true for OHT, notwithstanding the fixed situational setting of the interview between the interviewer and the interviewee.

Spoken language has specific characteristics. Given this chapter's central aims (cf. 1), I shall enumerate the characteristics of spoken language that, as a thorough investigation of all three Greek sources show, are salient and frequent in OHT and briefly define each one.

According to Scherer (1984, 147), oral utterances have three dominant categories:

1. **Discourse markers**, i.e., "a word or expression which shows the connection between what is said and the wider context" (Swan 2004). Discourse markers have a communicative and not an informative function, they structure the discourse, they are syntax-independent and usually do not differentiate the meaning of the utterance. Maschler (1998, 14) divides them into interpersonal (e.g., look, exactly, wow), referential (e.g., now, because, and), structural (e.g., so, in the end) and cognitive markers (e.g., oh!, uh!, um!, I mean!).

2. **Reduced forms**, such as the ellipsis, i.e., when a word or phrase is left out in an utterance.
3. **Defective forms**, such as the anacoluthon, i.e., "the syntactical inconsistency or incoherence within a sentence; *especially*: a shift in an unfinished sentence from one syntactic construction to another (as in 'you really ought—well, do it your own way')" [8] or any interruption of the utterance followed by corrective additions, and aposiopesis, i.e., the device of suddenly breaking off in speech. Both forms are intertwined with non-verbal behaviour, the knowledge of context, previous background knowledge, the sympractical environment (i.e., fields consisting of behaviour), the mindset of the interlocutors and the reference to the constancy of the total meaning of the communicative situation.

In addition to Scherer (1984), given their salience for OHT and persons with cognitive and learning disabilities, the following characteristics of spoken language should also be added to the aforementioned listing:

4. **Inversions**, i.e., placing the verb before the subject.
5. **Interjections**, i.e., exclamations, greetings, curses, hesitation markers and all other words that do not pertain to the category of discourse markers as shown above, and fillers, i.e., words that are pronounced in order to signal to the interlocutor that one wants a pause to think (e.g., thingamajig, whatchamacallit).
6. **Redundancy**, i.e., repetitions of words or information, which often is emphatic and reveals emotions of the speaker.
7. **Idiolectic lexis** of the speaker, such as old words that are already out of use and, thus, incomprehensible, as well as **colloquial lexis and expression**.
8. Extremely **deficient** and, therefore, **incomprehensible utterances**.
9. **Formulations of emotional anxiety**.
10. **Dialogue interpolations** by the speaker.

To summarize, we can ascertain that the aforementioned seven categories fit into four groups: mainly syntactical nature (2, 3, 4), lexical nature (5, 7), overlap in both of them (1, 5, 6, 8, 9) or are located on a textual level (10).

Other, dominant phonological elements of the utterance, i.e., intonation, prosody, speech speed and rhythm will not be taken into account in the following analysis (cf. 3) because this paper investigates OHT in its final form where the recording of an interview has been already accurately transcribed.

---

[8]   https://web.archive.org/web/20130425165000/http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/anacoluthon.

Before proceeding to the analysis, it is essential to look at the main principals of ERL.

2.2. Main principles and rules of and easy-to-read INTRT

ERL should be considered as a variety of any natural language that has been systematically reduced predominantly in syntax and vocabulary. In addition, the background knowledge needed to understand a text written in ERL is also reduced. Furthermore, ERL texts are characterized by a specific layout (cf. Maaß 2015, 11-12).[9] Its main purpose is to guarantee optimal reception by persons with disabilities.

ERL is based on specific principles and rules (cf. *Ibid*, 76). Its **principles** are twofold, i.e., the **general** ones and the **ethical** ones.

The general principles (GP) are the following four:
GP1. the grammatical function has to be clearly signified (e.g., "he has eaten" instead of "he ate", or clearly stated negations),
GP2. lexis and informational distribution have to be central instead of peripheral,
GP3. active orientation of linguistic formulation (e.g., verbal use instead of nominal use, denomination of agents, and actively oriented distribution of information),
GP4.important and central issues have to be repeated (redundancy principle and multicodality).

The ethical principles (EP)are four in numbers (cf. *ibid*, 81):
EP1. The bridging function of ERL should be always taken into account,
EP2. incorrect language use should be avoided,
EP3. adult recipients should be addressed to as such,
EP4. comprehensibility is the ultimate criterion and transcends other criteria (e.g., gender-responsive language).

According to Maaß (*ibid*, 86-149), the **rules (R)** of ERL focus on four categories, i.e., the **punctuation level**, the **word level**, the **sentence level** and the **text level**. Furthermore, ERL rules also refer to the **text type**, the **typographical details** and the **layout**. In the following, the rules of these categories that play a major role for the analysis of the Greek OHT (cf. 3.) will be presented. These categories are the word level, the sentence level, the text level, specificities of the text type, the typography and the layout.

---

[9] Maaß (2015, 11-12) makes special reference to the German language. However, notwithstanding some more specialized rules of ERL adapted to the German language, the language-independent guidelines should be regarded as applicable to all languages. In the following short analysis (cf. 3.), I shall only concentrate on the language-independent principles and rules. For a detailed analysis and presentation of ERL, as well as for a historical survey of ERL cf. (*ibid*.; Bredel and Maaß 2016).

25

RA. On the **word level**, the following rules are pre-eminent:
RA1. Use basic vocabulary,
RA2. use as short words as possible,
RA3. avoid special terms or foreign words (if salient to the text they must be explained),
RA4. avoid abbreviations of the written word (except for very well-known ones of everyday-language).

RB. On the **sentence level**:
RB1. Prefer verbal formulation to nominal ones,
RB2. avoid the passive voice, prefer using the active agent,
RB3. avoid the genitive-form,
RB4. use, wherever possible, the subject-verb-object syntactic structure,
RB5. deliver only one statement per clause,
RB6. resolve subordinate clauses,
RB7. avoid the subjunctive mood,
RB8. avoid the simple or continuous past, prefer the perfect tense (exception: modal verbs),
RB9. avoid metaphors, unless they are transparent),
RB10. avoid negations, but, if used, then prefer the word "not" set in bold letters.

RC. On the **textual level**:
RC1. Pay attention to the textual unfolding,
RC2. the selection of the information results from the text theme,
RC3. with regard to all word categories: use always the same words for the same information, use no synonyms,
RC4. use of personal pronouns: avoid the third person, use instead the first and second person; replace the third person by the noun it stands for; replace personal pronouns with the nouns the stand for,
RC5. use key words at the page margins and subheadings,
RC6. make informational references and explanation (in the reading direction),
RC7. when translating into ERL text changes are allowed (bridging function!),
RC8. adapt the use of imaging to the targeted age group.

RD. On the **text type level**:
RD1. Check whether one can adopt the specificities of the text type,
RD2. pay attention to any changes in the text function.

RE. On the **typographical and layout level**: ERL-texts are texts in list form:
RE1. Use indentations for explanations and examples,
RE2. use a sans-serif typeface,
RE3. emphasis should be with bold letters,
RE4. in-sentence-hyphenations should follow syntactical grouping,

RE5.use of pictures: use pictures, diagrams and pictograms that better explain central concepts, exhaust multicodality.

However, all the above-mentioned principles and rules seem not to take into account the emotional factor of language which, in the case of OHT, can be rather intense. It is obvious, that in order to achieve unimpeded communication, in particular, the emotional burden of OHT source-texts will have to be softened or even eliminated in easy-to-read INTRT for persons with cognitive disabilities. Otherwise, the emotional burden these target-receivers would experience is very likely to hinder and/or disturb the input reception. I would, therefore, like to introduce the additional rule of "emotional burdening must be softened or avoided". In the context of this article and in accordance with the alphabetical order used above, this additional rule will be labelled **RF**.

From a translational point of view, the production of ERL texts usually constitutes an intralingual and intracultural transfer procedure, whereby a given source-text of a specific language serves as the basis for the production of an ERL target-text in the same natural language. As has been shown above, the production of an ERL target-text resides in several diversifications and changes on all language levels and on text level in order to achieve the goal of easy comprehensibility and, thus, accessibility for persons with disabilities. Thus, easy-to-read INTRT constitutes a target-text-centered translation procedure that cannot be framed in all its manifestations by source-text-centered and equivalence-oriented theoretical approaches. Instead, functional translation theory (Reiß and Vermeer 1991, 133) and the concept of "adequacy" (Adäquatheit) frame it, according to which a target-text may differ from its source if the target-text accomplishes its skopos in a given situation. This also complies with the premise of functional translation theory that the source-text manifests an informational offer for the translator and the target-text is an informational offer that deals with a specific informational offer, and that overcomes linguistic and cultural barriers (cf. Reiß and Vermeer 1991, 85; cf. also Nord 2011, 104). (Cf. Maaß 2018)

3. Analysis of oral characteristics of the Greek OHT and easy-to-read INTRT-techniques and findings

For reasons of clarity and space economy, the analysis of the oral characteristics of the Greek OHT will be presented in Table 1. The tables vertical rows indicate, from left to right in the first row, the specific characteristic of orality under discussion and its linguistic level starting from the lexical level, then proceeding to the syntactical level, followed by the level where both of those overlap and with the textual level as the last category of orality. In the second row, examples of the sources illustrate the specific characteristic whereby, due to space constraints, not more than two examples will be demonstrated. In the third row, the proposed easy-to-read INTRT solution of the whole OHT excerpt will be presented

for each of these examples. However, the translational rendering of each oral characteristic under scrutiny will be presented in bold letters. Finally, in the fourth row, the specific ERL rule will be mentioned on which the proposed translation solution is grounded. For reasons of comprehensibility, as already pointed out (cf. footnote 6), all Greek excerpts will be translated into English by the author.

CHARACTERISTIC OF ORALITY	EXAMPLE	ERL INTRALINGUAL TRANSLATION SOLUTION	ERL RULE
LEXICAL LEVEL			
REDUNDANCY	«Μόνο που πέθαιναν **από την πείνα. Από την πείνα**, παιδάκι μου.» (Chionidou 2020, 402).[ENG: "Only that they were dying **of hunger. Of hunger**, my child."]	«Οι άνθρωποι πέθαιναν από την πείνα. **Οι άνθρωποι πέθαιναν από την πείνα**.» [ENG:"**People were dying of hunger. People were dying of hunger**."]	GP4, EP4, RB4
IDIOLECTIC LEXIS	«Οι ηλικιωμένοι άρρωστοι όλοι σχεδόν πεθάναν. **Πρησκόντανε** […]» (Chionidou 2020, 402) [ENG: "The elderly and the sick almost all died. They were swollen **[=unidiomatic morphology of the verb in Greek**] […]".]	«Οι ηλικιωμένοι άρρωστοι σχεδόν πεθάναν όλοι. **Οι κοιλιές τους πρήζονταν και πέθαναν**.» [ENG: "Most of the older people died. **Their bellies swelled and they died.**"]	EP1,EP2, EP4, RA1, RA5, RC7
COLLOQUIAL LEXIS	«Ο νεκροθάφτης, **ο**	«Ο νεκροφάφτης.»	EP1, EP4, RA3, RF

	γρουσούζης.» (Chionidou 2020, 402)[ENG: "The gravedigger, the jinx."]	[ENG: The gravedigger."]	
COLLOQUIAL EXPRESSIONS	«Είχαν δίκιο οι αντάρτες[…] Πολλές φορές μείνανε εκεί πέρα δεκαπέντε μέρες. Τους ταΐζανε, **τους κάνανε**.» (JMG 2020, Σάρα Γέσουα-Φόρτη) [ENG: "The Partisans were right [...] Many times they had stayed there for 15 days. They fed them and treated them well [=an **idiomatically used colloquial expression in Greek**]".]	«Οι αντάρτες είχαν δίκιο […]Οι Εβραίοι πολλές φορές μείνανε με τους αντάρτες 15 μέρες. **Οι αντάρτες τους πρόσεχαν πολύ**.» [ENG: "The Partisans were right. The Jews had stayed with the partisans many times. for 15 days. The partisans fed them. **The partisans took care of them**."]	RA3, RB4, RC7, EP1, EP4
SYNTACTICAL LEVEL			
REDUCTIVE FORMS Ellipsis	«Και φτάσαμε στην Πολωνία. **Όλη η οικογένεια στο ίδιο βαγόνι**.» (JMG2020, Ιακώβ Μαέστρο) [ENG: "And we arrived in Poland. **The whole family in the same train car**."]	«Και φτάσαμε στην Πολωνία. Η οικογένεια όλη **ήταν** στο ίδιο βαγόνι τρένου.» [ENG: "And we arrived in Poland. Our entire family **was** in one train car."]	RB4, GP1, GP2, EP4
DEFECTIVE FORMS	«Και μέσα στη	«Και μέσα στη	RB4, RB10,

Anacoluthon	μεγάλη πείνα ήταν ο τύφος […]; - Όχι. **Ήταν στο, μετά ήταν**.» (Chionidou 2020, 441) [ENG: "And during the great famine there was typhus […]? – No. **It was, later it was**."]	μεγάλη πείνα ήταν ο τύφος […]; -**Η άσχημη αρρώστια που λέγεται τύφος ήταν μετά από τη μεγάλη πείνα**.» [ENG: "And during the great famine there was typhus […]? –**The bad disease called typhus arrived after the great hunger.**"]	GP1, GP2, EP1, EP4, RF
Aposiopesis	«Σε γιατρό πήγανε, ή γιατρός τους είδε; - **Δε, να τους, να τους, μπα…**» (Chionidou 2020, 405) [ENG: "Did they go to a doctor, did a doctor see them? - **No, to them, to them, nah…**"]	«Σε γιατρό πήγανε, ή γιατρός τους είδε; - «**ΔΕΝ πήγανε σε γιατρό**». [ENG: "Did they go to a doctor, did a doctor see them? –**They did not go to a doctor**."]	RB2, RB4, RB10, GP1, GP2, EP1, EP4
INVERSIONS	«Σας λέγω, αυτή η οικογένεια μας βοήθησε. **Ένα μπουκαλάκι λαδάκι μας έδινε**, και προσπαθούσαμε με αυτό να ζήσουμε.» (Chionidou 2020, 65) [ENG: "I tell you, this family helped us. **A	«Η οικογένεια αυτή βοήθησε τη δικιά μου οικογένειά. **Η οικογένεια αυτή έδινε στη δικιά μου οικογένεια ένα μπουκάλι λάδι**. Με αυτό το λάδι προσπάθησε η οικογένειά μου να ζήσει.» [ENG: "This family helped us. **This family was	RB4, RB5, GP1, GP2, EP1, EP4

	small bottle of oil she gave us, and we tried to live on that."]	**giving my family a bottle of oil.** My family tried to live on this small bottle of oil.'"]	
LEXICAL/SYNTACTICAL LEVEL OVERLAPPING			
DISCOURSE MARKERS	1.«**Λοιπόν,** πηγαίνοντας το πρωί […]» (Chionidou 2020, 405) [ENG: "**Well**, when going in the morning […]"]	-«Το πρωί […]» [ENG: "In the morning […]".	GP1, GP2, EP4, RB2
	2.«Ήμασταν στο Άουσβιτς Ι, και εκεί ήταν περιποιημένα […] ενώ στο Μπίρκεναου είχαμε κάτι ποντίκια, **να!**» (Kounio-Amarillo and Nar 2002, 69) [ENG: "We were in Auschwitz I, and there it was neat […] while in Birkenau we had mice **like that**!!"]	- «Ήμασταν στο Άουσβιτς Ι. Εκεί ήταν περιποιημένα. Σε άλλο στρατόπεδο είδα **πολύ μεγάλα** ποντίκια.» [ENG: We were in Auschwitz I. There it was neat. In another concentration camp I saw **very big** mice."]	GP1, GP2, EP4, RB4, RB5
INTERJECTIONS	«**Αχ, Παναγιά μου**, μια μέρα πατέρα και γιο τους βγάλανε.» (Chronidou 2020, 401) [ENG: "Ah, **Virgin Maria**, one day, the father and son were taken	«Μια μέρα βρήκαν έναν πατέρα νεκρό. Την ίδια μέρα βρήκαν και τον γιο του. **Στεναχωριέμαι**.» [ENG: "One day they found a father and a son dead. **I am**	GP2, EP4, RA3, RB5, RF

	out."]	sad."]	
DEFICIENT/ INCOMPREHENSIBLE UTTERANCES	«Όλοι ήταν … όλοι ήταν άρρωστοι. Ήταν άρρωστοι, πρησκόνταν, **δεν μπορούσαν να … Δεν υπήρχαν να, ούτε, να δούμε και ο παπάς αν τις**…» (Chronidou 2020, 437) [ENG: "All of them … all were sick. They were sick, swollen, **they couldn't …They did not exist to, not even, to see and if the priest...**"]	----------------	EP1, EP2, EP4
FORMULATIONS OF EMOTIONAL ANXIETY	1.«**Βλέπεις που μου θυμίζεις πράγματα και με στεναχωρείς;**» (Kounio-Amarillo and Nar 2002, 412) [ENG: "**See how you remind me of things and make me sad**."]	----------------	EP1, EP2, EP4, RF
	2.«**Πού, πού να, πού να τα θυμόμαστε…**» (Chionidou 2020, 408)[ENG: "**Where, where**	----------------	EP1, EP2, EP4, RF

	to, I can't remember them ..."]		
TEXTUAL LEVEL			
DIALOGUE INTERPOLATIONS BY THE SPEAKER	«Το πρωί όταν ξημέρωσε, ο θείος ο Ισαάκ, ο οποίος κάτι ήξερε […] είπε **«πού πάμε, εδώ είναι η Κέρκυρα»** και αλλάζουμε ρότα και πάμε προς την άλλη πλευρά.»(JMG 2020, Σαμπετάι Μπέζας) [ENG: "In the morning, when the sun had risen, my uncle Isaak, who knew something, […] said '**where are we going, Corfu is in that direction**' and we changed course and go into the other direction."]	«Το πρωί ξημέρωσε. Ο θείος Ισαάκ είπε: **'Το καΐκι πάει λάθος. Η Κέρκυρα είναι από εδώ.' Το καΐκι πήρε μετά τη σωστή κατεύθυνση προς Κέρκυρα.**» [ENG: "It was morning. The sun had risen. My uncle Isaak said: '**The boat goes in the wrong direction. Corfu is that way'**. The boat corrected its course."]	GP2, GP4, EP1, EP4, RB4-6, RC7

Table1: Oral characteristics of Greek OHT and their easy-to-read INTRT

Easy-to-read INTRT for persons with cognitive and learning disabilities is undoubtedly a polydimensional communicative endeavour whereby all levels of written text production (interpunction, lexical, syntactical, (con-)textual, text type, typographical, layout) have to be taken into account and coordinated and harmonized with each other (Maaß 2015). Though these aspects also play a role in written/transcribed recordings of OHT, it is, however, the dimension of oral language that is in the forefront.

A closer look at Table 1 reveals that implementing easy-to-read INTRT on Greek OHT also has to consider the specific characteristics of

oral language if comprehension for persons with cognitive and learning disabilities and, hence, their CCI accessibility and inclusion in museums is to be secured. In accordance with the specific principles and rules on which the formulation of ERL is based (cf. Maaß 2015), the translator of easy-to-read INTRT for persons with cognitive and learning disabilities, who strives to implement it on OHT, has to adopt a series of, more or less, heterogeneous translation techniques in order to achieve ideal target-text comprehension by persons with cognitive and learning disabilities.

For the sake of clarity and completeness, the linguistic and translational choices made with regard to each category of orality and the ERL rules as presented above in Table 1, as well as the corresponding INTRT-techniques used to guarantee accessibility for persons with cognitive and learning disabilities to OHT (cf. also Table 2), will be now briefly discussed.[10]

    a. Table1, lexical level, characteristic of orality, *redundancy*: The example stated is, as such, in accordance with the ERL GP4 (redundancy principle and multicodality), i.e., that important and central issues have to be repeated, as the Greek word "πείνα" [ENG: "hunger"] is mentioned twice. However, its syntactical embedment is too elliptic. Furthermore, the subject in both clauses as point of reference is missing. Another missing element is the main verb "πεθαίνουν" [ENG: "they die"] in the second clause. All this does not comply with ERL rule B4 and the ERL ethical principle EP4, according to which the subject-verb-clause is to be used, wherever possible, and comprehensibility is the ultimate criterion. Thus, the INTRT-techniques of *syntactical restructuring and reformulation*, *repetition of central information* and of *lexical addition* had to be implemented in order to functionally cope with this accessibility obstacle.

    b. Table1, lexical level, characteristic of orality, *idiolectical lexis*: The idiolectic use of the Greek "πρησκόντανε" [ENG: "they were swollen"] verb resides in its unidiomatic and incorrect morphology. In addition to this, it is used incoherently, as it is not absolutely clear to the recipient *what* or *who* was swollen. This does not comply, first of all, with the ERL ethical principle EP2, which dictates that incorrect language use should be avoided. Taking into account the ERL ethical principles EP1 (bridging function of ERL) and EP4 (comprehensibility as the ultimate criterion) and the ERL rule RC7 (when translation into ERL text changes are allowed), as well as the ERL rules RA1 (use basic vocabulary) and RB5 (deliver only one statement per clause), the INTRT-techniques of *explanatory (re)formulation*, *omission and substitution of lexical peculiarities*

---

[10] Due to space constraints, the full examples and their ERL translation solutions will not be mentioned again. For the same reason, only one example of each characteristic of orality will be discussed.

and *short explanation if information is central* were implemented in order to ensure unimpeded reception.

c. Table1, lexical level, characteristic of orality, *colloquial lexis*: The Greek word "γρουσούζης" [ENG: "jinx"] is a colloquial lexis with an obviously negative connotation. In accordance with ERL rule RA3 (avoid special terms or foreign words), as well as with ERL rule RF (emotional burdening should be softened or avoided), the INTRT-technique used to overcome this problem was the *omission of the emotionally burdened text elements*.

d. Table1, lexical level, characteristic of orality, *colloquial expression*: The Greek idiomatic expression "τους κάνανε" [ENG: "they were well treated"] is characterized by intense colloquiality and, to some extent, it has to be regarded as anachronistic language use in Modern Greek. Though it is still encountered as the first part of a two-parts-expression used in colloquial Modern Greek "*τους κάνανε, τους ράνανε*" (meaning in English such as "they did things to them"), in the specific text example, one segment of the expression is torn from its whole and used separately and elliptically. Thus, beside its extreme colloquiality, the expression under discussion is also to some extent unidiomatic. This contradicts the ERL ethical principles EP1 (bridging function of ERL) and EP4 (comprehensibility as the ultimate criterion), as well as the ERL rules RA3 (avoid special terms or foreign words), RB4 (use, wherever possible, the subject-verb-object syntactic structure) and RC7 (when translation into ERL text changes are allowed). To cope with this problem, the INTRT-techniques of *lexical addition*, *explanatory (re)formulation*, *omission and substitution of lexical peculiarities* and *short explanation if information is central* were used.

e. Table1, syntactical level, characteristic of orality, *reductive form, "ellipsis"*: In the text source-text example, comprehension is impeded because the main verb is left out. Due to this, the syntactical structure of the utterance is also unconventional, as it begins with the adjective "όλη" [ENG: "all"] instead of commencing with the subject. This burdens immediate and unhindered reception of the message too. In view of this, this conflicts with ERL general principles G1 (the grammatical function has to be clearly signified), GP2 (lexis and informational distribution has to be central instead of peripheral), the ethical principle E4 (comprehensibility as the ultimate criterion) and RB4, according to which the subject-verb-clause is to be used, wherever possible. To ensure unimpeded reception in INTRT, the following translation techniques were implemented: *syntactical restructuring and reformulation* and *addition of missing information*.

f. Table1, syntactical level, characteristic of orality, *defective form, "anacoluthon"*: The text example clearly reflects the syntactical inconsistency or incoherence within the utterance where there is a shift in an unfinished sentence from one syntactic construction to

another: "Όχι. Ήταν στο, μετά ήταν" [ENG: "No. It was, later it was"]. The negation in the front and this unconventional interruption of the utterance followed by corrective additions, undoubtedly hinders the unimpeded comprehension of the message and conflicts with several ERL principles and rules, i.e., G1 the grammatical function has to be clearly signified), GP2 (lexis and informational distribution has to be central instead of peripheral), EP1 (bridging function of ERL), E4 (comprehensibility as the ultimate criterion), RB4 (use, wherever possible, the subject-verb-object syntactic structure) and RB10 (avoid negations, but, if used, than prefer the word "not" set in bold letters). Moreover, as this anacoluthon refers to a bad disease, i.e., typhus, it dramatically conveys through its connotations but also through the interruptions themselves an unsaid emotional burden of the speaker. This conflicts with ERL rule RF (emotional burdening has to be avoided). To cope with this oral characteristic in INTRT, the following techniques were implemented: *syntactical restructuring and explanatory reformulation*, *lexical addition and addition of missing information*, *omission of negation "no"*, *omission of emotionally burdening text elements*.

g. Table1, syntactical level, characteristic of orality, *defective form*, "*aposiopesis*": In the text example, there are all together three sudden breaking offs in speech, also connoting the rudimentary use of passive voice. As it is also the case with the anacoluthon, this form is inextricably intertwined with non-verbal behaviour, the knowledge of context, previous background knowledge, the sympractical environment (i.e., fields consisting of behaviour), the mindset of the interlocutors and the reference to the constancy of the total meaning of the communicative situation (cf. 2.1, 3.). Furthermore, the text example under discussion also contains the colloquial interjection of Greek oral speech "μπα…" [ENG: "nah ..."]. All this poses significant impediments for the accurate comprehension of the message. It contradicts the ERL principles G1 (the grammatical function has to be clearly signified), GP2 (lexis and informational distribution has to be central instead of peripheral), as well as with the ERL ethical principles EP1 (bridging function of ERL) and E4 (comprehensibility as the ultimate criterion), but also with the ERL rules RA3 (avoid special terms or foreign words), RB2 (avoid the passive voice, prefer using the active agent), RB4 (use, wherever possible, the subject-verb-object syntactic structure) and RB10 (avoid negations, but, if used, then prefer the word "not" set in bold letters). To cope with this oral characteristic in INTRT, the following techniques were implemented: *syntactical restructuring and explanatory reformulation*, *lexical addition and addition of missing information*, *omission of negation "no" and use of "not" in bold letters, i.e., suprasegmental emphasis*.

h. Table1, syntactical level, characteristic of orality, *inversion*: In the text example, the objects and the main verb are inverted in a main clause ("Ένα μπουκαλάκι λαδάκι μας έδινε» [ENG: "A small bottle of oil she gave us"]). In addition, this syntactical inversion is paratactically connected with another main clause, separated by a comma. Contrary to the defective syntactical forms, the inversion manifests a lesser problem for unimpeded understanding. However, it conflicts with several ERL principles and rules: G1 (the grammatical function has to be clearly signified), GP2 (lexis and informational distribution has to be central instead of peripheral), as well as with the ERL ethical principles EP1 (bridging function of ERL) and E4 (comprehensibility as the ultimate criterion), but also with the ERL rules RB4 (use, wherever possible, the subject-verb-object syntactic structure) and RB5 (deliver only one statement per clause). The techniques used to cope with this in INTRT were the following: *syntactical restructuring (also into two separated main clauses)*, *lexical addition/addition of missing information*.

i. Table1, lexical/syntactical level overlapping, characteristic of orality, *discourse marker (second example)*: The Greek discourse marker "να!" [ENG: "…, like that!"] is a colloquial way of pointing out the excessive size of something. This discourse marker has to be accompanied by kinetic means, i.e., parallel movement of both hands in certain distance of each other signifying the remarkable size of the object under discussion. In the case of the text example, its use by the speaker refers to very big mice. It is obvious that both the colloquiality of the discourse marker as well as the necessity of the parallel use of non-verbal means make it a communication obstacle in ERL for persons with learning and cognitive disabilities. As such, it conflicts with the following ERL principles and rules: G1 (the grammatical function has to be clearly signified), GP2 (lexis and informational distribution has to be central instead of peripheral), E4 (comprehensibility as the ultimate criterion), and in its contextual embedment it also conflicts with), RB4 (use, wherever possible, the subject-verb-object syntactic structure) and RB5 (deliver only one statement per clause). The techniques used to cope with this Greek discourse marker and its contextual embedment was, as in the case of *inversion*, the following: *syntactical restructuring (also into two separated main clauses)*, *substitution of lexical peculiarities, lexical addition/addition of missing information*.

- Table1, lexical/syntactical level overlapping, characteristic of orality, *interjections*: The Greek interjection "Αχ, Παναγιά μου" [ENG: "Ah, Virgin Maria"] is emotionally stressed, evoking sentiments of fear, pity and helplessness. Furthermore, the interjection interrupts the main informational content of the utterance, which is also to some extent elliptical, as it is not immediately clear how and where from "father and son were taken out". It is the interjection that connotes

37

the death of both father and son who were both taken out of their home dead. Hence, this contradicts GP2 (lexis and informational distribution has to be central instead of peripheral), EP4 (comprehensibility as the ultimate criterion), to some extent with RA3 (avoid special terms or foreign words) and RB5 (deliver only one statement per clause), as well as with RF (emotional burdening has to be avoided). The appropriate techniques used in INTRT to cope with the above were *syntactical restructuring and reformulation*, *lexical addition*, *explanatory (re)formulation* and *omission of emotionally burdened text elements*.

j. Table1, lexical/syntactical level overlapping, characteristic of orality, *deficient/incomprehensible utterances*: The text example contains a series of extremely deficient/incomplete and, therefore, incomprehensible utterances: "[δ]εν μπορούσαν να … Δεν υπήρχαν να, ούτε, να δούμε και ο παπάς αν τις…" [ENG: "[...] they couldn't ...They did not exist to, not even, to see and if the priest ..."]. It goes without saying that this conflicts with three of the four ethical principles of ERL, i.e., EP1 (bridging function of ERL), EP2 (incorrect language use should be avoided) and EP4 (comprehensibility as the ultimate criterion). However, as it is impossible to decipher their message not even in context, these utterances have to be left out completely. Hence, no further INTRT-techniques had to be implemented.

Table1, lexical/syntactical level overlapping, characteristic of orality, *formulations of emotional anxiety*: This also goes for the formulation of emotional anxiety "Βλέπεις που μου θυμίζεις πράγματα και με στεναχωρείς;" [ENG: "See how you remind me of things and make me sad. "Due to its intense emotional burden (RF), it has to be omitted and no further INTRT-technique is implemented to deal with this issue.

- Table1, textual level, characteristic of orality, *dialogue interpolations by the speaker*: In OHT, dialogical interpolations by the speaker are frequent. The specific text example used in table 1 (ο θείος ο Ισαάκ, ο οποίος κάτι ήξερε […] είπε "πού πάμε, εδώ είναι η Κέρκυρα"[ENG: uncle Isaak, who knew something, [...] said 'where are we going, Corfu is in that direction']) is characteristic of this trait of orality. Its syntactical perplexity and semantic ellipticity and the sudden shift of perspective do not comply with ERL GP2 (lexis and informational distribution has to be central instead of peripheral), GP4 (redundancy principle and multicodality), EP1 (bridging function of ERL), EP4 (comprehensibility as the ultimate criterion), RB4 (use, wherever possible, the subject-verb-object syntactic structure), RB5 (deliver only one statement per clause), RB6 (resolve subordinate clauses) and RC7 (when translating into ERL, text changes are allowed (bridging function!). The INTRT-techniques used to cope with this were *syntactical restructuring and*

reformulation, *explicit denomination of dialogue structure* and *explicit addition of connoted information*.

In Table 2, translation techniques that originate in the aforementioned short implementation of easy-to-read INTRT for persons with cognitive and learning disabilities of the Greek OHT excerpts, through which CCI accessibility is established, are presented in relation to the ERL rules that guide them on every language category.

OHT and easy-to-read INTRT for persons with cognitive and learning disabilities		
ELR rule (explanation mentioned only once) and frequency of use (in parentheses)		INTRT-techniques
LEXICAL LEVEL	*RA1 (1) Use basic vocabulary* *RA3 (2) Avoid special terms or foreign words* *(if salient for the text they must be explained)* *RB4 (2) Use, wherever possible,* *the subject-verb-object syntactic structure* *RB5 (1) Deliver only one statement per clause* *EP1 (2) The bridging function* *EP4 (2) Comprehensibility is the ultimate* *criterion and transcends other criteria* *GP4 (1) Important and central issues have* *to be repeated* *RC7 (2) When translating into EL text changes* *are allowed* *RF (1) Emotional burdening has to be avoided*	- Syntactical restructuring and reformulation - Lexical addition - Repetition of central information - Explanatory (re)formulation - Omission and substitution of lexical peculiarities - Short explanation if information is central - Omission of unusual lexis or lexis difficult to understand - Omission of emotionally burdening text elements
SYNTACTI CAL LEVEL	*RB2 (1) The passive voice, prefer using the active agent* *RB4 (4)* *EP 4 (4)* *EP1 (3)* *GP1 (4) The grammatical function has to be* *clearly signified* *GP2 (4) Lexis and*	- Syntactical restructuring and reformulation - Lexical addition - Explanatory (re)formulation - Omission of negation ("no"), use of "not" set in bold letters:

	informational distribution have to be central instead of peripheral *RB10 (2)* , but, if used, than prefer the word "not" set in bold letters *RF (1)* Emotional burdening has to be avoided	Suprasegmental emphasis - Addition of missing information - Omission of emotionally burdeningtext elements
LEXICAL/ SYNTACTI CAL LEVEL OVERLAPP ING	*EP4 (4)* *RB2 (1)* *RB4 (1)* *RB5 (1)* *EP1 (3)* *EP2 (3)* *GP1 (2)* *GP2 (2)* *RF (3)*	- Syntactical restructuring and reformulation - Explication of connoted information - Lexical omission - Substitution of lexical peculiarities - Omission of complete deficient/incomprehensi ble utterance (if information is not central) - Omission of emotionally burdening text elements
TEXTUAL LEVEL	*RB4-6 Resolve subordinate clauses* *E1* *E4* *GP1-4 Active orientation of linguistic formulation* *RC7*	- Syntactical restructuring and reformulation - Explicit denomination of dialogue structure - Explicit addition of connoted information (if salient)

Table 2: OHT and easy-to-read INTRT-techniques for the access of persons with cognitive and learning disabilities to CCI

As we can see from Table 2, easy-to-read INTRT of OHT for persons with cognitive and learning disabilities shows, despite its heterogeneity, in nearly all language categories, more or less, common denominators. In view of the above, the INTRT-techniques of the characteristics of oral language that have been referred to in this paper can be subsumed under the following ten categories*:* 1. **Syntactical restructuring and reformulation**, 2. **lexical addition** or **omission of unusual** or **difficult to understand lexis**, 3. **repetition of central information**, 4. **explanatory reformulation**, 5. **substitution of lexical peculiarities**, 6. **short explanation if information is central**, 7. **omission of negation "no" and use of "not" with suprasegmental emphasis**, 8.

explication or **explicit addition of connoted/missing information**, 9. **explicit denomination of dialogue structures**, and 10. **omission of emotionally burdening text elements**. Thus, we would argue that these findings can serve as guide for the translator of easy-to-read INTRT of OHT for persons with cognitive and learning disabilities. This necessitates, they are also taking into account the modifications needed from the perspective of the wider context of the utterances in which the oral characteristic is embedded, as well as from the perspective of the total text and its function (cf. Reiß and Vermeer 1991).

Finally, as the data input in Table 1 is limited due to the space constraints of this paper, and confirmed results make more statistical data necessary, the conclusions drawn by this paper have to be regarded as indicative for easy-to-read INTRT of OHT for persons with cognitive and learning disabilities.

4. Concluding remarks

This paper has highlighted intralingual translation as a means of contributing to ensuring museum accessibility for persons with cognitive and learning disabilities and, as such, to CCI. More specifically, it has shown that establishing accessibility of museum exhibitions for persons with cognitive and learning disabilities has also to take into account orality as a dominant feature of OHT. In accordance with its three central research questions and its purposes (cf. 1), this paper drew, first of all, attention to salient categories of oral language in OHT that pose cognitive barriers. This offers support in the translator's source-text analysis of OHT in easy-to-read INTRT for persons with cognitive and learning disabilities by facilitating and accelerating the correct detection and identification of relevant OHT orality characteristics. At the same time, it raises awareness of the fact that ensuring accessibility of persons with cognitive and learning disabilities to museum exhibitions with OHT demands the intralingual translator cope with multiple specific translational difficulties posed by oral language and, thus, implement very specific techniques of easy-to-read INTRT of OHT, based on the principles and rules of ERL (Maaß 2015).

In view of this, it has been shown that the principles and rules of ERL are directly applicable and can effectively be instrumentalized in order to deal with the cognitive barriers of OHT in easy-to-read INTRT posed by the specific categories of oral Greek language. Here, it seems important to mention that, as can be deduced from the analysis of OHT in this paper, one aspect that, to date, seems to have been neglected by the theoretical apparatus of ERL theory is the emotional aspect of language, which, in the case of OHT, is obviously rather frequent. However, as the emotional burden of the reception of target-OHT by persons with cognitive and learning disabilities should understandably be as small as possible, this paper therefore proposes, as a general guideline for dealing

with this feature, its complete omission in easy-to-read INTRT although (and because) it is a frequent characteristic of OHT.

Furthermore, this paper endeavoured to contribute to the acceleration, as well the amelioration of the target-text output of the production phase by proposing a concrete and comprehensive overview of easy-to-read INTRT-techniques with respect to specific categories of OHT oral features. I hope that these proposed techniques may serve as guidelines in easy-to-read INTRT of OHT for persons with cognitive and learning disabilities and that they will help the translator to more easily and efficiently provide accessibility for persons with cognitive and learning disabilities to museum exhibitions and, more broadly, to CCI.

Finally, having only referred to the principle and rules of ERL that can be considered as language-independent (cf. 2.2.), I believe that the guidelines offered in Table 2 of this paper can be applied to easy-to-read INTRT of oral language and, in particular, of OHT of every natural language. However, further empirical research, however, is needed to confirm, enrich and expand the findings of this research.

References:

Αργυρόπουλος, Βασίλειος. 2015. Αναπηρία όρασης και θέματα προσβασιμότητας στα πολιτιστικά αγαθά και τα μουσεία [Sight Impairment and Issues of Accessibility of Cultural Assets and Museums]. In: Αργυρόπουλος Βασίλειος, Χατζηνικολάου, Σοφία-Λευκή, Κανάρη, Χαρίκλεια. (eds.), *Πολιτισμός/Ειδική Αγωγή: πρόσβαση ατόμων με αναπηρίες και ειδικές εκπαιδευτικές ανάγκες στο φυσικό και πολιτιστικό περιβάλλον των μουσείων και των αρχαιολογικών χώρων [Culture/Special Needs Education: Accessibility of Persons with Disabilities and Special Educational Needs to the Natural and Cultural Environment of Museums and Archaeological Sites]*. Βόλος: Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλίας. pp. 28-44.

Αργυρόπουλος, Βασίλειος and Κατσαντώνη, Σοφία-Λευκή. 2020. Μουσεία, καθολικός σχεδιασμός και άτομα με αναπηρία όρασης: Μια οικολογική προσέγγιση [Museums, Universal Design and Persons with Sight Impairment]. In: *Επιστήμες Αγωγής.* 1: pp. 149-170.

Belde, Anna. 2016. *Evaluation von Übersetzungsentscheidungen in der intralingualen Übersetzung: Nachrichten in Leichte Sprache*. Unpublished MA thesis. Hildesheim: Universität Hildesheim, Institut für Übersetzungswissenschaft und Fachkommunikation. https://d-nb.info/1126255157/34. Accessed on: 19 August 2020.

Bredel, Ursula and Maaß, Christiane. 2016. *Ratgeber leichte Sprache. Die wichtigsten Regeln und Empfehlungen für die Praxis*. Duden: Berlin.

Bock, Bettina M., Fix, Ulla, and Lange, Daisy (eds.). 2017. *"Leichte Sprache" im Spiegel theoretischer und angewandter Forschung*. Berlin: Frank & Timme.

Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities.html. Accessed on: 10 August 2020.

Díaz-Cintas, Jorge, Orero, Pilar, and Remael, Aline. (eds.). 2007. *Media for All: Subtitling for the Deaf, Audio Description, and Sign Language*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Díaz-Cintas, Jorge, Orero, Pilar, and Ramael, Aline. 2007. Media for All: a Global Challenge. In: Orero, Pilar and Ramael, Aline. (eds.), *Media for All. Subtitling for the Deaf, Audio Description, and Sign Language*. Amsterdam: Rodopi. pp. 11-20.

Eardley, Alison F., Fryer, Louise, Hutchinson, Rachel, Cock, Matthew, Ride, Peter, and Neves, Joselia. 2017. Enriched Audio Description: Working towards an inclusive museum experience. In: Halder, Santoshi and Assaf, Lori Czop (eds.). *Inclusion, Disability and Culture. An Ethnographic Perspective Traversing Abilities and Challenges*. Berlin: Springer. pp. 195-207.

Greco, Gian Maria. 2016. On Accessibility as a Human Right, with an Application to Media Accessibility. In: Matamala, Anna and Orero, Pilar. (eds.). *Researching Audio Description. New Approaches*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. pp. 11-33.

Greco, Gian Maria. 2018. The nature of accessibility studies. In: *Journal of Audiovisual Translation.* 1(1): pp. 205-232.

Hellenic National Committee for Museums of Ethnography (2006). *Can Oral History Make Objects Speak? Η προφορική ιστορία στα μουσεία. Θεωρία και πράξη [Oral History in Museums. Theory and Practice]*. Congress proceedings, Nafplion, October 18-21, 2005. Peloponnesian Folklore Foundation (Πελοποννησιακό Λαογραφικό Ίδρυμα).

Hurtado Jiménez, Catalina and Gallego Soler, Silvia 2013. Multimodality, translation and accessibility: a corpus-based study of audio description. In: *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology.* 21(4): pp. 577-594.

Hurtado Jiménez, Catalina and Gallego Soler, Silvia. 2015. Museum accessibility through translation: a corpus study of pictorial audio description. In: Díaz Cintas, Jorge and Neves, Joselia (eds.), *Audiovisual Translation. Taking Stock*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. pp. 277-298.

Hurtado Jiménez, Catalina, Seibel, Claudia, and Gallego Soler, Silvia. 2012. Museums for all. Translation and Interpreting for Multimodal Spaces as a Tool for Universal Accessibility. MonTI 4trans. http://repositori.uji.es/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10234/60046/MonTI_04_16_trans.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y. Accessed on: 20 August 2020.

Interregeurope. 2017. https://www.interregeurope.eu/fileadmin/userupload/plp_uploads/events/TEAM_A_Creative_and_Cultural_Industries.pdf. Accessed on: 10 August 2020.

Κούνιο-Αμαρίλιο, Έρικα and Ναρ, Αλμπέρτος (eds.). 1998, ²2002. *Προφορικές μαρτυρίες Εβραίων της Θεσσαλονίκης για το ολοκαύτωμα [Oral Testimonies of Thessalonikian Jews on the Holocaust]*. Thessaloniki: Παρατηρητής (Etz Chaim Foundation).

Maaß, Christiane. 2015. *Leichte Sprache. Das Regelbuch*. Berlin: LIT Verlag.

Maaß, Christiane. 2018. Übersetzen in leichte Sprache. In: Maaß, Christiane and Rink, Isabel (eds.), *Handbuch barrierefreie Kommunikation*. Berlin: Frank &Timme. pp. 273-302.

Martins, Cláudia Susana Martins. 2012. Museum audio guides as an accessibility enhancer. In: Álvarez de Morales, Cristina, Limbach, Christiane, and Olalla Luque, María (eds.), *Accesibilidad en la nuevaera de las comunicaciones Profesionales y universidad: un diálogo imprescindible*. Granada: Tragacanto. pp. 101-115.

Maschler, Yael. 1998. Rotsèlishmoakéta? 'Wanna hear something weird/funny?' [lit. 'a segment']: Segmenting Israeli Hebrew Talk-in-Interaction. In: Jucker, Andreas H. and Ziv, Yael. (eds.), *Discourse Markers: Descriptions and theory.* Benjamins Publishing. pp. 13-60.

Matamala, Anna and Orero, Pilar. 2017. Audio Description and Social Acceptability. *Rivista Internazionale di Tecnica dellaTraduzione.*19: pp. 7-12.

Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary, s.v. "anacoluthon," https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/anacoluthon. Accessed on: 28 August 2020.

MLA. 2004. "Access for All" Toolkit: Enabling inclusion for museum, libraries and Archives. http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20081209011037/http://www.mla.gov.uk/resources/assets//A/access_mla_tk_pdf_5670.pd. Accessed on: 24 August 2020.

Nord, Christiane. 2011. *Funktionsgerechtigkeit und Loyalität: Theorie,*

Methode und Didaktik des funktionalen Übersetzens. Berlin: Frank & Timme.

OHA (Oral History Association). https://www.oralhistory.org/about/do-oral-history/. Accessed on: 24 August 2020.

Orero, Pilar. 2006. Audiovisual translation: A new dynamic umbrella. In: Orero, Pilar. (ed.), *Topics in Audiovisual Translation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. vii-xiii.

Πίσπα, Μαρία. 2018. *Σχεδιάζοντας ένα μουσείο για όλους! Το μουσείο της Ι.Μ. της Παναγίας Σκιαδενής στη Ρόδο [Designing a Museum for All! The Case of the Museum of the Church Panagia Skiadeni on Rhodes]*. Unpublished MA thesis. Athens: University of Athens, Inter-faculty Program "Museum studies". https://pergamos.lib.uoa.gr/uoa/dl/object/2820858. Accessed on: 22 August 2020.

Randaccio, Monica. 2018. Museum Audio Description: Multimodal and 'Multisensory' Translation: A Case Study from the British Museum. *Linguistics and Literature Studies.* 6(6): pp. 285-297.

Reiβ, Katharina and Vermeer, Hans J. 1991. *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

RNIB and VocalEyes. 2003. *Talking Images: Museums, galleries and heritage sites- Improving access for partially sighted people*. In: *RNIB and VocalEyes.* p. 28.

Sandell, Richard. 1998. Museums as agents of social inclusion. In: *Museum management and curatorship.* 17(4): pp. 401-418.

Scheele, Finja. 2017. *Multimodale Texte im barrierefreien Museum: Eine vergleichende Analyse von Audioguides in Leichter und Standardsprache am Beispiel des Stadtmuseums Trier*. Unpublished MA Thesis. Hildesheim: Universität Hildesheim, Institut für Übersetzungswissenschaft und Fachkommunikation. https://hildok.bsz-bw.de/frontdoor/index/index/year/2018/docId/755. Accessed on: 17 August 2020.

Scherer, Hans Siegfried. 1984. *Sprechen im situativen Kontext*. *Theorie und Praxis der Analyse spontanen Sprachgebrauchs*. Tübingen: Stauffenberg.

Siegert, Stephan. 2016. 1975/2015 – Schiffe erzählen Museumsgeschichten. In: Bock, Bettina M., Fix, Ulla, and Lange, Daisy (eds.), *"Leichte Sprache" im Spiegel theoretischer und angewandter Forschung*. Berlin: Frank &Timme. pp. 485-490.

Spinzi, Cinzia. 2019. A Cross-Cultural Study of Figurative Language in Museum Audio Descriptions. Implications for Translation. In: *Lingue Linguaggi.* 33: pp. 303-316.

Swan, Michael. 2005. *Practical English Usage.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Szarkowska, Agnieszka, Jankowska, Anna, Krejtz, Krzysztof and Kowalski, Jarosław. 2016. Open Art: Designing Accessible Content in a Multimedia Guide App for Visitors with and without Sensory Impairments. In: Matamala, Anna and Orero, Pilar. (eds.), *Researching Audio Description. New Approaches*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. pp. 301-320.

The Disability Directory for Museums and Galleries. 2000. http://www.lhac.eu/resources/library/uk_museumsand-galleries disability_directory_pdf_6877.pdf. Accessed on: 23 August 2020.

The Jewish Museum of Greece, Athens. Σαν πρόκες καρφώνονται οι λέξεις [Like Nails Must the Words be Hammered]. https://www.jewishmuseum.gr/san-prokes-karfonontai-oi-lexeis/. Accessed on: 30 August 2020.

Τσιβινίκου, Σωτηρία. 2015. Μαθησιακές Δυσκολίες και Θέματα Προσβασιμότητας στα Πολιτιστικά Αγαθά και τα Μουσεία [Learning Difficulties and Issues of Accessibility of Cultural Assets and Museums]. In: Αργυρόπουλος Βασίλειος, Χατζηνικολάου, Σοφία-Λευκή, Κανάρη, Χαρίκλεια. (eds.), *Πολιτισμός/Ειδική Αγωγή: πρόσβαση ατόμων με αναπηρίες και ειδικές εκπαιδευτικές ανάγκες στο φυσικό και πολιτιστικό περιβάλλον των μουσείων και των αρχαιολογικών χώρων [Culture/Special Needs Education: Accessibility of Persons with Disabilities and Special Educational Needs to the Natural and Cultural Environment of Museums and Archeological Sites]*. Βόλος: Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλίας. pp. 98-121.

Vercauteren, Gert. 2007. Towards a European Guideline for Audio Description. In: Orero, Pilar and Ramael, Aline. (eds.), *Media for All: Subtitling for the Deaf, Audio Description and Sign Language*. Amsterdam: Rodopi. pp. 139-150.

Vollenwyder, Beat, Schneider, Andrea, Krüger, Eva, Brühlmann, Florian, Opwis, Klaus, and Mekler, Elisa D. 2018. How to Use Plain and Easy-to-Read Language for a Positive User Experienceon Websites. In: Miesenberger, Klaus and Kouroupetroglou, Georgios (eds.). *ICCHP 2018, LNCS 10896*. pp. 514–522. https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2F978-3-319-94277-3_80.pdf. Accessed on: 15 December 2020.

Χιονίδου, Βιολέττα. 2020. *Η κατοχική πείνα μέσα από προφορικές μαρτυρίες. Η περίπτωση της Χίου, Σύρου και της Μυκόνου [The Occupation Hunger [viewed] through Oral testimonies. The cases of Chios, Syros and Mykonos]*. Αθήνα: Πατάκη.