Perspectives on the Translation of Discourse Markers

A case study of the translation of reformulation markers from English into Hungarian

Bálint Péter FURKÓ
Department of English Linguistics
Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary
furko.peter@gmail.com

Abstract. The aim of the present paper is to explore the difficulties translators have to face when translating discourse markers in general, and reformulation markers in particular. In the first part of the paper I will attempt to answer the question of why discourse markers are notoriously difficult to translate. Next, I will look at some of the genre-specific features pertaining to the translation of scripted discourse and subtitles. In the second part of the paper, after providing an overview of previous research into reformulation and reformulation markers, I will present the results of a case study of the translation of the English reformulation markers *I mean* and *actually* into Hungarian. By way of concluding, I will argue that a wider repertoire of translation strategies is needed in order to achieve dynamic equivalence in the target text.

Keywords: discourse markers, reformulation markers, the translation of illocutionary phenomena, scripted discourse, the language of subtitles

1. Introduction: contrastive approaches to discourse markers

Over the past few decades research on discourse markers (henceforth DMs) has been rapidly expanding and the theoretical appeal is amply demonstrated by the number of frameworks that have been applied to the study of these items (Relevance Theory, Rhetorical Structure Theory, Construction Grammar, coherence-based studies, Interactional Sociolinguistics, Conversation Analysis, to mention but a few). At the same time, empirical research has yielded detailed analyses of a variety of items in a wide range of languages.

Recently, empirical research has taken a new direction: contrastive studies have moved from their traditional linguistic fields of semantics and lexicology into the areas of pragmatics and discourse analysis. As a consequence, an increasing number of case studies are aimed at gaining insight into the functions and distributions of DMs across languages, thereby attempting to find translation equivalents and translation correspondences across a variety of languages.

Similar to an approach to content words using translation equivalents in order to establish semantic fields, a contrastive perspective on DMs is aimed at mapping the functional spectrum of a given DM across a wide range of bi- or multilingual contexts. As a result of the extreme multifunctionality and context-dependence of DMs, one can expect a larger number of correspondences between DMs across languages than, for example, between translation equivalents of nouns or verbs. Still, many argue (cf. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2004: 1786) that finding translation correspondences is in many ways a more reliable method of describing individual DMs than providing paraphrases and glosses, or establishing co-occurrence patterns, exemplified by the majority of monolingual research.

In addition, studies at the interface of DM research and translation studies can provide new perspectives for both disciplines. While finding translation equivalents is a reliable way of mapping individual DMs' functional spectra and can also serve as a heuristic for "establishing semantic-pragmatic fields" (Degand 2009: 174), such studies can be useful for analysing translation strategies as well.

2. Preliminary considerations

2.1. The translation of discourse markers – theory and practice

The translation of DMs is a notoriously difficult task because of the very properties that (prototypical) members of the functional class of DMs share, including non-propositionality, context-dependence, extreme multifunctionality and a primarily non-referential (interpersonal or textual) function. As a corollary of such criterial features, DMs do not change the basic meaning of utterances, but are essential for the organization and structuring of discourse as well as for marking the speaker's attitudes to the proposition being expressed. In addition, they facilitate the processes of pragmatic inferences, in other words, help the hearer to find out what is not explicitly stated but is implied by a given utterance.

Since DMs do not change the basic meaning of utterances, a straightforward translation strategy is to omit them in the target text (TT). The resulting translation, in certain contexts, might not lose any of the propositional content of the source text (ST), but will definitely lose a variety of communicative effects, such as the very naturalness of ordinary, everyday conversation, or the speaker's attitude to the

words being uttered (cf. Furkó 2013: 23). The difference between a conversational exchange including and omitting a DM can, in several cases, be captured along various social and functional dimensions such as the solidarity / social distance or affective / referential scales (cf. Holmes 2008), as well as along the lines of the spoken / written, planned / unplanned continua. Consequently, omitting DMs in the translation conspicuously and repeatedly can result in a text that does not match either the social dynamics or the intended style / register of the ST.

In addition to omission, translators have a variety of options depending on the extent to which they want to (or are able to) convey the subtleties of the ST and the linguistic means by which they choose to do so. Nida's (1964) classical distinction between formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence is especially relevant to the translation of DMs, since a TT that "focus[es] attention on the message" (Nida 1964: 159) will yield a radically different DM equivalent from a TT where the translator has observed "the principle of equivalent effect" (ibid.).

If the translator strives for formal equivalence, he or she can use the same (at times closely corresponding) DM in the TT every time a particular DM occurs in the ST. This will invariably turn out to be a bad strategy, since research has shown that it is impossible to find one-to-one correspondences between DMs in two different languages (cf. e.g. Lewis 2006). In fact, even when it comes to the functional spectra of cognates such as Swedish *alltså*, Norwegian *altså*, and German *also*, we find partial overlaps rather than close correspondences (cf. Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen 2009).

Equivalent effect is equally impossible to achieve, because of the various social, stylistic, interpersonal, and other effects that are simultaneously conveyed by a particular use of a DM. As a result, a series of compromises will occur, which is the staple of a translator's job. However, translating pragmatic effects, i.e. non-conceptual meaning, requires a greater flexibility in handling translation options, which range from lexical items such as TT DMs, modal particles and conjunctions, through the use of whole clauses as well as grammaticalized forms (cf. Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen 2003).

With reference to the differences between English and Hungarian in terms of linguistic means of marking illocutionary force, Hervey (1998) states that, compared to English, DMs (in Hervey's terms, illocutionary particles) are somewhat less frequent in Hungarian, and the Hungarian language has a tendency for "conveying illocutionary nuances through sequential focus" (1998: 17) rather than through intonation or the use of DMs. Hervey also formulates a strategy for translating DMs into Hungarian: "when translating illocutionary particles into Hungarian, be sure to consider possible uses of sequential focus that might be appropriate" (1998: 19). In the course of the present study, one of my aims is to examine the extent to which the translators of subtitles observed this strategy.

2.2. From scripted discourse to the language of subtitles

For the present study I used a corpus of bilingual subtitles in order to investigate the translation of reformulation markers from English into Hungarian. Several preliminary remarks are in order with regard to the study of dramatized dialogues in general and subtitles in particular.

Methodological issues concerning data gathering as well as the nature/ constitution of data for analysis have been heavily debated by discourse analysts and will most probably continue to be in the focus of research methodology. Brown and Yule, for example, differentiate between the 'constructed-data' approach and the 'performance-data' approach (Brown & Yule 1983: 20). One of the criteria Van Dijk sets up to define the term discourse is that it must be actual language in use, i.e. authentic and not invented language data (van Dijk 1985: 2). More recently, Chovanec has distinguished between data based on prototypical kinds of interpersonal communication such as "real-life conversations" (Chovanec 2011: 243) and data based on less prototypical types of interaction such as "television dialogue and other kinds of scripted dialogue" (ibid.). Both Chovanec (2011) and Dynel (2011) argue in favour of the legitimacy of the latter type of data in the field of language studies in general and discourse analysis in particular. Dynel (2011) observes that scripted discourse mirrors "language users' everyday communicative patterns" (2011: 43) and invokes "an illusion of real-life conversations" (ibid.). Furkó (2010) argues that – similarly to linguists, who rely on their own intuitions in order to make grammaticality judgements –, the discourse analyst who looks at dramatized dialogues relies on "script writers' intuitions about conversational mechanisms and communicative strategies" (Furkó 2010: 114). Moreover, since the script-writer's intuitions and skills manifest themselves in the "verisimilitude of fictional interactions" (Dynel 2011: 43), the study of scripted data strikes up a balance between the "armchair approach" to linguistics (i. e. theorizing about the implications of linguistic phenomena on the basis of constructed examples, cf. e.g. Hudson: 2001), and field methods that rely on the study of real-life conversations.

If we accept that (good) script writers' skills and intuitions are reliable with respect to conversational mechanisms and communicative strategies, we can presume that corpora based on film as well as TV scripts contain DMs in a wide range of communicative contexts and with an adequate range of textual and interpersonal functions. Moreover, Furkó (2011) found that co-occurrence patterns (DM clusters, collocations, speech act-DM pairings, etc.) observed in scripted data closely correspond to those established in research based on real-life conversations.

Another reason why the analysis of scripted discourse is amenable to the study of DMs is that the function of a particular DM is easier to identify in dramatized dialogues than in naturally-occurring conversations. Scripted discourse is

"thoroughly considered before being uttered" (Mattsson 2009: 2), as a result of which scriptwriters tend to make calculated use of every single linguistic (as well as paralinguistic) means of communication, including the use of DMs. In addition, information about the previous discourse, the social background, social status as well as some of the more dynamic personal characteristics of the speaker is more readily available than in the case of naturally-occurring language data. Such information is very useful, often indispensable, in disambiguating particular uses of DMs.

Naturally, we expect different patterns of use with respect to functions associated with performance phenomena such as self-repetition/self-correction, false starts and lexical search. While unplanned conversations are replete with mispronunciations, misformulations, overlaps, etc. (often marked by DMs, cf. Schirm 2010 and 2011), such occurrences are scarce in scripted data (cf. e.g. Richardson 2010). Dramatized dialogues are "stripped of conversational chuff such as *ah*, *y'know*, *well* and *ummm*" (Lucey 1996: 168), so that "the viewer's understanding is not impeded or even precluded" (Dynel 2011: 45).

Performance errors notwithstanding, whether or not subtitles reflect the full battery of DM functions, is a different matter. Subtitled versions of dramatized dialogues are constrained by a variety of additional rules of the genre. Hatim and Mason (2000) group these constraints into four categories: (1) the shift in mode from speech to writing, (2) technical constraints such as available space and the pace of the soundtrack dialogue, (3) the impossibility of back-tracking, and (4) the requirement of matching the visual image (Hatim and Mason 2000: 430-431). Goris (1993) notes the levelling effect of these constraints, as a consequence of which one can expect that DMs will tend to occur in subtitles in the ST when they have a precisely controlled effect in the dialogue and they will tend to be omitted even in the ST when no apparent significance is attached to their use. However, in the TT subtitles I expected no further levelling, because TT subtitles are based on ST subtitles rather than on the ST soundtrack, and because once an ST DM is selected for inclusion in the subtitle, the significance of its communicative effect should be duly noted by the translator.

3. Previous accounts of reformulation

3.1. Definitions and lists of reformulation markers

Before I turn to describing the different stages of the empirical part of my research, a few general words about reformulation are in order. Reformulation as a linguistic phenomenon in general and reformulation markers as a subclass of discourse markers in particular have been described from a variety of perspectives. Halliday & Hasan concentrate on the former and distinguish between avowal

and correction; the former is "an assertion of 'the facts' in the face of real or imaginary resistance ('as against what you might think')" (1976: 254), while the latter is a process whereby "one formulation is rejected in favour of another ('as against what you have been told')" (ibid.). Linguistic items that express avowal include *in fact, actually* and *as a matter of fact*, while *I mean* and *(or) rather* are correction markers, according to Halliday and Hasan.

Quirk et al. (1985: 1308ff) list four types of reformulation: (1) reformulation which involves rephrasing or rewording (i.e. it is based on "linguistic knowledge"), (2) reformulation based on background knowledge ("factual knowledge"), (3) more precise formulation and (4) revision. Similarly to Halliday and Hasan, Quirk et al. take a broad view of reformulation markers and list a variety of words, phrases, or even clauses that can express one of the four types of reformulation (e.g. *in other words, technically, that is, more specifically, that is to say, or … as he is usually called*).

A discourse coherence approach is provided by Fraser (1999), del Saz (2003) as well as del Saz and Fraser (2003). Fraser (1999) lists reformulation markers (henceforth RMs) such as *I mean, in particular, namely, parenthetically, that is to say* as a sub-class of the class of elaboration markers, which, in turn, constitute a sub-class of discourse markers.

Del Saz (2003) provides the most extensive list of RMs and defines reformulation as a "recharacterization of the message conveyed by the whole previous discourse segment S1, or one of its constituents" (2003: 211ff). He also states that a reformulation holds between "a source discourse segment S1 […] and a reformulated segment, or S2" along with the presence of a reformulation marker that displays "the type of relationship accomplished between the two linked discourse segments" (ibid.)

Del Saz and Fraser (2003: 4ff) list five types of reformulation:

1. paraphrase of a constituent (expressed by e.g. *that is*),
2. recasting of the intended meaning by the speaker (expressed by e.g. *in other words*),
3. revision of an implication of the prior message (expressed by e.g. *worse still*),
4. correction (e.g. *that is to say*),
5. request for information (e.g. *are you saying …*).

As is apparent from the list and types of RMs, del Saz and Fraser, unlike any of the previously described approaches, differentiate between self-initiated reformulation (items 1 to 4) and other-initiated reformulation (item 5).

Table 1 provides a summary list of the RMs that are mentioned in the literature discussed above.

Table 1. *Reformulation markers listed by author and year of publication*

Halliday and Hasan (1976)
instead, rather, on the contrary, at least, I mean, that is, in other words, to put it another way, for instance, for example, thus, actually

Quirk et al. (1985)
in other words, technically, that is, or…, at that, more specifically, that is to say, or rather, I mean

Fraser (1999)
that is to say, for example, more precisely, I mean, in particular, namely, parenthetically

del Saz and Fraser (2003)
in other words, technically, that is, at that, more specifically, more precisely, that is to say, or rather, I mean, namely, in a word, all in all, for instance, or better, to put it simply, on second thought

del Saz (2003)	
(Or) better (yet/still)	*In sum / to summarize / to sum up*
Especially	*More accurately / to be more accurate*
For example/for instance, e.g.	*More clearly / to be more clear / to make things clear*
I mean	
In a few words / to put it in a few words	*More exactly / to be more exact*
In a nutshell (in sum)	*More precisely / to be more precise*
In a sense (in other words)	*More simply / in simple(r) terms / Put more simply / to put it more simply*
In conclusion / to conclude	
In more technical terms	*More specifically / to be more specific*
In one word / In a word / in words of one syllable	*Or rather*
In other words / To put it in other words	*Particularly / in particular*
In short / in brief / in a nutshell	*Say (for example/for instance)*
	Technically speaking
	That is / that is to say / i.e. (id est)

I mean is the only item on the lists that displays most of the properties that are usually attributed to core members of the functional class of DMs, for example, *you know, well* or *of course*. With the exception of *actually, (or) rather, say* and *in other words*, most items do not even qualify as peripheral members, since they express (relatively context-independent) propositional meaning; furthermore, they are compositional, syntactically integrated and unmarked for oral style (for an extensive list of DM features cf. e.g. Schourup 1999, Furkó 2007, Dér 2010). Peripheral DMs such as *in other words, or rather* and *say* have no more than one or two tokens in the corpus.

Once I narrowed down the list of RMs to *I mean* and *actually*, the next step was to look at the various pragmatic and discourse functions of the two DMs based on the relevant literature. As we will see in the next section, mapping the functional spectrum of *I mean* and *actually* will be relevant in the course of part two of the research process, i.e. in the course of looking for correspondences between Hungarian counterparts of the two items and their discourse-pragmatic functions.

3.2. The functional spectrum of *I mean*

In Crystal and Davy (1975: 97ff) *I mean* is glossed as 'in other words', 'what I have been saying amounts to the following', 'my specific meaning is that'. Its main function is in clarifying the meaning of the speaker's immediately preceding expression, other functions include marking a restatement of the previous utterance, providing extra information and/or a fresh angle about a previous topic as well as marking a change of mind.

As we saw earlier, according to Halliday and Hasan (1976) *I mean* expresses correction, more specifically, an *additive conjunctive relation* (expository apposition) or an *adversative conjunctive relation* (correction of wording).

Schiffrin (1987: 296) defines *I mean* as a marker of the "speaker's upcoming modification of the meaning of his/her own prior talk". Its two main functions are "expansions of ideas" and "explanations of intention" (*ibid.*)

Swan (1997: 159) argues that *I mean* introduces explanations, additional details, expressions of opinion and corrections, while it can also serve as "a general-purpose connector of 'filler' with little real meaning". Further functions include "softening" and "gaining time" (ibid.).

Jucker and Smith (1998) approach the function of *I mean* from the perspective of processing information. They differentiate between *reception markers* (e.g. *oh, okay*), which mark a reaction to information provided by another speaker and *presentation markers*, which accompany and modify the speaker's own information. Information-centred presentation markers, such as *like* modify the information itself, while addressee-centred presentation markers (*I mean* is included here) relate the information to the presumed knowledge state of the addressee.

González (2004) concentrates on the functions of DMs with reference to story structure. Her research shows that the two most common functions of *I mean* in narratives are to mark (1) reformulation of previous information and (2) internal evaluation of the events presented in the narrative.

Parallel to the functions described above, Koczogh and Furkó (2011) found that DM uses of *I mean* include marking topic shift, elaboration, explanation, clarification, specification, false start, contrast, disagreement, conclusion, emphasis, explanation of speaker's intention and self-correction.

3.3. The functional spectrum of *actually*

Lenk (1998) describes *actually* as a globally oriented topical marker, which performs topical actions such as closing digressions, returning to a prior topic, changing topics, introducing a new topic, and inserting a subjective aside.

Smith and Jucker (2000) provide a Relevance Theoretic account of *actually* and propose that, on the one hand, it marks "an apparent discrepancy between

propositional attitudes of conversational partners" (2000: 207), on the other, it introduces "the presentation of a counterclaim" (2000: 208). Lumping *actually* together with *in fact* and *well* they state that conversationalists use *actually* to introduce repairs to the common ground.

Biber et al. (2000: 869) classify *actually* as a stance adverbial expressing "epistemic-actuality". It is important to note that, according to their research, *actually* occurs seven times as frequently in conversational data as in fiction, news reports and academic discourse.

Oh (2000) compares the function of *actually* with that of *in fact.* Both express counter-expectation, i.e. the fact that what the speaker is about to say goes against (the hearer's) expectations. However, while *actually* announces the denial of an assertion, *in fact* announces a strengthening of the assertion.

Taglicht (2001) differentiates between a DM and a non-DM use of *actually*. In its non-DM use, *actually* is an integral element in the sentence structure and is used scalarly and truth-insistently. *Actually* as a DM, on the other hand, is a marker of mild contradiction, surprise, topic change, or is used as a pragmatic softener.

4. The study

4.1. Data and methodology

For the present study I compiled a translation corpus with two subcorpora: the Language A corpus (henceforth LAC) consists of the dialogues in the first four seasons of the popular TV show *House* (also known as *House M.D.* © NBC Universal Television), while the LBC is a collection of the corresponding Hungarian translations. In the course of compiling the two subcorpora, whenever possible, I made a point of comparing the scripts and the transcripts with the official subtitles. For LAC I extracted the relevant dialogues from the television transcripts database (available at tvtdb.com). In order to make electronic search and concordance easier, LBC was compiled from the Hungarian subtitles of the relevant episodes; however, a mini-corpus containing the occurrences and translations of reformulation markers was also used and was compared with the transcripts of the Hungarian-dubbed version of the show. In order to investigate the 'translation effect' that might influence the choice of a TT translation equivalent, I considered alternative translations of the same LAC, which were readily available in the form of different subtitles / transcripts of the Hungarian-dubbed episodes.

The second stage of the first part of the research process involved making a concordance (Key Word in Context, KWIC) of the lexical items *mean* and *actually*, eliminating content words and non-RM uses. In the course of stage 3, I extracted DM uses of *I mean* and *actually* together with their contexts, matched them

with the Hungarian translations in the LBC and highlighted the key words that served as translation equivalents in the LBC. Finally, stage 4 involved compiling the 'mini-corpus' or 'Key Word Corpus' (henceforth KWC) by extracting the translation equivalents and their contexts in the LBC and aligning them with corresponding Key Words and Contexts in the LAC.

In the course of the second part of the research process I performed both a quantitative and a qualitative analysis of the various tokens of the two RMs in the KWC. In the first stage of this part of the research the individual tokens were tagged according to their Hungarian translations (or the lack of a translation equivalent). In the second stage, the same tokens were tagged in terms of the pragmatic functions / categories that were identified in the course of previous research into *I mean* and *actually* (as described in the previous sections). As a last stage of this part of the process, I looked for correspondences between translation equivalents and functions as well as between functions / categories and clusters.

The third part of the research process was aimed at mapping the functional spectrum of Hungarian reformulation markers *mármint* and *vagyis*, which emerged as the most salient Hungarian RMs and which also qualify as DMs. First, I made a concordance (KWIC) of *mármint* and *vagyis* in the LBC. Next (stage 2), I tagged tokens of *mármint* and *vagyis* in terms of the pragmatic functions I identified on the basis of all the occurrences in the corpus (rather than on the basis of previous research). Stage 3 involved tagging tokens of *mármint* and *vagyis* according to the source items / meaning relations in the LAC. Finally, as a final stage (stage 4) of the third part of the process, I looked for correspondences between the functions of *mármint* and *vagyis* and the English source items.

4.2. Findings

Part 2 / stage 1 of the research process yielded the following results, based on 288 tokens of *actually* (for easier reference, I use round percentages. A*ctually* is translated as *igazából* ('really', 'truly') in 44% of the cases, while *actually* lacks a translation equivalent in 20% of its contexts of use. In the third place we find the expressions *pontosabban* ('to be more exact') and *egészen pontosan* ('to be [quite] exact'), both of which correspond to the third type of reformulation given by Quirk et al. (1985), i.e. 'more precise formulation'. *Sőt* (~ 'what is more') occurs as a translation in 8% of the contexts; it is interesting to consider that 'what is more' occurs as an expanded, emphatic form of the additive 'and' type of conjunctive relation in Halliday and Hasan (1976) and not as an element that expresses reformulation. *Vagyis* (~ 'that is'), another typical Hungarian reformulation marker, occurs in 8% of the cases. Less frequent translations include *illetve* (~ 'or rather')*, tudja mit?* ('you know what?') *na jó, csak* ('all right, [I was] just […ing]'), the latter two correspond to more opaque (far-from-the-semantic-core) uses of *actually*.

As for the translations of *I mean*, based on 130 tokens *mármint*, a pragmaticalized combination of *már* ('yet', 'now', 'ever') and *mint* ('like'), occurs as a translation equivalent in 35% of the cases. *I mean* is not translated in 26% of the contexts. *Úgy értem* ('I mean [it like that]'), an expression, which has not undergone pragmaticalization to the extent the English *I mean* has, occurs as a translation equivalent in 22% of the cases. In the fourth place we find a variety of DMs and DM-like expressions such as *(úgy) gondolom* ('in my view', 'I think'), *mondjuk* ('let's say', 'one has to admit'), *egyébként* ('by the way') and *például* ('for example'). *Vagyis* ('that is'), a Hungarian DM, which, as we saw earlier, corresponds to *actually* in several contexts, appears as a translation equivalent of *I mean* in 9% of the cases. Less frequent translations include *hiszen* ('since', 'surely') and *persze* ('of course', 'naturally'); these two could be subsumed under the category 'miscellaneous DMs'. The reason I tag them separately was that the contexts where they serve as translation equivalents correspond to less transparent, more opaque uses of *I mean*.

As mentioned above, part 3 / stage 3 of the research process was aimed at investigating the back translations of the most frequent translation equivalents of English *I mean* and *actually*. I found that Hungarian *vagyis* occurs 270 times, while *mármint* occurs 66 times in the LBC. In 43% of the cases *vagyis* is a translation of a compositional / propositional item (i.e. non-DM) with the verb *mean*; in 11% of the contexts *vagyis* is a translation equivalent of *you mean* and is used for correcting the interlocutor's utterance. In such cases it is not used for self-correction, which means that it is considered a reformulation marker only in the framework of del Saz and Fraser (2003), where RMs of type 5 are 'requests for information'. In 11% of the contexts *vagyis* is a translation of a (non-propositional) use of *so*, while, based on the LBC, the functional spectra of *actually* and *vagyis* overlap in 9% of the contexts. This stage of the research also revealed that there are a number of contexts where the translator felt the need to include *vagyis* in the Hungarian version even though there is no RM, DM or any linguistic expression of reformulation, self- or other correction, etc. in the original text. The functional spectra of *vagyis* and *I mean* overlap in only 2% of the contexts. Other, less frequent contexts include utterances where we find *meaning, basically, at least* and *that is* in the original.

Despite the small number of occurrences, it is clear from the corpus that *mármint* serves as the translation equivalent of *I mean* in the majority of its functions (68%). In 20% of the cases it expresses other correction (*you mean*), while in a few cases it is the translation of the discourse marker *like* as well as *meaning* and *meaning what?*, which serve as requests for specification addressed to the interlocutor. Similarly to the case of *vagyis*, there are a number of contexts where *mármint* is used in the translation but there is no explicit expression of reformulation in the original.

4.3. Discussion, translation strategies and implications

On the basis of the large number of tokens (both in the case of *I mean* and *actually*) and the small number of ST DMs that are not translated we can observe that compared to previous research into the use of DMs in subtitles (cf. e.g. Chiaro 2000 or Mattsson 2009) there seems to be less of a levelling effect in English subtitles and their Hungarian translations than in other language combinations.

As for translation strategies, the data suggest that translators strive for formal equivalence in the majority of cases, and they achieve it by using one or two TT counterparts of an ST DM. However, as we can see above, the functional spectra of TT and ST DMs show only a partial overlap, as in the remaining contexts translators either choose an alternative, conceptual-compositional linguistic device to convey reformulation, self-correction, elaboration, etc., or omit the DM in the TT altogether. Moreover, even in the former case translators do not avail themselves of the Hungarian language's capacity to convey "illocutionary nuances through sequential focus" (Hervey 1998: 17), thus, they do not observe Hervey's guidelines for the translation of illocutionary phenomena from English into Hungarian. A possible reason is that they concentrate on the textual rather than the interpersonal functions of the DMs under scrutiny. A salient counterexample is (1) below, where the ST DM is omitted and focus is expressed through fronting the personal pronoun in the TT:

(1)
Tommy: [stops playing] It's been, like, two hours.
Brandy: And we will keep waiting. **I mean**, you've heard this guy play and you know what he does, so can you just shut up, Tommy?
És tovább is várni fogunk. [no DM] Te is hallottad őt. Tudod, hogy mire képes. Szóval pofa be, Tommy! (*House M. D.* © NBC Universal Television)

Another creative, dynamic equivalence strategy can be observed in utterances when *I mean* is used emphatically or as a booster of the force of its host utterance, in such contexts *hiszen* ('since', 'surely') appears as a Hungarian translation equivalent:

(2)
What does it matter where they are? **I mean** he's in pain. You gotta do something.
Mit számít, hogy hol vannak? **Hiszen** *fájdalmai vannak. Tenniük kell valamit!* (*House M. D.* © NBC Universal Television)

(3)
Mom: Is it possible the problem isn't his blood? It's just psychological? **I mean**, he almost killed himself.

Lehetséges, hogy a baj nem a vérével van? Hogy csak pszichológiai? **Hiszen** *majdnem megölte magát.* (*House M. D.* © NBC Universal Television)

In addition, the strategy of omitting the DMs in the TT is especially salient in narrative discourse. The data revealed that *I mean* (unlike *you know*) is usually not translated even when it marks a new unit in the narrative structure:

(4)
You know he just started school when Anne died? I was a mess. Still adjusting to being a parent, much less a single parent. **You know** I used to put cold pancakes in his lunchbox [chuckles]. **I mean**, that was the only thing that I could make that he would eat.
Tudja, *akkor kezdte az iskolát, mikor Ann meghalt. Össze voltam zavarodva. Szülőnek lenni is nehéz, nem hogy egy egyedülálló szülőnek.* **Tudja**, *mindig hideg palacsintát kapott tízóraira. [no DM] Ez volt az egyetlen, amit meg tudtam csinálni és meg is ette.* (*House M. D.* © NBC Universal Television)

5. Conclusions, limitations, directions for further research

In the present paper I have explored the problems translators have to face when dealing with illocutionary phenomena, such as the use of discourse markers in general and reformulation markers in particular. I argued that, even though DMs do not normally convey conceptual meaning, their omission in the TT may result in increased processing effort, unintended conversational implicatures, misrepresented interpersonal dynamics, or, what is even worse, the absence of the naturalness of ordinary conversations. This last effect is highly undesirable when translating dramatized discourse, since dramatized discourse is, by definition, scripted discourse designed in a way that it does not sound like scripted discourse.

The case study in the second part of the paper has hopefully shown that there is a lot to be gained by the cross-fertilization of DM research and translation studies for both fields of inquiry. More specifically, we saw that translators should be increasingly aware of dynamic equivalence strategies that are specific to the translation of illocutionary phenomena, for example, the strategy of using sequential focus to convey a particular DM's emphatic function.

Because of the genre-specific constraints posed by the translation of subtitles (outlined in section 2.2. above), further research is needed to investigate strategies for translating DMs that appear in a variety of other, scripted and non-scripted, discourse types. In addition, it is important to consider a wider range of DM types,

since the different subgroups of DMs (reformulation markers, evidential markers, general extenders, etc.) have different degrees of communicative transparency, and, as a result, cause different degrees of difficulty for the translator.

References

Aijmer, Karin & Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenbergen. 2003. The discourse particle *well* and its equivalents in Swedish and Dutch. *Linguistics*. 41(6): 1123–1161.

Aijmer, Karin & Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenbergen. 2009. Pragmatic markers. In Östman, Jan-Ola and Jef Verschueren (eds.), *Handbook of Pragmatics: 2009 Installment*, 1–29, Amsterdam/Philadephia: John Benjamins.

Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad & Edward Finegan. 2000. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman.

Brown, Gillian & George Yule. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chiaro, Delia. 2000. The British will use question tags, won't they? The case of *Four Weddings and a Funeral*. In Christopher Taylor (ed.), *Tradurre il Cinema. Atti del Convegno del 29-30 Novembre 1996*, Trieste: Università degli Studi di Trieste. http://www.openstarts.units.it/dspace/bitstream/10077/9214/1/Nocella.pdf, accessed on 24 September, 2014.

Chovanec, Jan. 2011. Humour in quasi-conversations – Constructing fun in online sports journalism. In Dynel, Marta (ed.), *The Pragmatics of Humour across Discourse Domains*, 243-264. Amsterdam / Philadephia: John Benjamins.

Crystal, David & Derek Davy. 1975. *Advanced Conversational English*. London: Longman.

Degand, Liesbeth. 2009. On describing polysemous discourse markers. What does translation add to the picture? In Stef Slembrouck, Miriam Taverniers, Mieke Van Herreweghe (eds.), From will to well. Studies in Linguistics offered to Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenbergen, 173–183. Gent: Academia Press.

Del Saz Rubio, M. 2003. *An Analysis of English Discourse Markers of Reformulation*. Universitat de València: Servei de Publicacions de la Universitat de València.

Del Saz, Rubio M. & Bruce Fraser. 2003. *Reformulation in English*. (unpublished manuscript).

Dér, Csilla Ilona. 2010. On the status of discourse markers. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 57: 3–28.

Dynel, Marta. 2011. Stranger than fiction? A few methodological notes on linguistic research in film discourse. *Brno Studies in English* 37(1): 41–61.

Fraser, Bruce. 1999. What are discourse markers? *Journal of Pragmatics* 31: 931–952.

Furkó, Bálint Péter. 2007. *The pragmatic marker - discourse marker dichotomy reconsidered - the case of 'well' and 'of course'*. Debrecen: Debrecen University Press.

Furkó, Bálint Péter. 2010. As Good as it Gets – Scripted Data in Discourse Analysis. *Argumentum* 6: 13–123.

Furkó, Bálint Péter. 2011. A Contrastive Study of English *of course* and Hungarian *persze*. In Balogné Bérces Katalin, Földváry Kinga and Mészárosné Kóris Rita (eds.), *Proceedings of the HUSSE 10 Conference, Linguistics Volume*, 94-105. Debrecen: Hungarian Society for the Study of English.

Furkó, Bálint Péter. 2013. The Presence and Absence of Pragmatic Markers in Naturally-occurring and Scripted Discourse. In Katarína Labudova and Nóra Séllei (eds.), *Presences and Absences - Transdisciplinary Essays*, 23–38. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

González, Montserrat. 2004. *Pragmatic markers in oral narrative - the case of English and Catalan*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Goris, Olivier. 1993. The Question of French Dubbing: Towards a Frame for Systematic Investigation. *Target* 5(2): 169-190.

Halliday, M.A.K. & Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Hatim, Basil & Ian Mason. 2000. Politeness in Screen Translating. In Venuti, Lawrence (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*, 430–445. London/New York, Routledge.

Hervey, Sándor G. J. 1998. Speech Acts and Illocutionary Function in Translation Methodology. In Leo Hickey (ed.), *The pragmatics of translation*, 10–24. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Holmes, Janet. 2008. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics.* Person: Longman.

Hudson, Richard A. 2001. *Sociolinguistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jucker, Andreas H. & Sara W. Smith. 1998. And people just you know like 'wow': Discourse markers as negotiating strategies. In Jucker, Andreas H. & Yael Ziv (eds.), *Discourse Markers: Descriptions and Theory*, 171–201. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Koczogh, Helga & Furkó Bálint Péter. 2011. It's just like, dude, seriously, it's been a bad week, I mean, kind of thing. Gender differences in the use of the discourse markers 'you know' and 'I mean'. *Argumentum* 7: 1–18.

Lenk, Uta. 1998. *Marking discourse coherence.* Tübingen: Narr.

Lewis, Diana. 2006. Contrastive analysis of adversative relational markers, using comparable corpora. In Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (eds.), *Pragmatic Markers in Contrast*, 139–153. Oxford: Elsevier.

Lucey, Paul. 1996. *Story sense. Writing story and script for feature films and television*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Mattsson, Jenny. 2009. *The subtitling of discourse particles: A corpus-based study of* well, you know, I mean, *and* like*, and their Swedish translations in ten American films*. Göteborgs: Göteborgs Universitet. https://gupea.ub.gu.se//handle/2077/21007, accessed on 11 December, 2014.

Nida, Eugene Albert. 1964. *Toward a science of translating*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Oh, Sun-Young. 2000. *Actually* and *in fact* in American English: a data-based analysis. *English Language and Linguistics* 4: 243–68.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

Richardson, Kay. 2010. *Television Dramatic Dialogue. A Sociolinguistic Study*. New York: Oxford.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schirm, Anita. 2010. Diskurzusjelölők a parlamenti beszédekben [Discourse Markers in Parliamentary Speeches]. In Kukorelli Katalin (ed.), *Hatékony nyelvi, idegen nyelvi és szakmai kommunikáció interkulturális környezetben* [*Efficient Linguistic, Foreign Language and Professional Communication in Intercultural Environment*], 168–175. Dunaújváros: Dunaújvárosi Főiskola.

Schirm, Anita. 2011. *A diskurzusjelölők funkciói: a hát, az –e és a vajon elemek története és jelenkori szinkrón státusa alapján.* [*The functions of discourse markers based on the history and present synchronic status of the elements "hát", "-e" and "vajon".*] Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Szeged.

Schourup, Lawrence. 1999. Discourse markers: tutorial overview. *Lingua* 107: 227–265.

Simon-Vandenbergen, Anne-Marie & Karin Aijmer. 2004. A model and a methodology for the study of pragmatic markers: the semantic field of expectation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36: 1781–1805.

Smith, Sara W. & Andreas Jucker. 2000. *Actuall*y and other markers of an apparent discrepancy between propositional attitudes of conversational partners. In Gile Andersen & Thorstein Fretheim (eds.), *Pragmatic markers and propositional attitude*, 207–237. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Swan, Michael. 1997. *Practical English Usage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Taglicht, Josef. 2001. Actually, there's more to it than meets the eye. *English Language and Linguistics* 5(1): 1–16.

van Dijk, Teun A. 1985. *Handbook of discourse analysis*. London: Academic Press.