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

JENNY MATTSSON

UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG

ABSTRACT

The aim of the present study is to investigate the four discourse particles (DPs) *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like*, and their Swedish subtitle translations. This is done in order to see to what extent it is possible to translate these elusive words and expressions in subtitling, which is a greatly constrained form of translation. The main reason for choosing *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like* for this study, is the fact that the degree of translation difficulty differs between the four DPs: *you know* and *I mean* have clear correspondences in Swedish, whereas *well* and *like* do not to the same extent.

A multimodal corpus of subtitled films was compiled especially for the present study. The corpus consists of the fully transcribed soundtrack of ten US films, each with up to four different subtitle versions, including the cinema and DVD subtitles, as well as the subtitles aired on the public service TV channel SVT and either of the two commercial TV channels TV3 and TV4. All in all, the corpus consists of approximately 420,000 words.

DPs are multifunctional and their context-dependent functions can be difficult to identify. However, analysing DPs in a multimodal film corpus often makes the identification of the DP functions possible through direct access to speakers' body language, intonation, social status, etc. A number of parameters (Svartvik 1980) are used for a closer analysis of each occurrence of *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like*, including e.g. intonation, pauses, collocation, and body language of the speakers. To further facilitate the analysis of the four DPs, a cross-theoretical approach is taken. This includes aspects of three theories, i.e. Politeness theory (Brown & Levinson 1987), Coherence-based theory (Schiffrin 1987), and Relevance theory (Sperber & Wilson 1995). The translations of the DPs are analysed in terms of their pragmatic and/or grammatical realisations, as well as of various translation strategies used by the subtitlers.

Results confirm that *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like* can signal both textual functions (i.e. functions signalling the structuring of discourse), and interpersonal functions (i.e. functions signalling the relation between speakers). The textual and interpersonal functions are not mutually exclusive, but one DP occurrence may have both functions simultaneously. However, it is most often possible to distinguish one DP function as more salient than other functions in a given context. The study demonstrates that the textual function of the DPs is translated more often than the interpersonal function, even though there are more DPs with an interpersonal function in the films. Nevertheless, overall, a variety of Swedish translation solutions is employed. This is in itself a verification of both the multifunctionality and versatility of each of the four DPs, and the fact that the translations often reflect the most salient functions of the DPs in the films.

In conclusion, the study shows that *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like* are all translatable from English to Swedish, but in a majority of cases they are not in fact translated in the subtitles. The study also provides an insight into pragmatic functions of English and Swedish, and the fact that these two languages can express the same or similar pragmatic functions even though they do so in different ways.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADDICTED	*Addicted to Love*
ADJ	Adjective
ADV	Adverb
AMPIE	*American Pie*
APPROX*	Approximation-marker
AVT	Audiovisual Translation
BETTY	*Nurse Betty*
BLONDE	*Legally Blonde*
CLAR	Clarification-marker
DM	Discourse Marker
DP	Discourse Particle
ELAB	Elaboration-marker
FARGO	*Fargo*
FRAME	Frame-marker
FTA	Face Threatening Act
IMDb	Internet Movie Database
INS	Insufficiency-marker
MIT	Mitigation-marker
p.c.	Personal communication
PRIMARY	*Primary Colors*
PULP	*Pulp Fiction*
RAPP	Rapport-building marker
REP	Repair-marker
SEVEN	*Se7en*
SMDB	The Swedish Media Database
SOL	Solidarity-marker
ST	Source Text
SVT	Sveriges Television ('Swedish public service TV')
TT	Target Text
TV3	Swedish channel 3 (commercial TV channel)
TV4	Swedish channel 4 (commercial TV channel)
WAG	*Wag the Dog*
WHILE	*While You Were Sleeping*

* The pragmatic functions are written in bold throughout the thesis in order to distinguish these from the other abbreviations.

TRANSCRIPTION SYMBOLS

↑	rising intonation
→	declarative intonation
↓	falling intonation
|	short pause = approximately 1 second
||	longer pause = approximately 2-5 seconds

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 Introduction

Subtitles offer a way into worlds outside of ourselves. They are a unique and complex formal apparatus that allows the viewer an astounding degree of access and interaction. Subtitles embed us. (Egoyan & Balfour 2004:30).

The quote above reflects the way subtitles provide a viewer of a film or TV programme with access to another world, by translating words and phrases, but also by translating something beyond mere linguistic structures. In the words of Sinha (2004:173): "[t]he subtitles come from outside to make sense of the inside". Sometimes, making sense of the inside is not possible in subtitles because of the special technical constraints this form of translation is constantly confronted with. At other times, however, subtitles seem to almost magically decode the message of a film or TV programme.

It was this special magic that first made me interested in translation studies in general, and subtitling in particular. The fact that words and expressions can be transferred from one language to another, despite great linguistic and cultural differences between the languages, is fascinating. For this thesis, I wanted to study whether it is possible to express linguistic meaning similarly in two different languages. I decided at an early stage to focus on film subtitling, because of its constrained form, and the direct access that a corpus of film translation gives to the speakers of the source text: film subtitling provides access to a whole world of characteristic traits of speakers, from their social status to the way they move and speak. Literary translation may also have access to character traits, through e.g. elaborate descriptions in the original works, but the fact that speakers in subtitled material have a clear body language, intonation, etc. makes this type of material uniquely suited for a linguistic analysis.

Because subtitling as a medium can decode numerous facets of a film or other moving images so well, while the technical constraints put on this form of translation are so great, I wanted to study an elusive linguistic feature to see whether it was possible to transfer its function from one language (spoken English in American films) into another (written Swedish subtitles). I chose discourse particles (DPs) as my focus of study since they are among the fuzziest, and thus most intriguing parts of any language, and notorious for being difficult to translate directly.

In this first chapter, I will give a background to the areas studied in the thesis, and I will discuss the aims and scope of the study briefly. A summarising outline of the study is also included.

1.1 Background: the subtitling of DPs

Spoken communication can be difficult to make sense of. It is full of poor structure, mistakes, and repetitions, as well as of irony, insinuations, judgements, etc. However, all communication includes more or less intricate clues that can be used to interpret a message. Discourse particles (DPs), e.g. *well* and *you know*, form one type of conversational clue by

which communication is made easier. Despite the fact that DPs do not have clear lexical meaning, a speaker can signal at least two important features of communication by using DPs, i.e. (i) how an utterance relates textually to other utterances in the discourse, or to a larger context, and (ii) how an utterance should be interpersonally understood in its social context. The various functions of DPs are notoriously difficult to decode as they are not constant but have more scalar qualities. One single DP used in an utterance may at the same time signal both how this utterance fits in structurally with the rest of the discourse, and what attitude the speaker has towards the communicative situation, towards other speakers, etc.

Despite the difficulties of deciphering the functions of DPs, it is often possible to locate one function that is more salient in a certain context than other functions. In order to do this, it is necessary to have access to a large amount of discourse context, as well as information on the use of the speaker's intonation, body language, etc. In addition, a certain knowledge of the (social, educational, etc.) background and status of the speaker(s) and listener(s), as well as an insight into their personal traits, are needed. These aspects of communication and communicators are not always easy to obtain from traditional corpora of authentic spoken interaction. They are, however, most often accessible from film dialogue as this type of language, contrary to authentic spoken interaction, is thoroughly considered before being uttered. Someone (the script writer, director and/or others involved in the production of a film) has considered carefully how to make the audience understand the message put forward. Consequently, although the functions of DPs are never clear-cut, if anything, they are more likely to be straightforward in film dialogue than in authentic spoken language.

The overall difficulty in assigning clear functions to DPs often becomes a challenge when translating them in film dialogue. Added to the difficulty of translating DPs, and thus "making sense of the inside" (Sinha 2004:173) of this part of language, are of course the technical time and space constraints experienced by subtitlers. Translating DPs can nevertheless be valuable as these words and expressions may guide the film viewer and give important clues as to what film characters actually mean by what they say. Below are examples from the corpus of the present study of two different target text (TT) subtitles of one and the same source text (ST) entry, the film *AMPIE*, including the DP *well*. The first subtitle example (a) shows the subtitles of the Swedish commercial TV channel TV3. The second subtitle example (b) shows the subtitles of the Swedish public service TV channel SVT. In the first example, *well* is not translated, but in the second example it is translated into the Swedish DP *nja* ('well')[1].

> (1)   Nadia: perhaps you could help me with my studies
> Jim: uh yeah absolutely that that that would be that would be uh great sometime how about tomorrow
> Nadia: **well** ↑ │ I have ballet practice │ perhaps uhm I could come by your house afterwards
>
> (*AMPIE* 00.38.11)

---

[1] The back-translations of the subtitles used throughout the thesis are not meant to be idiomatically correct, but to focus more on conveying the subtitles literally, in order to provide a more direct account of the subtitles (cf. 4.3.2)

(a)   **TV3**
Jag har en balettlektion då.
[I have ballet practice then.]

Jag kanske kan komma efteråt
och byta om hemma hos dig.
[Maybe I can come afterwards
and change at your place.]

(b)   **SVT**
Nja, jag har balettlektion. Men jag
kanske kan komma till dig efteråt?
[**Well**, I have ballet practice. But
maybe I can come to you afterwards?]

In the example above, Nadia asks Jim to help her with some homework, and Jim suggests he could help her the following day. Nadia's reply to Jim's suggestion is initiated by an occurrence of *well*, here signalling that Nadia is not able to answer either yes or no to Jim's idea. There is a certain insufficiency in her reply, i.e. a signal of the fact that Nadia cannot answer yes or no, and that this answer is not what Jim expects or indeed prefers. Subtitle (a) does not translate *well* and does not include a signal of the insufficiency in the reply. Subtitle (b), however, translates *well* into *nja* ('well'[2]), which transmits one function *well* has in the ST.

The instance of *well* in example (1) signals one function *well* may have in spoken discourse. All four DPs under study in this thesis, i.e. *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like*, are multifunctional. Due to their multifunctionality, these DPs are not always easy to translate. The main aim of the present study is to see whether these words are in fact translatable in subtitling.

1.2 Aims and scope

The multifunctionality of DPs makes their function hard to pin down, and translating them is far from a straightforward task: "[i]t is a common observation that discourse particles 'do not translate well' in the sense that they have no satisfying correspondences in other languages' (Aijmer 2008:95). Some DPs may translate more easily than others into corresponding features in other languages, but most often there is rarely a one-to-one correspondence between one language and another.

The fact that DPs often lack clear corresponding lexical translations in other languages is the starting point of the present study. Aijmer (2008) summarizes Bazzanella & Morra (2000) when giving her view on the complexity of translating DPs: "[w]ords that lack systematic lexical correspondences in another language constitute 'a crucial and stimulating area for translation theory'" (Aijmer 2008:95). It is this lack of lexical correspondences between languages that is the main focus of the present study. Where the lack of correspondences appears, interesting translation solutions are often employed, and a deeper

---

[2] Literally, *nja* means "yes and no" as this word is a fusion of the Swedish words *nej* ('no') and *ja* ('yes').

awareness of the differences and similarities between the functions of two different languages emerge.

The overall aim of the present study is to investigate the four DPs *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like*, and their Swedish subtitle translations in ten American films, to see to what extent it is actually possible to translate these elusive words and expressions from one language into another in subtitling. The reason behind choosing the four DPs *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like* in particular, is mainly the fact that the degree of translation difficulty varies between these four DPs (to be discussed in 1.2). Following this main objective are several questions which the study will attempt to answer. The questions have either a predominantly quantitative or qualitative approach. These two approaches are naturally not mutually exclusive, but blend into each other. The study will focus mainly on the qualitative questions and include numerous examples from the corpus as illustrations of the material used, but in addition, a quantitative account is needed as a background. The questions posed in order to examine the four DPs of interest are listed below:

1. What is the frequency of the source text DPs, and their translations?
2. How are the DPs and their translations distributed among the films/film genres?
3. How are the translations distributed among the TTs (Cinema, DVD, public service TV, and commercial TV)?
4. What are the various pragmatic functions of the DPs in the film soundtracks?
5. How are the pragmatic functions of the DPs distributed among the films/film genres, and how are the translations of these distributed in the film/film genres and in the TTs?
6. Are certain pragmatic functions of the DPs translated more often than others? Why (not)?
7. When DPs are translated, what Swedish linguistic means are used?
8. When DPs are translated, do the Swedish translations reflect the various pragmatic functions of the source text DPs?
9. Do the DPs show differences as far as translation versatility is concerned?
10. To what extent should DPs be translated in subtitling?

The first three questions are mainly quantitative and concerned with the frequency of the DPs in the films, and the number of translations found for these DPs, as well as with how the translations are distributed among the films and among the four TTs (Cinema, DVD, the public service TV channel SVT, and the commercial TV channels TV3 and TV4). The first question is posed to give a basic overview of the material at hand, and to see how many DPs are actually translated in subtitling. The purpose of the second question is to study how the DPs and their translations are employed in certain films or film genres. The third question has implications that are not merely quantitative. Comparing the number of DP translations in each of the four TTs will show whether or not there is a difference in the treatment of DPs in various subtitling environments. For example, it is often claimed that, due to the fact that cinema subtitles are shown longer on screen than both DVD and TV subtitles are, more ST features are possible to translate and fit into the cinema subtitles than into DVD and TV

4

subtitles. I want to see whether this is applicable for the subtitling of DPs. In addition, a comparison of Swedish public service TV subtitling and commercial TV subtitling has been requested in previous studies (e.g. Pedersen 2007:274, who would like to see comparisons concerning qualitative differences), and these two are also compared both quantitatively and qualitatively in the present study. In sum, the main reason behind the comparison in question three is to give a background to issues concerning time and space constraints experienced by different subtitling versions, and to see whether there are any quantitative and qualitative differences between public service TV subtitling and commercial TV subtitling. Possible reasons for any differences found will be discussed.

The fourth question is concerned with identifying the functions of the DPs. This is possibly the most difficult undertaking of the present study. To facilitate a functional definition of each DP, the contexts in which they are found will be scrutinised (through examining intonation, pauses, collocations, etc.), and a cross-theoretical view of DPs will be applied to support the analysis. Only the DP functions located in the corpus will be investigated (each DP possibly has additional functions in other contexts which are not brought up in the study).

The fifth question above is chiefly quantitative and relates to the pragmatic functions of the DPs, i.e. primarily the two main functions of DPs discussed in the study: the textual and interpersonal functions. The question involves the distribution of these functions in the films, as well as the distribution of the translations of the functions in the films and in the four TTs. The main reason for the inclusion of this question is to see whether there are differences between how DPs are used in various films/film genres, as well as in the translations of the films/film genres.

The next five questions focus on the actual translations of the DPs, and on how these relate to the functions of the DPs in the STs. The sixth question is concerned with whether certain pragmatic functions of the DPs are translated more often than others, while the seventh question concerns the Swedish linguistic means used to translate the DPs. In the present study, various ways of translating the DPs will be examined and numerous examples from the corpus will be included as illustrations of the translation variety. The central question in the present study is the eighth one, i.e. to what extent the Swedish linguistic means used as translations of the DPs reflect the various functions of the DPs in their different ST contexts. From this question, conclusions can be drawn about the similarities and differences between English and Swedish pragmatic functions. In connection with this, the question of differences concerning the DPs' translation versatility is posed, i.e. does one DP have a wider variety of Swedish translations in the corpus than the other DPs? This issue is brought up in question nine above.

The final question presented in the list above relates to whether or not DPs should be translated in subtitling. Possible reasons for translating or not translating DPs in subtitling will be considered.

The four DPs *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like* were chosen as an area of research for a variety of reasons: (i) they are all common in spoken language in general, but also in film dialogue and in the corpus of the present study in particular; (ii) as all DPs, these four are language-specific and thus many times difficult to translate directly; (iii), however, the degree

of translation difficulty varies between these DPs in that *you know* and *I mean* have clear literal correspondences in Swedish (*du vet* ('you know') for *you know*; and *jag menar* ('I mean') for *I mean*), whereas *like* has fewer literal correspondences, and *well* hardly has any. It is of interest to see whether there are any differences concerning the translations of these DPs on account of their (lack of) correspondences in Swedish: (iv) they can all signal both a textual function and an interpersonal function, depending on what context they are in.

The aim of the present study requires an extensive qualitative investigation. To a large degree, the study focuses on providing examples of DP entries from the films, along with corresponding subtitles. The analysis is purely descriptive and based on numerous examples in combination with a cross-theoretical approach.

I prefer not to position this thesis within any particular theory, but to use an eclectic and cross-theoretical approach to the empirical material and the analysis thereof. Aspects of three theories are used, i.e. Politeness theory (Brown & Levinson 1987), Coherence-based theory (Schiffrin 1987), and Relevance theory (Sperber & Wilson 1986). In addition, because the aim of the present study is to investigate subtitling, and the study of subtitling is a part of translation studies (TS), I will employ certain concepts and ideas from translation studies of relevance for the present study (the thesis will include discussions on subtitling norms, equivalence, etc., as well as examinations of the translations by means of various translation strategies, such as explicitation and omission (cf. 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 for a discussion on translation studies concepts relevant for the present study)).

1.3 Material and method: a preliminary note

The whole of chapter 4 is devoted to the material and method employed in the present study. However, a few points concerning both material and method need to be briefly mentioned here.

The empirical material used for the thesis consists of a corpus of the fully transcribed soundtrack of ten American films and up to four different subtitle versions of each film, in combination with the multimodal information of the moving images. I have compiled the corpus myself, and all in all it consists of approximately 420,000 words. Below is a list of the ten films, presented in alphabetical order with year of production and main production company:

1. *Addicted to Love* (1997, Warner Bros)
2. *American Pie* (1999, Zide-Perry Productions)
3. *Fargo* (1996, Working Title Films)
4. *Legally Blonde* (2001, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Inc.)
5. *Nurse Betty* (2000, Gramercy Pictures)
6. *Primary Colors* (1998, Mutual Film Company LLC)
7. *Pulp Fiction* (1994, Band Apart Productions)
8. *Seven* (1995, New Line Cinema Corp.)
9. *Wag the Dog* (1997, Tribeca Productions)
10. *While You Were Sleeping* (1995, Hollywood Pictures)

For each of the ten films, four different subtitle versions are transcribed: the subtitles used for the cinema release and the DVD release, as well as the subtitles aired on either of the two Swedish public service TV channels SVT1 and SVT2 (referred to as SVT throughout the thesis, cf. 4.2.7), and either of the two Swedish commercial TV channels TV3 and TV4. The reason for including four subtitle versions instead of one is to promote a more varied view on subtitling as it is performed in Sweden today, as well as to give a more accurate analysis of the variety of translations used. In addition, one of the questions posed in this thesis is whether or not there are any differences concerning various subtitle versions in Sweden today.

Some features make this corpus unique, and serve the purpose of analysing DPs in particular: first of all, as opposed to other similar corpora compiled in recent years (e.g. Schröter 2005; Pedersen 2007), the present one is transcribed in its entirety, thus serving as an aid for the analysis of context-dependent DPs; second, the multimodal material of the films in the corpus provides information on the speakers' intonation, body language, etc., vital for an analysis of DPs; third, and also significant for an analysis of DPs, is the fact that the information of the speakers and their individual characteristics is much more accessible in this corpus than in corpora of authentic spoken language.

Apart from the cross-theoretical framework on DPs found in Politeness theory (Brown & Levinson, 1987), Coherence-based theory (Schiffrin, 1987), and Relevance theory (Sperber & Wilson, 1986), the most important parameters for the analysis of the ST DPs in this study (based on parameters used by Svartvik (1980) in his analysis on *well*) are the following seven: (i) the intonation of the DP; (ii) pauses used in connection to the DP; (iii) collocations of the DP; (iv) the position of the DP in an utterance; (v) the type of utterance of which the DP is part; (vi) the body language of the speaker; and (vii) the larger social context in which the DP is used. To facilitate the analysis of the DPs, the ST examples throughout the study consist of transcriptions illustrating the first five parameters (see 4.3.2 for a list of transcription symbols).

The analysis of the Swedish translations of the DPs is carried out in view of the translation strategies used (e.g. explicitation, omission, doubling of function). In addition, the pragmatic and grammatical Swedish realisations of the ST DPs (i.e. Swedish DPs, modal particles, conjunctions, adverbs, punctuation marks, etc.), and various previous studies on the function and meaning of these features, are considered.

1.4 Outline of study

The outline of the present study is the following: Chapter 2 introduces DPs and their multifunctionality. DPs are defined and a cross-theoretical approach to DPs and their functions is discussed. An account of DPs in translation is also given. Chapter 3 provides an overview of audiovisual translation (AVT) in general and subtitling in particular. Chapter 4 describes the material used for the present study, as well as the method used for collecting the material and analysing it. Chapters 5 to 8 are concerned with the results of the corpus analysis of the four DPs *well* (chapter 5), *you know* (chapter 6), *I mean* (chapter 7), and *like* (chapter

8). These four chapters present a definition and a functional disctribution of each DP, and previous studies relevant for the functional classification of the DPs are introduced. Chapters 5 to 8 further provide quantitative overviews of the results, and examine numerous corpus examples of the DPs and their Swedish translations. Chapter 9 discusses and compares the results from chapters 5 to 8 in various ways: the four DPs and their translations are compared, and some general observations of the results are presented. Chapter 10, finally, summarizes the main results of the study, discusses some second thoughts, and gives suggestions for further research.

2 Discourse particles

2.1 Introduction

Discourse particles (DPs) are often studied within the theoretical framework of pragmatics[3], which is the study of language in use. Pragmatics has been described as follows:

> Pragmatics is the study of linguistic indices, and indices can be interpreted only when they are used. One cannot describe the meaning of indices – one can only describe rules for relating them to a context, in which the meaning can be found. (Bates 1976:3)

What the above quote refers to is the fact that pragmatic features are not possible to study in isolation. It is only within a context that these features acquire a meaning and a function that can be studied. In pragmatics, by looking beyond isolated grammatical structures and semantic functions, human communication is seen in its social and cultural context. In Leech & Thomas' words: "[w]e may roughly describe pragmatics as the study of the meaning of linguistic utterances for their users and interpreters" (1990:173). Pragmatics is concerned not so much with the propositional content of an utterance as with what speakers actually mean by what they say.

Because DPs to a large extent are void of semantic meaning, they can be very difficult to define. Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen summarise the main difficulties with defining DPs, here referred to as pragmatic markers:

> In addition to the difficulty of differentiating pragmatic markers from the rest of the linguistic system, two other problems seem prominent in this area of research, namely, the elusiveness of the meaning of pragmatic markers and their polyfunctionality (Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen 2006:103).

In this chapter, an attempt will be made to define DPs in general, taking as a point of departure previous works in the area and a cross-theoretical approach to DP functions in various contexts. A distinction will be made between DPs and other linguistic features such as adverbs, verbs, conjunctions, and interjections, etc, which are homonymous to DPs. The elusiveness of DPs, and their multifunctionality, will be looked at in relation to earlier definitions and functions of DPs. In connection with this, an overall classification and functional distribution of the DPs of the present study will be presented. Furthermore, the translation of DPs will be examined, and previous works with a focus on both literary and audiovisual translation will be mentioned. Finally, a view of DPs in film dialogue is given, as well as an insight into the subtitling guidelines used by subtitlers in Sweden today.

---

[3] DPs are also studied within other frameworks, e.g. semantics, socio-linguistics, phonology, etc.

2.2 The nature of DPs

In this section, I will present an initial observation of the nature of DPs, before attempting to define them more systematically.

DPs are words or expressions, common in spoken language, which do not have a clear lexical meaning, but which do have a pragmatic meaning. Most of the DPs used in the English language today derive from homonymous words and expressions which still have propositional meaning. DPs have, however, experienced a pragmaticalisation[4] and can be said to lack propositional meaning. In the present study, when a word or combinations of words function grammatically as e.g. an adverb, preposition or noun, and are truth-conditional, they are referred to as having referential meaning and a non-discourse use (Hasund 2003). When a word or combinations of words function as a DP, and are non-truthconditional, they are referred to as having non-referential meaning and a discourse use (Hasund 2003).

2.2.1 A few words on pragmaticalisation

Most DPs have undergone a mode of pragmaticalisation (Erman & Kotsinas 1993; Watts 2003), i.e. they have all developed from other uses of the same form. In the pragmaticalisation process, these features have lost (some or most of) their semantic meaning so that what we refer to as DPs do not have propositional content in the way their referential counterparts do. In the words of Watts (2003:179):

> Pragmaticalisation [shows] a development from fully morphosyntactic structures to reduced structures with procedural rather than propositional meaning [.]

When words go through pragmaticalisation processes, they become semantically bleached and their meanings change. One example of how the change from lexical to pragmatic meaning may confuse users of language is given by Crystal (2004:193), who quotes Shakespeare's *Macbeth* (V.i.5I):

(2)   Gentlewoman: I would not have such a heart in my bosom,
                             for the dignity of the whole body.
       Doctor: Well, well, well.
       Gentlewoman: Pray God it be sir.

As Crystal concludes, the Gentlewoman's response shows that she takes the Doctor's words literally, and, subsequently "[t]his must be the first recorded instance in written English of someone failing to understand a discourse function of *well*" (ibid.).

Watts (2003:179) gives two examples as an illustration of the pragmaticalisation of *you know*, repeated below.

---

[4] Another frequently used term is *grammaticalisation*. This term is not used here because of its broad use in the literature on DPs, making it quite a vague term (cf. Erman & Kotsinas 1993:78).

(3)
      (a) **You know** (that) you shouldn't say that.
      (b) You shouldn't say that, **you know**.

Watts states that the first use of *you know* in (3) above has referential meaning but that the second use "has taken on the discourse function of a solidarity marker" (ibid.), signalling how the addressee should process the proposition that *you know* follows.

One difference between words with lexical meaning, on the one hand, and DPs, on the other, is that the latter are greatly contextualised, i.e. the function of DPs can only be deduced in context (Erman & Kotsinas 1993:76). The process of pragmaticalisation also often presents the end product with a phonological reduction and a loss of stress (Erman & Kotsinas 1993:80), which is often the case with DPs deriving from words with propositional value.

In the present study, DPs are not viewed as a word class. The main reason for this is the fact that DPs and their functions are defined by the context they are in, and by intonation, pauses etc., used in connection with the DP. In contrast, a word class is defined by e.g. use of articles, inflection, and the lexical meaning of the word. DPs do not have any lexical meaning on their own, but each needs its context in order to mean something in an utterance, and to signal one (or more) pragmatic function(s). However, the line may be thin between words in the DP category, and words that are said to belong to a certain word class. This problem will be further discussed in chapters to come (cf. 5.2; 6.2; 7.2; and 8.2 for discussions on *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like*, respecticely).

In spite of the pragmaticalisation taking place, and the weakening of referential meaning in the process, DPs influence the proposition of a connected utterance or the surrounding discourse by indicating how this utterance or discourse should be interpreted, i.e. DPs are "instructions for processing propositional representations" (Blakemore 1992:151). DPs are homonymous with their referential counterparts, but "when an expression functions as a discourse marker[5], that is its exclusive function in the sentence" (Fraser 1990:189). The two examples below are similar to Watts' illustration of the pragmaticalisation of *you know* in (3) above. In (4) *well* is an Adverb and thus a lexical word with propositional content, whereas in (5), where *well* is a DP, it does not have propositional meaning.

(4) We need to talk **well**, I think. ADVERB

(5) **Well** I think we need to talk (*ADDICTED* 00.39.40) DP

Well in (4) and (5) are homonyms with different meanings. The DP *well* is quite easy to distinguish from the manner adverb *well* or indeed the noun *well* (even though there are of course examples of problems distinguishing this difference, cf. example (2), above). There are other DPs, however, whose meanings are more difficult to distinguish from the lexical meanings of the same form. As we will see in later chapters, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like* all have closely related referential, non-pragmaticalised meanings and the analysis of these expressions can be more complex.

---

[5] Cf. a discussion on terminology in 2.3

If we look at two identical utterances with identical propositions, the only difference between them being that one does not include a DP while the other one does, we can see how a DP may influence the interpretation of an utterance.

Consider (6) and (7) below.

    (6) I'll get used to things

    (7) I'll get used to things **you know** (*SEVEN* 00.55.35)

The proposition in (6) and (7) is the same because "[a] true sentence is true and a false sentence is false, whether or not it contains a discourse marker" (Jucker 2002:213). In (7), however, the insertion of *you know* indicates that the proposition here is to be viewed somewhat differently from that in (6). The addition of a DP may at a first glance seem to make an utterance more difficult to interpret: example (6) perhaps appears more straightforward than (7) because we do not know exactly how to understand the use of *you know* in (7) (the main reason for this is a need for a larger context in order to fully comprehend this utterance). However, adding DPs to propositions often provides useful information about that proposition, the person uttering it, and the context in which the utterance is used. In fact, if DPs are omitted, the discourse "[may] be judged 'unnatural', 'awkward', 'disjointed', 'impolite', 'unfriendly', or 'dogmatic' within the communicative context" (Brinton 1996:35-36).

Sometimes DPs can help the interpretation of ambiguous utterances. Consider (8), below.

(8)   Scotty: Are you calling Stan
        (a) Jerry: I'm-I'm going to bed now
        (b) Jerry: **Well** I'm-I'm going to bed now   (*FARGO* 01.09.52)

In (8), Scotty is asking Jerry whether he is going to call Stan. In the first version (a) Jerry's answer is *I'm-I'm going to bed now*, which may seem quite odd since the most logical answer should be either a 'yes' or a 'no' (the answer 'I'm going to bed now' does indicate that the answer is 'No, (I'm not calling Stan, I'm going to bed now)', but the negation is not completely clear). Adding *well* to the same utterance to formulate (8 b), which is how it originally appears, can help the listener make sense of the answer: *well* here (together with the duplication of *I'm*) illustrates that the speaker is confused and most likely knows "that [he is] not giving directly the information which the questioner has requested" (Jucker 1993:440). Of course, additional features such as intonation, use of pauses, etc. also highly influence how the proposition is processed.

Pragmaticalisation processes expereienced by the four DPs focused on in the present study, i.e. *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like*, will be further commented on in subsequent chapters.

2.3 Towards a definition of DPs

In 1976, Longacre talked about 'mystery particles' (1976:468) when referring to e.g. discourse particles and the difficulty of defining their word class, distribution and meaning. Before linguists started to look past written texts, it was almost impossible to define words and expressions such as *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like*. These words were seen as superfluous, and terms like *fillers* or *fumblers* were often used to describe them. DPs are still seen as quite elusive and difficult to define, and even today there is no universal term to use when speaking of them, but an array of labels is used in the literature on DPs. In order to show just how many labels exist, the terms most commonly used since the 1970s are listed here: *pragmatic connectives* (Crystal and Davy 1975; van Dijk 1979); *conjunctions and continuatives* (Halliday and Hasan 1976); *pragmatic particles* (Östman 1981); *fumblers* (Edmonson 1981); *fillers* (Brown and Yule 1983); *pragmatic expressions* (Erman 1986); *discourse markers* (Schiffrin 1987; Blakemore 1987; Fraser 1988; Lenk 1998a), *pragmatic formatives* (Fraser 1987); *discourse particles* (Schourup 1985; Aijmer 2002), *discourse operators* (Redeker 1991); *pragmatic markers* (Brinton 1996; Andersen 1998; Erman, 2001; Fraser 1996); *smallwords* (Hasselgren 2002).

The above twelwe ways of referring to DPs probably do not even represent half of the terms being used over the years. Reasons for the impossibility of scholars to agree on a term by which to name these features are, for instance, the varying theoretical frameworks in which DPs are incorporated, as well as the different functions of DPs that are under study. In the present study, the term *discourse particle* will be used exclusively (except, of course, for the use of additional terms given in quotes, e.g. *discourse markers* or *pragmatic markers*). The main reason for using this particular term is that it is commonly used in works in the area (e.g. Schourup 1985; Aijmer 2002). The frequently used term is *discourse marker* is not employed in the present study due to its significance as a chiefly structural marker.

As the labels of these mysterious words and expressions vary over time and from one researcher to another, so does the view of their appearance. Most studies, including the present one, view both shorter and longer words and expressions as possible to refer to as discourse particles/markers/etc. Östman discusses the variety of what he calls 'pause-fillers' and 'hesitation-markers' in terms of more and less prototypical category members: "[they] range in character from elongated vowels or nasals, to whole sentences (of the type *whatchamacallit*), with their prototypical category members being expressions like *I mean*, *you know*, *like*, *well*, *oh*, *uh*, and *ah*." (1981:9).

Below follows a quite extensive list of examples of DPs (from Stenström 1994:59) in alphabetical order. These DPs have been studied within varying theories and under different headings, but are all common features of interest for researchers of DPs. The DPs of particular interest for this study are in bold[6].

---

[6] *Like* is not part of table 2.1, possibly because the interest in this DP is quite recent.

Table 2.1. List of examples of DPs (from Stenström 1994:59).

Actually	I think	right
Ah	mhm	sort of
all right	no	sure
anyway	now	Q tag
God	oh	that's right
goodness	OK	yes/yeah
gosh	please	**you know**
I mean	quite	you see
I see	really	**well**

The definitions of DPs are as many as their labels[7], and my definition differs somewhat from the list above. I do not include interjections such as *God* and *gosh*, focus particles like *only* and *just*, or question tags such as *isn't it* or *aren't they*. In addition, I do not consider DPs that are more frequently used in written language (e.g. conjunctions like *however* and *because*), but focus here is on DPs commonly used in spoken dialogue.[8]

Even though DPs are not easy to define, some basic characteristics shared by DPs have been identified by many scholars[9]. Östman (1981:149) was one of the first to publish a list of prototypical conditions of DPs. Brinton (1996) collected a list of common features of DPs, later developed by Jucker & Ziv (1998:3) and Andersen (2001:21).

Andersen summarises Brinton's list of features shared by members of the DP category in a somewhat different manner than Jucker & Ziv do. Although Andersen and Jucker & Ziv all base their characterisations of DPs on Brinton, Andersen's is more similar to my own definition and is thus presented below. Jucker & Ziv's (1998) overview includes a few points that I find questionable, on the basis of more recent research (e.g. Bazzanella & Morra 2000, Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen 2003), such as the restriction of DPs to occur sentence-initially; the fact that DPs are more typical in women's speech; and that they are always phonologically reduced (Jucker & Ziv 1998:3). Research (e.g. Bazzanella & Morra 2000, Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen 2003), shows that not even prototypical DPs demonstrate these three particular features very often. In his modification of Brinton's criteria for DPs, Andersen omits the first two of the points above and tones down the third. In addition, Andersen's (2001) adaptation of Brinton's list includes DP *like*, one of the four DPs under investigation in the present study. *Like* is not included in the accounts of DPs in either Brinton (1996) or Jucker & Ziv (1998).

The list of DP characteristics included below is an account of (more or less) general DP characterisations as well as of my own preferred description of DP features. My definition of

---

[7] For an overview of various earlier studies on DPs, see Lenk, 1998b 40-46.

[8] However, Swedish interjections, focus particles, questions tags, conjunctions, etc. are used as translations of the English DPs *well, you know, I mean*, and *like* in the corpus of the present study, and are thus focused on in subsequent chapters.

[9] For a more extensive overview of different linguists' definitions of DPs, with a focus on individual DPs and which of their functions are considered most important, see Brinton 1996: 30-35.

DPs is based on the below list by Brinton (1996:33), as adapted by Andersen (2001:21), who finds that DPs:

- constitute a heterogeneous set of forms which are difficult to place within a traditional word class (including items like *ah, actually, and, just, **like**, now, really, **well**, **I mean**, I think* and **you know**[10]);
- are predominantly a feature of spoken rather than written discourse;
- are high-frequency items;
- are stylistically stigmatised and negatively evaluated;
- are short items and are often phonologically reduced;
- are considered to have little or no propositional meaning, or at least to be difficult to specify lexically;
- occur either outside the syntactic structure or loosely attached to it and have no clear grammatical function;
- are [grammatically[11]] optional rather than obligatory features;
- may be multifunctional, operating on different levels (including textual and interpersonal levels).

A shorter and more limited list of characteristic features, based on Hoelkher (1991), Luke (1990), and Bazzanella (1995) is Bazzanella & Morra's four essential features of DPs (2000:2), repeated below.

1. They do not affect the truth conditions of an utterance, and do not add anything to the propositional content of an utterance.
2. They are related to the speech situation and not the situation talked about.
3. They serve to indicate the mood of a sentence, and to express attitudes and emotions.
4. They are multifunctional, operating on several levels simultaneously.

To the above two lists, and for the sake of the aim of the present study, I would like to add an additional characteristic, more focussed on translation:

- As DPs are numerous, language-specific, multifunctional, stigmatised, grammatically optional, difficult to identify lexically, etc., they are many times difficult to translate directly.

2.4 Functions of DPs

It should be clear from the above discussion that identifying DPs is not the easiest task. One of the reasons why DPs form such a "fuzzy concept" (Jucker & Ziv 1998:2) is the vagueness of their uses. Scholars have struggled with the question of function for a long time. Some

---

[10] The DPs in bold are of special interest for this study (bold added by me).
[11] I indicate present author's comment. DPs are grammatically optional, but not always pragmatically optional.

believe (e.g. Lakoff 1973; Quirk et al. 1985) that each DP has a single function or use, but increasingly more scholars (e.g. Jucker 1993; Brinton 1996; Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen 2006) prefer to see each use of a DP within its context and relate each function to a core function of the same DP. The functions of one DP may overlap with the functions of other DPs.

Consider (9 a-e) below.

(9)   a) **well** ↑ I'm- │ I'm going to bed now (*FARGO* 01.09.52)

b) did David tell you that I teach 5th grade │ **well** → I did (*SEVEN* 00.55.52)

c) yeah I'm fine it's just morning sickness │ │ **well** ↑ that passed (*FARGO* 00.35.59)

d) **well** → I dunno (*SEVEN* 01.51.13)

e) **well** → what the fuck do I care (*WAG* 01.12.41)

At a first glance and without each DP's context, it is difficult to distinguish the functions of the instances of *well* above. For now it will suffice to say that all of the above occurrences of *well* have different functions in their respective contexts, depending on, among other things, the intonation and position of the DP, the use and length of pauses, and the context of the DP (the subtitle translations of (9 a-e) can be seen in 2.6). Parameters used when analysing the DP functions (intonation, use of pauses, etc.) will be further discussed in 4.3.1.

When deciphering the function of a DP it is sometimes impossible to know "[t]he degree to which markers themselves add a meaning to discourse […] or reflect a meaning that is already semantically accessible […]." (Schiffrin 2001:5). Most of the time, a combination of the two is possibly the most accurate analysis, i.e. the function of a DP reflects the function of the discourse at the same time as the discourse reflects the function of the DP. Regardless of this fact, DPs help both speakers and hearers decode the message of an utterance or a larger part of discourse (Blakemore 1992).

Scholars who view the polyfunctionality of DPs as a central concept have identified, among the many functions DPs can perform, two opposite poles of a continuum, influenced by the three Hallidayan (1994) modes of functions of language; the interpersonal, the textual and the ideational mode. The two opposite poles of the continuum comprise Textual/Structural/Coherence functions and Interpersonal/Interactional/Modal/Politeness functions (e.g. Östman (1981); Brinton (1996); Schiffrin (1987); Stenström (1989); Bazzanella & Morra (2000); Cuenca (2008)). The textual function is concerned mainly with DPs as textual markers, e.g. self-repair devices and markers of indirect speech, used when a speaker structures meaning as text, trying to make the discourse cohesive. The interpersonal function, on the other hand, is more concerned with the relation between interlocutors and their use of DPs as appealers for solidarity, and as politeness markers, face threat mitigators, hedges, etc. to express features such as attitudes, demands, and judgements.

Various two-fold classifications of DPs are used in the classification and analysis of DPs in the present study. These are introduced as they become relevant in each of the four chapters discussing the individual DPs. However, as a background to the functional classification used in the present study, a short account of two studies highly influencing this classification is given below. First, the Hallidayan modes of functions are examined briefly,

and second, Brinton's two-fold classification of DP functions into textual and interpersonal is presented.

2.4.1 The three Hallidayan modes of functions

The main functional division of DPs made in the present study is based on the Hallidayan (1994) account of modes of functions and the studies it has influenced, in general, as well as Brinton's (1996) list of functions, and her division of DP functions into textual and interpersonal, in particular.

Halliday's (1994) theory of language is based on a division into three metafunctions: the ideational, the textual, and the interpersonal metafunctions. Each metafunction relates to different aspects of the world. The ideational metafunction is described by Halliday as the "content function of language" (1994:27), relating to the content of discourse. As this metafunction represents the propositional value of language, it is not considered in connection with DPs because the propositional meaning of DPs is highly bleached. The textual metafunction is concerned with the organisation of text, "creating cohesion and continuity" (Halliday & Matthiessen 2004:30). This is the metafunction behind the label *textual function* in the classification of DPs in the present study. Finally, the interpersonal metafunction is concerned with the social world, the relations between people, and expresses judgements, attitudes, etc. This is the metafunction behind the label *interpersonal function* in the classification of DPs in the present study.

2.4.2 Brinton's textual vs. interpersonal classification

Brinton (1996:36-38) is influenced by the three Hallidayan metafunctions and collects a list of 9 functions from various studies (see references in Brinton's list, below) on DPs. Among these can be seen both textual and interpersonal functions. Below are two lists: the first one consists of the functions Brinton argues are textual and the second consists of functions that Brinton argues are interpersonal. In the list, there are references, included by Brinton, to various works raising a subject or using a certain terminology in question.

The following is a list of Brinton's textual functions (1996:37):

(i)   To initiate discourse, including claiming the attention of the hearer, and to close discourse.

(ii)   To aid the speaker in acquiring or relinquishing the floor.

(iii)   To serve as a filler or delaying tactic used to sustain discourse or hold the floor.

(iv)   To mark a boundary in discourse, that is, to indicate a new topic, a partial shift in topic (correction, elaboration, specification,

17

expansion), or the resumption of an earlier topic (after an interruption).

(v)   To denote either new information (Erman (1987:201); Schiffrin (1987)) or old information (Quirk et al. (1985); Schiffrin (1987)).

(vi)   To mark "sequential dependence", to constrain the relevance of one clause to the preceding clause by making explicit the conversational implicatures relating the two clauses, or to indicate by means of conventional implicatures how an utterance matches co-operative principles of a conversation (Levinson (1983)).

(vii)   To repair one's own or others' discourse.

The following is a list of Brinton's interpersonal functions (1996:37-38):

(i)   Subjectively, to express a response or a reaction to the preceding discourse or attitude towards the following discourse, including also "back-channel" signals of understanding and continued attention spoken while another speaker is having his or her turn and perhaps "hedges" expressing speaker tentativeness.

(ii)   Interpersonally, to effect cooperation, sharing, or intimacy between speaker and hearer, including confirming shared assumptions, checking or expressing understanding, requesting information, expressing deference, or saving face (politeness).

The above classification of DP functions will be commented on next. Additional two-fold approaches to DP functions (e.g. Svartvik (1980), Carlson (1984), Erman & Kotsinas (1993), Bazzanella & Morra (2000), Andersen (2001), Fox Tree & Schrock (2002) and Cuenca (2008)) will be discussed in each of the DP chapters relating to the DP under discussion.

2.4.3 The functional distribution of DPs used in the present study

The above functional distribution made by Brinton will be partly used throughout the present study, although with a somewhat different set of terms. In each of the four result chapters (one each for the DPs *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like*), parts of Brinton's division is used with the attempt to show a possible distribution of the functions of the DPs in the corpus. The functions of each DP are divided into a continuum from textual to interpersonal functions. This division is not to be seen as applicable to all the functions *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like* can have in spoken discourse in general, but only the functions these four DPs have in the corpus of the present study. The functional distribution of DPs in the present study does thus

not form a taxonomy of all the possible functions of DPs, but shows the functions of the DPs in the corpus in question only.

There are no clear boundaries between the functions, since placing a DP on the scale from textual to interpersonal is most often not straightforward. Just as there are grey areas in the classification of DPs in the present study, there is subjectivity in previous classifications of DPs or, for that matter, linguistic studies in general. Schröter (2005:365) and Pedersen (2007:97), in their studies on the subtitling of English language-play and extralinguistic cultural references, respectively, both found themselves working with continua when trying to define categories of these linguistic features: "[w]e are dealing with continua here, and any cut-off points on these are bound to have some degree of arbitrariness to them" (Pedersen 2007:97). However, as Erman & Kotsinas found (1993:81): "[…] although discourse markers such as those studied here [*you know*, *like*, etc.] are extremely multifunctional, there is some logic to the manner in which they are used". In a majority of cases, it is possible to decipher the most salient use of each DP (which may have other less salient uses simultaneously), taking into consideration certain parameters for analysis (to be discussed in 4.3.1). The functions found for DPs in the present study are all linked to one another at some point(s), and the lines drawn are often fuzzy. The fact that the boundaries between the functions are fuzzy should be born in mind by the reader throughout this study. It is not the aim of the present study to find clear boundaries between DP functions, because that would be impossible. One of the aims is, however, to decipher the most salient function of one DP in a certain context. In order to base a discussion of DPs on something tangible, and to enable an analysis of DPs and their translations, the DP functions located in the corpus are classified into whether they are mainly textual or interpersonal. The textual functions include frame-markers (**FRAME**), clarification-markers (**CLAR**), approximation markers (**APPROX**), and repair-markers (**REP**), whereas the interpersonal functions include insufficiency-markers (**INS**), solidarity-markers (**SOL**), elaboration-markers (**ELAB**), rapport-building markers (**RAPP**), and face threat mitigating markers (**MIT**).

The classification of DPs in the present study can be seen in connection to Brinton's classification of DP functions. In places, the correspondence is absolute, but often there is overlap between Brinton's functions and the ones used in the present study. One reason for this overlap may be the fact that Brinton refers to the functions of all DPs in a language whereas the functional distribution in the present study refers to the functions of the occurrences of DPs *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like* found in the film corpus only.

Table 2.2 below is an attempt to show the correspondences between these two functional distributions. The numbers in Brinton's classification that correspond most clearly to each of the labels in the classification of the present study are in bold in table 2.2. Brinton's textual functions (iv) and (v) overlap with all of the textual functions in one way or another.

Table 2.2. A comparison between Brinton's DP classification
of DPs and the classification used in the present study.

Brinton's (1996) DP functions	The DP functions in the corpus of the present study
Textual functions	Textual functions
(i); (ii); (iv); (v)	**FRAME**
(iii); (vi); (vii); (iv); (v)	**CLAR**
(iv); (v)	**APPROX**
(vii); (iv); (v)	**REP**
Interpersonal functions	Interpersonal functions
(i)	**INS,**
(i); (ii)	**SOL, RAPP**
(i)	**ELAB**
(ii)	**MIT**

Below follows a brief summary and explanation of the comparison between Brinton's classification of DP functions and the classification in the present study, as seen in table 2.2. A more elaborate account of the functions used for individual DPs will be given in subsequent chapters (cf. 5.2.2, 6.2.2, 7.2.2, and 8.2.2).

The textual function **FRAME**, used in the present study, is comparable to functions (i) and (ii) in Brinton's account; i.e. these functions entail an initiation and/or closing of discourse, including floor-gaining or floor-relinquishing. The second textual function **CLAR** can mainly be matched to Brinton's functions (iii), (vi) and (vii), i.e. the **CLAR** function may mark sequential dependence by linking parts of discourse or by holding the floor, and at times repairing a previous part of an utterance (e.g. by using the DP as a signal of the repairing paraphrase to come). The **APPROX** function is only found for DP *like*, and is similar to Brinton's functions (iv) and (v). Both (iv) and (v) have features applicable to all the textual functions in the classification of the present study, but perhaps most to **APPROX** as this function puts focus on elements in an utterance pertaining to new or old information, and marks a certain specification of parts of utterances (e.g. through focusing on the approximation of a number). The **REP** function is a complete function on its own for some DPs in the study and for others its function is included within the **CLAR** function. It is similar to Brinton's function (vii), i.e. it repairs the speaker's discourse when needed.

The four different interpersonal functions of the DPs in the present study are quite clearly comparable to Brinton's two interpersonal functions (i) and (ii). The **INS** and **ELAB** functions are close to Brinton's function (i), as they, among other things, express an attitude towards the preceding or following discourse (e.g. **INS** signals that there is some insufficiency in the previous or subsequent (part of the) discourse). The **SOL** and **RAPP** functions are both quite similar to Brinton's two interpersonal functions as they signal intimacy in the form of shared assumptions and understanding (e.g. as appealers for hearer solidarity). The final function found in the corpus of the present study is **MIT**, which is equal to the face saving signal brought up in Brinton's second interpersonal function (**MIT** signals that the speaker wants to mitigate the face threat of a situation).

In addition to the classification of DP functions based on Brinton (1996), a further theoretical framework is needed to be able to perform an analysis of the classified DPs. The

framework most applicable to the textual and interpersonal classification of functions is one that takes both of these poles of the functional continuum into consideration, while also focusing on DPs. There are various pragmatic theories that include approaches to DPs and that can help in understanding these features. In the section below I will briefly mention three such theories, each focusing on DPs at different points of the functional scale, and each applicable to a study on subtitling.

2.5 Further theoretical framework relevant for the analysis of DPs

The analytical approach in this thesis is cross-theoretic, incorporating pragmatic theories relevant for the analysis of DPs. Aijmer (1996a) found that, even though her study relied primarily on relevance theory, the elusive DPs require a wider theoretical basis to facilitate the analysis of their functional distribution:

> […] it should be emphasized that it is difficult to explain the use of discourse markers on the basis of relevance theory alone since there are a number of non-relevance-theoretical factors 'producing' discourse markers, such as the speaker's wish to be polite or to modify illocutionary force (Aijmer 1996a:210).

Given that one of the aims of this thesis is to decipher a few functions for each of the four DPs, to see how these functions are translated, an approach including more theories than one is necessary. There is no theory available providing a complete functional examination of DPs on its own accord. A combination of three pragmatic theories, each frequently employed in research on DPs (see below) as well as in research on subtitling (e.g. Kovačič 1993; Hatim & Mason 1997; Pavlović 2003) is thus used in the analysis of the ST DPs in the corpus under consideration: Relevance theory (Sperber & Wilson 1986), Coherence based theory (Schiffrin 1987), and Politeness theory (Brown & Levinson 1987).

Below follows a brief overview of each of these theories as a background for the discussion to come. The theories will not be fully scrutinised in any way, but those parts of each theory most significant for this study will be extracted and used as an aid for the analysis.

2.5.1 Relevance theory

Relevance theory is possibly the most widely used theory in the analysis of DPs (e.g. Lakoff 1973; Watts 1986; Jucker 1993; Andersen 1998, 2001). Furthermore, this theory is applied in studies on subtitling (e.g. Kovačič 1993).

Relevance theory draws on the Gricean (1975) maxim of Relevance ('be relevant'), which makes up the cooperative principle together with the maxims of Quality ('tell the truth'), Quantity ('be informative') and Manner ('avoid ambiguity'). In short, relevance theory views DPs as providing processing instructions for a hearer by reducing the processing effort and thereby increasing the hearer's ability to interpret the utterance. DPs thus aid the speaker in making an utterance as optimally relevant as possible. Taking contextual

information into consideration is essential in relevance theory (Aijmer 1996a:208; Andersen 1998:32). The notion of context entails not only the physical environment of the speaker and hearer, or the preceding or succeeding textual context in which the DP is found, but context in Sperber & Wilson's view also involves the speaker's and hearer's assumptions about the world, i.e. their knowledge and beliefs: "it is these assumptions […] rather than the actual state of the world, that affect the interpretation of an utterance" (Sperber & Wilson 1986:15).

Studies focusing on relevance theory as a method for analysing DPs will be considered more thoroughly in each of the chapters discussing the four DPs under consideration. For now it will suffice to give one example to further explain relevance theory in connection to DPs. Example (10), below, shows two versions of the character Tracy's utterance in the scene in question. She is giving an answer to Somerset's question *Why don't you talk to him about it tell him how you feel*, trying to explain to Somerset how she feels about her situation in a new city. The first version of the utterance does not include any DPs, but the second one (which is how the utterance is presented originally in this scene) does. It illustrates how the inclusion of DPs *you know* and *I mean* provides the hearer with instructions for how to interpret the proposition in the utterance.

(10)   Somerset: why don't you talk to him about it tell him how you feel

(a) Tracy: I can't I can't be a burden especially now I'll get used to things I think I just │ I wanted to talk to someone who's lived here for a long time upstate it's a completely different environment

(b) Tracy: I can't **you know** I can't be a burden especially now I'll get used to things **you know** I think I just │ I wanted to talk to someone who's lived here for a long time **I mean** ↓ upstate **you know** it's a completely different environment

(*SEVEN* 00.55.29)

In the first utterance (10 a), all instances of DPs are taken away, making it more difficult for the hearer to know how to process the utterance. In the second utterance (10 b), however, the hearer obtains "clues" as to how to interpret the same utterance. The insertion of *you know* and *I mean* in (b) indicates the speaker's desire to appeal to the solidarity of the hearer (Watts 2003). By including *you know* and *I mean* in the above example, the speaker possibly reduces the processing effort for the hearer, i.e. making it easier for the hearer to interpret the speaker's utterance, thus increasing the relevance of the utterance.

Relevance theory can be applied to DPs for both textual and interpersonal analyses.

2.5.2 Coherence-based theory

The second theory relevant for the present study is Coherence-based theory (Schiffrin, 1987) which sees DPs as "sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of thought" (1987:31). Unlike relevance theory, where physical context as well as the speaker's and hearer's knowledge and beliefs play a significant part, the coherence-based approach focuses on coherence relations and the structure of the discourse when analysing DPs (Blakemore 2001:113). Many times the label *discourse markers* is preferred to *discourse particles* in

studies within a coherence-based framework. DPs in coherence-based theory are devices whose most important function is to contribute to discourse coherence, that is, they show various coherence relations between parts of text, between speaker and hearer, and between text, speaker, hearer and context. Schiffrin (1987) focuses on utterance-initial DPs that connect utterances on different levels of discourse (i.e. a DP can for instance connect actions, ideas, or justifications of requests (Schiffrin et al. 2001:57)). Schiffrin et al. (2001) argue that DPs display local and/or global relationships. A local relationship appears between adjacent utterances, while a global relationship appears "across wider spans and/or structures of discourse" (2001:57).

In the example below, *well* is used (close to) utterance-initially as a structuring device, initiating a new topic as well as a physical move from one place to another.

(11)   Marianne: oh thank you governor Walsh oh Governor Stanton I'm sorry [laughter] I'm a little nervous I'm sorry
Someone: that's okay
Marianne: │ uhm │ │ **well** ↑ if you walk with me I'll take you up to the │ the library
(*PRIMARY* 00.02.34)

In example (11), the character Marianne is showing a group of Governmental people around at the school where she is teaching, and she is slightly nervous. After her first turn, where she calls Governor Stanton by another name, and after the turn of 'Someone', Marianne makes a pause before changing the subject by means of *well* used as a coherence marker. By using *well*, she also prompts the physical move from the courtyard where they are standing, to the library they are going to (Marianne is connecting the utterance subsequent to *well* with her idea of showing the party around at the school.)

Coherence-based theory can be applied to DPs mainly for textual analyses.

2.5.3 Politeness theory

Politeness theory (Brown & Levinson, 1987 (who expanded on Goffman's (1967) theory of face)) is used quite extensively in studies on DPs (e.g. Watts 2003; Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen 2003; Cuenca 2008). At the core of politeness theory is the notion of *face*, which is the public self-image all competent language users have. In communication and social situations in general, all speakers want to preserve their face, as well as the face of the hearer(s). Face is divided into positive and negative face, where positive face refers to each person's wish to be seen as a good human being and liked by others (in the words of Brown & Levinson: "[positive face is] the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others" (1987:62)), and negative face denotes each person's desire to remain autonomous and not to be intruded on (in the words of Brown & Levinson: "the want of every 'competent adult member' that his actions be unimpeded by others" (1987:62)). Threats to a person's face are identified as *face threatening acts* (FTAs). Examples of FTAs are e.g. suggestions, disagreements, confessions, requests, apologies or any other similar situation causing a person to lose face. Just how threatening an FTA is depends on "variables of the

social distance and relative power of speaker and addressee" (Hatim & Mason 1997:81). For example, a request for a favour is more face threatening between people in a hierarchical relationship such as employee and employer than between close friends. There are various strategies of maintaining face, one of which is the use of DPs. All four DPs in this thesis may in certain contexts have the function of mitigating a face threat, i.e. of trying to withhold a breakdown of communication between speaker and hearer. Example (12) below shows the face threatening situation of the characters Sam and Maggie the morning after they have spent a night together in bed.

(12)   Maggie: can you go clean up the kitchen cos we really should get out of here
        Sam: **well (1)** → │ │ I think we should talk
        Maggie: nothing to talk about
        Sam: **well (2)** → yes there is something happened and I would like to talk about it
        Maggie: nothing happened Sam okay nothing happened (*ADDICTED* 00.39.38)

In example (12), Sam and Maggie are both embarrassed about their night together and they handle the situation quite differently: Maggie denies that anything has happened while Sam wants to talk about it. As Sam keeps suggesting that they should talk, he puts himself in a face threatening situation, which he mitigates by using the DP *well* twice. In the first instance, he mitigates the suggestion itself, and in the second he mitigates both the suggestion and his disagreement with Maggie's attitude.

This example was included here as a general illustration of the way politeness theory can be applied to the study of DPs. In chapters to come, more focus will be given to various approaches to DPs and politeness theory (e.g. Aijmer 2002; Watts 2003). When the DPs are analysed, there will be no application of the difference made in politeness theory between positive and negative politeness, but focus will be on the overall mitigating function of DPs.

Politeness theory can be applied to DPs mainly for interpersonal analyses.

2.6 Translation of DPs

DPs are known for being difficult to translate. The main reason for this is their multifunctionality and the fact that they do not translate very well directly, i.e. "[DPs] do not translate well in the sense that they have no satisfying correspondences in other languages" (Aijmer 2008:95). One reason behind the choice of the four DPs *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like* for the present study, is that some are more transparent in Swedish than others, and thus easier to translate directly: *you know* and *I mean* both have clear correspondences in the direct Swedish translations *du vet* and *jag menar*, respectively, whereas *like* to a certain extent, and *well* to a large extent do not have corresponding translations in Swedish. Of course, as all DPs are multifunctional, the direct Swedish translations of *you know* and *I mean* are not applicable to all facets of these DPs, and there are many other translation solutions available, but *du vet* and *jag menar* can still be used quite often as translations of *you know* and *I mean*. *Well* is the least transparent of the four DPs, and does not have clear correspondences in Swedish (Johansson 2006).

As a result of the non-transparency of DPs, translating them is never a straightforward task. The issue of formal and dynamic equivalence (Nida 1964) must be brought up in connection to DP translation, and in particular in connection to the subtitling of DPs (formal and dynamic equivalence will be further discussed in 3.1.1). Briefly, formal equivalence can be defined as "focus[ing] attention on the message itself, in both form and content" (Nida 1964:159), i.e. a more literal translation, whereas dynamic equivalence is based upon "the principle of equivalent effect" (ibid.), i.e. a more free translation. Striving for formal equivalence when subtitling DPs is not easy and most often not a good idea, as most DPs are difficult to translate literally. Aiming at achieving dynamic equivalence between ST and subtitle is, however, more feasible and will possibly produce a more accessible translation. Gottlieb (1997) and Chaume (2004a) are both inspired by Nida's terminology as they come to the conclusion that formal equivalence is in fact not at all possible in audiovisual translation, and that the most important task of audiovisual translation is to "produce a similar effect on the target language audience as the source text produced on the source culture audience" (Chaume 2004a:844).

Because of the multifunctionality of DPs, producing a similar effect on the target language audience as the ST audience had of the DP (and its context) in the ST, can be quite complex. The translation of one and the same DP can vary between, for instance, DPs, modal particles, conjunctions, whole clauses, or a combination of these (Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen 2003), depending on the context of the DP in the ST. Below, the examples from (9) are repeated, and this time their translations are included in order to illustrate the diversity of possible functions of one and the same DP (*well*), here shown by the variety of translations in the subtitles.

(13)   a) **well** ↑ I'm- │ I'm going to bed now (*FARGO* 01.09.52)
      Jag ska **nog** lägga mig nu (SVT)
      [I'm **probably** going to bed now.]

    b) did David tell you that I teach 5th grade │ **well** → I did (*SEVEN* 00.55.52)
      Har David berättat att jag är lärare?
      Var lärare. (DVD)
      [Has David told you that I'm a teacher?
      Was a teacher.]

    c) yeah I'm fine it's just morning sickness │ │ **well** ↑ that passed (*FARGO* 00.35.59)
      Så där, det gick över. (SVT)
      [**There**, that passed.]

    d) **well** → I dunno (*SEVEN* 01.51.13)
      Ja, inte vet jag… (TV4, DVD)
      [**Yes**, I don't know…]

    e) **well** → what the fuck do I care (*WAG* 01.12.41)
      Det skiter **väl** jag i. (SVT, DVD)
      [**Surely**, I don't give a shit.]

The Swedish translations in (13) vary and they reflect the different functions of *well* in the ST: in a), the modal particle *nog* ('probably'[12]) reflects an insufficiency in the answer in the ST; in b), the italicised *var* ('was') marks the change from present to past tense, also put forward in ST *did*; in c), the two-word frame-marking expression *så där* ('(so) there') reflects a transition and shift in topic, in d), the affirmative *ja* ('yes') together with the punctuation marks at the end of the translation illustrate a certain hesitation in the ST; and, finally, in e), the modal particle *väl* ('surely') demonstrates a mitigation of a face-threatening situation in the ST.

The variety of translations of one and the same DP thus seems endless because of the many different functions one DP may have in various contexts. Below is an overview of a number of previous studies on the translation of DPs and related themes, both in literary and audiovisual translation.

2.6.1 Studies of DPs in literary translation

Not much research has been carried out on the literary translation of DPs, but a few recent cross-linguistic studies are of significance for this study. Most studies on DPs generally focus on the DP *well*, because this is the most frequent English DP and a much studied one. The following three studies focus on *well* and its Italian, Swedish, Dutch, Norwegian, and German translations.

Bazzanella & Morra (2000) discuss to what extent DPs can actually be handled in translation, and they do this by looking at translations of *well* in the Italian translation of the literary text *Brothers and Sisters* by Ivy Compton Burnett. They focus on the polyfunctionality of *well* in connection with its core meaning, and emphasise the importance of translators to "vary [their] translation according to the context, in order to preserve the functionality of the item in question" (2000:9). For the DPs in their study, Bazzanella & Morra identify two opposite poles of a functional continuum, i.e. the Interactional and Meta-textual functions, and they list subfunctions of each pole. The importance of translators to vary their translation according to context is contrasted with the apparent difficulty of translating DPs, due to e.g. their polyfunctionality and discourse-boundness. Bazzanella & Morra find a 39% omission rate of *well* in their material, but they uncover a wide variety of Italian translation types of *well*.

Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen (2003) analyse English fiction texts and their Swedish and Dutch translations in the English-Swedish Parallel Corpus (ESPC) and the Oslo Multilingual Corpus (OMC). They find that the various Swedish and Dutch translations of *well* reflect the multitude of context-dependent functions that *well* can perform, and they highlight its interpersonal function as e.g. a marker of modality and politeness, on the one hand, and its textual function as e.g. a boundary marker and topic introducer, on the other. Both of these main functions, they argue, can be related to a general core function of modality which they suggest *well* has. Similar to Bazzanella & Morra (2000), Aijmer & Simon-

---

[12] *Probably* is a literal backtranslation of *nog* in the context of example (13a) more than an idiomatically correct backtranslation (cf. 4.3.2 for a short discussion on the backtranslations used in the present study).

Vandenbergen put focus on the special challenge translators are up against when dealing with DPs. However, they find quite a few translation solutions for the ST instances of *well* in both the Swedish and Dutch TTs, suggesting that the translators are after all able to find methods of translating *well*, even though "the translations of *well* did not capture all aspects of its meaning [and at times] resulted in unnatural translations" (2003:1144). Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen calculate an omission rate of translations of *well* in the Swedish and Dutch TTs of 21 % and 7 %, respectively. Furthermore, they find that some element of the interpersonal meaning of *well* is missing in the TTs as compared to the ST (2000:1153).

The two above studies of *well* and its translations form a background to Johansson's (2006) study on the Norwegian and German translations of w*ell*. Johansson uses the English-Norwegian Parallel Corpus (ENPC) and the Oslo Multilingual Corpus (OMC). By investigating these corpora he tries to find some correspondences in the three languages, and learns that neither Norwegian nor German own clear-cut counterparts of English *well*, but "[m]any different means are used to pick up facets of its meaning" (2006: 135). One shortcoming with all three studies above, a shortcoming that Johansson mentions, is the fact that DPs in general and *well* in particular are characteristic of conversational interaction, but all the material referred to is written.

In conclusion, the above studies all discuss one prerequisite for the translation of DPs, namely the need to decode as far as possible the different functions of DPs (and in doing so consider the context of each DP) before attempting to translate them. In spite of the difficulty of translating DPs, this is to some degree done in the translations in question as they show a great diversity of translation types. However, there is an overall tendency in the above three studies that DPs are not translated. DPs are nevertheless translated more in literary translation than in audiovisual translation, and above all in subtitling (Chaume 2004a), as will be seen below.

2.6.2 Studies of DPs in audiovisual translation

The following four contrastive studies in audiovisual translation can be divided into two parts: the first two studies (Hatim & Mason 2000; Pavlović, 2003) do not focus on DPs per se, but more on the interpersonal function of politeness, and how it is rendered in subtitling, while the final two studies (Chaume 2004a; Cuenca 2008) discuss DPs more closely in both subtitling and dubbing.

Hatim & Mason (2000) do not focus directly on DPs (even though there are examples of non-translated DPs in the examples), but on the wider area of the interpersonal function of politeness (Brown & Levinson 1987) in subtitling. They find that this function is underrepresented in subtitling and discuss the effects this may have. They also raise the issue of the special features of film dialogue in connection with subtitling. Their data consists of the cinema version of the French film *Un coeur en hiver* (Claude Sautet, 1992) and its English subtitles. One reason for choosing this particular film is that the "theme of the film is the establishment, maintenance and modification of personal relationships […]" (2000:435), making this film a good candidate for an analysis of interpersonal pragmatics. Their analysis

shows that the subtitles "unsurprisingly – and almost inevitably" (2000:438) present a completely different picture than the ST does.

The fact that interpersonal dynamics may be retrieved from characters' facial expressions, gestures, intonation, etc. in film dialogue, is brought up by Hatim & Mason. Although they agree with this claim to a certain extent, they say:

> […] if indicators of politeness in the target text are at variance with those suggested by the moving image, then a discordance is created which may need more processing time to resolve than the cinema audience has available to it. The problem is not so much that explicit markers of politeness are just absent from the translation; rather, that subtitling may create a substantially different interpersonal dynamics from that intended. (2000:438)

In sum, Hatim & Mason focus on what features are omitted in subtitling, determining that the aspect most often neglected is interpersonal politeness in various forms.

A similar study to that of Hatim & Mason's is Pavlović (2003). From analyses of the subtitling of the American TV series *ER*, she draws similar conclusions as Hatim & Mason. Pavlović finds that many indicators of politeness are lost in the subtitling process, and as Hatim & Mason she sees this loss as unfortunate but many times inevitable due to the wordiness of most politeness strategies. DPs (*well*, *okay*, *now*), indicators of informality and repetitions found in her material are never translated, even though these features may be quite short. However, Pavlović observes a tendency for certain politeness indicators, such as obliqueness and unfinished utterances (the latter indicated by three dots (...)) to be preserved.

Chaume (2004a) focuses on DPs in audiovisual translation. He examines the DPs *now*, *oh*, *you know*, (*you*) *see*, *look*, and *I mean* (with a focus on *now*) in three different Spanish translations of the American film *Pulp Fiction* (*Pulp Fiction* is also part of the corpus of the present study). He examines the written translation of the script, as well as the dubbed and subtitled film translations. His main aim is to see how the omission of DPs in the translation "affects the balance between interpersonal meaning and semantic meaning" (2004a:843). He puts emphasis on the pragmatic features of language and how important it is for a polysemiotic audiovisual text to be "coherent in the way ideas are linked and their relation to each other" (2004a:845). Chaume's study has features in common with the present one: e.g. the overall aim to study DPs in audiovisual translation; to a certain extent, the choice of DPs and material under investigation; and the aim to see how a non-translation of DPs may affect the balance between different kinds of DP functions. The reason for the choice of DPs in Chaume's study is the lack of Spanish correlates demonstrating the same pragmatic meaning as the English DPs. Chaume concludes that there is an omission of DPs in all three translation types, but that the exclusion is greatest in the subtitled version. He emphasises the fact that the loss of DPs in audiovisual translation "does not seriously affect the target text in terms of semantic meaning – whereas it does in terms of interpersonal meaning" (2004a:854).

In comparison to Chaume, Cuenca's (2008) study is more concentrated on DP functions in the ST than their rendering in the TT. She focuses on the extent to which a contrastive analysis of a DP can "help identify its meaning and functions" in the source language. Cuenca explores the DP *well* in the film *Four Weddings and a Funeral*, and the translations of *well* in the Catalan and Spanish dubbed versions. In her contrastive analysis, she finds that DP *well* is polysemous and that it has two main functions; a structural and a modal function (to be

further discussed in 5.2.1). From the analysis of *well*, Cuenca draws the conclusion that "*well* is translated by a wide range of possibilities according to different facets of its meaning" (2008:1376). The omission rate of translations of *well* is 46.4% and 25 % in the Catalan and Spanish dubbed versions of *Four Weddings and a Funeral*, respectively. Cuenca concludes, similar to Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen (2003) and Hatim & Mason (2000) that *well* with a structural (or textual) function is more often translated than *well* with a modal (or interpersonal) function. There is thus evidence in literary translation (Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen 2003) as well as in both subtitling (Hatim & Mason 2000; Pavlović 2003; Chaume 2004) and dubbing (Chaume 2004; Cuenca 2008) that interpersonal meaning is often lost in translation. Furthermore, most of the above studies on DPs in both literary and audiovisual translation conclude that, on the one hand, DPs are a great challenge for translators, but on the other hand, and in spite of these difficulties, translators often seem to find a variety of possible solutions to the translation of the multifunctional DPs. Many times, however, DPs are left untranslated. Non-translations of DPs are for various reasons more widespread in subtitling than in other forms of translation. The authors of the above mentioned studies bring up e.g. time and space constraints on subtitling as possible reasons for a non-translation of DPs and other semantically bleached feures (to be further discussed in 2.8, 3.4 and 9.4.3).

Below follows an account of the special environment of the DPs in the corpus of the present study, i.e. film dialogue.

2.7 Film dialogue and DPs

As we will see in chapter 3, subtitles almost always undergo reduction. An important point to keep in mind is that the original film soundtrack also undergoes reduction. Film dialogue is 'authentic' only to a certain extent: characters in films speak to each other as if they were real people, but in reality script writers "[construct] discourse for the sake of the effect it will have on its receivers" (Hatim & Mason 2000:434). The words in film scripts are thoroughly considered before finally used by actors, and alterations are made for various reasons throughout the film-making process, i.e. compared to a great deal of real conversation, "movie dialogue has a mission" (Lucey 1996:168). The unpredictability of uttered words, which is so noticeable in real life conversations, is most often not present in film conversations: "[b]ecause motion pictures are intensely focused, characters do not speak unless there is reason […]. Unlike real speech, movie dialog is seldom repetitive or vague (unless there is reason)" (Lucey 1996:167).

Just like most authentic spoken dialogue, the use of DPs in authentic conversation may be random, while their use in film dialogue is not arbitrary to the same extent. The overuse of DPs, which now and then is an element of authentic speech, does not exist in film dialogue unless there is reason for it to illustrate certain characteristics: "[u]nlike real life, movie dialogue is stripped of conversational chuff such as *ah*, *y'know*, *well* and *ummm*." (Lucey 1996:168). As a consequence of this, one may draw the conclusion that DPs in film dialogue are often there for a reason and do not to the same extent have the redundant quality they may

sometimes have in authentic language. Research shows that, because DPs are less arbitrarily used in film dialogue than in authentic dialogue, they are easier to define in the former than in the latter:

> [I]t appears that DMs[13] are easier to annotate in pre-planned dialogs, because such dialogs are less ambiguous than the natural ones. […] [E]ven if movie dialogs are made to reproduce the naturalness of naturally occurring dialogs, they are never as ambiguous, mainly because they only reflect the global communicative intention of one person (the author) (Zufferey & Popescu-Belis 2004: 66)

Defining DPs and classifying their functions is consequently less complicated in film dialogue than in authentic dialogue (even though it is far from easy to decipher DP functions in film dialogue either), hence the use of a film corpus for the analysis of DPs in the present study. Studying DPs in a corpus of film dialogue is an efficient way of approaching these elusive features. A great difference between film dialogue and authentic language is the fact that speakers in film dialogue usually try to be as comprehensible as possible for the viewer, while speakers of authentic language do not strive for transparency, but rather the opposite many times: "while drama uses words and actions to *portray* the character's thoughts and feelings, in real life, people often use their words to *disguise* what they really think and feel" (Wray 2008:174, italics in original). Generally, a film viewer acquires a great many clues on how the characters in a film are to be perceived, as the characters in a film are usually less complex and more predictable than real people. From these clues it is easier to identify various functions of DPs and other words. The corpus of the present study is thus an invaluable source for studying DPs (to be further discussed in 4.2.5).

2.8 DPs in subtitling guidelines

DPs are "one of the most elusive aspects of language" (Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen 2006:113) and this is probably one of the reasons for their omission in subtitles. Another possible reason for this omission is that DPs are semantically bleached, a quality which causes them to be perceived as redundant features of language: they are considered a frequent component of spoken language that does not have much significance in written text in general. Certain socio-cultural norms at play, perceiving DPs as a part of spoken language that does not generally enjoy a high status, view an (over)use of DPs as "bad language" (Kotsinas 2004). These norms in Swedish society to a large extent govern literary translation of DPs which in turn governs the subtitling of these features (for a further account of the norms governing subtitling, see 3.4.5).

In this section, a few extracts from various subtitling guidelines that bring up the translation of DPs will be discussed. The guidelines were used by most Swedish subtitlers at the time the subtitling of the films for the corpus of the present study was made.

---

[13] Discourse Markers.

Ivarsson & Carroll's (1998) influential work on subtitling is used by many subtitlers as a hands-on guide, and has influenced most professional subtitling guidelines in Sweden. Ivarsson & Carroll say, under the heading 'Ellipsis':

> Words whose main purpose is to keep the conversation ticking over ("well", "you know") […] can safely be omitted. But this does not mean to say that subtitlers should ignore those little words that often make all the difference or give the lie to a person's character. There can be a world of difference between "It's ridiculous", "It's just ridiculous" and "It's ridiculous, isn't it?" (Ivarsson & Carroll, 1998)

The above quote claims contradictorily that on the one hand DPs like *well* and *you know* can safely be omitted, but on the other hand words like focus particle *just* and question tag *isn't it* should not be ignored. Ivarsson & Carroll thus seem to discard DPs completely, whereas other words arbitrarily are considered to have more important functions and as a consequence should not be ignored. The quote from Ivarsson & Carroll is a much quoted excerpt in Swedish subtitler guidelines. The Swedish public service channel SVT states that the reduction of a source text is a must, giving no rules but some advice on how to treat English DPs in Swedish subtitling (my translation, square brackets added by me):

> There is usually no problem not translating words that only fill pauses (*well*, *you know*, etc) […]. However, one should not take away all those little words adding nuances to the language and characterizing people. There is a difference between 'Han är hemma' ['He is at home'], 'Han är ju hemma' ['He is at home, you know']', 'Han är väl hemma' ['He is at home, isn't he']. (SVT 2003)

Just as in Ivarsson & Carroll (1998), the SVT subtitling guidelines discuss DPs (*well* and *you know*) as unnecessary, while modal particles *ju* (which has functions very similar to functions of DP *you know*) and *väl* ('surely') are seen as "little words adding nuances to the language and characterising people" (SVT 2003).

Another subtitling guideline was produced by Subtitling International Sweden, Svensk Text AB, in 1990, and was still used by SDI media among others, in 2006 (Johansson 2006 p.c.). On the subject of reduction from English into Swedish, this guideline states that it is up to each translator to choose what is most important to communicate to the viewer, but they give some suggestions (my translation):

> As a rule, words that fill pauses, unnecessary repetitions [etc.] can be removed. However, one should not remove little words adding nuances to the language. (Subtitling International Sweden, 1990)

As is clear from the above two quotes from Swedish subtitling guidelines, they both quote Ivarsson & Carroll's excerpt more or less verbatim, here illustrating how influential Ivarsson & Carroll's view is on the subtitling of DPs, and other features whose meaning is semantically bleached. There seems to be a tendency in the subtitling guidelines to view DPs as "fillers" that can easily be removed in the subtitles. However, the two quotes from the guidelines reflect Ivarsson & Carroll's view that "those little words that often make all the difference or give the lie to a person's character" should not be ignored completely. The

question is which words simply "[keep] the conversation ticking over" and which words "make all the difference"?

It is clear that neither Ivarsson & Carroll nor the two subtitling guidelines take the multifunctionality of DPs into consideration, but for some reason they distinguish DP functions from the functions of focus particles, modal particles, question tags, etc. Had the multifunctionality been taken into consideration, connections could have been found between the functions of DPs and the functions of other features. The present study wants to show that DPs *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like* (in Ivarsson & Carroll (1998) as well as in the subtitling guidelines, focus is on *well* and *you know*) may share functions with focus particles, modal particles, question tags, etc. When allowing for the multifunctionality of DPs, and the fact that DP functions may overlap with functions of other features in language, the translation of both words that keep the conversation ticking over and words adding something to speaker characteristics can be facilitated.

2.9 Summary

In this chapter, I have tried to define discourse particles (DPs), and to describe their special nature, as well as examine them within a film translation perspective. One important feature of DPs is the fact that they are not analysable in isolation, but they all need to be seen in the linguistic and socio-cultural context which they are in. Another important characteristic of these words is that they are a result of pragmaticalisation processes, i.e. all DPs have developed from homonymous uses with propositional content.

There are almost as many labels of these features as people studying them. I have chosen to use the term *discourse particle* in the present study mainly because this is a commonly used term in previous as well as contemporary studies. In my definition of DPs, I do not include interjections, focus particles or question tags, nor DPs that are more commonly used in written language, such as *however*, *anyway*, etc.

An important aspect of DPs is their multifunctionality. In the present study, I draw on Brinton's (1996) classifications of DP functions, which is influenced by the Hallidayan (1994) modes of functions. Brinton's study, as well as the present one, classifies DPs into textual and interpersonal functions, where the textual functions are concerned with the organisation of discourse, and the interpersonal functions are concerned with (maintaining) relationships between speakers. The line drawn between these two functions is to be seen as a continuum more than a static boundary. Each occurrence of *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like* in the corpus is classified as having a more salient textual or interpersonal function in each context in question. The classifications for each DP are based on various parameters, including e.g. intonation, use of pauses, and position of the DP in the discourse (to be further discussed in 4.3.1). The textual functions include frame-markers (**FRAME**), clarification-markers (**CLAR**), approximation markers (**APPROX**), and repair-markers (**REP**), whereas the interpersonal functions include insufficiency-markers (**INS**), solidarity-markers (**SOL**), elaboration-markers (**ELAB**), rapport-building markers (**RAPP**), and face threat mitigating markers (**MIT**).

In addition to the above division of the DPs into a continuum of textual and interpersonal functions, a further cross-theoretical framework is utilised in order to facilitate an analysis of the DPs in the ST. This framework includes three theories, i.e. Relevance theory (Sperber & Wilson 1986), Coherence-based theory (Schiffrin 1987), and Politeness theory (Brown & Levinson 1986), and is used to make an analysis of as many facets as possible of each DP feasible.

Due to their multifunctionality, DPs are not easy to translate directly from one language into another. In this chapter, I have briefly discussed formal and dynamic equivalence (Nida 1964) as a background to a discussion of the translation of DPs in literary translation as well as in subtitling. I have drawn the conclusion that DPs are best translated by a dynamic equivalence approach, as most DPs do not have clear correspondences in different languages. Previous studies on audiovisual translation (e.g. Gottlieb 1997; Chaume 2004) have concluded that the main task of this form of translation can only ever be to generate a similar effect on the target language audience as the ST did on the source language audience, i.e. aspiring for dynamic equivalence between ST and TT is preferred to seeking formal equivalence.

The chapter also discussed DPs in connection to film dialogue. One conclusion drawn was that DPs are more often included in film dialogue for a reason than they are in authentic dialogue. The unpredictability of authentic conversation is not present in film dialogue, and DPs are most often not over-used in films (only if there is reason to over-use them to show special characteristics etc.). DPs in film dialogue reflect character traits more clearly than DPs in authentic conversation, as they are most often not randomly included in film dialogue. Due to the less arbitrary use of DPs in film dialogue, as well as to the fact that films contain all the clues needed for a DP analysis, e.g. intonation of the DP, body language of the speaker, socio-cultural context of the speaker, etc. (to be further discussed in 4.3.1), analysing DPs in film dialogue is less complex than analysing DPs in authentic conversation. The corpus used for the present study can thus facilitate an analysis of DPs that is many times not possible in corpora of authentic dialogue.

The final aspect of DPs discussed in the chapter was the treatment of DPs in Swedish subtitling guidelines. The stigma put on DPs was briefly discussed in connection with various norms governing both literary translation and subtitling in Sweden today. Two subtitling guidelines were examined in relation to their treatment of DPs: one guideline was used by the public service television channel SVT at the time the subtitling of the films relevant for the present study was made, and the other was produced by Subtitling International Sweden, and used by the commercial TV channels as well as agencies subtitling for cinema and DVD at the time the subtitling of the films relevant for the present study was made. It is clear that both guidelines rely heavily on Ivarsson & Carroll's (1998) influential work on subtitling. Ivarsson & Carroll, as well as the two subtitling guidelines, give a contradictory view of how the subtitling of DPs should be approached. The multifunctionality of DPs is not considered in Ivarsson & Carroll (1998) or in the two guidelines.

3 Subtitling

3.1 Introduction

According to Catford (1965), subtitling, due to its polysemiotic nature and distinction from literary translation, is not feasible. He says: "[t]ranslation between media is impossible (i.e. one cannot "translate" from the spoken to the written form of a text or vice versa)." (1965:53). For a long time, subtitling was not seen as real translation (Newmark 1981, Titford 1982). Marleau even goes as far as calling subtitling "a necessary evil" (1982:1). Translation scholars did not consider subtitling to be an important part of translation studies, or indeed a part at all.

One reason for not considering subtitling as a type of translation, or as worth studying at all, may be its constrained character. Due to a number of technical constraints (cf. 3.4), subtitling inevitably entails a loss of ST features. However, constraints per se are not a characteristic of subtitling only. All forms of translation are constrained to a certain point: "[…] different forms of translation are constrained in different ways and by different factors" (Zabalbeascoa 1997:330).

Today, most translation theories and scholars view the translatability of a film as quite unproblematic, and subtitling, in spite of its many difficulties and constraints, as something well worth both practising and studying. Before the 1990s, subtitling was not a widely studied area. Over the last twenty to thirty years there has been a change, however, and today there seems to be a consensus that subtitling, dubbing, voice-over and other types of audiovisual translation are all to be included under the umbrella term *Translation Studies*.

I will not explore translation studies theories to a great extent in the present study. However, as subtitling is part of the field of audiovisual translation (to be discussed in 3.2, below), which is "an autonomous field within the broader domain of Translation Studies" (Diaz Cintas 2009b:5), some of the translation studies theories and concepts relevant for the present study will be briefly discussed below as a background for subsequent discussions. These theories include formal and dynamic equivalence, and the sociocultural context of the TT, within which skopos theory and polysystem theory will be mainly considered.

3.1.1 Formal and dynamic equivalence

Pragmatic meaning can be difficult to translate. A word or expression may have one function in a certain language or culture that the same/similar word or expression does not have in another language or culture. Skuggevik (2009:208) explains this visibly with an imagined example from a British film subtitled into Norwegian. In the example, a coal miner "exhausted after a terrible ordeal down a burning mine shaft exclaims: 'I think I need a cup of tea'." (ibid.). The miner's statement, Skuggevik says, seems clear and referential at first glance: the miner wants to drink a cup of tea, and that is all. However, Skuggevik argues that the statement 'I think I need a cup of tea', expressed in this special situation and in the British source language (SL) culture, is more an expression of the speaker's feelings than of his

actual need for a hot beverage, and is greatly associated with his need for comfort, safety and normality. Skuggevik's suggestion for a Norwegian translation remaining within the emotive sphere of the original statement is the equivalent of the English 'I need something soothing/relaxing to drink'.

When translating statements such as the above, or other words with pragmatic meaning, such as DPs, a word-for-word translation is most often not enough. The translator has to take into consideration the fact that the translation must function adequately in the target language culture. Ideally, the target language phrasing will then have the same or similar effect on the target culture audience as the original phrasing had on the ST audience (it is not clear, however, how this effect can or should be measured). This is especially central in subtitling, due to its constrained form and constant need for a reformulation of the ST message (cf. 2.6).

One translation studies concept dealing with linguistic meaning in source language and target language cultures, and the fact that different text types need different forms of translation, is Nida's (1964) division into *formal* and *dynamic* equivalence. The difference between formal and dynamic equivalence can be described as follows: formal equivalence "focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content" (1964:159), i.e. it is focused on the source language, unlike dynamic equivalence which is based upon "the principle of equivalent effect" (ibid.), i.e. it is more focused on the target language version.[14] Put in more basic terms, a translation that is formally equivalent to an ST is essentially a literal translation of this text, whereas a translation that is dynamically equivalent to an ST is a more free form of translation, where the message of the ST is more important to transmit than a word-for-word account of the ST. Skuggevik's translation choice 'I need something soothing/relaxing to drink' is dynamically equivalent to 'I think I need a cup of tea' in the context of the example given above. Another example of a dynamically equivalent translation, here used as the subtitling of an utterance including *well*, is example (13) above, repeated as (14), below.

(14)   **ST:**
Scotty: are you calling Stan?
Jerry: │ │ **well ↑** │ I'm │ │ I'm going to bed now
                              (*FARGO* 01.09.52)
         TT:
Jag ska **nog** lägga mig nu.
[I'm **probably** going to bed now.]

A Swedish more formally equivalent translation of *well I'm I'm going to bed now* in example (14), could be *Tja jag jag går och lägger mig nu* ('Well I I am going to bed now'). There is nothing wrong as such with this formally equivalent translation, but the more dynamically equivalent *Jag ska nog lägga mig nu* ('I'm probably[15] going to bed now') gives the viewer a more implicit and nuanced picture of the emotive state of the speaker, and possibly triggers an experience of the statement that is closer to what the ST audience had. DPs are known for

---

[14] For a more in depth account of equivalence in translation studies, see Baker (2005:100-104).
[15] *Probably* is a literal backtranslation of *nog* in the context of example (14) more than an idiomatically correct backtranslation (cf. 4.3.2 for a short discussion on the backtranslations used in the present study).

being language specific to a large extent, and aiming for a dynamically equivalent translation of DPs is often the best solution.

On the subject of subtitling and equivalence, Gottlieb says that "a translation can never be a clone of the original" (1997:88). He further states that equivalence is not possible in audiovisual translation, providing a more realistic alternative:

> In trying to get the message through to the target audience, across language and culture barriers, a more realistic ideal would be achieving the same effect on the audience as the one the original audience experienced; the same text they cannot get. (Gottlieb 1997:89)

Gottlieb draws on Nida's (1964) notion of formal and dynamic equivalence, and concludes that formal equivalence is not possible to achieve in subtitling, whereas dynamic equivalence may be possible. Chaume argues in a similar manner as he says that "the main function of audiovisual translation is to produce a similar effect on the target culture audience as the source text produced on the source culture audience" (2004a:844). What Gottlieb's "same effect" or Chaume's "similar effect" actually entail is not completely clear, however.

Formal and dynamic equivalence will be discussed further in later chapters, and in connection with examples from the corpus.

3.1.2 The sociocultural context of the TT

Within translation studies at large, over the last fifty years or so there has been a move away from prescriptive studies to more descriptive ones. With this change, ways of considering translation in a wider sociocultural perspective, and of focusing on the function of the TT in its target culture context more than on the ST, have evolved.

One theory concerned with the purpose of the TT is skopos theory (Reiss &Vermeer 1984). In skopos theory, assessing what the function of the TT will be in the target culture, determines which translation strategies are to be used to make a functionally adequate translation. Skopos theory will not be discussed further in the present study, but is still worth mentioning as an example of the overall tendency of translation studies to focus more on the TT and its context than on the ST alone.

One aspect of translation studies that is connected to skopos theory, and that will be discussed further in the thesis (cf. 3.4.5, for instance,) is translation norms (e.g. Toury 1995; Chesterman 1997). Norms can be seen as the general values and ideas shared by a society at a certain point in time; what is accepted and what is not accepted in that society. Norms form a graded continuum in between the two extremes absolute rules on the one hand, and idiosyncrasies, on the other. Translators are (most often subconsciously) influenced by various sociocultural norms in a target culture. According to Toury (1995:53-69), these norms concern the overall translation strategy and the choice of text (genres) to be translated (preliminary norms), as well as the translator's choice to adhere primarily to the ST or to the target culture (initial norms), in addition to more specific choices made during the act of translation (operational norms). When using translation norms as a starting point for

translation analysis, it is the position of a translation within the social system of the target culture that is mainly under study.

Another translation studies theory, also taking the target culture into account, and more specifically the various cultural, social, and historical systems that the TT is part of, is polysystem theory (Even-Zohar 1978/2000). Polysystem theory is concerned with the fact that no translation should be seen in isolation, but within the web of target culture systems of which it is part. As with skopos theory and the study of translation norms, it is thus the context of the translation that is in focus in polysystem theory. There has been some criticism of polysystem theory (e.g. Gentzler 1993:121-123), emphasising among other things the lack of empirical study behind the theory, and the weakness of the theory in its focus on the abstract model rather than the real constraints put on TTs and translators. However, polysystem theory has had a profound influence on translation studies and on the move from a prescriptive to a more descriptive view of a translation within its particular contexts (Munday 2001:111), and is employed in studies on audiovisual translation (e.g. Karamitroglou 2000, to be discussed in 3.4.5).

3.2 Audiovisual translation: an overview

Audiovisual translation (AVT) is an umbrella term for the transfer taking place between a ST and a TT through a range of simultaneous channels such as sound, image and writing (examples being subtitling, dubbing, voice-over, etc). Two other common labels used, which are nearly synonymous to AVT, are *(multi)media translation* and *screen translation*. The former of these terms is perhaps the broadest one but mainly used for computer games, computer software and web sites, and thus not of interest for the present study. The latter, *screen translation*, includes all translations being shown on screens, i.e. translations for the television screen, cinema screen and computer screen alike. *Audiovisual translation* will be the term used in the present study, mainly due to the fact that this label seems to be the most widely applied today for this type of translation. Numerous articles, conferences, etc., use *audiovisual translation* as the umbrella term encompassing both interlingual and intralingual forms of subtitling, as well as dubbing, voice-over, etc.

The three most widely used forms of AVT are subtitling, dubbing, and voice-over. These three modes of AVT can be either *intralingual* (i.e. the transfer occurs within one and the same language) or *interlingual* (i.e. the transfer occurs between two different languages). Whenever the term *subtitling* is used in the present study, it refers to *interlingual subtitling*. Intralingual subtitling will be discussed briefly in 3.2.3. Before examining subtitling further, (cf. 3.3) a short account of dubbing and voice-over will be given.

3.2.1 Dubbing

In (interlingual) dubbing, the ST soundtrack is substituted for a TT soundtrack. There is thus a transfer from one language to another, but the same mode of communication, i.e. spoken language, is used. Schröter (2005:7) defines dubbing as:

the replacement of the original dialogues in filmic media by dialogues in
another language that are scripted and spoken so as to correspond to the
visual elements of the film, most notably the lip movements of the person on
screen.

The purpose of dubbing is to give the viewer the impression that the new, translated dialogue is in fact uttered by the actors on screen. To a person raised in a subtitling country, this may seem awkward, but people in dubbing countries are used to famous American actors speaking German, Italian, etc., and prefer this type of translation over subtitling.

Countries where dubbing is used extensively in Europe are e.g. Germany, France, Italy, and Spain, and outside of Europe e.g. Latin America, Québec, China, and Japan (Schröter 2005:9). In Scandinavia, dubbing is almost only used for children's films and cartoons (the same is true for voice-over as we will see in 3.2.2, below). The rest of the translated films shown on cinema, DVD and TV, as well as all TV series, shows, etc. broadcast in Scandinavia, are subtitled.

Historically, the reasons behind some European countries' choice of dubbing over subtitling had to do with a country's size and economy as well as with a certain extent of nationalism and protectionism rising in Europe in the 1930s and 1940s. As far as the former reason is concerned, because the cost of casting dubbing actors makes dubbing quite expensive (figures vary from ten to fifteen times the cost of subtitling (Pedersen 2007:33)), only countries with markets large enough to afford dubbing used this as a translation method. As far as the latter historical reason is concerned, nationalism in the 1930s and 1940s, illustrated by extremes such as Fascism in Italy and Spain, and Nazism in Germany, established legislation "sanctioning dubbing and forbidding or limiting subtitling" (Ivarsson & Carroll 1998:10), and on account of this, "[t]hese countries have stayed strongholds of dubbing until today" (Ivarsson & Carroll 1998:11).

A further reason for keeping the mode of dubbing in these countries, and a reason for many supporters of dubbing to choose this type of AVT over subtitling is the fact that a dubbed version may be easier to comprehend than a subtitled one, in particular for viewers with poor knowledge of the ST language, or viewers with reduced eyesight. Others prefer dubbing over subtitling simply because they find subtitles disruptive and experience that they are missing out on what is going on on the screen as they are forced to move their eyes between the subtitles and the moving image. A more linguistically interesting reason for choosing dubbing over subtitling is the minimal reduction possible in this form of AVT: compared to subtitling, the reduction when transferring a ST to a TT via dubbing, is minute (Schröter 2005:53).

Dubbing experiences various constraints which are different from the constraints on subtitling, but just as significant. The most noteworthy constraint on dubbing is to achieve synchronisation between the lip movements of the characters on screen with the audio of the dubbing. This so called lip-synch, together with other types of synchrony (such as harmonising the duration of the dubbed version with the duration of the original utterance, and matching the dubbed voice with the body movements of the character on screen) are specific for dubbing (Chaume 2004b:41).

3.2.2 Voice-over

Voice-over is the third most common form of AVT (after subtitling and dubbing). It is the technique of superimposing a spoken translation (delivered by speakers/actors) on the original soundtrack. The original is audible but toned down so that the read-out translation can be heard. In general, the viewer gets a few seconds of the original soundtrack before and after the voice-over.

This is a less expensive form of AVT than dubbing, but more expensive than subtitling. Today, voice-over is mostly used for TV translation of foreign languages in Eastern Europe, e.g. in Russia and Poland (Pedersen 2007:34). In Scandinavia, it is essentially used for children's programmes (sometimes a 'third-person voice over' is used for children's programmes, i.e. the speaker uses the third person when referring to the speakers in the original, rather than using the first person).

The constraints on voice-over are not as great as those on subtitling or dubbing: there is no need for lip-synchronisation and there is room for quite a free and extensive translation.

3.2.3 Intralingual subtitling

While interlingual subtitling involves the translation of a spoken soundtrack in one language into a written version in another language, intralingual subtitling is not concerned with translation but with the rendering of the spoken soundtrack in one language into the written version in the same language. Intralingual subtitling is thus concerned with one language only. This form of subtitling is primarily used for the deaf and hard of hearing viewers, who can generally choose whether they want to read the subtitles or not (as a teletext option for TV, or as an option on a DVD). When the subtitles are not automatically part of the film or programme but a viewer can turn it on and off as s/he pleases, it is referred to as *closed captions*. Subtitles which cannot be turned on and off are called *open captions*. Below follows a short exploration of two studies on intralingual translation of interest for the present study, namely de Linde & Kay (1999) and Sahlin (2001).

de Linde & Kay (1999), in their study on intralingual subtitling and hard-of-hearing viewers, briefly bring up the notion of DPs in (intralingual) subtitling (the study examines above all the reading behaviour of viewers by means of eye-movement analyses of both deaf and hearing people). They discuss the relationship between text, image, and subtitle, and the final message communicated through these three channels collectively. Focus is on the transfer between speech and writing in both intra – and interlingual subtitling, and the difficulties this transfer inflicts on a subtitler "in an attempt to respect the features of both spoken and written modes" (1999:4). DPs are viewed as a feature of spoken language reflecting a speaker's characteristics. de Linde & Kay argue that features like these may seem redundant at an initial stage, but can actually be relevant for a viewer's experience of a film:

> […] there are many elements of speech which at first sight appear superfluous and consequently omittable when converted into written form, for example *actually*, *well*, *you know*, etc, but these may in fact be integral to a character's style of spoken discourse. (de Linde & Kay 1999: 4)

Sahlin's (2001) study on intralingual subtitling for the hard of hearing in Sweden (with a corpus made up of about 60 hours of TV programmes aired on the public service channels SVT1 and SVT2) discusses DPs and related features in a similar manner to de Linde & Kay. Sahlin mentions Swedish DPs, modal particles and adverbials such as *alltså*, *ju*, *väl*, *liksom* and *va*, arguing that these may be characteristic of a speaker's way of speaking. As they are almost always omitted in her material, so are the signals of character identification (Sahlin 2001:643). She further states that omission of words or expressions like these may "from the perspective of the playwright and/or director, lead to a loss of an intentionally communicated signal" (2001:644, my translation). Sahlin concludes that an omission of DPs, and features with similar (both textual and interpersonal) functions, in intralingual subtitling, may give a viewer of a subtitled programme/film a changed impression of the character using these types of words. Sahlin's study is the first comprehensive work on (intralingual) subtitling performed in Sweden, incorporating translation studies and translation theory into subtitling research. Earlier Swedish studies (e.g. Ivarsson 1992) were focused on technical aspects of subtitling and/or surveys of audience behaviour.

3.2.4 Live subtitling

Live subtitling is a special type of subtitling, most often used for intralingual subtitling and for live TV broadcasts such as political debates or sport events. Live subtitling can be very stressful for translators because it is always carried out in realtime. There are different ways of performing live subtitling. The most common method used today is respeaking, which can be seen as a form of simultaneous interpreting. When respeaking, a translator repeats (a condensed version of) words spoken on screen, using voice recognition software that identifies the translator's spoken words and transfers it onto the television screen as subtitles. Another way of performing live subtitling is to use special keyboards, created especially for the typing speed needed in this form of language transfer.

3.2.5 Audio description

Audio description is to the blind and visually impaired what intralingual subtitling is for the hard of hearing. Simply put, in audio description, a speaker describes in quite some detail what is going on on the screen. The narrator describes the whole film as if s/he were telling a story. Body movement and facial expressions of the characters are explained, and signs etc. shown on screen are read out loud. Because audio description is intralingual, the dialogue is usually left untouched, leaving the description for natural pauses in the original soundtrack as far as this is possible. Audio description is not as common as intralingual subtitling for the deaf and hard of hearing, but an increased interest in this type of language transfer causes more and more films to be audio described.

3.3 Towards a definition of subtitling

In this section, an attempt will be made to define subtitling. First, a short introduction is given to how subtitling came about in the beginning of the 20th century[16], and next, certain characteristics of subtitling will be considered.

3.3.1 The introduction of subtitling into cinema and television

Subtitles have existed in different forms as part of films ever since the era of silent movies. In those days (at the beginning of the 20th century) they consisted of descriptive or commentary cardboard signs inserted in films. We now refer to these as *intertitles*. The term *subtitles* was later used because of the similarity between the use of film subtitles and newspaper or book subtitles (Ivarsson & Carroll 1998:9).

The first sound movie to be shown in cinemas was *The Jazz Singer* from 1927. This film was distributed to countries where English was not spoken and hence this was also the first film to be subtitled. The same subtitling technique was used in 1938 for the first film subtitled for TV, *Der Student von Prag* from 1935, aired on BBC with English subtitles (Gottlieb 1994:21). The technique used for subtitles in the cinema was not transferable to television, however, since the contrast of a television screen differs largely from that of a cinema screen (Ivarsson & Carroll 1998:20). The technique had to be further refined and these days subtitles are used in cinema and television as well as on DVDs.

Today, (interlingual) subtitling is used in many countries, including the Scandinavian countries, Greece, Ireland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Wales, parts of Belgium (Gambier 1996:9), the Faroe Islands, Slovenia, and Croatia (Gottlieb 1997:310).

3.3.2 Subtitling characteristics

Subtitling is a special form of translation working under various constraints (cf. 3.4.1) and showing certain characteristics that to a large degree determine its appearance. One of the most significant features of subtitling is its fleeting character: the subtitles are there on the screen one moment and gone the next. Another unique trait of this type of translation is the fact that it is "not ever read in isolation from image and sound" (Pelsmaekers 2002:264), but that the ST is always present simultaneously with the TT, and that the subtitles thus are part of a polysemiotic whole created by image, sound and translation.

Karamitroglou (2000:5) defines (interlingual) subtitling as follows:

> [Subtitling is] the translation of the spoken (or written) source text of an audiovisual product into a written target text which is added onto the images of the original product, usually at the bottom of the screen.

---

[16] For a much more extensive account of the history of subtitling as well as its technical development, see e.g. Gottlieb (1994: 13-28; 1997:49-68) and Ivarsson & Carroll (1998:9-32).

In order to fully understand what subtitling is, Karamitroglou's quote above will be broken down into smaller, more accessible segments and considered one by one.

Firstly, the line "subtitling is the translation of a spoken (or written) source text" refers to the fact that a subtitle is most often a translation of the spoken discourse in a film, TV programme, etc. Subtitling does not only function as a translation of the spoken word, however, but also of written text being part of a filmic scene, e.g. signs or letters, as well as captions inserted onto the screen, e.g. prologues or finales. Most films include written language in this way, although it is most often not used extensively. Example (15) below, shows the text of a birthday card (not read out loud by the character, but visible for the viewer as a hand-written card) in *Nurse Betty*, and its (SVT) subtitles, while example (16) shows a part of the inserted final caption of *Legally Blonde*, and its (SVT+DVD) subtitles:

(15)   ST: For Our Lovely
        Granddaughter On her Birthday (*BETTY* 00.10.39)

       SVT: Till vårt kära barnbarn
          på födelsedagen
          [To our dear grandchild
          on her birthday]

(16)   ST: Vivian dumped Warner.
        She and Elle are now best friends. (*BLONDE* 01.27.05)

       SVT+DVD:Vivian dumpade Warner.
          Hon och Elle är bästisar.
          [Vivian dumped Warner.
           She and Elle are best friends.]

Subtitling is thus the written translation of the spoken or written ST. How, then, should we define the ST itself? It is usually the soundtrack of a film and not the pre-written script that subtitlers translate. On rare occasions, however, subtitlers only have access to the script of a film and not the actual sound and/or image when they translate[17]. In connection with this, the aspect of pivot translations should be mentioned. A pivot translation is "a translation from which other translations are made, rather than making these translations directly from the ST" (Pedersen 2007:41). This means that a subtitle may in fact not be a translation of the soundtrack of a film, but of a previously made translation of that film. To give an example, subtitles in a film aired on Danish TV may have as their model the subtitles of the same film aired on Swedish TV. Translating this way may cause a decrease in quality as the second generation subtitler (i.e. a subtitler translating once again a film translated by the first generation subtitler) may be influenced by the first generation TT to the extent of using false friends etc. According to Pedersen (2007:232), as it reduces the time and effort of the subtitling production at length, there is generally no special incentive for a second generation subtitler not to use the TT of the first generation subtitler. In Scandinavia, Sweden is generally the source of the first generation translations (Pedersen 2007:233), so the case of pivot

---

[17] To my knowledge, the subtitlers translating the films included in the corpus of the present study all had access to the soundtrack and image of the films.

translations is not of great importance for the subtitling in the films of concern for the present study.

The next part of Karamitroglou's quote above mentions the fact that subtitling is a translation of an audiovisual product. In the present study, "audiovisual product" refers to the polysemiotic medium of films. This entails the sound (audio) and the image (visual) of a film, and the fact that both sound and image are accessible to the viewer simultaneously with the subtitles. The sound does not consist of dialogue alone but of all sorts of sounds such as doors slamming, guns going off, and cars honking, as well as a variety of more or less verbal features like grunts, burps, etc. However, the most noteworthy aspect of the audio of a film, apart from the dialogue, is probably its background music, which can set the mood of a scene and guide a viewer towards a certain interpretation of that scene. At a more linguistic level, the intonation and use of pauses in characters' language are there for the viewer to hear. The access to all these sounds influences any viewer's and translator's conception of a film. The same is true for the visual part of a film, which involves numerous features important for the understanding and reading of a film and its plot. Had we only had access to the original sound of a film, we probably would not understand much of it (hence audio description, cf. 3.2.5). The visual part of a movie includes, among numerous other things, the characters' body movements and facial expressions, which are fundamental for a more profound understanding of the characters' dialogues, and of both textual and interpersonal meanings behind their words.

In the quote above, Karamitroglou next refers to the fact that the TT is written, as opposed to e.g. dubbing, where the TT is spoken. This entails a "semiotic switch from the spoken to the written word" (Pedersen 2007:165) and often a use of more formal language in the subtitles. The nature of the written language in subtitles differs somewhat between subtitling countries. Some prefer a more formal written language in the subtitles, while others use a mixture of formal written features and informal ones[18]. This possibly also depends on the formality of the product being subtitled: the subtitle language of a documentary on the war in Iraq would most likely be more formal than the subtitle language of a comedy show. Moreover, this difference in formality is applicable to the diversity in language between various film genres (cf. 4.2.4). A further account of the shift in mode from speech to writing in subtitling is provided in 3.4.1, below.

The next part of the quote above states that the written translation "is added onto the images of the original product". The fact that the subtitles coincide with what is taking place audiovisually on screen may, as was mentioned in 3.2.1 above, be disruptive for viewers as they must absorb the whole polysemiotic experience of listening to the dialogue (and additional sounds of a film) and watching everything taking place on the screen at the same time as reading the subtitles. For most viewers in subtitling countries this is not so difficult, mainly because they are used to subtitling and they have a fairly good knowledge of the ST language, which is most often English (Commission of the European Communities 2007). However, to people with poor eyesight or a limited knowledge of the ST language, this can be a problem. This is one of the reasons why subtitles are condensed as much as they are (cf. 3.4, below for a further discussion on the constraints on subtitling).

---

[18] According to Pedersen (2007:165), the language in Swedish subtitling is less formal than in Danish subtitling.

The final part of Karamitroglou's quote says that subtitles usually are inserted at the bottom of the screen. This is undeniably most often the case. However, certain Asian countries (Nornes 1999) place the subtitles at the left or right on the screen, from top to bottom. In Japan as early as in the 1930s, subtitles were sometimes placed on the screen in accordance with the composition of the photography: when a character on the left spoke, the subtitles appeared on the right, and vice versa (Nornes 1999:27).

Gottlieb has listed what he finds are the most salient characteristics of subtitling, with a focus on its semiotic traits in contrast to other forms of translation. He defines (inter/intralingual) subtitling as:

A. **Prepared** communication
B. using **written** language
C. acting as an **additive**
D. and **synchronous** semiotic channel,
E. and as part of a **transient**
F. and **polysemiotic** text
(Gottlieb 2001:15, emphasis in the original)

Gottlieb's list of characteristics is worth discussing here as a supplement to Karamitroglou's definition above. A-F contrasts subtitling to other forms of translation. In A, **prepared** communication refers to the fact that subtitling is different from e.g. simultaneous interpreting in that a subtitler does not need to make real-time translation decisions (cf. live subtitling in 3.2.4, however). B compares the **written** form of subtitling with the spoken type of dubbing and voice-over. In C, the issue of subtitling acting as an **additive** is brought up. This means that subtitling adds information to the screen whereas dubbing substitutes one semiotic channel (the spoken soundtrack) with another channel (the spoken translation). The additive nature of subtitles provides the target audience of a subtitled film or TV programme, contrary to the target audience of e.g. literary translation and dubbing, with constant access to the ST. This influences the translation process in subtitling: a subtitler has to take into consideration the fact that a target audience (depending on the viewers' knowledge of the source language) has access to the ST. Sometimes the additive character of subtitling presents this form of translation with a low status. Because it does not have a life on its own such as literary translation or dubbing, subtitling is sometimes viewed as a mere supplement to the other semiotic channels on screen (image and sound).

Returning to Gottlieb's list above, D refers to subtitling as a **synchronous** semiotic channel, requiring timing between the ST utterances and the subtitles. However, the exactness of the timing is not as central in subtitling as it is in dubbing. Conversely, this form of timing is not an issue in e.g. literary translation. In E, Gottlieb mentions the **transient** character of subtitling, which is not an issue in e.g. literary translation either. Subtitles are on the screen for a few seconds only (cf. 3.4.2), and the viewer cannot return to the subtitles if s/he has missed something (this is true for TV and cinema subtitling, but in DVD subtitling, it is possible for the viewer to go back and read a subtitle again). Finally, F brings up the **polysemiotic** quality of subtitling. According to Gottlieb, "[t]he term 'polysemiotic' refers to

45

the presence of two or more parallel channels of discourse constituting the text in question" (2004:227). Unlike literary translation, subtitling is part of a polysemiotic environment on screen where it co-occurs with both sound and image. Above all, (interlingual) subtitling is concerned with the translation of the dialogue, but it is also influenced by other forms of sounds and images.

3.4 The nature of subtitling

It should be clear from the above characterisation of subtitling that this is indeed a special form of translation. A great deal of its peculiarities depends on the unavoidable technical constraints put on subtitling. These constraints, as well as additional factors influencing the final subtitling product, such as norms governing subtitling, and the varying working conditions of subtitlers, are further discussed below.

Hatim & Mason mention four kinds of constraints on subtitling, and moreover difficulties for a subtitler (1997:78), repeated below in an abbreviated version.

- The shift in mode from speech to writing
- Physical constraints of space and time
- The reduction of the ST as a consequence of the latter point.
- The requirement of matching the visual image

The four kinds of constraints on subtitling suggested by Hatim & Mason will be discussed below in the order they are presented in the list above (the second and third points are combined under 3.4.2).

3.4.1 A shift in mode from speech to writing

The shift in mode from speech to writing is an important constraint on subtitling. This has been discussed by Gottlieb (1997) who introduced the term *diagonal translation* to illustrate the transition from spoken dialogue to written subtitles in interlingual subtitling. The term *diagonal translation* suggests that the subtitler of interlingual subtitling translates diagonally (as opposed to intralingual subtitling where the subtitler translates vertically), i.e. both (i) from one language into another and (ii) from one channel into another, i.e. from spoken to written language. The diagonal feature provides a kind of two-dimensional translation. It is this two-dimensional feature of subtitling that Catford (1965) thought impossible (cf. 3.1). Gottlieb raises the problem of the "graphemic subtitles [to] correspond with the phonemic dialog that the subtitles should double" (1997:112). The fact that subtitlers must translate both from one language to another and from one mode (the typically informal spoken language) to another (the typically more rigid written language) may cause considerable difficulties when subtitling. It is, however, necessary to make the distinction between spoken and written language when subtitling so as not to cause the audience to be "taken aback by reading the oddities of spoken discourse" (Gottlieb 1997:113). The question is how strictly a subtitle

should follow the rules and norms of written language and whether it is possible to clearly draw a line between the spoken and written features of a language. There is an ongoing discussion on this subject in the area of subtitling research. According to Gambier "a certain sanctity [is] attached to written discourse in our culture" (1994:280), which makes it impossible to use some spoken features in subtitles. The norm is clearly that subtitles should contain a more formal language than the ST. Kovačič is one of many researchers being critical of norms "that make most subtitlers choose solutions typical of written texts, even when a more oral style would be a feasible alternative" (1993:107). Suggestions have been made to make the language in subtitles less rigid and even include features such as smileys, illustrating the mood of characters etc. (Gambier, p.c. 2005). This is further discussed in 3.4.3 below.

3.4.2 Reduction as a consequence of space and time constraints

The second and third points in Hatim & Mason's list of constraints, above, can be viewed jointly, since the third is a consequence of the second. One of the most apparent particularities of subtitling is the time and space constraints under which it works. A two-line TV subtitle is allowed a maximum of six seconds on screen, and there is room for only forty characters per subtitle line (Ivarsson & Carroll 1998:53, 65). These constraints are different for different media as we will see below (3.4.4), but all media experience these constraints and they are a prerequisite for all kinds of subtitling. A word-for-word translation of a source text soundtrack would rarely physically fit into the two lines at the bottom of a TV or cinema screen and is thus in most cases not considered a solution. The example below, taken from *Pulp Fiction*, illustrates the physical appearance of a source text utterance and its corresponding subtitle. There are 35 words and 162 characters in the ST utterance; compared to 16 words and 76 characters in the corresponding subtitles (the subtitles are identical in all four TT versions).

(17)   Vince: all right well you can walk into a movie theatre in Amsterdam and buy a beer and I
        don't mean just like you know in a paper cup I'm talking about a glass of beer
                                                                          (*PULP* 00.07.38)

Cinema+DVD+SVT+TV4
Man dricker öl på bio i Amsterdam.
[You drink beer at the cinema in Amsterdam.]
Och inte i en pappersmugg,
utan i ett glas.
[An not in a paper mug,
but in a glass.]

As is clear from the example, the dialogue of films often has to be condensed when converted into a subtitle. Translators try to retrieve intended meaning, but this is of course not an easy task. A question for subtitlers is which features are to be preserved and which are to be omitted by complete deletion or reductive paraphrasing. Another question is what actually happens to a viewer's experience of a film if certain words are omitted from the subtitles.

There are no rules to be found in the literature on subtitling or in professional guidelines for subtitlers on condensing text, but the advice given on the subject touches upon the fact that irrelevant or unnecessary information can usually be omitted (cf. 2.8). Ivarsson and Carroll (1998) prescribe no rules "but generally speaking, abridgement consists of either paraphrasing or omitting something that is not regarded as strictly necessary for an understanding of the dialogue" (Ivarsson & Carroll 1998: 86). Ingo (2007) states that information with no major relevance for the plot of a film can be omitted for the sake of brevity and viewers will still fully comprehend the ST. A problem with the two pieces of advice above is that phrases such as 'not strictly necessary for an understanding' and 'no major relevance for the plot' are never clearly defined, making the suggestion on how to practically go about subtitling certain features somewhat unclear. This can be compared with the notion that an audiovisual translation should preferably produce the same effect (Chaume 2004a) or similar effect (Gottlieb 1997) on a target language audience as the source text produced on the source culture audience (cf. 3.1.1). Like the phrases given above from Ivarsson & Carroll (1998) and Ingo (2008), the concept of *similar/same effect* is not defined.

Gottlieb (1994), by viewing reduction of the source text as context-dependent, gives a more nuanced illustration of subtitling reduction than e.g. Ivarsson & Carroll (1998) and Ingo (2007) do. The subtitling of certain genres, e.g. feature films and shows, Gottlieb argues, may lose more through reduction than other genres, e.g. news or documentaries, so that a viewer may not experience a translated film as the same viewer would experience the original. Gottlieb gives an overview of the constraints on subtitling, which he divides into *formal (quantitative) constraints*, including the time and space constraints, and *textual (qualitative) constraints*, including the visual intrusion of the subtitles on the picture/screen as well as constraints imposed on the subtitles by the visual and auditory context of the film. Gottlieb does not necessarily see the two types of constraints as problems, but the constraints "[q]uite often […] prove to be stepping stones in the river of transmission" (Gottlieb 1994:293), and to communicate a "balancing act" in which certain techniques are used, consciously or subconsciously by the subtitler. The techniques are illustrated by Gottlieb's typology of ten strategies of interlingual subtitling (cf. 4.3.3). Used consciously or not, these strategies concern different types of reduction. Gottlieb argues that subtitlers often omit more than is actually necessary, making the language in subtitles impoverished, because reduction is generally seen as a must and may turn into a fixation. Many times, Gottlieb states, this reduction is more due to habit or a difficulty in finding an accurate translation, than the need for fewer characters per subtitle line (1994:67-69).

Furthermore, in relation to the context-dependence of reduction in subtitling, Gottlieb suggests an analysis of the type and purpose of the ST, and categorises subtitled material into three major genres. In the first genre, the *language* of the ST is central, which is mainly the case for satire, comedies, song programmes, etc., where puns, allusions and rhyme play an important part. The second genre is concerned mostly with the *people* of the ST, which is most often the case for feature films, TV series, etc., where a characterisation of the person speaking is of importance. Finally, the third genre in Gottlieb's discussion is centered around the *event*, which is often the case in news, documentaries and sports programmes where the content of the language is more important than both the form of the language and a portrayal

of the person speaking (1994: 70-71). The reduction of an ST in subtitling, Gottlieb suggests, should thus be made according to what type of genre the ST belongs to.

Out of the three genres put forward by Gottlieb, the one most relevant for the present study is clearly the *people* genre, as this pertains to the characterisations in feature films. As Gottlieb states, this genre may lose more through reduction than other genres.

3.4.3 Matching the visual image

The forth and final constraint on subtitling and subtitlers mentioned in Hatim & Mason's list in 3.4 is the requirement of the subtitles to match the visual image. It is of course also of importance to match the sound, including dialogue as well as non-verbal sound effects and music (Schröter 2005:39). The need for coherence between the subtitled text and the image and sound on the screen poses various problems. The subtitles have to match what is said on screen when it is said and not before or after. This may be of great importance for certain parts of films or TV programmes where a speaker for instance reveals something, one example being court room scenes where the "guilty" or "not guilty" evaluation of a jury is given. If the subtitle reveals the judgement before the speaker on screen does, it takes away some of the suspense and excitement from the viewer. It is impossible to display a subtitle for exactly the time it takes for an utterance to be spoken, but, as far as it is possible there should be a match.

Hatim & Mason's (1997:78) four kinds of constraints on subtitling discussed above, give a clear picture of the nature of subtitling. Below follows some additional special traits of this type of translation.

3.4.4 Differences between media

The technical constraints influence subtitling in all media. Subtitles for cinema, DVD and television are all, to a larger or lesser degree, condensed versions of the ST soundtrack. However, there are differences between the subtitling in different media as far as technical constraints are concerned. In the present study, a comparison is made between the subtitling for the different versions Cinema[19], DVD and television. This is done in order to see whether there are any differences between how DPs are treated, both quantitatively and qualitatively, in various subtitle environments (cf. 1.2).

The space used for subtitles in the three different media is similar. In theory, the cinema screen could make room for longer subtitle lines than the TV screen, but to allow for the front row cinema viewers' ability to read subtitles, the limit of 40 characters used in TV subtitling is usually adhered to in cinema subtitling too (Ivarsson & Carroll 1998:53). There is a more striking difference between the various media's time constraints, however, in that the cinema version generally enjoys a higher frequency of subtitles and more words in all subtitles combined than the TV and DVD versions do. Ivarsson & Carroll claim that "[…] the number

---

[19] In the present study, Cinema with a capital C refers to the subtitle version (the Cinema TT) in the corpus, and cinema with a lower-case c refers to cinema (subtitling; auditorium; etc.) in general.

of subtitles in an average 90-minute film is 900 for the cinema version, 750 for the video version[20], and 650 in the television version" (1998:71).

According to Ivarsson & Carroll, viewers read subtitles at the cinema faster than on TV: "[e]xperience has shown that audiences need about 30% less time to read film subtitles on a big cinema screen than for the same subtitles on a television screen" (Ivarsson & Carroll 1998:65). Possible reasons for this are (i) that the letters in a cinema subtitle are larger and at a greater distance than on TV, making it easier to read; (ii) that the definition of a (analogous) TV screen is inferior; (iii) that a cinema goer generally is more focused on what is going on on the screen because it is dark in the movie theatre, and the possible interruptions are fewer than when watching TV at home.

In the present study, a calculation is made of the total number of words in all the subtitles included in the film corpus. The four TTs Cinema, DVD, public service TV (SVT), and commercial TV (TV3+TV4) are compared quantitatively in 4.2.7, below.

3.4.5 Norms governing subtitling

The issue of norms in subtitling has been touched upon above, in connection with the difference between a film's spoken language and a subtitle's written language (cf. 3.4.1). This issue will be further examined here.

In current research on subtitling there is a growing tendency to look beyond the mere technical constraints on subtitling and in addition examine the possibility of the power of translation norms over the final product. Fawcett states:

> It is possible to argue […] that the apparently objective, material constraints are in fact conventions or, in the terminology of descriptive translation studies, norms, which raises the question: how much of the target text is itself manipulated, consciously or not, by norms rather than constraints? (Fawcett 2003:145)

Fawcett finds that norms seem to dominate subtitlers' choice of translation strategies, but that "film translation, like other modes of translation, [also is] subject to human randomness" (2003:145).

Many factors influence a final subtitling product and it is not easy to isolate a norm. Karamitroglou (2000) makes an attempt at investigating norms in audiovisual translation, putting forward a model for this investigation. He applies this model, which is influenced by polysystem theory (cf. 3.1.2), specifically to norms influencing the choice between subtitling and revoicing children's TV programmes in Greece. The framework of his model originates in the idea that the subtitler alone is not the sole influencing factor on a translation product. Karamitroglou sees a final translation product as being dependent on 'the interaction between the elements which constitute the system and the levels at which these elements/factors operate' (2000:69). Karamitroglou's framework is based on the relationship between, on the one hand, hierarchical levels of what he calls 'the system', and on the other, free-flowing equal factors. A norm can derive "from a higher level and reflect a more general phenomenon

---

[20] This was before the break-through of the DVD, so what is referred to as video is the VCR

rather than be restricted to the situation where we first discovered it" (2000:69). This means, for example, that a norm governing the subtitling of films in a certain socio-cultural environment may derive from norms governing literary translation in that same socio-cultural environment. The norms governing literary translation in turn may derive from norms of originals written in the same target culture, which then derive from norms of written and spoken language (Mattsson 2006:136). What Karamitroglou's work shows is that subtitling does not exist in a vacuum, but is connected to numerous factors surrounding it.

The formal written language norm governing subtitling in Sweden and many other countries has most likely derived from the formal written language norm governing both written originals and literary translation in this country.

Gambier (2005) requests a view of subtitling as not only striving for linguistic accomplishment but where practitioners, viewers and researchers alike may regard subtitles "as a specific corpus where verbal content and images work together and the rhythm of sequences and dialogues takes priority over linguistic perfection" (2005:5). Gambier would thus like to see a less orthodox view of subtitling and believes this is possible: "Orthodoxy, tradition [and] conventions concern the socio-ideological dimensions of the work and can be changed" (Gambier 2005, p.c.). If the traditions are changed, perhaps we will see subtitles including both visible effects such as different colours, smileys and unconventional positioning of the text, as well as alternative linguistic techniques with an increased use of e.g. discourse particles and other linguistic features mostly found in spoken language (Gambier 2005, p.c.).

One area of subtitling where the idea of collaboration between verbal content, images and overall rhythm of a film is of more interest than mere linguistic flawlessness is fan subtitling, the subtitling performed, mainly on the Internet, by non-professional subtitlers who are driven solely by their film interest. Fan subtitling is not always linguistically acceptable. However, due to both its flaws on the one hand and inventiveness on the other, it often differs from the orthodoxy otherwise exercised by subtitlers adhering to the norms of the target text culture and the guidelines of the translation agencies. Nornes (1999), looking closer at Asian subtitling, introduces the terms *abusive subtitling* and *corrupt subtitling*, to explain the difference between the inventive, playful (but, bear in mind, not linguistically flawless) subtitling and the more orthodox, according to Nornes sometimes censored, subtitling that most of us are used to. Nornes exemplifies abusive subtitling with early (1939) Japanese subtitles adapted to the composition of the frames (by moving the subtitles from the left to the right of the frame depending on where the character speaking on screen is situated (cf. 3.3.2)), as well as with recent Japanese anime fan-subtitling where the subtitler has experimented with different fonts, colours, longish footnotes, etc "to correspond to material aspects of language, from voice to dialect to written text within the frame" (1999:32). Nornes' position on subtitling as a translation type where conventional and established rules and norms need to be looked at more closely, illustrates a shift in how subtitling is viewed in both the professional and the academic world today.

3.4.6 Further situational factors for subtitling

In addition to the technical constraints on subtitling, and the system of norms governing this form of translation, there are other factors influencing the final subtitling product. These will be briefly mentioned here.

The work of a subtitler is not the work of one person only. Any subtitler is part of a larger team of adaptors, engineers, time-coders, film distributors, etc., and all of these different people to a larger or lesser degree influence what the subtitle eventually will look like. All subtitlers abide by the guidelines set forth by the translation agencies or the in-house companies they work for (cf. 2.8). The guidelines give instructions on how to approach everything from time-coding to punctuation, to how to subtitle songs and poetry. These guidelines are often difficult to acquire for anyone outside the professional world of subtitling.

One important factor behind the final subtitling product is the working conditions of subtitlers. Just as the technical constraints vary between media, so do the working conditions. These differences are perhaps most clear when comparing the commercial television channels with the public television channels: "[i]n Scandinavia, it is common knowledge that the public service subtitlers have traditionally enjoyed a privileged position of higher wages, permanent jobs, and lower workloads than most of their freelancing commercial colleagues" (Pedersen 2007:24). In addition, the Swedish public service channel SVT requires academic merits from their subtitlers, whereas the commercial channels do not (Johansson 2005, p.c.). Lower workloads may naturally enable a more carefully completed subtitling product. Higher wages and the security of a permanent job may also function as an incitement for subtitlers to put more effort into their work. The differences between the public service TV channels and the commercial TV channels in Sweden may not be as great anymore as SVT since 2006 is not only using in-house subtitlers but also independent translation companies. Today (2009), many films are translated by the same companies but aired on different TV channels, so that the public channels and the commercial channels often use the same translating companies. All films in the corpus of the present study are nevertheless subtitled before this change and are consequently not affected by this reorganisation. The different working conditions at the public service and commercial channels considered here thus have to be kept in mind when discussing discrepancies found in comparisons made of the subtitling versions in the present study.

In addition to the factors already mentioned, the question of individual translator differences must be raised. A translator's "skill, personality, artistic ambitions, etc. all affect the translation" (Ingo 2007:18, my translation). The subtitlers of interest for the present study will be further brought up in 4.2.8, below.

3.5 Summary

The main aim of the present chapter has been to introduce subtitling, and its special appearance and constraints. Subtitling is one type of audiovisual translation (AVT), which is a field within the broader area of translation studies (TS).

A few translation studies concepts (with a focus on formal and dynamic equivalence; skopos theory; and polysystem theory) were introduced initially as a background to discussions to come. These particular concepts focus on aspects of the subtitling of DPs that will be brought up subsequently in the present study, e.g. the fact that the sociocultural context of a TT needs to be taken into consideration both when translating a ST, and when analysing the translation of a ST; and the importance of taking equivalent effect into consideration, especially when subtitling DPs.

Various types of AVT (dubbing, voice-over, intralingual subtitling, live subtitling, and audio description) were introduced in the chapter before a more detailed account of interlingual subtitling and its characteristics was given. Subtitling is a special form of translation with particular characteristics, e.g. the technical time and space constraints of the subtitles' exposure on the screen. In addition, as opposed to literary translation, for instance, subtitling has a fleeting character, i.e. it is there one minute on the screen and gone the next. Another aspect which makes subtitling different from literary translation above all, is its polysemiotic character, created by a combination of image, sound, and translation. The film soundtrack (i.e. the ST) is always present simultaneously with the subtitles (i.e. the TT).

Additional technical constraints on subtitling are, for instance, (i) the change in mode from spoken to written language that subtitling always entails; (ii) the fact that the ST has to be greatly reduced to fit in on the screen, and to be readable for the viewers; and (iii) that the subtitles must match the visual image as far as possible.

The technical constraints influence subtitling in all media, but there are nevertheless some differences between various media's constraints, as far as the reduction of the ST is concerned. One of the reasons for the comparison made in the present study of the four different TTs Cinema, DVD, public service TV (channels SVT1+SVT2), and commercial TV (channels TV3+TV4), is to see whether there are any differences between how often DPs are translated (and in what way) in various subtitle environments. The most prominent difference between the TTs is the fact that a cinema version of a film generally has a higher frequency of subtitles and thus includes more words in one whole subtitled film than both the DVD and TV versions technically are able to include. Whether this difference in constraints between the TTs has in any way influenced the subtitling of DPs will be discussed further in subsequent chapters.

Besides the technical constraints, two additional aspects of subtitling are discussed in the chapter, i.e. various norms governing subtitling, and situational factors influencing the final subtitling product. Subtitling, like all types of translation, does not exist in a vacuum, but must be viewed in connection with various norms present in the target culture. Examples of norms influencing the subtitle TT vary from a written language norm, possibly derived from norms governing written originals in a target culture, to the orthodoxy stating how subtitles should physically appear on screen. The situational factors that are discussed in the chapter

are mainly concerned with the working conditions of subtitlers in Sweden today. A difference is most clearly found between the working conditions at the public service and commercial TV channels (referring to how the conditions were before 2006 when a reorganisation of the subtitling agencies and TV channels was performed). In Sweden, public service subtitlers have traditionally had a more privileged position of permanent jobs, higher wages, and lower workloads than subtitlers translating for the commercial channels (Pedersen 2007). In addition, the public service TV channels require its subtitlers to show academic merits, whereas the commercial channels do not. This difference will be further discussed and studied in the following chapters, in connection with the presentation of the results of the study.

4 Material and method

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the material used in the present study, and the methodology behind analysing the material, are both discussed. A large part of the work behind this thesis is the compilation of the corpus employed, and the corpus will thus be focused on quite extensively here. The films in the corpus will be presented, and selection criteria for the films will be discussed. Parameters behind the analysis of the DPs and the translations found will also be looked at.

4.2 The corpus

Many previous studies on audiovisual translation (see Pedersen 2007:51 for examples) are based on case studies, i.e. the corpus consists of one film only. Compiling the corpus of the present study is one step away from case studies (even though case studies have been performed on some of the films in the corpus at earlier stages of the investigation), a step that some scholars have wished for (e.g. Gambier 2008).

Ten American films (cf. 4.2.3) were selected for the corpus on the basis of various criteria, which can be seen in 4.2.2 below. The corpus in its final form consists of these ten films, each with up to four different translations[21]: the Cinema and the DVD subtitles as well as the subtitles of the public service TV channels SVT1 and SVT2, and of either of the two commercial TV channels TV3 and TV4. Five of the ten films have thus been broadcast on TV3 and five on TV4, while all ten of the films have been shown at the cinema, released for DVD and broadcast on the public service TV channel SVT (including SVT1 and SVT2, cf. 4.2.7) Both TV3 and TV4 are commercial channels, to a large degree using the same translation agencies, and so they are both appropriate to include in the commercial channel TT.

The size of the corpus for this study may seem small compared to corpora in previous similar studies. Schröter's (2005) 18 films and Pedersen's (2007) combination of 50 films and 50 TV programmes evidently include a larger quantity of broadcast material. However, because the rationale behind these two studies and the present one are widely different, and because the two earlier corpora include only relevant extracts of the broadcast material and not the fully transcribed ST and TT, the sizes of the corpora are not comparable. Because the corpus of the present study consists of the fully transcribed soundtrack and subtitles, as opposed to a transcription of the relevant extracts with DPs only, a great number of films cannot be included. The amount of ten films, each with up to four different TTs, resulted in a sizeable yet workable corpus, totalling nearly 420,000 words.

---

[21] Some of the subtitle versions are identical and so a few films have three instead of four individually different TTs, cf. 4.2.7.

4.2.1 Some previous corpora of interlingual AVT

Just as the interest in subtitling has increased over the last few years, so has the appeal of compiling corpora of audiovisual translation material. Four such corpora of interlingual subtitling and dubbing will be considered briefly here: the Forlixt corpus, the ESIST corpus, the corpus used by Schröter in his thesis (2005), and the Scandinavian subtitling corpus used by Pedersen in his thesis (2007).

The Forlixt corpus is a searchable electronic collection of films and their dubbed translations compiled at the Department of Interdisciplinary Studies in Translation, Languages and Cultures at the University of Bologna at Forlì. It is a parallel corpus (i.e. it is made up of originals and translations to and from Italian and German) which in 2005 consisted of 32 hours of fully transcribed audiovisual material (of approximately 200,000 words). There are 11 Italian and 9 German films in the corpus, for the most part of the comedy genre (Heiss et al. 2008).

The ESIST (European Association for Studies on Screen Translation) corpus consists of 48 subtitled versions of three short segments including challenging subtitling problems, for instance songs and differently paced dialogue (Pedersen 2007:50). The subtitled material was collected from professional subtitling companies from 25 different countries and covers 18 languages (for more information see www.esist.org, and Pedersen 2007:50-51).

Schröter's (2005) corpus is made up of 18 English-speaking family films and their Swedish, Danish, Norwegian and German subtitled and dubbed translations. The focus of the transcribed extracts is language play and puns used in the films. The films in Schröter's corpus have been shown in cinemas and released on DVD.

Pedersen (2007) collected material (extracts focused on culture specific phenomena from the STs) for his corpus, the Scandinavian subtitling corpus, from 100 different Anglophone films (aired on TV), and TV programmes with Swedish and Danish subtitles. Both terrestrial and satellite TV channels are represented in this corpus, as are both public service and commercial broadcasters. Genre-wise, the corpus contains non-fiction films and TV programmes as well as various fiction genres.

Even though all four corpora mentioned above are carefully compiled and well developed, none of them were an option for me to use for the present study. The Forlixt corpus does not include English or Swedish and is thus not of interest here. The reason for not using the ESIST corpus is that its English-Swedish material is not large enough to be used for this study. Parts of Schröter's and Pedersen's corpora would possibly have been interesting to use had they consisted of the fully transcribed English ST and Swedish TT, and not extracts from the material relevant to their respective studies only. A corpus of (American) English films and their Swedish subtitles had to be accumulated in order to pursue the present study.

4.2.2 Selection criteria for the films

The ten films were selected from a variety of criteria. These criteria concern production, broadcast, language/discourse, and genre.

At an early stage, I decided to use American English films exclusively and no other variety of the English language, so as to make the films in the corpus comparable. In order to find a great quantity of DPs used in the English language today, the American English in the films had to be contemporary, and thus all films chosen are set in present-day America. The films are set in the 1990s or at the beginning of the 21st century and all of them are produced from 1994 to 2001.

Two factors were decisive for a comparison of DPs and their (non-) translations in different environments. First, a variety of translations was chosen to facilitate a comparison of subtitling in different media. Each film is thus released for cinema and for DVD, as well as aired on public service TV channels and commercial TV channels. Second, a small variety of film genres was chosen to contrast both the use of DPs in the various STs and the (non-) translations of the DPs in varying surroundings. The films were divided into five major genres, based on the categorisation made by the Internet Movie Database (IMDb, www.imdb.com), as well as on what type of language is used in the films (cf. 4.2.4).

All ten films have essentially the same intended audience, i.e. they are aimed at an adult, average audience and are all fairly mainstream, well known and popular movies. It was not my wish to include only films that had undergone some kind of quality control, e.g. award-winning or otherwise highly respected films, but I wanted a sample of films viewed by average Swedish consumers of TV, DVD and cinema. This is also the reason why I chose the TV channels SVT, TV3 and TV4: SVT and TV4 are terrestrial channels and can be viewed by all people in Sweden; TV3 is a satellite channel but as such it has a considerable number of Swedish viewers. Following Gottlieb's division of subtitled material into the three genres *language*, *people* and *events* (1994: 70-71, c.f. 3.4.2), and to be able to find and analyse a large quantity of DPs, the main focus of all ten films is the characters and their relationships. For instance, no documentaries or purely satirical films were considered for the corpus, but only films where the characters themselves are the main focus.

The central selection criteria for the films in the corpus can be seen in (a-f), below, where (a-d) are external criteria and (e-f) internal criteria. The external criteria are related to production and broadcast, whereas the internal criteria are related to the plot of the films as well as to the quantity and type of discourse used in the films. All ten films in the corpus pertain to the following conditions:

a) Produced in the US with a contemporary American English language soundtrack
b) Produced in 1994 or later (all films are produced between 1994 and 2001)
c) Released for cinema and DVD (1994-2001)
d) Broadcast on the Swedish public service TV channel SVT as well as on either of the commercial TV channels TV3 and TV4 in the year 2000 or later
e) Including a great deal of dialogue
f) Possible to divide into five main genres

The ten films chosen for the corpus will be further examined in 4.2.3 and 4.2.4, below.

4.2.3 The films

The ten films chosen on the basis of the selection criteria above are presented below in alphabetical order (abbreviations of the film titles are included in brackets and are henceforth used instead of the full titles), with production date, main production company, and a short outline (largely based on outlines in IMDb) of the story of each film:

1. *Addicted to Love* (*ADDICTED*) 1997, Warner Bros

Astronomer Sam is left by the love of his life, Linda, who moves from their small town to New York and falls in love with Anton, a French chef. Sam is determined to break up their relationship and therefore follows Linda to New York, moves into an abandoned building opposite hers and starts spying on the couple in hope of winning Linda back. Sam is joined in his pursuit by Maggie, Anton's ex-girlfriend, who also wants to end the relationship between Linda and Anton. Complications develop as Sam and Maggie start falling for each other, both refusing to admit this.

2. *American Pie* (*AMPIE*) 1999, Zide-Perry Productions

The four high-school friends Jim, Kevin, Finch, and Oz make a pact that before they graduate they will lose their virginity, a mission which is not as easy as they first think. They all use different means of achieving this goal, but fail miserably. The plot evolves around these four boys, their friends and girlfriends, and the parties they go to throughout one year at high school.

3. *Fargo* (*FARGO*) 1996, Working Title Films

Set in Minnesota, this is the story of Jerry Lundegaard, a car salesman who in the midst of financial difficulties comes up with the desperate plan of hiring two men to kidnap his wife. The kidnappers demand a ransom from Jerry's wealthy father-in-law and the ransom is later to be split between the kidnappers and Jerry. From the moment of the kidnapping, things go from bad to worse and the blood that was not supposed to be shed is, to Jerry's horror, shed in large quantities. Jerry falls deeper into problems as pregnant sheriff Marge Gunderson takes on the case.

4. *Legally Blonde* (*BLONDE*) 2001, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Inc.

Elle Woods' life evolves around her presidency of the college sorority, her Miss June title in the campus calendar and her wish to become Mrs. Warner Huntington III, i.e. marry her boyfriend. Boyfriend Warner, however, breaks up with Elle because he does not consider her smart enough to be his wife as he is beginning his studies at Harvard Law School. Elle decides to win Warner back by proving to him that she can also get into Harvard. Through hard work and by being herself at all times, Elle eventually finds success at Harvard and realises that Warner is not smart enough for her.

5. *Nurse Betty* (*BETTY*) 2000, Gramercy Pictures

Kansas waitress Betty Sizemore dreams of becoming a nurse. She turns delusional after witnessing her car salesman husband Del being brutally murdered by two men, and is suddenly convinced she is the former fiancée of a her favourite soap opera character, cardiologist David Ravell. Betty drives to L.A. to find the hospital where David works. She is followed by her late husband's killers Charlie and Wesley as they believe the husband has stored some drugs in the trunk of Betty's car.

6. *Primary Colors* (*PRIMARY*) 1998, Mutual Film Company LLC

Jack Stanton is running for president in this fictionalised description of Bill Clinton's time as a candidate in 1992. The election process is seen through the eyes of Henry Burton, a young campaign manager. Many people, including Henry, Jack's wife Susan and campaign worker Libby Holden, admire Jack's political abilities in spite of many morally questionable steps taken in his life. The film follows Jack, Susan, Henry and Libby throughout the election process.

7. *Pulp Fiction* (*PULP*) 1994, Band Apart Productions

The lives of various seemingly unrelated characters (for instance, the robbers Pumpkin and Honey Bunny, the hitmen Jules Winnfield and Vincent Vega, and the aging boxer Butch Coolidge) are woven together involving a series of bizarre and bloody incidents. The story mainly concerns the two hitmen Jules and Vince, and their mission of reclaiming a suitcase stolen from their employer, Marsellus Wallace.

8. *Se7en* (*SEVEN*) 1995, New Line Cinema Corp.

From one tortured victim to another, this film takes us through the seven deadly sins as the sociopathic John Doe kills, and the detectives Somerset and Mills investigate the murders. The story is set in a dark and grim city with a dismal atmosphere. The detectives try to solve the murders but are themselves trapped in the diabolic plan of the killer.

9. *Wag the Dog* (*WAG*) 1997, Tribeca Productions

When the president of the United States is about to get caught in a scandalous situation only days before an election, one of his advisors contacts a top Hollywood producer in order to construct a war in Albania that the president can heroically end, all through mass media. The story evolves around the Hollywood producer Stanley Motss and the president's political advisors Conrad Brean and Winifred Ames.

10. *While You Were Sleeping* (*WHILE*) 1995, Hollywood Pictures

Lucy is a train ticket seller who finds the man of her dreams, Peter, and without exchanging a word with him falls in love with him and unexpectedly also saves his life. Peter goes into a coma and his family by mistake gets the impression that Lucy is Peter's fiancée, thus taking her in as a family member. Unluckily, Lucy falls in love with Peter's brother Jack just as Peter comes out of his coma, and complications arise.

4.2.4 A genre division

Just as the plots are different for the films in the corpus, the discourse varies in the five genres that the films have been divided into. A genre division is never a straightforward task and I do not set out to make a perfect one here. It is, however, of interest for the analysis of the films to attempt to divide them into genres. The reason behind this genre division is to see whether the different discourse types in the films influence the treatment of DPs in the originals and of the DPs' translations. Pedersen argues "that the single most influencing factor on the skopos of a subtitling act is the genre to which the film or TV programme belongs" (2007:59). Similarly, Gottlieb states that "many subtitlers take genre into account when they work" (Gottlieb 1994:70). The five genres in this corpus show variation in how narrative, argumentative, informative, descriptive, etc. the discourse in the films is. de Linde and Kay (1999) include a quote from Minchinton (1993:4.14-4.15), which is repeated below:

> [With an 'I love you' story] viewers need not read many of the titles; they know the story, they guess the dialogue, they blink down at the sub-titles for confirmation, they photograph them rather than read them…Crime stories and espionage tales give translators and viewers a harder time. The subtitles have to be read if the subsequent action is to be understood. (de Linde & Kay 1999:6)

Genre differences may thus present translators and viewers with varying processing difficulties. A romantic story and a thriller, for instance, are not absorbed in the same way. As a consequence, there may be differences in the language used in both the original film soundtrack and its translations, as far as DPs and many other features are concerned.

The age of characters in a film can also be of importance for the language used. Erman (2001) finds in two different spoken language corpora (the Bergen Corpus of London Teenager Language, COLT; and the London-Lund Corpus, LLC) that the DP *you know* is used differently among younger people than among adults, and that the adolescent use can possibly illustrate an ongoing change in the use and functions of *you know*. It seems thus that adults and younger people not only use different DPs but that they also use one and the same DP differently. Film characters' age differences may thus have significance for both the use of DPs in the originals and the (non-)translations of these.

The ten films in the corpus of the present study have been classified into five genres (two films in each genre), based on the genre division made by the Internet Movie Database (IMDb, www.imdb.com) as well as on the type of discourse used in each film. The IMDb is a well-known and respected Internet source on all matters of information concerning film, one of these matters being genre division. The same source is used by both Schröter (2005) and Pedersen (2007) as a reference and an aid for genre division, respectively.

A division of genres overlaps at times and often there is not a clear-cut boundary between one film genre and the next. One example of this from the IMDb is the film *BETTY* which is categorised there as a comedy/crime/drama/romance/thriller. An attempt has been made here to limit the categorisation of the films as much as possible. In addition, as the IMDb's division is based mainly on the plot and the characters of a film, it was felt that a further focus on the type of discourse used in each film was needed for the genre division in

the present study. Below is a list of the ten films, presented in alphabetical order with year of production, main production company, and genre:

1. *ADDICTED* (1997, Warner Bros) Romantic Comedy.
2. *AMPIE* (1999, Zide-Perry Productions) College Comedy.
3. *FARGO* (1996, Working Title Films) Criminal Drama.
4. *BLONDE* (2001, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Inc.) College Comedy.
5. *BETTY* (2000, Gramercy Pictures) Criminal Drama.
6. *PRIMARY* (1998, Mutual Film Company LLC) Political Drama.
7. *PULP* (1994, Band Apart Productions) Crime/Gangster.
8. *SEVEN* (1995, New Line Cinema Corp.) Crime/Gangster.
9. *WAG* (1997, Tribeca Productions) Political Drama.
10. *WHILE* (1995, Hollywood Pictures) Romantic Comedy.

The films *ADDICTED* and *WHILE* are clear-cut Romantic Comedies with a fairly uncomplicated plot and discourse. *AMPIE* and *BLONDE* are straightforward comedies, both with predominantly high school students' or college students' language, hence the label College Comedy. *FARGO* and *BETTY* are the most elusive films as far as genre categorising is concerned (as can also be seen in the variety of genres the IMDb presents), but the discourse in the two films is similar, and the plots have clear components of crime and drama (as well as of comedy) and are thus labelled Criminal Drama. *PRIMARY* and *WAG*, here labelled Political Drama, are films set in a political environment with quite extensive parts of argumentative dramatic discourse. Finally, *PULP* and *SEVEN* both display quite intricate and action-filled Crime/Gangster storylines with aggressive dialogue.

The genres in the above list are not mutually exclusive: there is some legal language in *BLONDE*, some romance in *BETTY*, some comedy in *WAG*, etc. The list is to be seen as a rough guide to the difference the films show as far as plot, characters, and discourse is concerned.

4.2.5 Compiling the corpus

It was my aim at an early stage to use a corpus that would transmit the functions of DPs in the best possible way. Film dialogue can notably facilitate an analysis of DPs, as it provides access to speaker characteristics as well as speakers' intonation, use of pauses, facial expressions, etc. In addition, film dialogue is a hybrid between authentic spoken language and scripted language, and usually far more constrained and to the point than authentic dialogue is (even though film dialogue is often more elaborate than the scripted version), thus being less ambiguous and easier to analyse than authentic dialogue (cf. 2.7). My aspiration to make use of a multimodal film corpus for the analysis of DPs required a great deal of work regarding the compilation of the corpus. The compilation of the material is described in some detail in the following.

To find films adhering to the selection requirements, I searched the on-line database at what was then (2005) called *The Swedish National Archive of Recorded Sound and Moving*

Images, but which is today (2009) called *the Department of Audiovisual Media under the National Library of Sweden* (before the year 2009 found at www.slba.se; from the year 2009 found at http://smdb.kb.se/slbaweb). The database itself is called *Svensk Mediedatabas* (*The Swedish Media Database*, henceforth: SMDB). The SMDB provides lists of material that has been broadcast in Sweden. All material that has been released for cinema and DVD as well as aired on TV, radio, etc, can be searched in the database together with the name of the publisher (e.g. production company or TV channel), and for the televised material also the date and time of transmission. Finding films released for both cinema and DVD was not difficult, but locating films that had also been aired on both public service TV and commercial TV presented some difficulties and limited the selection of films. After finding ten films following the selection criteria, I started my second search, that of finding the actual physical films and their translations. The DVD versions were purchased from various Internet retailers (e.g. www.cdon.com) and all of the TV versions (one SVT translation and either a TV3 or a TV4 translation for each film) were ordered from *The Swedish National Archive of Recorded Sound and Moving Images* (from the year 2009 called *the Department of Audiovisual Media under the National Library of Sweden*). The cinema versions were gathered by different means: film companies and individual subtitlers had to be contacted in order to attain these translations, which were sent to me as transcribed documents, in most cases free of charge. For a few films this was an easy task, but for the majority of the films, locating their cinema subtitles was a lengthy detective activity[22].

I transcribed the entire material at the Gothenburg University Library. I decided at an early stage to transcribe the whole soundtrack of each film as opposed to extracting only the parts where the DPs were found. In previous studies on subtitling where corpus compilations are an important part (e.g. Schröter 2005; Pedersen 2007), a more fragmented transcription has been made. I felt, in spite of the labour involved in such a task, that I should take the unique opportunity of collecting a corpus of complete film STs and subtitle TTs. This was very time-consuming work. The time it took depended on the amount and complexity of the dialogue in the films, as well as on how easily audible the soundtrack was. To assist the perceptibility of the film soundtracks, on-line scripts at the Internet Movie Script Database (www.imsdb.com) or Simply Scripts (www.simplyscripts.com) were consulted. Sometimes on-line transcripts made by movie fans were also used to aid the transcription of the ST. These sources were only used when words were inaudible and they were never copied word for word unless there was a total match between the soundtrack, and the on-line script/transcript. Despite the attempts of distinguishing every word in the soundtracks, there are extracts in the films that have not been grasped. These are, however, few and far between.

Transcribing the subtitles was naturally not as time-consuming as transcribing the soundtracks, as they could simply be duplicated from the subtitles. Also, as the Cinema subtitles were sent to me, one fourth of the subtitled material was already transcribed. However, transcribing the rest of the subtitles was still quite a lengthy procedure. It is possible that the DVD and TV subtitles would have been obtainable directly from the translation

---

[22] The cinema subtitles for one film, *ADDICTED*, were unfortunately never located, in spite of numerous phone calls, e-mails, and much appreciated help from individuals at film companies and subtitling agencies.

agencies or translators, but judging from the time and effort it took to acquire the Cinema subtitles, it seemed more efficient to transcribe the DVD and TV subtitles myself.

One major reason behind the complete manual transcription was to diminish the risk of overlooking DPs. Because DPs are quite short and at times uttered under the breath of characters, they may be difficult to recognise in a film soundtrack. However, when the whole ST is transcribed, a minimal amount of DPs will be missed, and the corpus will be more statistically reliable. In addition, at an early stage I had a desire to possibly develop the corpus in the future and to be able to use it again at a later stage, alternatively let other researchers use it. Another advantage of manually transcribing such a large amount of text was a further awareness and understanding of the material at hand.

The corpus has played an important part of the present study. To my knowledge, it is the first multimodal corpus of its kind being used in an analysis of DPs. As the complete soundtracks and up to four subtitle versions of these were transcribed, collecting the material took quite some time, but resulted in a unique corpus that is ideal for analyses on pragmatic function.

4.2.6 Some corpus statistics

The corpus consists of the fully transcribed soundtrack of ten films (see 4.2.3) and their cinema, DVD, and TV subtitles. There are approximately 420,000 words in the whole corpus, including both STs (the soundtrack of the ten films) and TTs (the subtitles of the ten films, each film with up to four subtitle versions). Table 4.1 below shows the (approximate) number of words in the corpus. The number of words in each soundtrack (including mostly spoken discourse, but also a small amount of written words, on signs etc.) is calculated from the Microsoft Word documents containing the transcriptions. As these transcripts sometimes include words and characters not part of the film soundtrack (e.g. short comments included by me), the numbers of words are not always exact. However, the additional words which may be included in the totals are very few.

Table 4.1. The total number of words in the corpus.

Texts	Number of words
STs (all ten films)	113,531
TTs (Cinema, DVD, SVT, TV3+TV4)	305,957
Total	**419,488**

As can be seen in the table, all ten films combined contain approximately 113,500 ST words. This means that each film's soundtrack has about 11,350 words on average. The totals of the TTs show the combined numbers for all four subtitle versions Cinema, DVD, the public service channel SVT, and the commercial TV channels TV3+TV4. Each subtitle version has 76,489 TT words on average, which means that each film has about 7,649 words in one subtitle version. When dividing the average number of words in one TT for each film (7,649) with the average number of words in each film's soundtrack (11,350), we find that about 67% of the soundtrack is translated into the subtitles. There is thus a total omission rate of

approximately 33 % in the subtitles in the corpus. This number is within the range of quantitative reduction in subtitled texts, as calculated by Gottlieb (1994:72). He found that 20-50 % of the ST material is omitted when transformed into subtitles. The translations will be discussed in more detail in 4.2.7, below.

Table 4.2 below shows the total number of DPs (i.e. *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like*) in each film soundtrack, as well as a calculation of the frequency of these DPs per 100 ST words.

Table 4.2.The total number of DPs, approximate number of words in each soundtrack, ST words per minute, and DP frequency per 100 words.

Film	Number of DPs (*well, you know, I mean, like*)	Number of words in each soundtrack	ST words per minute	DP frequency per 100 words
PRIMARY	158	18767	137	0.8
AMPIE	145	8764	93	1.7
WHILE	114	10192	103	1.1
WAG	105	14297	153	0.7
FARGO	103	7878	86	1.3
BETTY	97	10910	101	0.9
PULP	95	15456	105	0.6
BLONDE	88	8788	97	1.0
ADDICTED	69	8779	92	0.8
SEVEN	58	9700	80	0.6
Total	**1,032**	**113,531**		**9.5**

Table 4.2 demonstrates that the film with the highest number of DPs (i.e. *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like*) in its soundtrack is *PRIMARY*, followed by *AMPIE*, *WHILE*, and *WAG*. The film with the lowest number of DPs in its soundtrack is *SEVEN*. Other films with quite low numbers of DPs are *ADDICTED*, *BLONDE*, and *PULP*.

As the films are not equally long, the frequency of DPs per 100 ST words is also estimated. The table shows that there is an average of 1 DP per approximately 100 words in the soundtrack of each film[23], although there are clear individual differences. The film with the highest DP frequency is *AMPIE*, followed by *FARGO*, and *WHILE*. The two films with the lowest frequency are *SEVEN* and *PULP*, followed by *WAG*, *PRIMARY*, and *ADDICTED*. There is thus not always a correlation between the number of DPs in a film soundtrack and the frequency of DPs per 100 words in the same film.

4.2.7 The translations

The TT versions used for this thesis consist of Swedish subtitles from Cinema and DVD, as well as from the public service TV channel SVT, and either of the two commercial TV channels TV3 and TV4. These various translations are produced at different times: the cinema

---

[23] The total of 9.5 occurrences of DPs per 100 words is divided by the number of films (ten), with the result of approximately 0.95 DP occurrences per 100 words in each film.

subtitles were produced first, followed by the DVD subtitles and lastly the TV subtitles. The exact production dates for the TV subtitles are not known, as subtitles are sometimes reused, but they were all broadcast between the years 2000 and 2006. Due to the fact that the increased viewer reading speed for cinema subtitles allows more space for these subtitles than for DVD and TV subtitles (Ivarsson & Carroll 1998:65), the cinema subtitles have to be reduced when restructured for DVD and later TV. Many times the translator subtitling the cinema version also subtitles the DVD and/or TV version(s).

No quality assessment of the subtitles has been carried out since it is not my aim to include only what is considered qualitative work, but rather a sample of the subtitles produced in Sweden today, and consumed by cinema, DVD, and TV viewers. Two conditions for all ten films are, however, concerned with quality: first, all films are released for cinema and not just DVD, as films directly released on DVD often have shown to be of considerably lesser quality, or less popular, in the original production country, i.e. in this case the US. Second, all TV versions are broadcast on prime viewing time[24] so as to guarantee a certain degree of quality "as primetime TV traditionally holds a primary position in the TV polysystems" (Pedersen 2007:53). Here should also be mentioned that I have no information on whether the translations in question have been quality-checked, and if so, by whom.

Each film in the corpus has either three or four different TTs. The number depends on the fact that some TTs are identical. Five DVD versions are identical with an SVT, TV3, or TV4 translation.

Moreover, five of the films have a TV3 translation and five have a TV4 translation. The choice to include two commercial channels instead of one, and divide the films among them was made in order to observe whether there are any clear differences between these two commercial channels' subtitles. For the most part in this thesis, however, these two channels will be considered collectively as commercial channels and compared with the public service channel SVT.

For an overview of the films and their respective TTs consider table 4.3., below. Two TTs on either side of a slash (/) indicates that they are identical.

Table 4.3. The number and version of the different TTs for each film.

Film	Number of different TTs	TTs
ADDICTED	3	DVD, SVT1, TV3
AMPIE	4	Cinema, DVD, SVT1, TV3
FARGO	3	Cinema, DVD/TV4, SVT1
BLONDE	4	Cinema, DVD, SVT1, TV4
BETTY	4	Cinema, DVD, SVT1, TV3
PRIMARY	3	Cinema, DVD/TV3, SVT1
PULP	3	Cinema, DVD/TV4, SVT1
SEVEN	4	Cinema, DVD, SVT1, TV4
WAG	3	Cinema, DVD/SVT1, TV4
WHILE	3	Cinema, DVD/TV3, SVT2

---

[24] In the present study, prime viewing time equals a commencement of a film after 20.00 hrs, but before 22.25 hrs (the films starting after 22.00 hrs are usually aired at the weekend).

Table 4.3 shows which TTs of each film are included in the corpus. The Cinema subtitles for *ADDICTED* are not included in the table because they have unfortunately not been located. Apart from *ADDICTED*, the cinema subtitles of all ten films are included, as are the DVD subtitles. For five of the films, i.e. *FARGO*, *PRIMARY*, *PULP*, *WAG*, and *WHILE*, the DVD subtitles are identical with one other TT (the SVT, TV3, or TV4 TT). The Cinema TTs are never identical to any of the other TTs.

The public service TV channel SVT consists of two channels: SVT1 and SVT2. Nine out of ten films subtitled by SVT are aired on SVT1 (the only film aired on SVT2 is *WHILE*), and for this reason the channels SVT1 and SVT2 will not be differentiated in the rest of the present study. Whenever either of the channels is referred to, the label SVT is used without reference to the individual SVT channels.

There is a difference in the production of the public service TV subtitles on the one hand and the commercial TV subtitles on the other. All TV translations in this corpus were compiled before the summer/fall of 2006 when SVT reformed its subtitling production and let external companies take over the translation of most of the material broadcast on SVT1 and SVT2 (cf. 3.4.6). In the corpus, all translations broadcast on the public service channel SVT were made by SVT's in-house subtitlers at *SVT Undertext*, and all the translations broadcast for TV3 and TV4 were made by external companies, mostly *SDI Media* and *Broadcast Text*.

The total number of words in each TT (i.e. in the Cinema, DVD, SVT (public service TV channel), TV3 (commercial TV channel), and TV4 (commercial TV channel) subtitles) for each of the films can be seen in table 4.4, below.

Table 4.4. Number of words in the subtitles of each film, and in each of the TTs Cinema, DVD, SVT, TV3, TV4 (the total of TV3 and TV4 are combined for the joint number of the commercial channels).

Film	Cinema	DVD	SVT	TV3	TV4	Total
ADDICTED	*(6715)	7791	6120	6235	-	**26861**
AMPIE	6682	6370	6437	6560	-	**26049**
FARGO	4756	4667	5203	-	4667	**19293**
BLONDE	6091	7414	5895	-	6268	**25668**
BETTY	8625	8090	7772	8230	-	**32717**
PRIMARY	12858	12133	12247	12133	-	**49371**
PULP	10308	10113	9859	-	10126	**40406**
SEVEN	7045	6717	6468	-	6951	27181
WAG	8256	7627	7627	-	8440	**31950**
WHILE	6888	6645	6283	6645	-	**26461**
Total	**78224**	**77567**	**73911**	**39803** (+TV4=76255)	**36452** (+TV3 =76255)	**305957**

* The Cinema subtitles have not been found, and a hypothetical number is thus included, based on the average totals of the other three TTs.

The table is a confirmation of the discussion in 3.4.4 on the difference between numbers of words in various subtitle versions. It was said there that the limit of 40 characters per subtitle pair on screen at a time is usually the same for all forms of subtitling (Ivarsson & Carroll 1998:53). However, there is a difference between the various media's time constraints in that the cinema version generally includes more words in all subtitles combined than the TV and DVD versions do. The inclusion of more words in cinema subtitles is possible due to a higher frequency of subtitles in the cinema version (cf. 3.4.4). Table 4.4 shows that for the subtitles in the present corpus, it is indeed the Cinema TT that has most words in all films combined

(78,224 words). The DVD subtitles have the second largest amount of words (77,567 words), while the TV3+TV4 subtitles combined have the third largest amount of words (76,255 words). The TT with the smallest number of words is SVT (73,911 words). The Cinema subtitles for the film *ADDICTED* have unfortunately not been found, and are subsequently not part of the corpus. A hypothetical number of words are included for these subtitles, based on the average number of the other three TTs.

It should also be explained here that, all through the present study (especially in chapters 5 to 8), what is referred to as *translation tokens* is the combined number of translations, while *translation types* refer to the number of individually different translations. One single translation type may thus occur numerous times: e.g. the Swedish modal particle *ju* (one type) is used as a translation of *I mean* twenty-one times (twenty-one tokens).

4.2.8 The translators

A final subtitling product is not the work of one person only (cf. 3.4.6). The work of individual translators is, however, vital for the appearance of a subtitle and should not be seen as anything less: "[w]ithout a translator, there would be no translation" (Leppihalme 1994:85).

There are many examples in the corpus of translators producing more than one translation (e.g. both a cinema and TV subtitle) for one and the same film. There are also examples of translators subtitling more than one film. The subtitlers are usually credited in a separate subtitle before the film itself begins or just after the end credits. It is more common for cinema and TV subtitles to credit the translators than for DVD subtitles to do so. The latter most often do not credit the translators and sometimes not even the name of the company behind the translation. I have been able to identify altogether 14 different translators for the ten films in the corpus.

The information I have of the individual translators is limited. I have been in touch with a few of them (mainly in order to ask them for cinema translations or to discuss various questions arising throughout the study), but I do not know much more about them other than their names and their gender, and in one or two cases their age and educational as well as professional background. Nor do I have much knowledge of the conditions under which the subtitlers have been working, apart from what is said above about the difference between the conditions at *SVT Undertext* and the external TV companies (cf. 3.4.6). It is impossible to go into great detail with this issue and it is not an aim of the present study to closely investigate the translators individually.

4.3 Analysing the material

In the words of Erman (1987:33):

> There are different ways of carrying out linguistic investigations. Either we
> start with a set of functions which we wish to find realized in actual

The present study uses the latter method of analysis, i.e. I have first studied the four DPs *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like* in connection with seven specific parameters that are mentioned below, and after this I have applied a cross-theoretical framework (including three theories in particular, i.e. Relevance theory (Sperber & Wilson 1986), Coherence-based theory (Schiffrin 1987), and Politeness theory (Brown & Levinson 1986), cf. 2.5, as well as other previous studies and functional distributions of the DPs) in order to facilitate the classifications of the DPs. I have thus not tried to use the four DPs in order to verify certain theories, but I have used the theories as an aid for the analysis of the DP functions. The advantage of this method is, according to Erman, "that the analyst has not decided beforehand what functions to search for but carries out the analysis with an open mind […]" (ibid.). A disadvantage that Erman mentions is the inability of the results of such a study to fit neatly into a certain theoretical framework. This, in my mind, as well as in Erman's it seems, is not so much a disadvantage as an advantage, as the aim to make functions fit into a certain theory may blind an analyst and cause him/her to fail to see certain features of the analysed material.

At an initial stage, the material, i.e. the corpus transcriptions, consisted of a large collection of Microsoft Word documents in a table format with one ST (the film soundtrack) and three to four TTs (the public service TV channel, the commercial TV channel, the DVD, and the cinema subtitles) per film. The DPs and their (non-)translations were identified manually so as to not mistake a DP for its homonym (e.g. DP *well* vs. adverb *well*). Later, ST extracts with DPs and corresponding (non-) translations were transferred to the Filemaker Pro database software. Information of interest was added to each DP entry. This information includes, (i) the film and its genre, (ii) the discourse context of the DP, (iii) the subtitle corresponding to the ST utterance of which the DP is part (with or without a translation of the DP), (iv) type of translation (modal particle, marker of punctuation, etc) for translated DPs, (v) the pragmatic main function (textual or interpersonal) and sub-functions (frame-marker, politeness marker, etc) of the ST DPs, and (vi) the names and companies of the translators (whenever known to me). In addition, all the parameters for analysing the ST DPs (to be discussed in 4.3.1), are included, i.e. (i) the intonation of the DP; (ii) pauses used in connection to the DP; (iii) collocations of the DP; (iv) position of the DP in the utterance (initial, medial, or final position); (v) the type of utterance of which the DP is part (statement, question, etc.); (vi) body language of the speaker; and, finally (vii) the larger social context of the DP.

In an ideal world, creating a computerised and tagged corpus would have been preferable to working with Filemaker Pro database, but due to time restrictions this was not an option.

4.3.1 Parameters for analysing the DPs

The most important parameters for the analysis of the DPs in this study (based on parameters used by Svartvik (1980) in his analysis on *well*) are listed below. All parameters are more or less different for the four DPs in the corpus and will thus be discussed more thoroughly in

each DP chapter in connection to theories relevant for the individual DPs. However, the parameters will be briefly looked at here one by one. The first five parameters in the list below are brought up again in 4.3.2, as they are indicated in the transcriptions of the examples all through the present study.

The following is a list of the parameters behind the analysis of the DPs in the STs:

- **Intonation of the DP**
  Three intonation patterns are focused on here: a rising, a falling and a declarative intonation (see more under 4.3.2). The line between these types of intonation is not always definite, and the analysis performed is not to be seen as absolute but more as an aid in the overall analysis of the DPs.

- **Pauses used in connection to the DP**
  Pauses five words before and five words after each DP are included in the analysis. The length and position of a pause are mainly considered here.

- **Collocations of the DP**
  Collocations many times give clear indications of the function of a DP, e.g. a use of hedges such as *kind of* and *maybe* may indicate a mitigating DP function.

- **Position of the DP in an utterance** (initial, medial, final)
  Not all DPs are found in all three positions (e.g. *well* is almost never found finally). Overall, an initial position of a DP often signals one function (e.g. a textual turn-taking), while a medial or final position signal another (e.g. an interpersonal emphasis).

- **Type of utterance of which the DP is part** (statement-question, question-reply, etc.)
  This parameter is especially useful for the analysis of certain DPs, e.g. *well*, which usually has a textual function when it is used in initiating statements but an interpersonal function when it is used in replies to questions.

- **Body language of speaker**
  The characters' body language and facial expressions are discussed whenever they are of importance for the use of the DPs. However, this parameter is inferior to the parameter of intonation when analysing the DPs.

- **Larger social context of the DP**
  This has to do with the general plot of the films as well as with additional characterising features such as individual traits of speakers: their age, gender, social status, etc.

4.3.2 Transcriptions of the DP examples

To facilitate the analysis of the listed parameters above, transcriptions illustrating as many parameters as possible were needed. These include the first five parameters in the list: intonation, pauses, collocations, position, and type of utterance. Transcriptions are performed for each DP and its nearest surrounding context in the STs. For the remaining parts of the STs (the parts with no DPs), a less complex transcription is made which does not indicate intonation, pauses, etc. In previous studies on subtitling (e.g. Schröter 2005 and Pedersen 2007), solely written language has been used for the ST transcriptions (i.e. there is no indication of intonation etc. in these transcriptions). For this study, however, it is important to include a transcription illustrating the spoken features of language since the analysis of DPs is so dependent on those features.

In all the ST examples of the present study, a transcription demonstrating the five first parameters listed above is used. The transcription method employed is a simplified version of principles of transcriptions given in Norrby (1996:88-89), motivated by Norrby's reference to Linell (1994:7) on the practicality of a transcription: "[a transcription] should be readable as some kind of text [and] it should be possible to execute with a common word processing program" (Norrby 1996:81, my translation). It should be emphasised that the transcriptions in the present study are simplified and not meant to be a complete phonetic transcription. They are merely an illustration of the spoken discourse used in the films, for the reader to get a clearer picture of the film discourse, and as an aid in the analysis of the DPs. The transcribed pauses are not measured with any kind of apparatus, but are estimated by myself.

Symbols used for the transcription are the following:

↑   rising intonation

→   declarative intonation

↓   falling intonation

| short pause = approximately 1 second

|| longer pause = approximately 2-5 seconds

One example of the transcription used in the present study is seen below (the Cinema and DVD subtitles of the ST example are also provided).

(18)   Paulette: you're asking the wrong girl │ **I mean (1)** →
                I'm with my guy eight years and then one day
                it's │ I met someone else move out
                            (*BLONDE* 00.31.43)

Cinema	DVD
Du frågar fel tjej.	Du frågar fel tjej.
[You're asking the wrong girl.]	[You're asking the wrong girl.]
Efter åtta år med min kille	Jag hade varit med min kille i åtta år,

70

träffar han nån annan och kör ut mig. [After eight years with my guy he meets someone else and kicks me out.]	[I'd been with my guy for eight years] när han en dag säger Jag har träffat nån annan. Flytta ut." [when he says one day "I've met someone else. Move out."]

The above ST utterance is an example if the DP *I mean*, where intonation, pauses, collocations, position, and type of utterance are indicated (the number (1) directly after *I mean* shows that this is the first of two occurrences of this DP in the example (only one is included here)). The intonation is indicated by an arrow (→), here showing the declarative intonation of *I mean*. In the example above, there are two short pauses (│). A short pause is about 1 second, whereas a longer pause (││) is about 2 to 5 seconds. Pauses are included in the transcriptions when they occur 5 words before the DP or 5 words after it (sometimes additional pauses are indicated to facilitate the understanding of an example, as in (18) above). When collocations are important for an analysis they are underlined (in the example above there are no significant collocations). As is clear, the position of *I mean* in example (18) is medial, and it is part of a statement.

The transcriptions of the DPs and their immediate contexts facilitate the cross-theoretical analysis and classification of functions of the DPs in the ST (discussed in 2.4 and 2.5, above).

In addition to the transcription symbols, the examples also indicate the film concerned and the exact time the example appears in the film in question. The time is illustrated by the amount of hours, minutes, and seconds into each film that the first utterance of an example begins (cf. *BLONDE* 00.31.43, in the example above). Whenever subtitles are included in an example, the subtitles are presented identically to how they are displayed originally on screen (i.e. both the number of lines and the cut-off points between the lines are the same in the examples and in the original subtitles). English backtranslations are provided with the subtitles, and inserted within square brackets. The backtranslations are not meant to be idiomatically correct, but to first and foremost function as gloss translations, putting across quite literally what the characters are saying[25].

We now turn to a discussion on the parameters used for the analysis of the translations of the DPs in the corpus.

4.3.3 Parameters for analysing the translations

Many studies on translations base their analysis on strategies used by the translators (e.g. Chesterman 1997; Gottlieb 1997; Pedersen 2007). Translators all use various strategies when solving translation problems, even though they may not always be aware of doing so (Leppihalme 1994:92). As all translators, and especially subtitlers, work under time preassure, they tend to use "minimax strategies" (Levý 1967), i.e. they use a minimum of effort to arrive at a maximum of effect.

---

[25] As far as possible, the backtranslations are graphically presented identically to the original subtitles (i.e. the number of lines and cut-off points between the lines are the same). At times, however, small changes are made due to lack of space.

71

In the present study, I will not use a ready-made taxonomy of translation strategies as these are usually more general and there is no descriptive or prescriptive classification available for the translation of the specific area of DPs (except short overviews on the subtitling of DPs in Ivarsson & Carroll (1998) and in subtitling guidelines, cf. 2.8). Due to the fact that DPs are semantically bleached (cf. 2.2.1), they are not easy to include in any existing taxonomy of translation strategies, and they cannot be analysed on the basis of translation strategies alone. For example, many of Gottlieb's (1997:75) strategies in his taxonomy of subtitling strategies relate to the loss of semantic meaning in the TT compared to the ST[26]. Gottlieb's strategies are more relevant for an overall analysis of a whole subtitled text than for an analysis of subtitling of DPs only.

A few translation strategies will however be discussed in the following. The most widely used translation strategies for DP translations in the corpus of the present study are (i) *omission* (similar to *deletion* used in e.g. Gottlieb 1997), (ii) *explicitation* (Blum-Kulka 1986; Klaudy 1993), (iii) *match* (similar to Chesterman's term *literal translation* (1997) and Pedersen's label *direct translation* (2007:127)), (iv) *paraphrase* (Gottlieb 1997), and (v) *doubling of function* (Aijmer & Simon Vandenbergen 2003).

The first three strategies, *omission*, *explicitation* and *match*, render clear (non-) translations, i.e. they are fairly easy to identify; while the last two strategies, *paraphrase* and *doubling of function*, render non-clear (non-) translations, i.e. they are not so easy to identify.

Clear (non-)translations are relatively easy to spot in the subtitles. An *omission* of a DP is a non-translation, i.e. there is no translation of the DP in question in the ST, and there is no other rendering of the function of the DP in the subtitles. Example (19) below, illustrates an omission of a DP.

(19)   ST: **well** → I'm uncle Charlie and whatever else he
          says he's the master (*PRIMARY* 00.11.10)
     TT: Jag är farbror Charlie
         och allt han säger. Han bestämmer.
        [I'm uncle Charlie
         and all he says. He makes the decisions.]

As is clear in (19), the DP *well* is not translated into the subtitle, and no other method is used to put across the use or function of *well* in the TT.

The second strategy used in the corpus is *match*. In the present study, *match* refers to a TT element being as close to an equivalent of the DP in question as possible, e.g. *you know* translated into *du vet* ('you know') as in (20) below. The DP function may also be conveyed from the ST in any other way that makes it a clear translation, e.g. *I mean* in (20) below, translated into *För* ('because'), where *För* in the subtitles is situated in the exact same position as *I mean* in the ST and is clearly included as a translation of *I mean*.

---

[26] Gottlieb's subtitling strategies include (i) expansion, (ii) paraphrase, (iii) transfer, (iv) imitation, (v) transcription, (vi) dislocation, (vii) condensation, (viii) decimation, (ix) deletion, and (x) resignation. For a discussion of these, see Gottlieb 1997:75. For an overview of taxonomies of translation strategies in both literary and audiovisual translation, see Pedersen 2007:110-127.

(20)

ST: there's this stupid man **you know** ↑ some guy with a monkey (*ADDICTED* 00.33.10)
TT: och där är en korkad man.
   Du vet, en kille med en apa.
[and there's a stupid man.
   You know, a guy with a monkey.]

ST: Maybe she had to go to the bathroom **I mean** → she does pee
   doesn't she or is she too poise to pee (*BETTY* 01.01.19)
TT: Hon kanske behövde gå på toaletten.
   För hon kissar väl?
[Maybe she had to go to the toilet.
   Because she does pee, doesn't she?]

The next translation strategy is *explicitation* (e.g. Blum-Kulka 1986; Klaudy 1993), described by Perego as follows (Perego 2009:59):

> Explicitation is a linguistic phenomenon whereby a ST's covert, implicit, unsaid and implied information is expressed overtly and verbally in the translated text, without altering the source message, but making it clearer and more informative, more complete and unambiguous, enriching, developing and reconstructing it for the sake of the target viewer

There are different types of *explicitation*, e.g. *addition*, *reformulation*, and *specification* (Perego 2009:59). The type focused on in the present study is *specification*, used when a vague feature of the ST is specified more clearly in the TT, without changing the source message. As the term *explicitation* is a widely used term within translation studies, I have chosen to use this label throughout the present study when referring to a translation strategy that makes vague ST features less vague in the TTs. One example of explicitation is (21), below, where (*it's*) *like* is translated into the unambiguous quotation marks ("[…]") to show that (*it's*) *like* has a function of signalling quotative thought in the ST.

(21)

ST: oh sure I know what people think it's **like** ↑
   Oz he's just this kick ass lacrosse player
                   (*AMPIE* 00.29.18)

TT: Jag vet vad folk tänker.
   "Oz är en hård lacrosse-spelare.**"**
[I know what people think.
   "Oz is a tough lacrosse player.**"**]

The non-clear translations *paraphrase* and *doubling of function* are not as easy to spot in the subtitles as the clear translations. By *paraphrase* is meant a TT feature that can compensate for a DP that is not translated by a matching feature. A paraphrase espresses a function identical or similar to the DP function in the ST. Consider (22) below.

(22)

ST: I decided not to I uh I uh **you know** → I'm not uh I decided
   not to take the trip as it turns out so (*FARGO* 00.55.18)
TT: Jag ska **nog** inte resa bort
   i alla fall…
   [I'm **probably** not going away
   anyway...]

In (22), the speaker in the ST uses *you know* as a solidarity marker and down-toner of the message he wants to put across. The TT uses the modal particle *nog* ('probably') as a paraphrase of *you know*, putting across a similar function. The translation rendered with the *paraphrase* strategy is not positioned in the same slot as the DP in the ST and it is sometimes difficult to know whether it is a translation of the DP or of some other feature in the discourse. The final translation strategy discussed here is the *doubling of function*. This strategy includes cases where the function of a DP in the ST is supported by the function of features in the TT that are possibly not translations of the DP in question, but of other features in the ST conveying the same function. In (23) below, the ST speaker uses the two DPs *okay* and *well*, and they both have a transitional function of moving the discourse along. The subtitler has chosen to translate only one of these DPs, i.e. *okay*, thus still conveying the function of *well* to a certain degree.

(23)   ST: You do **okay well** → | uhm did did did you see this one (*AMPIE* 00.49.35)
         TT: Gör du? **Okej**…
             Har du sett den här?
             [You do? **Okay**…
             Have you seen this one?]

Renderings like the one in (23) are most often not considered as translations in the present study, as it is quite clear that *okej* in (23) is a translation of *okay* and not of *well*, even though the function of *well* to a certain extent is also put across in *okej*. If the doubling of function concerns DPs focused on in the present study (*well*, *you know*, *I mean*, *like*), the DP most clearly translated will be considered to be translated, while the other(s) will not. This type of doubling of function does not occur very often, but will be commented on whenever necessary in subsequent chapters. Example (24) illustrates this phenomenon.

(24)
         ST: He's had a tough year **you know well** ↓ with the accident
             last month and all (*WHILE* 00.21.42)
         TT: En bra kille. Har haft ett svårt år.
             Olyckshändelsen, **menar jag**.
             [A good guy. Has had a difficult year.
             The accident, **I mean**.]

Both *you know* and *well* are used in the ST in (24), and *menar jag* ('I mean') is used in the subtitles, putting across the essence of both *you know* and *well* in the ST. In this particular example, the clarifying phrase *menar jag* is considered to be a clearer translation of *you know* than of *well*. The main reason for this is the explaining character of the part of the ST utterance where *you know* and *well* appear.

DPs translated with the clear translation strategies *omission*, *match*, and *explicitation* are always counted as (non-)translations of the DPs in the corpus and thus included in the statistics. The non-clear translation strategies *paraphrase* and *doubling of function* are often very difficult to pin-point and transfers made in this way between ST and TT are only counted as DP translations if it is clear that the DP somehow is transmitted from ST to TT. For *doubling of function*, it is most often additional features in the ST that are transferred to the TT, and these are thus, in a majority of cases, not considered to be translations of the DP in

question. Throughout the result chapters in the present study (chapters 5, 6, 7, and 8) both clear and non-clear translation strategies will be brought up and possible borderline examples will be commented on continuously.

The next step in the analysis is a focus on the actual translations. The (clear and non-clear) DP translations are divided into their pragmatic and grammatical Swedish realisations. These divisions are (loosely) based on translation categories suggested by Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen for the DP *well* (2003), and include the following categories (some Swedish features can appear in more categories than one, e.g. *alltså* can be an adverb or a DP, and the line between the two is not always clear):

- DPs (e.g. *tja*; *du vet*; *jag menar*; *typ*) / Modal particles (e.g. *ju*; *väl*; *nog*)
- Conjunctions (e.g. *och*; *men*; *fast*; *för*)
- Adverbs (e.g. *alltså*; *riktigt*)
- Punctuation marks (e.g. –; …; !; "[…]")
- Adjectives (e.g. *bra*; *lite*)
- Clauses (e.g. *rättare sagt*; *du vet väl hur det är*)
- Pronouns (e.g. *du*)
- Abbreviations (e.g. *t.ex*)
- Other (e.g. Conjunction+Pronoun (e.g. *men du)* and Miscellaneous (e.g. *ja [...]förstås*)

Not all four DPs have as many categories of translation types as seen in the list above, but the first four categories (DPs / Modal particles, conjunctions, adverbs and punctuation marks) are used as translations of all four DPs. Most of the translations (especially the first four categories) are frequently used. After being categorised into one of the above ten pragmatic or grammatical groups, each translation is analysed, and its function compared to that of the function of the DP in the ST. The most frequently used translations of each DP are most thoroughly analysed. The analysis is based on various previous studies of Swedish DPs, modal particles, adverbs, etc., used as translations of English DPs (e.g. Aijmer 1996; Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen 2003; Johansson 2006; Aijmer 2007; etc) or used in Swedish original texts or original spoken interaction (Saari 1986; Norrby & Wirdenäs 2001; Josephson 2005; Nilsson 2005; Ottesjö 2006; etc.)

4.4 Summary

The corpus has played an important part of the present study and is focused on at length in this chapter together with the method of analysis used. The multimodal corpus consists of the fully transcribed soundtrack of ten US films, each with up to four different subtitle versions: the Cinema subtitles, the DVD subtitles, and the subtitles of the public service TV channel SVT, as well as either of the commercial TV channels TV3 and TV4. All in all, the corpus includes approximately 420,000 words.

The main reason for choosing a multimodal corpus for the investigation of the present study is the access provided by film dialogue to speakers' intonation, use of pauses, body language, etc. This access greatly facilitates the analysis of DPs in the study. Compiling the

corpus was a time-consuming undertaking, but I decided at an early stage to do it myself and to perform a complete transcription of both film soundtracks and subtitles.

The ten films were chosen from various selection criteria including e.g. production, broadcast, and the type of discourse used in the films. In addition, the films are dividable into five film genres. The most important reason behind the genre division is to see whether the different discourse types in the films in any way influence the treatment of the DPs in the films and/or in the subtitles. The genres classified are not mutually exclusive, and only preliminary results can be drawn from the classification.

The ST material is analysed according to a number of parameters (Svartvik 1980) that include (i) intonation of the DP; (ii) pauses used in combination with the DP; (iii) collocations of the DP; (iv) position of the DP in an utterance; (v) type of utterance of which the DP is part; (vi) body language of the speaker; and (vii) the larger social context of the DP. The five first parameters are made visible in the examples given throughout the present study by using a simplified transcription method. In addition to the seven parameters, a cross-theoretical approach is used to facilitate the analysis of the DPs further. This contains parts of the three theories Politeness theory (Brown & Levinson, 1987), Coherence-based theory (Schiffrin, 1987), and Relevance theory (Sperber & Wilson, 1995). Additional studies on *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like*, and their various pragmatic functions, are also employed in the analysis.

The translations of the DPs are analysed in terms of various translation strategies used by the subtitlers, e.g. explicitation, omission, paraphrase, and doubling of function; as well as of their pragmatic and/or grammatical realisations (e.g. DPs/modal particles, conjunctions, adverbs, punctuation marks, and adjectives).

5 *Well*

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the results of the corpus analysis of the DP *well* (as in e.g. *did David tell you that I teach 5th grade well I did* (*SEVEN*)) and its translations will be discussed. First, I will present my definition and classification of *well*, using various parameters and previous classifications. Then, a quantitative and qualitative account of *well* and its translations will be presented. The quantitative analysis includes an overview of the distribution of the ST occurrences of *well*, its pragmatic functions, and translations. The qualitative analysis, which is the main part of the chapter, provides an illustration and a discussion of the translations of *well* found in the corpus.

5.2 Definition and functional distribution of *well*

Well is "the most frequent of the discourse particles" (Brinton 1996:36), and also possibly the most studied of all DPs. In addition, *well* is the most frequent DP in the corpus of the present study. The countless studies of *well* reflect the different views on its function(s) and use(s). Not many scholars agree on what function(s) *well* really has, or on how one should go about analysing this DP. When scholars first began analysing *well*, it was, alongside other DPs, and together with "the 'umms', 'ers' and 'mmhmms' of conversation", often given labels such as "'hesitation phenomena' and 'fillers'" (Watts 1986:37). Gradually, researchers have started to view *well* as a more complex feature of language, covering a great range of functions which are many times difficult to isolate.

To separate the non-referential discourse function of *well* (a function that has developed through a pragmaticalisation process, cf. 2.2.1) from its referential function as noun, verb, adjective, manner adverb, and degree adverb (Kaeser 2001:19), a list of examples is provided below. In the corpus, there are no examples of *well* as either noun or verb so (25), illustrating *well* as a noun, is taken from *Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners* (2002:1627) and (26), illustrating *well* as a verb, is taken from *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (2005:1470). In (27) *well* is an adjective and in (28) *well* is a manner adverb. In (29) *well* is a degree adverb. Because *well* in (25) – (29) to a larger or lesser extent has referential meaning, it cannot be removed without generating a grammatically incorrect utterance or greatly changing the original meaning of the utterances.

> (25) We used to get our water from a **well**.
> (*Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners*) NOUN

> (26) As she read the letter tears **well**ed up in her eyes.
> (*Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary*) VERB

(27)   everyone's **well** everyone's happy (*WHILE*) ADJ

(28)   that was money **well** spent *(SEVEN* 01.02.49) MANNER ADV

(29)   and wouldn't somebody who's had say thirty perms in their life
          be **well** aware of this rule (*BLONDE* 01.22.40) DEGREE ADV

Numbers (25) and (26) are clear examples of *well* demonstrating non-discourse use and being grammatically impossible to remove. Removing *well* from (27) and (28) could be possible (e.g. stuttering or repair in (27) and irony in (28)), but in their respective contexts a removal of *well* would be, if not grammatically incorrect, then at least very awkward. The degree adverb function of *well* in (29) is the least grammatically indispensable out of the five examples of *well* given above. However, *well* in this utterance is needed in its context: it is not a question of "somebody who's had thirty perms in her life" being aware of a certain rule, it is a question of this person being <u>well</u> (highly, greatly) aware of this rule.

    In its actual form, as it appears in the film *SEVEN*, example (28) has not only one instance of *well*, but two. Example (30), below, shows the whole utterance as it is in the film, with two occurrences of *well*: the first one (a) with discourse function, and the second (b) with non-discourse function.

(30)   **(a) well**, that was money **(b) well** spent. (*SEVEN* 01.02.49) DP+ADV

The instance of *well* marked as (a) in (30) is a DP and can thus be removed without rendering the utterance ungrammatical, whereas the instance of *well* marked as (b) is an adverb, which for this utterance (cf. (28)) cannot be removed without making the utterance ungrammatical and/or generally awkward in its context. DP *well* in (30) is thus redundant grammatically, but it is not without meaning. In this example, *well* has quite an elusive function somewhere between frame-marking and what could perhaps be called polite irony (not a functional label in the present study) which greatly influences the proposition following it.

    In this chapter, examples such as (25) – (29) will not be further considered, but focus will be on the discourse function of *well*, illustrated in e.g. (30 (a)).

5.2.1 Some previous multifunctional studies of *well*

The classification of *well* used in the present study is my own, and it is based on the data in the corpus. However, my classification has been influenced by a number of studies of *well* (e.g. Lakoff 1973; Svartvik 1980; Owen 1981; Carlson 1984; Watts 1986; Schiffrin 1987; Jucker 1993; Aijmer 1996a; Schourup 2001), and some of them will now be discussed. The most appealing aspect elicited from these studies is a view of *well* as a multifunctional entity, as opposed to a feature covering only one function. *Well* is seen in most of the studies as demonstrating a core function, and a number of interrelated functions originating from this core function. The basis for the analysis in this chapter is that *well* is able to perform many functions in discourse. Studies on *well* in translation (e.g. Bazzanella & Morra 2000; Aijmer

& Simon-Vandenbergen 2003; Johansson 2006; Cuenca 2008) have also influenced my analysis.

As all studies on *well* show, deciphering and separating its functions is not a simple task. To a large extent, previous studies discuss *well* in connection to a core function of a certain renegotiation of the surrounding context, regardless of whether this is a renegotiation of a more textual or interpersonal kind. Jucker (1993:446) defines the core function of *well* as:

> […] a signpost that directs the addressees to renegotiate the relevant background assumptions, either because a new set of assumptions becomes relevant or because some of the manifest assumptions are mistaken.

Svartvik (1980:177) concludes his analysis on the function(s) of *well* with a thought on its core function:

> *Well* signals a modification or partial change in the discourse, i.e. it introduces a part of the discourse that has something in common with what went before but also differs from it to some degree.

Cuenca (2008) develops Svartvik's idea and suggests two core features of *well*, namely continuity and downtoning: "*well* is both retrospective and prospective: it presupposes an existing previous context to which the forthcoming utterance is a qualified response, and it indicates that such an utterance is about to come" (Cuenca 2008:1385). *Continuity*, Cuenca argues, can be related to the structural functions of *well*, and *downtoning* to the modal functions and politeness.

There seems to be agreement among scholars that the core function of *well* is to signal some sort of renegotiation of the ongoing discourse. In the present study, the label *re-evaluation* will be used instead, since a negotiation (if seen as a dialogical process) is not always part of the procedure including *well*, but an evaluation (if seen as a less dialogical process) is. In this re-evaluation also lies a prospective function, as mentioned by Cuenca: the purpose of the re-evaluation is to support the new information that is about to come. *Well* is seen in the present study as a means of signalling re-evaluation either textually or interpersonally. As we will see below, other studies also divide the core function of *well* into several interrelated functions, illustrating what kind of re-evaluation is being made in a certain utterance in a certain context.

One of the first analyses of *well* was carried out by Lakoff (1973) who relied solely on intuitive data. Lakoff's study employs a relevance-theoretical approach to *well* and is concerned mainly with *well* in answers to questions. She finds that "*well* is used in case the respondent knows he is not giving directly the information the questioner sought" (1973:458). Lakoff suggests that in answers to questions "*well* is used in case the speaker senses some sort of insufficiency in his answer, whether because he is leaving it to the questioner to fill in the information on his own or because he is about to give additional information himself" (1973:463). One much quoted example from Lakoff is the following:

(31)   A: Did you kill your wife?
      B: Yes.
      C: **Well**, yes.

Example (31) shows two different replies to the yes/no-question *Did you kill your wife?*. Both replies have the same truth-conditional proposition, but they are not interchangeable (Jucker 1993:441). The first one (*Yes*) is a straightforward answer, whereas the second one (*Well, yes*) is a much less direct answer. The latter shows some insufficiency, signalled by *well*: the respondent knows that s/he "is not giving the information which the questioner has requested" (Jucker 1993:440). Lakoff sums up her own ideas about *well* as follows: "the generalization seems to be that *well* is used in case of an insufficiency of response, either by the respondent himself or by someone else" (1973:464). As Carlson (1984) notes, Lakoff's treatment of *well* is fine as far as it goes, i.e. it gives "an appropriate interpretation of the notion of insufficiency" (1984:19), but does not account for the more textual function(s) of *well*.

Jucker (1993) also examines *well* from a relevance-theoretical perspective and distinguishes four main uses of the DP. The first function of *well* that Jucker finds is as a marker of insufficiency "indicating some problems on the content level of the current or preceding utterance" (1993:438). This function is more or less identical to Lakoff's account of *well* as a marker of insufficiency. The second of Jucker's functions is *well* as a face threat mitigator (based on Brown & Levinson 1987), "indicating some problems on the interpersonal level" (ibid.). One of Jucker's examples of *well* as a face-threat mitigator is seen below.

(32)
      A: can I just see them
      B: um **well** I'm not allowed to do that

In (32), A is requesting to see something that B is not allowed to show, hence B's noncompliance rather than compliance, mitigated by the use of *well*.

Jucker's third function of *well* is as a frame marking device, "indicating a topic change or introducing direct reported speech" (ibid.). Examples (33) and (34) below illustrate the topic changing function and the reported speech function, respectively (Jucker 1993:447, examples shortened somewhat).

(33)
      A: […] and got a letter back saying we have arranged for you to stay – **well** let's take the interview first.

(34)
      A: and I said **well** I don't really think I could write

In the first utterance, there is a shift in topic focus, signalled by *well*, and in the second utterance (quoted in Jucker from Svartvik 1980), *well* indicates that what follows it is an instance of reported direct speech.

The fourth function of *well* that Jucker finds is *well* as a delay device. He gives an example adapted from Svartvik's analysis of recorded casual conversations (1980:171, phonetic symbols removed here):

(35)   A: on on the **well** on the you know on the hatchway there

According to Jucker, *well* in example (35) is used as a temporising or delaying tactic. Jucker argues that *well* in all four functions is a kind of signpost, "directing the way in which the

following utterance should be processed by the addressee" (1993:438) against a background of the context (the addressee's personal cognitive environment as well as the previous discourse).

A two-fold classification of *well* is adopted in quite a few studies, e.g. Svartvik 1980; Carlson 1984; Bazzanella & Morra 2000; Aijmer 2002; Cuenca 2008. Three of these, namely Svartvik's, Carlson's and Cuenca's classifications of *well* are quite detailed and will thus be discussed here in relation to the functional classification of *well* in the present study.

Svartvik (1980) was one of the first to move beyond intuitive data when studying *well* (cf. Lakoff 1973 who used intuition only). He used the London-Lund corpus and extracted 45,000 words of recorded casual conversation, including approximately 300 occurrences of *well*. Svartvik divides these occurrences of *well* into two main uses, i.e. *well* as a qualifier and *well* as a frame, to be seen as positions in a spectrum. Svartvik supports his analysis of *well* with a use of English paraphrases and Swedish translations, as well as a variety of parameters (also to a large degree used for the present study, cf. 4.3.1), including position and prosody of *well* along with pauses and collocations in the surrounding discourse structure. Svartvik relies more on the paraphrases than on the other parameters when analysing *well*, something which he himself finds "no more than moderately successful" (1980:176), due to the fact that DPs do not show semantic meaning to the same extent that lexical words (nouns, verbs, etc.) do. The dichotomy of qualifier and frame is further divided by Svartvik into a system of subfunctions. This two-fold view of *well* has influenced subsequent studies on *well* and other DPs. Svartvik's division is clearly shown in Carlson (1984:21-22), repeated here:

***Well* as a frame**	***Well* as a qualifier**
Closing previous discourse and focusing on following discourse	Agreement, positive attitude
Introducing explanations	Reinforcement
Indicating the beginnings of direct speech	Exclamatory surprise
Editing marker for self-correction	Answer prefix

The four frame functions of *well* in Svartvik's model are quite straightforward as frame-markers/turn-takers, markers of explanation, markers of direct speech (quotation), and markers of self-correction (repair).

Well with a function of closing previous discourse and focusing on following discourse is illustrated with the example later used by Jucker (cf. (33)), repeated here:

(36)   A: […] and got a letter back saying we have arranged for you to stay – **well** let's take the interview first.

Svartvik finds that this type of *well* usually has a falling intonation and is preceded by a long pause.

Another frame function in Svartvik's analysis is *well* as an introduction of explanations and clarifications. For this function he finds the collocations *you see* and *I mean* to be the most frequent. Consider (37) below (1980:175, transcription simplified):

(37)
> A: I acquired an absolutely magnificent sewing machine by foul means did I tell you about that
> B: No
> A: **Well** when I was doing freelance advertising the advertising agency that I sometimes work for rang me […]

Svartvik concludes about *well* in (37) that it is "a partial shift of topic in that the preceding question has cleared the way for the preceding story to be told but does not directly indicate that the speaker intends to tell the story" (1980:175).

A frequent function of *well* in Svartvik's corpus is that of a marker of direct speech. Svartvik gives the following example (1980:170, transcription simplified):

(38)   […] and I said **well** I don't really think I could write […]

Common collocations with *well* as a marker of direct speech in Svartvik's material are *oh* and *then* as in *oh well* and *well then*, as well as a form of *say* (as in the example above) or *think, you know, you see, I mean*, etc.

The final frame function of *well* that Svartvik finds in his study, is the self-correction marker. This is exemplified in (39).

(39)   A: it has a lot of **well** it has a few

Well in (39) is an editing marker, used by the speaker as he corrects himself and needs to start over.

The four labels relating to Svartvik's qualifying functions of *well* are somewhat vaguer than the frame functions. By *agreement and positive attitude*, Svartvik seems to mean agreement to questions or requests that are "not straight, but saying 'this information is the best I can do in answering your question'" (Svartvik 1980:173). It is thus similar to what Lakoff (1973) and Jucker (1993) refer to as a function of insufficiency. The below example is given by Svartvik (1980:173, transcription simplified).

(40)
> A: […] can you […] what's the word connect them in such a way that they just go on so nobody can detect it
> B: **well** there's um there's a mark on the um

B's answer in (40) is not straightforward, but communicating "this information is the best I can do in answering your question" (ibid.).

Svartvik's label *reinforcement* is exemplified by an utterance reinforcing the previous speaker's claim, but also disagreeing with it, which makes this function similar to markers of politeness.

(41)
> A: I think they've got quite a good opinion of him
> B: **well** uh I I have too

B in (41) reinforces A's utterance, but also disagrees with it, suggesting that A has failed to see a point.

Svartvik's third qualifying function, labelled *exclamatory surprise*, is exemplified by the utterance *Well, I'll be damned!* and is said to be infrequent in the corpus.

By the label *answer prefix*, Svartvik means a softening of non-straight and incomplete answers. Examples given are again similar to the insufficiency function discussed by Lakoff (1973) and Jucker (1993). It is also comparable to the face threat mitigating function discussed by Jucker (the line drawn between mitigating functions and functions signalling insufficiency is many times fuzzy in Svartvik's account of *well*, as they are in the present study, cf. 5.2.2):

(42) A: are these copies
      B: **well** that's a copy uh that's only a Stoke student has made a copy of the painting which […]

A's question is a yes/no-question but it is not possible for B to reply with either a *yes* or a *no*: s/he has to elaborate on the answer, indicating this with *well*. Svartvik finds that this type of *well* does not only occur in answers to questions, but B's reply could just as easily have occurred if A had said "I believe these are copies".

Like Svartvik, Carlson labels the two main functions of *well* as *frame* and *qualifier*. Using a corpus of some three hundred excerpts of fictional dialogue from British and American detective novels, he makes a solely qualitative study without statistical conclusions. Carlson includes an abundance of examples, only a few of which are given below as an illustration of his findings.

Well as a frame in Carlson's model is a transitional device opening or closing a dialogue. *Well* signals a return to a topic after an intermission (e.g. through turn-taking), i.e. it performs transitions in discourse and shifts in topics. The frame function can be positioned initially or medially in an utterance. One example of the transitional function of *well* as an opener of dialogue found by Carlson is seen below (1984:54).

(43) Ralph cleared his throat. – **Well** then. […] We're on an island.

Well in (43) is used in combination with *then* as an indicator of topic shift, and it moves the dialogue forward.

Carlson also finds a prompting function of *well*, labelled as a frame function and exemplified in (44).

(44) […] **Well**? Restarick hardly waited until he had come through the door. – **Well**, what about my daughter?

Well as a qualifier in Carlson's model can signal, among other things, defective questions, e.g. when a question seems irrelevant by the answerer, or defective answers, e.g. when an answer does not "meet the demands of the question" (1984:37). Both the label *defective questions* and the label *defective answers* have features in common with the insufficiency marking function of *well* already mentioned in the accounts of Lakoff, Jucker, and Svartvik above (labelled *agreement and positive attitude*, or *answer prefix* in Svartvik's study). Carlson's label *defective questions* is exemplified in (45).

(45) – Is it a murder, then? – **Well**, it is conjectured to be so […]

Another qualifier function that Carlson finds *well* to have is as an indicator of what he labels *demanded explanations*. This function is similar to what Svartvik labels *introducing*

explanations, a function Svartvik means has more frame-marking than qualifying characteristics. *Well* used in Carlson's function *demanded explanations* is always subsequent to a question, as in (46) below.

(46)　– But it's all wrong, M. Poirot. It's all wrong.– What is wrong, Mademoiselle?
　　　– **Well**, it just couldn't have happened […].

Carlson found a few more qualifying functions of *well* in his corpus that will be discussed briefly: *conversational maxims compromised*, *(dis)agreements*, and *arguments*. The category labelled *conversational maxims compromised* may, according to Carlson, include a certain caution in answering questions, which can be traced to the politeness function of *well*. An example of this function is (47), where the speaker using *well* is toning down his message with *well*.

(47)　– Would you call me a looker, he asked.
　　　– **Well**, Henry--- – Don't pansy up on me, he snarled. No, Henry, I should not
　　　　call you very handsome.

(Dis)agreements and arguments are additional situations where *well* as a marker of politeness is used in Carlson's study. Carlson does not find *well* before a direct denial to be very common, but "*well* may show up if the dissent is partial or hesitant, or if it is disguised as a comment for reasons of politeness or dramatic effect" (1984:41). Examples of this type of *well* are (48) and (49), below.

(48)　– It seems to me an excellent plan. –**Well**, I disagree. Holder-Watts sounded sulky.

(49)　[…] –It's ten as far as I can remember. – **Well**, you're wrong, madam. Kramer turned and
　　　stalked out.

In both of the examples above, *well* is used as a down-toner of the disagreements *I disagree* and *you're wrong, madam*.

The many functions that Carlson finds *well* to have are part of a complex functional continuum, and he states that the functional categories in his model are not mutually exclusive.

Another more recent model of a division of subfunctions of *well* is Cuenca (2008). In order to see whether the functions of *well* can be identified through a contrastive analysis, she examines the behaviour of *well* and its translations in the Spanish and Catalan dubbing of the film *Four Weddings and a Funeral*. Her two-fold functional division is based on structural *well* (equal to Svartvik's and Carlson's *frame*) and modal *well* (equal to Svartvik's and Carlson's *qualifier*), which she further subdivides into several more or less interrelated subfunctions. The structural functions of *well* include transitional functions of opening and closing of a discourse unit, as well as reformulations and change of topic. *Well* as a transition marker is illustrated in (50).

(50)　Charles: Thanks.
　　　Carrie: **Well**, I'm going now.

In examples such as the one above, Cuenca states that *well* "indicates a boundary and a change in the discourse structure. Cuenca's function of reformulation is exemplified in (51).

> (51)   Carrie: Boatman.
>   Charles: Right. But now I'm going to stay at some friend's house with
>   some friends. **Well**, I say 'house' – I think 'enormous castle' is a more accurate description.

In (51), Charles reformulates his utterance so that what he first refers to as *a house* is changed into *an enormous castle*.

Cuenca's modal functions of *well* signal (partial) agreement, doubt, (partial) disagreement or contraposition. An example of partial agreement is (52) below, where Hamish uses a combination of *yes* and *well* which introduces "an utterance that partially contradicts the implicit assumption in Charles' statement (i.e. that Carrie wanted to be back in the UK)" (2008:1380).

> (52)   Charles: […] How do you do, Hamish. Delighted to meet you. Charming surprise to find
>   Carrie back in the country.
>   Hamish: Yes, **well**, took a lot of persuading, I can tell you.

Cuenca's function *partial disagreement* in the above example seems to be positioned somewhere between Lakoffs' and Jucker's label of *well* as a marker of insufficiency and Jucker's (etc.) label of *well* as a face threat mitigator.

Cuenca, like Carlson, emphasises the fact that "modal and structural functions cannot always be dissociated" (2008:1385), i.e. there is not always a clear line to be drawn between the two main functions of *well*, but one occurrence of *well* may convey both structural and modal functions.

As is clear from the above discussion, many studies of *well* discuss this DP in terms of being both a textual device (in the above studies labelled *frame* or *structural device*) signalling turn-taking, topic change, repair, etc., and an interpersonal device (in the above studies labelled *qualifier* or *modal device*) signalling the speaker's attitude towards the communicative situation through using insufficiency, face threat mitigation, etc. Below follows my own classification of *well*, which is based on parts of the multifunctional approaches discussed above, as well as on the paremeters (cf. 4.3.1) and on the cross-theoretical framework (cf. 2.4 and 2.5) used in order to analyse the DPs of the present study.

5.2.2 Classification of *well* in the present study

I have based my functional classification of *well* on the seven parameters used for analysing all four DPs in the present study (cf. 4.3.1), as well as on the cross-theoretical framework (also cf. 2.4 and 2.5) including the categorisations of *well* discussed above: primarily Lakoff 1973; Svartvik 1980; Carlson 1984; Jucker 1993; and Cuenca 2008. The classification of *well* is my own, but it is compared to previous classifications in the present section to show differences and similarities between the classifications.

The two-fold categorisation of *well* into frame and qualifier (Svartvik 1980; Carlson 1984) or structural and modal (Cuenca 2008) is used here with the labels *textual* and *interpersonal*. The different systems of interrelated subfunctions are narrowed down to the

four functions seen below, with supplementary examples. These functions are not meant to include all the possible functions *well* can signal in discourse in general, but only the functions *well* conveys in the corpus relevant for the present study. The four functions are exemplified below: the first two functions are positioned on the textual side of a functional continuum and the last two on the interpersonal side of a functional continuum: Frame-marker (**FRAME**); Clarity marker (**CLAR**); Insufficiency marker (**INS**); and Mitigation marker (**MIT**). In order to decode the functions of *well*, a great deal of context is often needed, and it is thus difficult to distinguish functions from short extracts only. The functions will therefore be further explained after the examples below.

(53) FRAME A: that's okay
       B: uhm │ │ **well** ↑ if you walk with me I'll take you up to the │ the library
                      (*PRIMARY* 00.02.34)

(54) CLAR A: does she have any relatives in the area
       B: no │ │ **well** ↑ she does have some grandparents down in Oklahoma
        but that's it (*BETTY* 00.27.14)

(55) INS   A: how about tomorrow
       B: **well** ↑ │ I have ballet practice │ perhaps uhm I could come by your house
        afterwards (*AMPIE* 00.38.11)

(56) MIT   **well** ↓ I'm sorry sir we still gotta charge you the four dollars (*FARGO* 00.55.24)

The core function of re-evaluation is integrated into all of the four functions above. The labels of the four functions are approached quite similarly to the studies mentioned in 5.2.1. What follows is a brief overview of the four functions and how they relate or not relate to the studies mainly influencing the classification (Lakoff (1973); Svartvik (1980); Carlson (1984); Jucker (1993); and Cuenca (2008)), followed by a more detailed explanation of each function of *well* in the present study, with additional examples. The following is not meant to be a comprehensive description of the various labels, and how they are related per se, but simply a look into the different functional distributions of *well*, and how the functions are labelled. Each of the four functions will be discussed in more detail throughout this chapter, and additional examples will be provided.

    FRAME and **CLAR** are the two textual functions. **FRAME** is similar to what Jucker calls a frame marking device "indicating a topic change or introducing direct reported speech" (1993:438). It is also comparable to what Svartvik refers to as "closing previous discourse and focusing on following discourse", as well as "indicating the beginnings of direct speech" under his heading of '*well* as frame' (Svartvik 1980:171-172). Both Carlson's and Cuenca's classifications of *well* include a transition in discourse through opening and closing a discourse unit, and changing topics, and are also relevant for the **FRAME** function in the present study. In the corpus of the present study, **FRAME** is most often used to open or close a topic or to signal reported speech. In example (53) above, the character performs a transition in the discourse as well as in the physical events in the scene. By saying *well*, she initiates a move from one topic to another and starts walking towards the library she is talking about.

    The **CLAR** function can be found in Svartvik's model, referred to as "introducing explanations" and in Cuenca's model labelled "reformulations". In the present study, **CLAR**

refers chiefly to repairing functions of *well*, as can be seen in example (54), above. *Well* here signals character B's change from *no* (*she does not have any relatives in the area*) via repair-marking *well* to s*he does have some grandparents down in Oklahoma*. An additional **CLAR** function in the corpus is a prompting type of *well*, used with a rising intonation. Carlson also found a prompting function of *well* in her study, and she labelled this a frame-marker.

INS and **MIT** are the two interpersonal functions. The **INS** function of *well* is more or less identical with what both Lakoff and Jucker distinguished as marker of insufficiency, i.e. it is used when there is some kind of insufficiency on the content level in the dialogue. Svartvik also brings this function up in his terms *agreement and positive attitude* and *answer prefix*. Carlson labels this function *defective questions* (irrelevant questions) and *defective answers* (answers that do not meet the demands of the question). In addition, Cuenca brings up the function of insufficiency in her term *partial agreement*. The **INS** function is exemplified in (55) above by an answer to the yes/no-question *how about tomorrow*. The question refers to whether or not speaker B can meet speaker A tomorrow. In (55), *well* has the function of marking the insufficiency in B's answer. Speaker B is not able to give a clear *yes* or *no* as an answer to A's question, and so she uses *well* as a signal of the complexity in her answer: as she has ballet practice, she can perhaps meet speaker A, but it includes certain logistic adjustments. Many times, *well* as an insufficiency marker is used in replies to questions, and more often than not these questions are quite straightforward yes/no-questions. In cases such as these, a simple *yes* or *no* is not sufficient enough as an answer, but further evaluation is needed.

The fourth and final function of *well* suggested here is the **MIT** function. This is similar to Jucker's *face threat mitigator* and Svartvik's *reinforcement* (a disagreement mitigated through reinforcement) and *answer prefix* (a softening of answers). Carlson discusses the politeness function in quite a broad sense and brings up agreements, disagreements, and arguments to observe how *well* can be used as a mitigator of various face threatening situations. Cuenca's terms *partial agreement*, *(partial) disagreement* and *contraposition* also have to do with politeness and mitigation used in order to soften the disagreement etc. **MIT** is exemplified above in (56) by a speaker (a car attendant) requesting payment from a defiant client, by using *well* as a mitigator, diminishing the face threat of this request.

To sum up, in the present study, the functions of *well* are classified as **FRAME**, **CLAR, INS** and **MIT**. The two functions **FRAME** and **CLAR** are seen as operating textually, while the two functions **INS** and **MIT** are seen as operating interpersonally. The functions are not mutually exclusive, but one instance of *well* may signal two or more functions at the same time. The functions are situated in a functional continuum, and they overlap here and there. However, when allowing for the seven parameters used for the analysis of all DPs in the present study (cf. 4.3.1), alongside the cross-theoretical approach taken; one function of *well* most often manifests itself as more salient in a given context than the remaining functions do. Each of the four functions will now be looked at in more detail using examples with more context.

On the textual side of the continuum are the **FRAME** and **CLAR** functions of *well*. These functions give *well* certain qualities that are the same for both textual functions: e.g. (i) they both structurally signal that a re-evaluation of (one part of) an utterance or of a larger

contextual whole is to come; (ii) they most often entail a pause before *well* or, if *well* is utterance-initial, they are most often associated with a pause after *well*; (iii) they usually present *well* with a rising intonation (mainly for transitional **FRAME** and prompting **CLAR**), a declarative intonation (mainly for quotative **FRAME**), and a falling intonation (mainly for repairing **CLAR**); (iv) they are most often used for utterance-initial *well*, but sometimes also for utterance-medial *well* (the latter mainly for repairing **FRAME**).

    FRAME is the function demonstrating the most textual qualities of all four functions. Included in this function are both transitional moves such as floor-gaining and turn-taking, and markers of quoted speech and thought. The transitional function is exemplified in (57), below.

(57)   Lou: jeez you okay Margie
          Marge: yeah I'm fine │ │ it's just morning sickness │ │ **well** ↑ that passed

                                                          (*FARGO* 00.35.55)

The transitional **FRAME** function signals a conclusion or a beginning of a topic or conversation and is often used as a turn-taking device. In (57), the speaker Marge has unexpectedly vomited a moment ago and her colleague asks her whether she is okay. Marge replies that she is fine and that it is just morning sickness, then makes a short pause and finally concludes the topic by using *well* as a transition marker before stating that the sickness has passed. Other transition markers could have been used here instead of *well*, e.g. *okay*, *now*, *right* or *anyway*. The pause before *well*, and the rising intonation of *well* are typical features of this function. Svartvik (1980:174) also finds that a long pause preceding a transitional *well* is common, but in his corpus a falling tone is more frequent then a rising one. Common collocations for *well* with a transitional **FRAME** function are *then* (as in *well then*), and *umh*s, but the clearest sign of this function is a pause preceding *well*.

    The quotative **FRAME** function is illustrated in (58), below.

(58)   Henry: yeah but not too pissed off he's running for president
          Daisy: right right it should be more like **well** →**well**→ that's too bad but we don't take it
                   seriously

                                                 (*PRIMARY* 00.49.48)

Well with a quotative **FRAME** function signals a quote as a part of direct speech or thought, often within a speaker's indirect speech. Frequently collocating verbs are *say* or *think* (Svartvik 1980:170), but *well* can signal direct speech without such verbs. In (58) above, *well* collocates with (*more*) *like* to express an utterance the speaker thinks is appropriate for a certain situation: the speaker Daisy suggests how her superior, a governor running for president, may communicate to the press the fact that he is accused of adultery. Daisy imagines what the governor will say by using direct speech (*that's too bad but we don't take it seriously*), indicating by (*more*) *like* and *well* that this is a (n imagined) quote. Unlike the transitional **FRAME** function of *well*, the quotative **FRAME** function does usually not entail any pauses prior to or subsequent to *well*. The position of *well* with a quotative function is always medial, and the intonation most often declarative. Using *well* as a marker of quotation does not usually mean that *well* itself is part of the utterance quoted. It is simply there to

structure the discourse and make it easier for the hearer to process. It is not always possible to see a difference between *well* as a part of a quoted utterance or thought, functioning as a turn-opener, or *well* as a pure signal of direct speech or thought. However, because *well* as a quotation marker is usually prosodically unmarked and can be removed without changing the meaning of the utterance, its function can "be taken merely as a signal indicating the beginning of direct speech, parallel to that of quotation marks in writing" (Svartvik 1980:175).

CLAR is the second of the textual functions of *well* found in the present study. The most frequent use of *well* with this function is as a repair marker, used to signal the rephrasing of a previous (part of an) utterance. *Well* with a repair function operates as an "editing marker for self-correction" (Svartvik 1980:175). The intonation of repairing *well* is often falling, the position almost always medial, and a longer pause often included before *well*. Collocations used include DP *I mean*, broken-off utterances, etc. Example (59), below, is an example of *well* with a repairing **CLAR** function.

(59)   Tracy: did David tell you that I teach 5th grade │ │ **well** ↓ I did
(*SEVEN* 00.55.52)

In (59), the speaker Tracy changes the tense of her narrative from the present to the past by using *well* as a repair marker. She asks the hearer whether he knows that she is teaching fifth grade, then realises she actually has no teaching employment at the moment, and changes from *I teach 5th grade* to *I did* (*teach*). The repair signal *well* here indicates that what is to come is an edited version of what has been said. Repair has a re-evaluating function in that it makes the speaker stop momentarily to rephrase a mistake in an utterance.

Another type of **CLAR** is a prompting function of *well*, exemplified below.

(60)   Rosa: look who's here over there.
         Betty: Hm
         Rosa: **well** ↑ │ │ │ what are you waiting for │ talk to him huh you came 1500 miles for this
(*BETTY* 00.54.19)

Prompting *well* is always used in the corpus as an introduction to a question or a demand. Carlson found a clarification function that is more or less identical with the one found in the present study, and he labels this function a frame-marker, i.e. a textual marker. *Well* as a prompting device has the function of eliciting a clarification or an action from the hearer, either by using an eliciting question, or a demand in the form of an imperative. In (60), Rosa uses *well* to move along in the discourse (as a marker of transition), but moreover she applies *well* in this context as a prompter to make Betty do something, i.e. talk to the man she has travelled 1500 miles to meet. In the corpus, *well* as a prompter is most commonly used with eliciting questions, and thus has a rising intonation to demonstrate the eliciting, as (60) shows. In addition to this, there are also a few examples of prompting *well* with a declarative intonation, used for orders or demands and the elicitation of actions. Most often, this type of *well* is used utterance-initially, with a subsequent pause. Despite its main textual and structuring functions, the prompting function of **CLAR** is situated quite close to the interpersonal function in the continuum. It also has a meaning which is beyond mere

structuring, as it often elicits a quite complex proposition from the hearer and sometimes has qualities resembling those of politeness markers.

On the interpersonal side of the functional continuum in the present study are **INS** and **MIT**. These functions provide *well* with characteristics that are the same for both functions: e.g. (i) they both interpersonally signal that a re-evaluation of (a part of) an utterance or a larger contextual whole is to come; (ii) they most often include a pause after *well*; (iii) they most often present *well* with a rising intonation (**INS**) or a declarative or falling intonation (**MIT**); (iv) they are most often used for utterance-initial *well*.

INS indicates insufficiency on the content level in the ongoing dialogue. Example (55) above is repeated as (61) below to illustrate this.

(61) Nadia: perhaps you could help me with my studies
      Jim: uh yeah absolutely that that that would be that would be great sometime how about tomorrow
      Nadia: **well** ↑ I have ballet practice │ perhaps uhm I could come by your house afterwards I could change clothes at your place

(*AMPIE* 00.38.11)

In the above example, Nadia is asking Jim whether he is able to help her with some homework. Jim is more than eager to help and suggests meeting the next day. Nadia cannot reply with a direct *yes* or *no*, but needs to renegotiate the background assumptions (Jucker 1993:442) first. She gives a reason why it may not be possible to meet the next day (*I have ballet practice*), but then suggests a solution to this mainly logistic problem (*Perhaps uhm I could come by your house afterwards I could change clothes at your place*). The rising intonation of *well* and facial expressions of the speaker using *well* confirm the functional label chosen. As a reply to Jim's question, Nadia first re-evaluates the background and then gives information concerning his question.

The main function of the insufficiency marker is thus to signal that what one speaker is about to say does not altogether logically follow from what the previous speaker has said. The insufficiency marking function is defined quite broadly here as either a reply to a question, or a comment to a statement. This reply/statement can be either an agreement or a disagreement, but is always a re-evaluation of the ongoing discourse.

Sometimes **INS** has a more explanative or hesitant function than in the above example. The explanative function has a structural effect as it signals a return to an immediately preceding part of the discourse and rephrases this part to make it more understandable to the hearer. It is, however, categorised here as an interpersonal function for various reasons (cf. Carlson (1984:38) who positions what he calls "demanded explanations", a function similar to the present one in that it is an explanation following a question, under the heading *Qualifier*, a heading similar to what I refer to as *Interpersonal*). It is mainly an interpersonal function as it points to the complexity in the proposition which the speaker is trying to put across, and because it has the function of clarifying something to the hearer beyond the mere structural functions of *well*. Carlson states that the first speaker's question giving rise to *well* in the second speaker's reply "is the gambit of questioning an assertion by asking for clarification or confirming evidence" (1984:38). Such questions are countered by *well* "because they show

that previous communication has been defective" (ibid.). Example (62), below, is an illustration of the explanative **INS** function.

(62)
Elle: although Mr. Huntington makes an excellent point I have to wonder if the defendant kept a thorough record of every sperm emission made throughout his life
Callahan: interesting why do you ask
Elle: **well** ↑ │ │ unless the defendant attempted to contact every single one-night stand to determine if a child resulted in those unions he has no parental claim over this child whatsoever why now why this sperm

(LEGALLY 00.46.17)

The scene in (62) takes place in an auditorium at Harvard Law School as the character Elle is questioning an argument presented by a peer. Her view is considered interesting by the teacher, but he needs further explanation and thus wonders why she is making this particular point. As it is quite an intricate problem Elle is raising, she needs to go back to her previous statement and explain this further. She is thus re-evaluating her first statement before moving on, developing it further. The explanative **INS** function of *well* usually appears after questions (such as *Why do you ask?* above) or statements (such as *I don't follow*) in which the questioner asks for further information concerning the content of the speaker's utterance. This explanative function of *well* almost always has a rising intonation.

Due to its clear re-evaluative character, **INS** sometimes has features of hesitation. This quality shows the speaker's uncertainty or attempt to find the right expression for the intended content in a difficult situation. Example (63), below, illustrates this.

(63)
Saul: Peter, there's something │ │ you have to know about her you see she **well** ↓ │ │ uh │ │ she's │ │ you know │ │ she's not only your fiancée she's your guardian angel yeah Peter she saved your life

(WHILE 01.14.01)

As in many examples of hesitation, example (63) has instances of hesitant features such as repetition, DP *you know*, stuttering, and pauses together with *uh*-sounds. In the example above, Saul is about to tell his godson Peter that he (the godson) is married, a fact Peter is not aware of since he is currently suffering from amnesia. Saul cannot bring himself to inform Peter of the marriage and thus starts to stutter and make long pauses before surrendering to his cowardice, saying something completely different.

The final function of *well* which will be mentioned here is **MIT**. This label is more or less synonymous with 'Face Threat Mitigator' (FTM) as used by e.g. Jucker (1993), Watts (2003) and Owen (1981). The term FTM is taken from Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory of Face Threatening Acts (FTAs). Jucker defines FTMs as indicating "a problem on the interpersonal level. Either the face of the speaker or the face of the hearer is threatened" (1993:444). FTMs are most often used in requests, disagreements, etc., i.e. in situations where the speaker does not want lose face, or threaten the face of the hearer, and thus mitigates his/her utterance. Owen describes *well* as "a move minimizing the face threat" in an FTA (1981:44). In the corpus, *well* with a **MIT** function is often used as a mitigator of disagreement. Example (64), below, is an illustration of this.

(64)

Henry: I think the phone landed in the brush
Jack: **well** → you're wrong it landed over here in the tree I saw it

(*PRIMARY* 00.30.30)

The scene in (64) takes place just as Jack, in a moment of fury, has thrown his own mobile phone out of a car window. Henry, the reason for Jack's anger, saw the phone flying through the air and says he thinks it landed in the brush. Jack, aggravated and obstinate, says he believes the phone landed in the trees and that Henry is wrong. The accusation *you're wrong* is quite harsh, especially considering the fact that Henry actually is right, and that Jack possibly knows this. Inserting *well* before *you're wrong* mitigates the harshness of Jack's accusation somewhat. *Well* with a **MIT** function most often has a declarative or falling intonation. In most cases, there are no pauses before the DP, but sometimes following it.

The above examination of the functions of *well* should make it clear that none of these functions are definite, but as all DP functions they are somewhere on a gradient scale and sometimes intertwined. The above account of *well* is a way of trying to decode the functions and limit them as much as possible. As we have seen, however, the functions of *well* often overlap. Below are two further examples of difficulties arising when classifying the functions of *well*. Both examples focus on differences between the functions **INS** and **MIT**, as these are possibly the most ambiguous functions of *well*, and most difficult to set apart.

Example (65), below, could be interpreted as, for instance, either **INS** or **MIT**.

(65)

Callahan: do you think she woke up one morning and said I think I'll go to law school today
Emmet: **well** → | that lapse in judgment aside I think she's got a lot of potential

(*BLONDE* 00.47.22)

Example (65) is far from being a straightforward example of *well*, due to the use of irony and a rhetoric question. The character Callahan is confused about why the character Elle has decided to go to Law School, as she is so different from all other Law School students and does not really fit in. Callahan asks Emmet a rhetoric question, which Emmet answers, initiating the reply with *well*. Emmet's answer is a defence of Elle, and *well* thus has a **MIT** function: Emmet's face is threatened by his defending Elle, as Callahan is his superior. However, this occurrence of *well* is classified as having an **INS** function in the present study for a few reasons: (i) Callahan's question is a yes/no question and *well* with an **INS** function commonly follows yes/no questions; (ii) the fact that Emmet does not answer Callahan's question directly (as the question is rhetoric and not really possible to answer with a *yes* or *no*), but changes the subject somewhat, signalling this insufficiency in his answer with *well*; and (iii) the intonation and body language of both speakers show that the tone is friendly and ironic, and there is thus not much need for a face-threat mitigation in Emmet's reply. Neither the intonation nor the irony is possible to identify from a written example only, and so the multimodality of the corpus is required for the analysis.

Another example where it is difficult to draw the line between the **INS** and **MIT** functions is (66) below:

(66)

| Anton: | when will I meet her |
| Sam: | **well ↑│** we're actually not together anymore |

In example (66), Anton asks Sam when he will meet Sam's girlfriend, and Sam answers that they're not together anymore, initiating the answer with *well*. In this example, *well* has a **MIT** function, as Sam is mitigating the face-threat of the situation (there is a degree of embarrassement in the situation as Anton does not know that Sam has broken up with his girlfriend, and Sam has to explain this). The label chosen for this occurrence of *well* is not **MIT**, however, but **INS**, as *well* follows a straightforward question, has a rising intonation, and clearly marks the insufficiency in Sam's answer.

The above two examples are meant to illustrate various problems arising when analysing and classifying the functions of *well* in the present study. Most occurrences of this DP in the corpus are clearer and easier to analyse than the above examples, but the functions of *well* do overlap and no instance of this DP is completely unambiguous, functionally.

Below follows a more quantitative view on *well* and its translations.

5.3 *Well* and its translations: quantitative aspects

In this section, as well as in section 5.4, below, some basic quantitative results concerning *well* and its translations will be brought up. Focus will be more on general quantitative tendencies, and the discussion will not always go into great detail with all aspects of the tables.

All in all, there are 555 occurrences of *well* in the corpus. It is the most frequent of the four DPs studied in the present study. 117 of the 555 tokens[27] of *well* are translated into one or several of the TTs Cinema, DVD, SVT, and TV3+TV4, making a 21.1 % translation of all instances of *well* in the ten STs. In all four TTs combined, there are a total of 264 translation tokens of *well*. All ten films have instances of *well* and all TTs include translations of *well*. Table 5.1, below, shows the total number of *well* in each film, compared to the (approximate) number of words in each soundtrack and the number of *well* per 100 words.

Table 5.1. Occurrences of *well* with number of words per film and frequency per 100 words.

Film	*Well*	Number of words in each soundtrack	Frequency of *well* per 100 words	Films ranked by frequency of *well*
PRIMARY	92	18767	0.50	4
WHILE	68	10192	0.67	2
FARGO	67	7878	0.85	1
PULP	60	15456	0.39	7
WAG	54	14297	0.38	8
BETTY	52	10910	0.48	5
AMPIE	51	8764	0.58	3
BLONDE	42	8788	0.48	5
ADDICTED	38	8779	0.43	6
SEVEN	31	9700	0.32	9
Total	**555**	**113 531**	**5.08**	

On average, there is approximately 1 instance of *well* per 200 ST words[28], although there are clear individual differences between the films. The number 200 can be compared to Svartvik's study of *well* in the London-Lund corpus of spoken English, where an average of 1 token of DP *well* was found for every 150 words (Svartvik 1980:169). When contrasting these numbers, one has to take into consideration the fact that the London-Lund corpus consists of natural spoken language (both dialogues and monologues, where some monologues include prepared/written language), while the corpus of the present study consists of film dialogue).

As can be seen in table 5.1, *PRIMARY*, which is the film with the most words in its soundtrack, also has the highest occurrence of *well* in the ST. However, there is not always a correlation between number of ST words in the films and number of *well*. An illustration of this is *FARGO* which has the lowest number of ST words, but the third highest number of *well* of all ten films. *FARGO* has the highest frequency of *well* of all the films. The film with

---

[27] What is referred to as *translation tokens* in the present study is the combined number of translations, while the term *translation types* refers to the number of individually different translations (cf. 4.2.7).

[28] The total of 5.08 occurrences of *well* is divided by the number of films (ten), with the result of approximately 0.5 occurrences of *well* per 100 words in each film.

the lowest occurrence of *well* in its soundtrack, i.e. *SEVEN*, also has the lowest frequency of *well*.

There are a few points to be made concerning the genre division in connection to table 5.1. The two Crime/Gangster films are among the three films with the lowest frequency of *well*. One reason for a smaller amount of DPs in this genre is the harsh and broken up language used in the films. This is especially true for *SEVEN*, which has the lowest frequency of ST words per minute (80 words / minute) of all ten films in the corpus (cf. 4.2.6), as well as low occurrences of all four DPs in the present study. As a comparison to the low number of *well* in the Crime/Gangster genre, we can consider the College Comedy genre. The two films in this genre, *AMPIE* and *BLONDE*, have the third and fifth highest frequency of *well*, respectively. This may indicate that the latter genre has a more communicative language than the Crime/Gangster genre generally has. In addition, the characters in the College Comedy genre films are young and not very complicated, compared to the older and more complex characters in the Crime/Gangster genre. The rest of the genres (Criminal Drama, Romantic Comedy and Political Drama) do not demonstrate any clear tendencies as far as the frequency of *well* is concerned.

All ten films include translations of *well*. Table 5.2, below, shows the number of *well* in each film, and the number of DP translations in the films, as well as in all four TTs, individually and combined[29]. The average number of translations in each TT is also shown, with the average percentage of *well* translated into each TT.

Table 5.2. The distribution of *well* and its translations in each film, and in the four TTs.

Film	ST	Cinema	DVD	SVT	TV3+TV4	Total number of translations	Average number of translations per TT
PRIMARY	92	12	13	5	13	43	10.8 (12 %)
WHILE	68	9	9	9	9	36	9.0 (13 %)
FARGO	67	4	4	7	4	19	4.8 (7 %)
PULP	60	6	5	5	5	21	5.3 (9 %)
WAG	54	7	7	7	4	25	6.3 (12 %)
BETTY	52	7	7	8	5	27	6.8 (13 %)
AMPIE	51	3	3	13	8	27	6.8 (13 %)
BLONDE	42	4	16	4	4	28	7.0 (17 %)
ADDICTED	38	*(5)	1	9	4	(19)	(4.8 (13 %))
SEVEN	31	7	8	4	5	24	6.0 (19 %)
Total	**555**	**59 (64)**	**73**	**71**	**61**	**264 (269)**	

* The Cinema subtitles have not been found, and a hypothetical number is thus included, based on the average number of the other three TTs.

The table shows that *PRIMARY*, which has the most tokens of ST *well*, also has the highest total number of translations of this DP. The same pattern applies to *WHILE*, which has the second highest number of ST *well*, and the second highest total number of translations. One difference between the number of translations of these two films is the fact that *PRIMARY*

---

[29] The asterisk in the Cinema column for *ADDICTED* in table 5.2 indicates that this version has not been located and is thus not included in the total number of Cinema translations. A hypothetical number (5) is included for the Cinema TT for this film, based on the average number of translations in the other *ADDICTED* TTs. The figures in brackets in the *ADDICTED* and Cinema columns are all based on the hypothetical number, and these numbers are the ones referred to in the discussion following table 5.2.

shows a discrepancy between how many translations the TTs include (the SVT subtitles include much fewer translations of *well* for this film than the other TTs do), while each TT for *WHILE* has as an equal number of translations of *well*.

BLONDE and *AMPIE* have the third and fourth highest total number of translations (in addition, *BETTY* has the same total number of translations as *AMPIE*), in spite of their comparably low number of ST *well*. These two films do, however, have a fairly high frequency of ST *well* per 100 words (cf. table 5.1), which may be a reason for both films' quite high translation rate. Two of the TTs show much higher translation totals for *AMPIE* and *BLONDE* than the rest of the TTs do: the SVT subtiles have considerably more translation instances for *AMPIE* than the other subtitle versions do (especially when compared to the Cinema and DVD versions), and the DVD subtitles have four times as many translations for *BLONDE* as the other three TTs do. The films with the lowest total number of translations are *ADDICTED* and *FARGO*.

When comparing the total number of translations of *well* (the total numbers are divided by four to show the average number and percentage of each TT) with the total number of ST occurrences of *well*, the percentages illustrate a rather similar distribution of translations of this DP. Some films stand out in comparison, e.g. *SEVEN*, which has a higher percentage of translated occurrences than all the other films, and *FARGO*, which has the lowest number of translations, but on the whole, the films show a similar quantitative distribution of translations of *well*.

Regarding the distribution of the translations between the four TT versions Cinema, DVD, SVT, and TV3+TV4[30], there is a slight discrepancy. The DVD subtitles and the SVT subtitles hold the majority of the translations of *well* with a total of 73 and 71 instances, respectively. The Cinema subtitles and the TV3+TV4 subtitles have 64 and 61 translations, respectively. The distribution of the translations of *well* in the four TTs Cinema, DVD, SVT, and TV3+TV4 thus illustrates a tendency of the DVD and the SVT versions to include more translations of *well* in their subtitles than the Cinema and TV3+TV4 subtitles, which have somewhat fewer translations. The quantitative distribution of translation types for *well* in each TT will be commented on in connection with table 5.5, below.

---

[30] The numbers for TV3 (37 instances in total) and TV4 (24 instances in total) are combined to show the total number of translations in the two commercial channels.

5.4 Distribution of functions in STs and TTs

The quantitative distribution of the four functions of *well* (**FRAME**, **CLAR**, **INS** and **MIT**) will now be studied more closely. First, the distribution of the functions in the STs will be viewed, and then, the distribution of the translations of the functions will be discussed. Table 5.3, below, shows the distribution of the functions of *well* in the individual STs.

Table 5.3. The distribution of functions of *well* in all ten STs

FUNCTIONS	*ADDICTED*	*AMPIE*	*BETTY*	*BLONDE*	*FARGO*	*PRIMARY*	*PULP*	*SEVEN*	*WAG*	*WHILE*	Total
FRAME	11	20	16	21	31	41	22	19	21	25	**227**
CLAR	3	5	5	0	2	5	2	1	2	7	**32**
INS	13	18	21	14	21	28	19	6	25	23	**188**
MIT	11	8	10	7	13	18	17	5	6	13	**108**
Total	**38**	**51**	**52**	**42**	**67**	**92**	**60**	**31**	**54**	**68**	**555**

The most common function in all ten STs combined is **FRAME** (227 tokens). **INS** is the second most common function in the STs (188 tokens). The third most common function is **MIT** (108 tokens), while the least common function is **CLAR** (32 tokens).

The distribution of the functions of *well* shows that all of the films either have a majority of the **FRAME** or **INS** functions. Seven out of ten films, *AMPIE*, *BLONDE*, *FARGO*, *PRIMARY*, *PULP*, *SEVEN*, and *WHILE* have a majority of **FRAME** marking *well*, while the remaining three films, *ADDICTED*, *WAG*, and *BETTY* have more *well* with an **INS** function. In addition, most of the films have quite a few **MIT** tokens. This is especially true for *ADDICTED* and *PULP*, but also *BETTY*, *FARGO*, *PRIMARY*, and *WHILE* have a fair number of **MIT** in comparison to the numbers of the other three functions. The total number for **CLAR** is not very high, one possible reason for this being the fact that film dialogue generally has few markers of repair and repetition (cf . 2.7).

A few points can be derived from the distribution of the functions, based on the genre division of the films, or individual features of certain films. The film with the highest frequency of *well* with a **FRAME** function, i.e. *PRIMARY*, also has the largest discrepancy between the most common function and the second most common function. *PRIMARY* is a political drama containing numerous political speeches and debates where characters either perform transitions within monologues or take turns in dialogues. There are thus many naturally occurring positions for *well* functioning as a **FRAME** in the discourse of this film. The other political drama film, *WAG*, also holds quite a few **FRAME** tokens of *well*, but the majority of tokens in this film nevertheless belong to the **INS** function. This may reflect the fact that there is not as much political discourse in *WAG* as there is in *PRIMARY*. In addition, there is a great deal of language used on a more interpersonal level in *WAG,* as well as elements of humour, a feature not employed as much in *PRIMARY*. Another film with a high frequency of **FRAME** is *SEVEN*. This Crime/Gangster film has the lowest frequency of *well* out of all ten films (but, as we saw in table 5.2, it has the highest percentage of translations of *well*). Again, one reason for the majority of *well* with a **FRAME** function in *SEVEN* may be the harsh and slow-moving dialogue of this film, as opposed to other films with a quicker and

livelier dialogue (e.g. *WAG, ADDICTED*, and *BETTY*). The fact that there are many occurrences of *well* with a **FRAME** function in *SEVEN* may influence the amount of translations of *well* for this film. The majority of tokens of *well* in the other Crime/Gangster film *PULP* are found in the **FRAME** category. The difference between **FRAME** and **INS** is not as striking for *PULP* as for *SEVEN*, however. Another aspect which is noteworthy of *PULP* is the high frequency of **MIT** in this film. As will be discussed below (cf. 5.5.4), the discourse in *PULP* has numerous examples of face threatening acts that are often mitigated by *well*.

The two College Comedies *AMPIE* and *BLONDE* have similar patterns concerning the distribution of the functions of *well*, even though *BLONDE* has slightly more **FRAME** while *AMPIE* has slightly more **INS**. *BLONDE* is the only film without a **CLAR** in its soundtrack (this is the single example of an exclusion of one of the four functions of *well* in a ST). As far as the two Romantic Comedies, *WHILE* and *ADDICTED*, are concerned, the former has slightly more **FRAME** than **INS**, while it is the other way around for the latter. However, they both have similar distributions of tokens of *well*.

The two films in the Criminal Drama genre, *FARGO* and *BETTY,* show similar numbers in table 5.3, except for the fact that *FARGO* has more occurrences of *well* with a **FRAME** function.

The distribution of functions of the translated occurrences of *well* can be seen in table 5.4, below. The numbers in the table refer to how many times the ST functions of the DPs are translated, and not in any way to the functions of the translations.

Table.5.4. The distribution of functions of translated *well* (all four TTs combined for each film).

FUNCTIONS	*ADDICTED*	*AMPIE*	*BETTY*	*BLONDE*	*FARGO*	*PRIMARY*	*PULP*	*SEVEN*	*WAG*	*WHILE*	Total
FRAME	7	6	3	20	13	17	13	11	12	11	**113**
CLAR	0	3	4	1	0	7	0	3	0	5	**23**
INS	3	13	7	4	6	12	8	6	9	10	**78**
MIT	4	5	13	3	0	7	0	4	4	10	**50**
Total	**14**	**27**	**27**	**28**	**19**	**43**	**21**	**24**	**25**	**36**	**264**

The distribution of the totals of the four functions in table 5.4 is similar to the distribution of the ST occurrences of *well* seen in table 5.3, i.e. the order of frequency of the translated functions is the same as the order of frequency of the functions in the STs: **FRAME** has most translations, **INS** the second most, **MIT** the third most, and **CLAR** the least number of translations. The numbers in table 5.4 all refer to the total number of translations in the four TTs combined. These numbers are divided by four in table 5.5, below, and contrasted with the number of DPs in the STs.

Consider table 5.5, below, for the distribution of functions of the translated DPs (both tokens and translation types) among the four TTs Cinema, DVD, SVT, and TV3+TV4.

Table 5.5. The distribution of functions (tokens and types) and translations of *well* in all four TTs.

Functions	ST	Cinema tokens/types	DVD tokens/types	SVT tokens/types	TV3+TV4 tokens/types	Total tokens	Average tokens	(Average tokens as) % of ST
FRAME	227	26/14	32/16	32/19	23/10	**113**	28.3	**12.5%**
CLAR	32	6/4	6/5	5/5	6/5	**23**	5.8	**18.1%**
INS	188	15/7	23/8	20/10	20/6	**78**	19.5	**10.4%**
MIT	108	12/9	12/10	14/13	12/8	**50**	12.5	**11.6%**
Total	**555**	**59/23**	**73/30**	**71/29**	**61/24**	**264**	**66.1**	

The table above shows the number of translations of the functions **FRAME**, **CLAR**, **INS**, and **MIT** in the various TTs. It says nothing about the functions of the Swedish translations of *well*, but considers the functions of the ST occurrences of *well* only, as well as how many times each function is translated into each TT. In order to give a more accurate account of the translations, the total TT numbers are divided by four to show the average number of translations in each TT, as well as the average percentages of the functions translated into each TT.

When considering the average percentages, the most frequently translated function is **CLAR** and the least translated function is **MIT**. The average percentages do not vary greatly, however.

If we compare the distribution of each function among the TTs, we see that all four TTs treat the functions similarly. This is especially true for the **CLAR** and **MIT** functions. For instance, the **MIT** function is translated 12 times into the cinema, DVD and TV3+TV4 subtitles, and 14 times into the SVT subtitles. For the **FRAME** and **INS** functions there are minor differences: the **FRAME** function of *well* is translated slightly more in the DVD and SVT subtitles than in the Cinema and TV3+TV4 subtitles, and the **INS** function is translated somewhat less in the Cinema subtitles than in the other three TTs (this may be due to the exclusion of the Cinema subtitles for *ADDICTED*).

Table 5.5 also shows the distribution of translation types among the TTs. As can be seen, the DVD subtitles include more individually different translation types than the other TTs, while the Cinema includes the fewest types (this may also be due to the exclusion of the Cinema subtitles for *ADDICTED*).

Table 5.6 below shows the combined numbers of the textual functions **FRAME** and **CLAR**, on the one hand, and the interpersonal functions **INS** and **MIT**, on the other. This division is made in order to illustrate the distribution of the 555 occurrences of *well* among textual and interpersonal functions in the ST, and also in order to see how many tokens of *well* with either function are translated (again, table 5.6 says nothing about the functions of the Swedish translations of *well*). For a more accurate picture of the translations, the total TT numbers of both the textual and the interpersonal functions are divided by four to show the average number of translations in each TT.

Table 5.6. Functions of *well* in the STs, with number of translations

Functions	STs	Number of translations in all four TTs	Average number of translations in each TT	Average % translated into each TT
Textual function	259 (46.7%)	136 (52.5%)	34	13.1%
Interpersonal function	296 (53.3%)	128 (43.2%)	32	10.8%
Total	**555**	**264**		

The table summarises the fact that there are more occurrences of *well* in the STs with an interpersonal function than with a textual function. The interpersonal functions **INS** and **MIT** are more frequent in the STs than the textual functions **FRAME** and **CLAR**. However, when considering the translations of these functions, a different pattern emerges: the translated occurrences of *well* more often have a textual function than an interpersonal function. An average of 10.8 % of the instances of *well* with an interpersonal function, and an average of 13.1 % of the instances of *well* with a textual function are translated into each TT. The difference is not great between these two numbers, but table 5.6 nonetheless points to the fact that the majority of the translated occurrences of *well* in the corpus have a textual function, despite the fact that most of the ST occurrences of *well* have an interpersonal function. Possible reasons for this will be discussed in 9.4.2.

5.5 Translations of *well*

There is a total of 264 translations of *well* in the four TTs combined (117 of the ST tokens of *well* are translated into one or several TTs), divided among 49 types of translations. Table 5.7 below lists the translations and their occurrences in relation to the descending order of frequency of their respective grammatical and pragmatic realisations. The categories are loosely based on the translation categories suggested by Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen for *well* (2003), and are to be seen as a mere proposal for a division of the translations rather than a static way of viewing these features in general.

Table 5.7. Translation categories and translations of *well* in all 4 TTs

Category	Translations (+occurrences)	Tokens/types
DP/Modal particle	ju (49); då+då?+då! (36); tja+tja… (14); jo+jo… (9); väl (8); nej (5); nå+nå? (5); ja+ja! (4); så (3); nog (3); ja […] ja (3); nåväl (2); nåja (1); jaså? (1); nja (1); okej (1)	**145/16**
Conjunction	men (17); och (11); då så (8); jaha (2); men nu (2); först (1); så där (1); ja och (1)	**43/8**
Punctuation mark	”[…]”(17);… (10); – (5)	**32/3**
Adverb	i så fall (6); nu (6); i alla fall (5); fast (1); bara (1); säkert (1) *;* eller […] i alla fall(1); men […] i alla fall (1)	**22/8**
Miscellaneous	annars […] ju (3); rättare sagt (2); ja […]förstås (1); ja, eller (1); *var* (1)	**8/5**
Adjective	lite (4); bra (1)	**5/2**
DP+modal particle	då[…]nog (2); då […]väl (1); ja […]ju (1)	**4/3**
Conjunction+punctuation	"och" (1); eller? (1)	**2/2**
Pronoun	du (2)	**2/1**
Conjunction+pronoun	men du (1)	**1/1**
Total		**264/49**

The categories in table 5.7 are not always mutually exclusive. For instance, *då* ('then') can possibly be both a DP and an adverb, and *då så* ('well then') can possibly be both a conjunction and a DP, depending on the contexts. The table is only an indication of how the translations are distributed among pragmatic and grammatical categories. As the line is especially difficult to draw between words functioning as DPs or modal particles, these two are combined to form a separate category.

The most frequent category in the Swedish subtitles is the DP/modal particle (with or without added punctuation such as three dots (…), exclamation marks and question marks). Examples of this category include modal particle *ju* ('as you know'), which is the most common of all translations of *well* in the corpus, DP *då* ('then'), which is the second most common translation of *well*. Other examples of translations are DPs *tja* ('well'), and *jo* ('yes'/'well'), and modal particles *väl* ('surely'), and *nog* ('probably').

The three categories of conjunctions (e.g. *men* ('but'), *och* ('and')), punctuation marks (e.g. quotation marks ("[…]"); three dots (…)), and adverbs (e.g. *i så fall* ('in that case'), *i alla fall* ('in any case'); *säkert* ('surely')) are rather similarly frequent in the corpus. The miscellaneous category mainly includes combinations of two words/expressions that do not clearly fit in with any of the other categories[31]. Examples of this type include *annars* […] *ju* ('Otherwise […] as you know'), *rättare sagt* ('rightly said'/'rather'), and *ja* […] *förstås* ('yes/well […] of course'). Two adjectives are found as translations of *well* in the subtitles, i.e. *lite* ('a little') and *bra* ('good'/'well'). The remaining categories, DP + modal particle (e.g. *då* […] *nog* ('then […] probably'), conjunction + punctuation (e.g. "*och*" ("and"), pronoun *du* ('you')), and conjunction + pronoun (*men du* ('but you/hey')) are not very frequent.

The above list of 264 translations of *well* can be compared to the 148 occurrences of translations of *well* that Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen (2003:1134-1135) found in their corpus of English fiction texts and their Swedish translations. The ten most commonly used Swedish translations in Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen's study, presented here in order of frequency, are *ja* ('yes'), *tja* ('well'), *men* ('but'), *nå* ('well'), *nåväl* ('oh well'), *nja* ('well'), *jaha* ('uhu/well'), *jo* ('yes'), *nåja* ('oh well') and *då* ('then'). All of these ten types of translations are found in table 5.7 (most of the translations in Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen's study are found in table 5.7, even more unusual examples such as *ja* […] *ju*), but the frequency of the translations differ between their study and the present one. The two most commonly used translations in table 5.7., *ju* and *då*, are used more sparingly in Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen's list of translations, which, on the other hand, shows far more instances of *ja* and *nå* than table 5.7 does. However, there are some similarities, e.g. the fact that the two translations *tja* and *men* have similar frequencies in the two corpora: *tja* is the second most common translation in Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen's study, and the fourth most common translation in the present one, and in both studies *men* is the third most common translation (in the present study, however, there are as many occurrences of quotation marks as of *men*). The differences found between these two studies may be explained by the different types of corpora used in the studies (Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen used literary translations and the present study uses subtitles) as well as possible differences in the classification of translations.

The most common translations of *well* in the corpus of the present study, *ju*, *då*, *men*, quotation marks ("[…]") and *tja* will be briefly examined individually below. The rest of the translations will be discussed in connection to corpus examples given in subsequent sections. The most frequent translation of *well* in the four TTs is *ju* ('as you know'). The function of this modal particle is not easy to pin-point as it changes with the context as well as with the

---

[31] The fact that words from the subtitles are sometimes left out in between the words/expressions in question is illustrated by the symbol […] (the same applies to the category labelled DP + modal particle).

relationship between the speakers, as do all modal particles and DPs to a larger or lesser extent. Typically, however, *ju* indicates the function of shared knowledge: "by emphasising that the speaker and hearer have some knowledge in common, *ju* may create a feeling of intimacy and rapport" (Aijmer 1996b:402), hence the paraphrase 'as you know'. This modal particle is also a common translation of *you know* (to be discussed in 6.5). By using *ju* to establish rapport with the hearer, the speaker may try to persuade the hearer that the speaker has valid reasons for his/her claim, i.e. "[j]u is an obviousness particle ('as you know') with a rhetorical, argumentative character" (Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen 2003:1140). This last function of *ju* is often used in political debates when a speaker wants to make a claim seem self-evident. *Ju* can also be used as a hedge, to tone down the message and make it seem of less importance, often applied in face-threatening situations to avoid conflict. *Ju* is thus a feature of "both agreement and conflict" (Josephson 2005:10 (my translation)).

The second most frequent translation of *well* in the corpus is *då* ('then'). Traditionally, *då* is a temporal adverb with the referential meaning 'then'. Kotsinas (2003) discusses the negative view of (an overuse of) the pragmaticalised *då* with a discourse use in Swedish, quoting a reporter from one of Sweden's leading newspapers: "[*då* is a] useless filler pushing its way through all possible places, in the beginning and in the middle as well as in the end of sentences" (Kotsinas 2003:71, my translation), and someone else said that the discourse use of *då* is "an abuse of linguistic energy, a diversion from its more important task of structuring and organising language" (ibid., my translation). The latter quote shows the writer's (Kotsinas does not reveal the name of the writer) unawareness of the fact that the discourse use of *då* often fulfils the tasks of structuring and organising which the writer wants to see more of. The occurrences of *då* in the corpus of the present study are found both utterance-initially and utterance-finally. In utterance-initial position, *då* most often has the function of an adverb, while in utterance-final position, *då* functions more as a DP. Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen (2003) find that *då* in final position may have a textual function of creating coherence, e.g. functioning as a frame between two subtopics in one utterance. Example (67) below is taken from Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen (2003:1142-1143).

(67)   "**Well**, where did you sleep last night?" the woman
         said softly. "You get kicked out?"

         "Var har du varit i natt **då**?" frågade kvinnan mjukt.
         "Har du blivit utsparkad eller någonting?"

The third most common translation of *well* is the adversative conjunction *men* ('but'). *Men* is most often used as "a marker of contrast signalling that what is to follow is in conflict with what is previously said" (Ottesjö 2006:91). This verifies the function of *men* as a translation of *well*, since the core function of *well* is a re-evaluation of the discourse in one way or another. *Well* may sometimes indicate disagreement rather than agreement and this can be rendered by using *men* as a translation (Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen 2003:1140).

The fourth most commonly used translation of *well* in the corpus are the quotation marks ("[…]"). These are exclusively used as a translation of the quotative function of *well* and illustrate the ability of written language to reflect functions used in spoken language, such

as the function of DPs to indicate reported speech and thought. Quotation marks as a translation of *well* will be discussed further in connection to examples given below (cf. 5.5.1). The fifth most frequent translation of *well* found in the corpus is *tja* ('well'). Both *tja* and *nja* are described by Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen (2003:1141) as demonstrating hesitant positive agreement and as being used to express emotions. Johansson (2006) states that the dictionary definition of Norwegian *tja* (which is very similar to Swedish *tja*) is that this word is "used to express doubt or deliberation" (Johansson 2006:122). The example below is taken from Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen (2003:1142).

(68)   "How could nothing be done? You've been living there over a month."
        "**Well**, I'm not so wonderfully perfectly efficient as you are, Macon.

        "Hur kommer det sig att ingenting har blivit gjort?" Du har ju bott där i över en månad."
        "**Tja**, jag är inte lika underbart högeffektiv som du, Macon."

The above account of the five most frequent translations of *well* is a short examination of the translations of *well* found in the corpus. Below follows a more qualitative description of each of the four functions of *well* (**FRAME**, **CLAR**, **INS,** and **MIT**), and their respective translations.

5.5.1 The frame-marker translated

FRAME is the most common function in the ST with 227 tokens in all ten films combined. There are 113 translations of **FRAME** in the four TTs combined which makes an average of 28.3 translations per TT. An average of 12.5 % of all ST tokens with a **FRAME** function are translated into each TT. Table 5.8 below lists the translations of *well* with a **FRAME** function.

Table 5.8. Translations of the **FRAME** function

Translations	Total
då ('then')	27
"[…]"	17
men ('but')	8
då så ('then so')	8
ju ('as you know')	6
och ('and')	4
–	4
nu ('now')	4
ja ('yes')	3
i så fall ('in that case')	3
annars […] ju ('although […] as you know')	3
men nu ('but now')	2
nåväl ('oh well')	2
jaha ('uhuh'/'okay')	2
då […] nog ('then […] probably')	2

väl ('surely')	2
du ('you')	2
så ('so')	2
"och" ("and")	1
fast ('although')	1
men du ('but you')	1
jo… ('yes…')	1
okej ('okay')	1
tja ('well')	1
så där ('so there')	1
då […] väl ('then […] surely')	1
ja […] ju ('yes […] as you know')	1
bra ('good'/'well'))	1
…	1
först ('first')	1
Total tokens/types	**113/30**

The most common **FRAME** function is a transition backwards or forwards in the dialogue and/or larger context. The most frequent translation of this function of *well* is *då* ('then'). Traditionally, *då* is a temporal adverb with the referential meaning 'then'. *Då* with a discourse function is "usually found finally in utterances functioning as questions, anticipations or even declaratives serving as links in a story or argumentation." (Lindström 2008:67, my translation). Final *då* has "the potential of signalling that an utterance, e.g. a link in an argumentation, is finished." (ibid.). In the subtitles in the corpus, *då* is used most extensively as a conclusion to an utterance. *Då* is exemplified in (69), below, as a translation in the DVD and TV3 subtitles.

(69)   Jack: I'll wait til you get inside
             Lucy: **well** ↑│ │ good night

                            (*WHILE* 00.50.38)

Cinema	DVD+TV3	SVT
Jag väntar tills du gått in. [I'll wait until you get inside.]	Jag väntar tills du gått in [I'll wait until you get inside.]	Jag väntar tills du kommit in. [I'll wait until you get inside.]
God natt. [Good night.]	God natt, **då**. [Good night, **then**.]	God natt… [Good night…]

In (69), Jack and Lucy are saying goodbye to each other after a date. Lucy's *well* here signals the ending of the date, and combined with the long pause, *well* indicates the transfer taking place both linguistically and physically as Lucy is saying goodbye to Jack. The Cinema subtitles do not translate *well*, but the DVD and TV3 subtitles do by using final *då* following *God natt* to signal the ending of the utterance. The translation in the DVD+TV3 subtitles is a *match* (cf. 4.3.3).

    In (70) below, *då* is used initially in the Cinema subtitles and does not have the function of ending an utterance, but of beginning a new one, thus still showing a transitional function. In the example below, there is also an instance of the translation *jaha*.

(70)   Marianne: oh thank you governor Walsh oh Governor Stanton I'm sorry [laughter] I'm a little
                 nervous I'm sorry
        Someone: that's okay
        Marianne: │uhm │ │ **well ↑** if you walk with me I'll take you up to the│ the library

<div align="right">(PRIMARY 00.02.34)</div>

Cinema	DVD+TV3	SVT
Tack, guvernör Walsh…Stanton, ursäkta mig! [Thanks, GovernorWalsh…Stanton, I'm sorry!] Jag är lite nervös, förlåt. **Då** går vi **väl** upp till biblioteket... [I'm a little nervous, sorry. **Then** we will (**surely**) walk up to the library, **won't we**…]	Tack, guvernör Walsh…Stanton! [Thanks, Governor Walsh…Stanton!] Jag är lite nervös. [I'm a little nervous.] **Jaha**, då går vi till…biblioteket. [**Okay**, then we will go to…the library.]	Tack governor Walsh. Governor *Stanton* – förlåt mig! [Thanks Governor Walsh. Governor *Stanton* – I'm sorry!] Jag är lite nervös. [I'm a little nervous.] Ingen fara. [That's okay.] Följ mig, så går vi till biblioteket. [Follow me, and we will go to the library.]

The speaker Marianne in (70) is just about to show a small group of people around the school where she is working. She mistakenly calls Governor Stanton by the wrong name (Walsh), causing the group of people surrounding her to laugh. Marianne apologises and then somebody (it is not clear who) says *that's okay*, at which point Marianne pauses, says *uhm*, pauses again and then says *well* as she starts moving and points towards the library they are going to visit. As she says *well*, Marianne also seems to pull herself together after the giggle and therefore changes her facial expressions to appear more serious and professional to the Governor and his associates. *Well* in example (70) signals the transition from the laughter shared by the group of people, to Marianne's invitation to let the group see the library. This function of *well* is translated by the Cinema subtitles as *Då* ('then'). The Cinema subtitles also include a *väl* ('surely'/'won't we'), which indicates a more interpersonal function of the utterance. Here the translator has interpreted the ST utterance as somewhat more hesitant, possibly due to the use of *well* together with the pauses before *well* and towards the end of the utterance. The DVD and TV3 subtitles use *Jaha* ('uhuh'/'okay') as a translation of the **FRAME** function of *well*. This word is also a sign of transition in the given context. In addition, the DVD and TV3 subtitles use *då*, but *Jaha* is a much clearer matching translation of *well*. The SVT subtitles do not have a translation of *well* in example (70): there is no transition signal but a direct imperative in *Följ mig, så går vi upp till biblioteket*, and the function of *well* is thus omitted.

The second most common translation of *well* as a transitional marker (together with *då så*) is the conjunction *men* ('but'). *Men* is most often used as "a marker of contrast signalling that what is to follow is in conflict with what is previously said" (Ottesjö 2006:91, my translation). This verifies the function of *men* as a translation of *well*, since the core function of *well* is a re-evaluation of the discourse in one way or another. Example (71) below, illustrates the function of *men* in all the subtitles as signalling the contrast between the first part of the utterance and the second, and is a clear translation of *well* in the ST.

(71)

John Doe: we see a deadly sin on every street corner in every home and we tolerate it we tolerate it because it's common it's it's trivial │ we tolerate it morning noon and night││**well** not anymore │I'm setting the example

(*SEVEN* 01.43.15)

Cinema+DVD	SVT	TV4
Vi tolererar det morgon middag kväll. [We tolerate it morning noon night.]	Vi tolererar det morgon, middag och kväll. [We tolerate it morning noon night.]	Vi låter det ske morgon, middag, kväll. [We let it happen morning, noon, night.]
Men nu är det slut med det. [**But** now it's over.]	**Men** inte nu längre. [**But** not anymore.]	**Men** nu är det slut med det. [**But** now it's over.]
Jag statuerar ett exempel. [I'm setting the example.]	Jag statuerar exempel. [I'm setting the example.]	Jag statuerar ett exempel. [I'm setting the example.]

The mass murderer John Doe in (71) is giving his view on the acceptance of deadly sins, saying *we tolerate it morning noon and night*, then pausing for about 4 seconds before using *well* as a transition marker to signal that what is to come is opposed to the previous part of his utterance. All TTs use *men* as a matching translation, indicating the contrasting function, as well as the frame-marking function of *well* as a **FRAME**.

Consider (72) below for another example of the **FRAME** function.

(72)

Lou: jeez you okay Margie
Marge: yeah I'm fine ││it's just morning sickness ││**well** ↑ that passed

(*FARGO* 00.35.55)

Cinema, DVD, TV4	SVT
Hur mår du? [How are you?]	Hur är det, Margie? [How is it, Margie?]
Bra. [Good.]	Ingen fara. [No problem.]
Jag mår illa på mornarna. [I feel sick in the mornings.]	Det är bara morgonillamående. [It's just morning sickness.]
Det gick över. Nu är jag hungrig igen. [That passed. Now I'm hungry again.]	**Så där**, det gick över. Nu är jag hungrig igen. [**So then**, that passed. Now I'm hungry again.]

In (72), Marge makes a long pause between *it's just morning sickness* and *well that passed* to collect herself somewhat. This pause, as well as a shift from one subtopic to another (from the fact that it is morning sickness causing her nausea, to informing Lou that this nausea has now passed) connects *well* in (72) to the group of transition marks in the corpus. The Cinema, DVD, and TV4 subtitles have not translated this function of *well* in the example, but the SVT subtitles have: *well* in the ST is translated into the match *Så där* ('so then'/'well then') in the SVT version, illustrating the same transition function *well* has in the ST.

In addition to the transitional **FRAME** function, there are a few instances of the quotatitve **FRAME** function of *well* in the corpus. This function is translated each time it appears in the STs into one or several TTs making a combined translation of 18 TT instances. The translation of the quotative **FRAME** function is always in the shape of quotation marks

(or in one case quotation marks and the conjunction *och* ('and')). A translation of *well* as quotation marks is illustrated in the Cinema subtitles in example (73), below.

(73) Richard: he he should act pissed off
      Henry: yeah but not too pissed off he's running for president
      Daisy: right right it should be more like **well** → **well** → that's too bad but we don't
             take it seriously

(*PRIMARY* 00.49.48)

Cinema	DVD+TV3	SVT
Han kan få bli lite sur. [He can get a little cross.]	Han ska bli arg. [He should get angry.]	Han måste låta förbannad. [He must sound pissed off.]
Ungefär: **"Trist, men inget vi tar så allvarligt."** [Approximately: **"That's too bad, but Nothing we take seriously. "**]	Inte för arg. Han ska bli president. [Not too angry. He's going to be the President.] Mer beklaga, inte ta det på allvar. [More apologise, don't take it seriously.]	Men inte för förbannad, han vill ju bli president. [But not too pissed off, he wants to become the President.]

The Cinema subtitles translate the phrase *it should be more like* into *Ungefär:* ('sort of', approximately', 'like'), and *well* functioning as a quotation indicator is here translated into quotation marks ("[…]"), using the explicitation strategy, and showing where the quote and direct speech begins. The DVD and TV3 subtitles are the same and do not include a translation of *well*. These subtitles do not use direct speech but indirect speech as Daisy suggests how the Governor should act (*Mer beklaga, inte ta det på allvar* ('More apologise, don't take it seriously'). The SVT subtitles do not include a translation of the utterance in question.

As is previously mentioned, it is not always clear whether *well* is an indicator of a quotation or in fact part of the quoted utterance itself. (74), below, attempts to illustrate this with the different choices the subtitlers have made.

(74) Nana: it was two characters a French man and a girl in the beginning he's on his way home
      and she's upset about something and it turns out uh she thinks he's having an affair
      and he says I didn't I didn't and she says **well** ↑ how do you explain this and shows him
      some female undergarments she found in the couch

(*ADDICTED* 01.02.41)

DVD	SVT	TV3
Det visar sig att hon tror att han vänsterprasslar. [It turns out that she thinks he's having an affair.]	Sen visar det sig att hon tror att han varit otrogen. [Then it turns out that she thinks he's been having an affair.]	Hon tror att han är otrogen, men han nekar. [She thinks he's having an affair, but he denies it.]
Och han säger två gånger: "Det gjorde jag inte!" [And he says twice: "I didn't! "] Och hon säger, **"Och** hur förklarar du det här?"… [And she says, **"And** how do you explain this?"…]	Han nekar och hon säger: **"Förklara det här då!"** [He denies it and she says: "Explain this, **then!"**] Hon visar honom nåt slags underplagg som hon hittat i soffan- [She shows him some kind of undergarment that she's found in the couch.]	Då visar hon honom ett par trosor som hon hittat i soffan. [Then she shows him a pair of knickers that she's found in the couch.]

In example (74), the character Nana is retelling the events of (what she thinks is) a radio show. She uses direct speech to illustrate two quotations (*he says I didn't I didn't* and *she says well how do you explain this*), where the second one includes *well*. The DVD, TV3, and SVT subtitles show three different ways of translating the latter sequence of direct speech. The

DVD and the SVT subtitles both keep the direct speech of the ST and use quotation marks to show where the quotation begins and ends, while the TV3 subtitles use indirect speech throughout and do not include a translation of quotative *well*. In addition to the quotation marks, the DVD and SVT versions also use the conjunction *och* ('and') and the adverb/DP *då* ('then'), which are probably also translations of *well*, alongside the quotation marks. The translator of the DVD and SVT subtitles seems to view *well* as being part of the utterance and not just an indicator of a quotation. The two functions of quotative *well* is thus translated in the DVD and SVT subtitles of (74), but not in the TV3 subtitles.

5.5.2 The clarity-marker translated

The function **CLAR** has 32 tokens in all ten films combined. There are 23 translations of **CLAR** in the four TTs combined, making an average of 5.8 translations per TT.

Table 5.9. Translations of the **CLAR** function

Translation	Total
då+ då?+då! ('then')	8
nå? ('well?')	4
…	4
rättare sagt ('rather')	2
eller? ('or?')	1
var ('*was*')	1
eller […] i alla fall ('or […] in any case')	1
–	1
jaså? ('oh?', 'really?')	1
Total tokens/types	**23/9**

The most common translation of **CLAR** is *då*, with or without a question mark or exclamation mark. All three types of *då* are translations of the prompting **CLAR** function: *då* with a question mark indicates the rising intonation of this function of *well* with a question mark; *då* with an exclamation mark indicates an imperative; and *då* without a question mark or exclamation mark is followed either by a question or an imperative in the subsequent discourse. Other translations of this function of *well* are *nå?* ('well?'), *eller?* (or?'), and *jaså?* ('oh?'/'really?').

Example (75), below, illustrates the eliciting function of *well* as a marker of prompting **CLAR**, translated in the Cinema subtitles into the matching *då?*.

(75)   Lucy: the Callaghans a-are they inside
       Saul: you missed'em
       Lucy: **well ↑ |** what was their reaction to the news
       Saul: I didn't tell'em yet
                                    (*WHILE* 01.20.14)

Cinema	DVD+TV3	SVT
Familjen. Är de här?	Familjen. Är de här?	Vad sa de? Callaghans. Är de här?
[The family. Are they here?]	The family. Are they here?]	[What did they say? The Callaghans. Are they here?]
De har just gått.	De har just gått.	De har gått.

[They have just left]	[They have just left]	[They've left.]
Hur reagerade de, **då?** [How did they react, **then?**]	Hur reagerade de? [How did they react?]	Hur reagerade de? [How did they react?]
Jag har inte berättat det än. [I haven't told them yet.]	Jag har inte berättat än. [I haven't told them yet.]	Jag har inte sagt nåt ännu. [I haven't said anything yet.]

The DVD and TV3 subtitles, on the one hand, and the SVT subtitles, on the other, do not include a translation of *well* in (75), but use the question *Hur reagerade de?* ('How did they react?'), without the final *då?*.

(76) is an example of the demanding type of **CLAR** *well*, translated into either *då* or *då!*.

(76)　　Lucy: and if I tell her the truth she's gonna have a heart attack and she's gonna die and it's
　　　　　　gonna be on my head
　　　　Jerry: **well** │↓ then go along with it and when Peter comes out of the coma the family'll be
　　　　　　so happy they won't care that you lied to them│they'll probably even thank you for it
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(*WHILE* 00.22.09)

Cinema, DVD, TV3	SVT
Spela med, **då**. När Peter vaknar upp, kommer familjen att bli så glad- [Play along, **then**. When Peter wakes up, the family will be so glad-]	Säg inget **då!** När Peter vaknar blir de så lyckliga att de struntar i det. [Don't say anything, **then!** When Peter wakes up, they will be so happy that they won't mind.]
-att de kanske tackar dig för din lilla lögn. [-that they might thank you for your little lie.]	De kanske till och med tackar dig. [They might even thank you.]

A common collocation for this type of prompting *well* is *then*, with a short pause between *well* and *then* as in *well then go along with it* in example (76). Here, it is translated into *Spela med, då*. ('Play along, then.') in the Cinema, DVD and TV3 subtitles, and *Säg inget då!* ('Don't say anything, then!') in the SVT subtitles. The collocation of *well* and *then* translates into *då* in Swedish, and it is impossible to know whether the above subtitles have translated either *well* or *then*, or the collocation *well+then*. The translation strategy *doubling of function* (cf. 4.3.3) is used in all subtitles in example (76).

The most common translation of the repairing **CLAR** function is a punctuation mark: the three dots (…) are used 4 times and the dash (–) is used once as translations of this function.

Example (77) shows the three dots as a translation of the repairing **CLAR** function in the DVD and SVT subtitles, which are identical in this example.

(77)　　Wesley: does she have any relatives in the area
　　　　Sueann: no │ │**well** ↑│ she does have some grandparents down in Oklahoma but that's it
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(*BETTY* 00.27.14)

Cinema	DVD+SVT	TV3
Nej. [No.]	Nej**…**morföräldrarna i Oklahoma bara. [No**…**only the grandparents in Oklahoma.]	Nej. [No.]
Hon har sina morföräldrar i Oklahoma, inga andra. [She has her grandparents in Oklahoma, no others.]		Hon har sina morföräldrar i Oklahoma, men det är allt. [She has her granparents in Oklahoma, but that\s it.]

In (77), Sueann is asked whether her friend Betty has any relatives in the area, whereupon she quickly answers *no,* then makes a pause and changes her mind to *she does have some grandparents down in Oklahoma but that's it*, signalling the contrast between *No* and the change with the repair marker *well*. The repair is illustrated by three dots in the DVD and SVT subtitles. As in all translations in the corpus of the present study, the three dots are difficult to analyse as they may be a translation or a demonstration of a number of features in the ST, above all hesitation. In (77), the DVD and SVT subtitles seem to illustrate hesitation more than repair, but they do provide an impression of the repair taking place in the ST. The Cinema and TV3 subtitles, on the other hand, do not include any form of repair or hesitation. The lines *Hon har sina morföräldrar i Oklahoma, inga andra/men det är allt* do not contrast with the *Nej* ('no'), as the utterance *she does have some grandparents down in Oklahoma but that's it* does in the ST and *morföräldrarna i Oklahoma bara* does to a certain extent in the DVD and SVT subtitles.

Example (78) below illustrates the only translation of *well* as a repairing **CLAR** not being a punctuation marker.

(78) Tracy: did David tell you that│ I teach 5th grade │ **well** → │ │I did

(*SEVEN* 00.55.52)

Cinema+DVD	SVT	TV4
Sa David att jag är mellanstadie-lärare? Var, **rättare sagt**. [Did David say that I'm a 5th grade teacher? Was, **rather**.]	Har David berättat att jag är lärare? *Var* lärare. [Has David told you that I'm a teacher? *Was* a teacher.]	Har David berättat att jag är lärare? **Eller** var, **i alla fall**. [Has David told you that I'm a teacher? **Or** was, **in any case**.]

In the above example, Tracy is repairing her utterance by changing the present tense to the past tense so that *I teach 5th grade* becomes *I did* (*teach 5th grade*). The repair itself is signalled by *well* followed by quite a long pause (the body language of the speaker also indictes the repairing **FRAME** function of *well* here). There are three different translations connected to this occurrence of *well*. The Cinema and DVD subtitles, on the one hand, and the TV4 subtitles, on the other, both use expressions that have quite a clear referential meaning and that are fairly long and space-demanding. The Cinema and DVD subtitles use *Var, rättare sagt* ('Was, rather'/'rightly said'), while the TV4 subtitles use *Eller var, i alla fall* ('Or was in any case'). Both subtitle versions change from the present to the past tense (from *är* ('is') to *var* ('was')), but they indicate the repair presented by *well* differently. The SVT subtitles show a third way of translating this function of *well*. This version uses a more concise option by simply italicising the repaired tense of the verb to illustrate emphasis (*Var lärare*). Here, it is the use of the italics more than anything else that puts across the function of the repair taking place in the ST. In all three subtitle versions, the translation strategy explicitation (cf. 4.3.3) is used, making the translations more explicit than *well* is in the ST.

5.5.3 The insufficiency-marker translated

INS is the second most common function in the ST with a total of 188 tokens in all ten films combined. There are 78 translations of **INS** in the four TTs combined, making an average of 19.5 translations per TT.

Table 5.10, below, shows all translations of *well* as a marker of Insufficiency.

Table 5.10 Translations of the **INS** function

Translation	Total
ju ('as you know')	36
tja + tja…('well')	13
men ('but')	5
…	5
i alla fall ('in any case')	5
jo ('yes', 'well')	4
ja […] ja ('well […] well')	3
nog ('probably')	2
ja ('yes')	2
ja, eller ('yes, or')	1
nåja ('oh well')	1
nja ('well')	1
Total tokens/types	**78/12**

The most common translation of the **INS** marker is *ju*. *Ju* is used as a translation of *well* in utterances which, as opposed to most instances of *well* functioning as a marker of insufficiency, are not replies to questions but statements with the same renegotiating task. Example (79) below is an illustration of *ju* as a translation of *well* with an insufficiency function.

(79)   Vince: what did you think about what happened to Antwan
Mia: who's Antwan
Vince: Tony Rocky Horror you know him
Mia: he fell out of a window
Vince: mh mh │**well** ↑ that is one way to say it │another way to say it would be that
he was thrown out another way would be he was thrown out by Marsellus
and yet even another way is that he was thrown out of a window by
Marsellus because of you

(*PULP* 00.42.58)

Cinema+DVD+TV4+SVT
Så kan man **ju** säga. Annars kan man säga att han blev utkastad.
[One can say it like that, **as you know**. Or one can say that he was thrown out.]

In (79), Vince asks Mia a question which she answers. The answer is not satisfactory to Vince and so he re-evaluates Mia's reply by first agreeing with her (*mh mh*) and then using *well* as a signal of the insufficiency to be completed in the remaining part of the utterance. This

occurrence of *well* also has a **MIT** function, as Vince is disagreeing to some extent with what Mia says, mitigating this with *well*. The **INS** function is, however, considered to be more significant in this example due to e.g. the rising intonation of *well* and the fact that the phrase *he fell out of a window* can be either agreed or disagreed with, and *well* signals that Vince's answer is neither an agreement nor a disagreement, but something in between. Vince gives Mia other possible ways of viewing what happened to "Tony Rocky Horror" than him falling out of a window, ways that Vince considers more adequate than Mia's suggestion. A re-evaluation is thus taking place in Vince's utterance, signalled by the use of *well*.

All four TTs translate Vince's utterance in the same way, using *ju* as a kind of translation of *well*. *Ju* as a marker of re-evaluation is not as clear a match as *tja* ('well'), however, which is the second most common translation of *well* as a marker of **INS**. Example (80) below is an example of *tja* as a translation of *well* with an insufficiency marking function.

(80)   Brooke: is he always such an ass
        Emmet: he's the top defence attorney in the state of course he's an ass
        Brooke: fine but is he an ass that's gonna win my case
        Emmet: **well ↑** │he's an ass who's gonna try

                                    (*BLONDE* 01.15.38)

Cinema	DVD
Men kan han få mig frikänd? [But can he win my case?]	Bra, men är han ett arsel som kommer vinna mitt mål? [Fine, but is he an ass who will win my case?]
Han kommer att försöka. [He will try.]	Tja, han är ett arsel som kommer försöka. [Well, he's an ass that will try.]
SVT	TV4
Kan det arslet vinna målet? [Can the ass win the case?]	Är han en idiot som kan vinna? [Is he an idiot who can win?]
Arslet kommer att försöka. [The ass will try.]	Han är en idiot som ska försöka. [He's an idiot who will try.]

In (80), Brooke asks Emmet whether he thinks a man, referred to as "an ass" all through the example, will win her case in a court of law. Emmet cannot answer this question with a direct yes or no, something which he signals with the use of *well* as a marker of the insufficiency that is to be completed in his reply *he's an ass who's gonna try*. The insufficiency of *well* in the ST is illustrated in the DVD subtitles only, with the use of *tja* ('well'). Swedish *tja* is a DP denoting "hesitant positive agreement" (Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen 2003:1141) and is used in the corpus as a translation of *well* either as a marker of insufficiency or as a more hesitant feature. The three remaining subtitle versions do not include a marker of insufficiency or hesitation.

Closely related to *Tja* is *Nja*, which is a combination of *nej* ('no') and *ja* ('yes'), with only one occurrence in the corpus. Svartvik (1980) finds that *nja* in his corpus is used as a marker of what he calls *answer prefix* (1980:174), a term which is similar to both the **INS** marker and the **MIT** marker in the present study. Example (81) below has been discussed briefly as (55) and (61) above, and provides an example of a typical insufficiency function of *well*.

(81)

Nadia: perhaps you could help me with my studies
Jim: uh yeah absolutely that that that would be that would be uh great sometime how about
    tomorrow
Nadia: **well** ↑ │I have ballet practice│perhaps uhm I could come by your house afterwards

<div align="right">(AMPIE 00.38.11)</div>

Cinema+DVD	SVT	TV3
Då dansar jag balett. [Then I'm dancing ballet.] Jag kunde kanske komma hem till dig efter det. Jag kan byta om hos dig. [I could maybe come home to you after that. I could change at your place.]	**Nja**, jag har balettlektion. Men jag kanske kan komma till dig efteråt? [**Well**, I have ballet practice. But maybe I can come to you afterwards?]	Jag har en balettlektion då. [I have ballet practice then.] Jag kanske kan komma efteråt och byta om hemma hos dig. [Maybe I can come afterwards and change at your place.]

The insufficiency function of *well* is translated in the SVT subtitles into the matching *nja*, clearly showing the speaker's inability to answer *yes* or *no*. The Cinema+DVD and TV3 subtitles do not translate *well*.

Another translation of *well* as a marker of **INS** is *nog*, exemplified in (82), below.

(82)

Scotty: is is everything okay
Jerry: yah
Scotty: are you calling Stan
Jerry: │ │**well** ↑│I'm│ │I'm going to bed now

<div align="center">(FARGO 01.10.06)</div>

Cinema	DVD+TV4	SVT
Jag går och lägger mig. [I'm going to bed.]	Jag går och lägger mig nu. [I'm going to bed now.]	Jag ska **nog** lägga mig nu. [I'm **probably** going to bed now.]

The background story to the above example is quite complicated but of importance for the reaction of the speaker Jerry. Shortly before the dialogue in (82) takes place, Jerry has witnessed his father-in-law being killed, and Jerry is indirectly responsible for his death. The dialogue takes place as he returns home, troubled by what he has experienced. Jerry's son Scotty is upstairs, not visible in the scene, as he asks his father if everything is okay and whether he is calling a character named Stan who has phoned twice the same evening and left messages. Scotty's question is a straightforward yes/no-question, but Jerry, perhaps due to the shock of the previous events, is not able to answer accordingly. Jerry's *well* in his reply signals that what he is about to say is not the answer Scotty is expecting. He does not answer the question but says that he is going to bed (which may indicate that the answer is *No, I'm going to bed now*). The Cinema and DVD+TV4 subtitles translate *I'm going to bed (now)*, but not *well* as a marker of the insufficiency in the reply. However, the SVT subtitles include *nog* ('probably', 'possibly') as a paraphrasing translation. This modal particle generally has the function of presenting probability, mitigation and uncertainty, and it often "signals that the speaker weighs the validity of the proposition against what he knows or what is generally known" (Aijmer 1996b:406) (to be further discussed in 6.5). *Nog* in (82) is thus a reasonable translation of *well* as a marker of insufficiency, even though it may not be the most corresponding translation. The translation strategy *paraphrase* (cf. 4.3.3) is used for *well* in the SVT subtitles in (82), as *nog* is not a clearly corresponding translation of *well* but still expresses a function similar to *well* in example (82).

The explanative function that **INS** may show is exemplified below. Like the **INS** function in general, it is most frequent as a reply to a question. Examples (83) and (84) are common illustrations of the more explanative function as *well* in both examples follows the question *Why do you ask (me)?*, raised in order to obtain an explanation. Example (83) shows *ju* in the TV3 and SVT subtitles.

(83) Sam: how do you like America
  Anton: why do you ask me
  Sam: **well** ↑│ you're French │ do you ever miss it do you ever get lonely for your own country
  (*ADDICTED* 00.51.11)

DVD	SVT	TV3
Du är fransman. [You're French.] Saknar du Frankrike? [Do you miss France?] Saknar du aldrig ditt hemland? [Do you miss your home country?]	Du är **ju** fransman - saknar du aldrig ditt eget land? [You're French, **as you know-** don't you ever miss your own country?]	Du är **ju** fransman. [You're French, **as you know**.] Saknar du aldrig ditt hemland? [Don't you ever miss your home country?]

In (83), Sam asks Anton how he likes America whereupon Anton asks *Why do you ask me?*. Sam's reply is short (*you're French*), but *well* signals that the proposition Sam wants to explain is somewhat more complicated than that. He continues his reply with a longer, more intricate explanation (*do you ever miss it, do you ever get lonely for your own country?*). The DVD subtitles do not translate *well*, but the SVT and TV3 subtitles both use *ju* ('as you know') as a paraphrasing translation.

Example (84) below is (62) repeated, this time with subtitles. Again, the question *Why do you ask?* is used to obtain an answer.

(84) Callahan: interesting why do you ask
  Elle: **well** ↑│ │unless the defendant attempted to contact every single one-night stand to determine if a child resulted in *those* unions │ he has no parental claim over this child whatsoever why now why this sperm
  (*LEGALLY* 00.46.17)

Cinema	DVD
Vart vill du komma? [Where are you going with this?] Om han inte kontaktade varenda kvinna han haft sex med- [If he didn't contact every woman he's had sex with-] -för att hävda sitt faderskap så hade han ingen rätt att göra det nu. [- to make his parental claim, he had no right to do it now.]	Intressant. Varför frågar du det? [Interesting. Why do you ask?] **Jo**, såvida inte den svarande kontaktade alla sina engångsligg. [**Yes**, unless the defendant didn't contact all his one night stands,] för att fastställa om de resulterade i barn, [to determine if a child resulted from them,] kan han inte ställa några faderliga krav. [he cannot make any parental claims.] Varför den här sperman? [Why this sperm?]

SVT	TV4
Varför frågar du det? [Why do you ask?] Om han inte sökte upp alla partners för att fastställa om de fått barn-	Intressant. Varför frågar ni? [Interesting. Why do you ask?] Såvida han inte undersökt om ett barn kommit till vid varenda samlag-

[If he didn't contact all partners to determine if they'd had children-]	[Unless he hasn't investigated if a child has been made during every intercourse-]
-så kan han inte göra anspråk på det här. Varför just den här sperman? [-then he cannot claim this. Why this particular sperm?]	-har han ingen rätt alls till barnet. Varför just den här sperman? [-he has no right at all to the child. Why this particular sperm?]

The proposition of Elle's reply in (84) is quite intricate, and *well* signals this. There are four different subtitles in (84) and only one of them, the DVD subtitles, translates the explanation function signalled by *well* in the ST. The DVD subtitles use *Jo* ('yes', 'well'), which comes across as somewhat more textual in the subtitles than *well* does in the ST. *Jo* may be used by speakers in monologues "to return to the main point of an argument", also after interruptions (Ottesjö 2006:94). *Jo* in the DVD subtitles in example (84) is not part of a monologue, but is used in a smilar manner to the *jo* referred to by Ottesjö (2006).

The re-evaluating character of **INS** sometimes leads to an uncertainty in the utterance. The more hesitant form of **INS** performs a re-evaluation of the previous (part of an) utterance with a high degree of uncertainty, and signals that what the speaker is about to say does not entail sufficient information due to the, many times, complex proposition. The uncertainty is found in the quantity and length of pauses, as well as in the intonation of *well*, and the quantity of stuttering, *uh*-sounds and use of other DPs.

The most common translation of the hesitant **INS** function of *well* is *tja*, illustrated in (85) below.

(85)   Susan: why did you stop working for Adam Larkin careful it's hot [32]
        Henry: thank you[33] │**well** → uhm I just uh │I
        Susan: it 's allright I know you can't talk about your old boss to your new boss
                                                    (*PRIMARY* 00.15.23)

Cinema	DVD+TV3	SVT
-	Tack. **Tja**, jag… [Thanks. **Well**, I**…**]	Tack. [Thank you.]

In (85), the Governor's wife Susan is asking the political assistant Henry why he stopped working for one politician and chose to work for her husband and her instead. Henry's reply is full of hesitant features such as *well*, pauses, *uhm*s and the use of hedging *I just*. Susan understands his hesitant behaviour rightly as a sign of Henry's difficulty to talk about his old boss to his new boss. The Cinema subtitles do not translate Henry's hesitant utterance at all, but instead focus on Susan's utterances only. The DVD and TV3 subtitles translate Henry's utterance including *tja* as a matching translation of *well*. These subtitles have also rendered some of the stuttering and general hesitant behaviour of Henry in this scene by using three dots indicating his uncertainty. The SVT subtitles have translated *thank you*, but not the insufficiency and/or hesitation in Henry's reply.

The second most common translation of the more hesitant **INS** function of *well* is the use of three dots (…). Example (86), below, illustrates this.

---

[32] *Careful it's hot* refers to the cup of tea Susan is giving Henry in this scene.
[33] Henry says *thank you* referring to the cup of tea.

(86)
Saul: Peter there's somethin' │ you have to know about her you see she │ │**well**
→ │ │uuuhm│ │she's │ │huh │uh you know ↑ │ │mhhh │ │she's not only your fiancée she's
your guardian angel

(*WHILE* 01.14.01)

Cinema	DVD+TV3	SVT
Det är en sak du måste få veta om henne. [There's a thing you need to know about her.]	Det är en sak du måste få veta om henne. Hon**…** [There's a thing you need to know about her. She…]	Det är en sak du måste veta om henne. [There's a thing you must know about her.]
Hon**...** - [She…-]	Hon**…** [She…]	Hon är**…** [She is…]
Hon**...** - [She…-] Hon är inte bara din fästmö, hon är din skyddsängel! [She's not only your fiancée, she's your guardian angel!]	Hon är inte bara din fästmö, hon är din skyddsängel! [She's not only your fiancée, she's your guardian angel!]	Hon är inte bara din fästmö. Hon är din skyddsängel. [She's not only your fiancée. She's your guardian angel.]

In this example, Saul is trying to tell his godson Peter that the latter is married to a woman he has never met. Saul does not feel at ease giving Peter this piece of information and so he starts stuttering as well as using long and numerous pauses together with *uhm*s, *mhh*s, and DPs *well* and *you know*. At the end of his utterance, Saul gives in and says something other than what he had planned.

It is not possible here to decode exactly which part of the ST is translated into the subtitles, as the translation strategy doubling of function is employed here (cf. 4.3.3), but all four use three dots as an indication of the hesitation in Saul's utterance. The Cinema and the DVD+TV3 subtitles use three dots twice after *Hon* ('She'). The first *she* in the ST is followed by a lengthy pause plus *well* followed by another lengthy pause. The first *Hon…* in the Cinema and DVD+TV3 subtitles is possibly a translation of *she* │ │*well* │ │ in the ST. The second *Hon…* in the same subtitle versions is possibly a translation of *she's* │ │*huh* │*uh*. The SVT subtitles have one indication of the hesitation in the ST, i.e. *Hon är…*, possibly illustrating either of the two *she* + pauses in the ST

5.5.4 The mitigation-marker translated

There are 108 occurrences of *well* as a **MIT** marker in the ten films combined. There are 50 translations of **MIT** in the four TTs combined, making an average of 12.5 translations per TT. Table 5.11 below shows all the translations of *well* as a **MIT** marker.

Table 5.11. Translations of the **MIT** function

Translation	Total
ju ('as you know')	7
och ('and')	7
väl ('surely')	6
men ('but')	4
nej ('no')	4

lite ('a little')	4
jo ('yes')	4
i så fall ('in that case')	3
nu ('now')	2
nog ('probably')	1
ja […] förstås ('yes […]of course')	1
ja! ('yes!')	1
nå ('well')	1
bara ('just')	1
säkert ('surely')	1
då ('then')	1
ja, och ('yes, and')	1
men […] i alla fall ('but […] in any case')	1
Total tokens/types	**50/19**

Well as a **MIT** marker in the corpus is used in a variety of face threatening acts (FTAs), including confessions, apologies, partial agreement, suggestions, requests, disagreements, refusals, defences, and complaints.

The most common FTAs used in connection to mitigating *well* are disagreements (with varying directness), defence situations and complaints. As the line is difficult to draw between different types of FTAs in the corpus, all instances of *well* as a **MIT** marker are considered together here. However, comments will be made about different FTA types and translations thereof.

In the corpus, *well* is never used in common politeness conventions such as greeting, address or gratitude (Carlson 1984:92), but most often it is a signal of mitigation of an objection or a disagreement of some sort. Because of this, *well* is regularly part of more or less heated discussions and arguments in the films. In Carlson's (1984) corpus of fictional dialogue from British and American detective novels, *well* before direct disagreement (such as *you're wrong*) is not common. Carlson explains this as a consequence of what core function he considers *well* to have: *well* is a sign of acceptance and thus not to be used in disagreements. Despite Carlson's view of *well* as a sign of acceptance, he gives examples of *well* as a clear marker of non-acceptance (*Well, I disagree* and *Well, you're wrong, madam* 1984:42). In the corpus of the present study, there are quite a few examples of direct disagreement (e.g. *well, you're wrong* (*PRIMARY*)), but the majority of the utterances prefaced by *well* are less explicit and their analyses are in need of a larger context.

As can be seen in table 5.11 above, *ju* and *och* are the most common translations of *well* as a **MIT** marker. *Ju* is exemplified in (87) below.

(87)

Charlie: get rid of that fucking thing get rid of it fucking great Wesley now we don't know
   where the stuff is
Wesley: **well** → he said it's in the Buick
Charlie: which fucking Buick
Wesley: why did you shoot him
Charlie: I had to shoot him Wesley it was the only decent thing to do after you scalped him

(*BETTY* 00.18.56)

Cinema+DVD	SVT	TV3
Han sa att det låg i Buicken. [He said it's in the Buick.]	Det låg **ju** i Buicken. [**As you know** it's in the Buick.]	Han sa att de låg i Buicken. [He said they're in the Buick.]

In (87), Charlie and Wesley are arguing over a killing they have just both taken part in (Wesley has scalped a man and Charlie afterwards shot the same man to save him from too much suffering). Charlie is angry with Wesley because the dead man had information on the whereabouts of some hidden-away drugs which will now be difficult for them to find. Charlie says *now we don't know where the stuff is*, and Wesley defends himself by reminding Charlie that the dead man did in fact say that the drugs were in a car. Wesley says *well he said it's in the Buick*, using *well* as a mitigation of the disagreement *he said it's in the Buick*. The Cinema+DVD and TV3 subtitles do not translate *well*, but the SVT subtitles do by using modal particle *ju*. As we have seen previously, *ju* can be used as a hedge and a down-toner in face-threatening situations such as the one in example (87), in order to achieve common ground. The seven occurrences of *ju* as a translation of *well* with a **MIT** function are found in ST examples where the speakers using *well* are either defending themselves as in the example above or only partially disagreeing with the other speaker(s). *Ju* may thus be found in quite heated arguments, but is used by composed speakers (in the scenes in question) who are trying to tone down their own aggression or the other speaker's aggression in order to reach common ground. Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen (2003) found in their study that *ju* as a translation of *well* in the context of verbal confrontation was used in "arguments, objections, defences, concessions, reservations to achieve common ground" (2003:1143)

The translation *och* ('and') has as many occurrences as *ju* (7 occurrences), but does not have the same down-toning effect as *ju* has. Carlson (1984:45) points out the difference in pragmatic function between *well*, *and*, and *but* and draws the conclusion that *well* is the most mitigating, *but* more contrasting than mitigating and *and* hardly mitigating at all. Because Swedish *och* and *men* correspond directly to English *and* and *but*, Carlson's idea can be applied to the translations of *well* as a mitigator in the corpus. *And* has a more apparent structural function as "a marker of speaker continuation" (Schiffrin 1987:63) than both *well* and *but* have. Example (88) below is an illustration of *Och* and *Ja, och* ('Yes, and') as a translation of *well* with a **MIT** function.

(88)

Elle: I used to take her class at the Los Angeles Sports Club she's amazing
Callahan: amazing how
Elle: she can make you lose like three pounds in one class │ she's completely gifted
Callahan: **well** ↓ │ in all likelihood she's completely guilty as well │ she was seen standing over
   her husband's dead body

(*LEGALLY* 00.50.03)

Cinema	DVD
Jag tränade för henne på L. A. Sports Club. Hon är fantastisk! [I took her class at L.A Sports Club. She's fantastic!]	Men jag brukade ta hennes pass i Los Angeles sportklubb. Hon är fantastisk. [But I used to take her class at the Los Angeles Sports Club. She's fantastic.]
Hur då? [How so?]	"Fantastisk"? Hur? ["Fantastic"? How?]
Man går ner ett drygt kg på ett pass. Hon är helt genial. [You lose about one kilo in one class. She's a total genius.]	Man gick ner ett drygt kilo på hennes pass. Hon är så begåvad. [You lost about one kilo in her class. She's so talented.]
Och troligen skyldig också. [**And** probably guilty too.]	**Ja, och** sannolikt även skyldig. [**Yes, and** probably guilty as well.]
Hon sågs vid makens kropp. [She was seen by her husband's body.]	Hon sågs stå böjd över sin mans lik. [She was seen standing over her husband's corpse.]

SVT	TV4
Jag brukade gå på hennes träningspass. Hon är fantastisk! [I used to take her work out class. She's fantastic!]	Gick ut fyra år före mig. Jag gick på hennes gympapass, hon är otrolig. [Graduated four years before me. I went to her jym class, she's amazing.]
Man gick ner ett drygt kilo. Hon är genial. [You lost about a kilo. She's a genious.]	Hur då otrolig? [Amazing how?]
	Man gick ner 1,5 kg på hennes pass. [You lost 1.5 kilos in her class.]
Hon är tydligen skyldig också. Hon ertappades vid makens döda kropp. [Apparently, she's guilty too. She was caught at her husband's dead body.]	Troligtvis är hon skyldig. Hon blev sedd stående över den döda kroppen. [She's probably guilty. She was seen standing over the dead body.]

Elle in example (88) is giving praise to an old school friend who is now a suspect in a murder trial. Callahan, Elle's teacher and superior, questions Elle's enthusiasm saying *in all likelihood she's completely guilty as well*. Callahan thus only partially disagrees with Elle, suggesting that Elle may be right in admiring her friend's talents as an aerobics instructor, even though she may be a murderer as well as an aerobics instructor. Callahan uses quite an ironic tone in his voice which implies that he considers Elle to be somewhat naïve in her admiration of the friend. He mitigates the partial disagreement and the irony by using *well* at the beginning of the utterance, i.e. the face threatening act (FTA). The Cinema subtitles translate *well* into *och*, thus in a sense removing the politeness function *well* has in the ST as a down-toning marker. In the DVD subtitles, the partial disagreement is more noticeable than in the Cinema subtitles as the affirmation *Ja* ('yes') is used together with *och*. The TV4 subtitles choose not to translate Elle's utterance *she's completely gifted*. As a consequence, the link between this utterance and Callahan's objection is lost and there is no need for a translation of neither mitigating *well* nor the partial disagreement following it. The TV4 subtitles make Callahan's second turn seem as initiating a new topic instead of reacting to Elle's admiration of her friend. The SVT subtitles, finally, use the word *tydligen* ('evidently') in *Hon är tydligen skyldig också* ('She is evidently guilty too') which has a more down-toning effect than *troligen/sannolikt/troligtvis* ('probably'). The SVT translation, like the TV4 translation,

does not communicate the sense of objection present in Callahan's second turn in the ST, and does not need to include a mitigation thereof either.

The adversative conjunction *men* ('but') is the fourth most used translation of *well* as a marker of **MIT** (together with *nej* ('no') and *lite* ('a little')). In the corpus, a common collocation of *well* as a marker of **MIT** is *but*. This is most likely due to the counterargument function of the utterance that *well* as a mitigator introduces. Carlson (1984:44) also finds this in his corpus and considers the functions of *well* and *but* to be overlapping: "In the context of an argument, *well* is often accompanied or replaced by the conjunction *but*." (1984:44). The adversative conjunction *but* has the function of "introducing counterarguments and contrasts" (ibid.) and could because of this possibly both grammatically and semantically replace *well* in many ST examples in the corpus. The pragmatic difference between *well* and *but* is, however, quite considerable as *well* does not make "the contrast between the two viewpoints [of an argument] explicit in the way *but* does" (ibid.). Moreover, Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen (2003) found in their material that "when *well* was translated by *men* 'but', the interpersonal function of the particle was lost" (2003:1144).

In one example from the corpus, (89) below, there are two instances of *well* in the ST, one of which is translated into *och* and one which is translated into *men* in some of the subtitles. Here we are again encountering Wesley and Charlie, the two criminals presented in example (87). While in (87) they were having a heated discussion (mitigated somewhat by Wesley's utterance prefaced by *well*), in (89) they are both admitting to being wrong previously, now giving credit to the other person. They both use *well* as a marker of disagreement even though, at the same time, they are reinforcing the other person's point.

(89)   Wesley: you were right about Del he wasn't lying
         Charlie: │ yeah **well** → │ │ you were right about what the lady bartender said
         Wesley: yeah **well** → you were right first │ you gotta follow your instincts

                                                                              (*BETTY* 01.23.23)

Cinema	DVD+SVT	TV3
Du hade rätt – Del ljög inte. [You were right – Del wasn't lying.]	Du hade rätt – Del ljög inte. [You were right – Del wasn't lying.]	Du hade rätt om Del, han ljög inte. [You were right about Del, he wasn't lying.]
Och du hade rätt när det gällde den där kvinnliga bartendern. [**And** you were right about that lady bartender.]	**Och** du hade rätt när det gällde den kvinnliga bartendern. [**And** you were right about the lady bartender.]	Du hade rätt när det gällde den kvinnliga bartendern. [You were right about that lady bartender.]
Men du hade rätt först. Man ska följa sin intuition. [**But** you were right first. You should follow your intuition.]	**Men** du hade rätt först. Man ska följa sin intuition. [**But** you were right first. You should follow your intuition.]	Du hade rätt först. Man måste följa sin instinkt. [You were right first. You have to follow your instincts.]

Both Charlie and Wesley use the collocation *yeah well* to initiate the FTAs , showing that they agree (by using *yeah*), but that they also disagree to some extent (by using *well*). The Cinema and DVD+SVT all use *och* ('and') as a translation of Charlie's *yeah well*, and *men* ('but') as a translation of Wesley's *yeah well*. It seems logical to use *och* in the first turn (Charlie's) with *well*, and *men* in the second (Wesley's) since *och* is a signal of Charlie's continuation from Wesley's first turn and *men* a marker of contrast from Charlie's turn. The TV3 subtitles do not include *och* nor *men*, or any other translation of *well*.

In (90), below, *men* is used as a translation of *well* in the DVD subtitles.

(90)   Callahan: Brooke I believe you but a jury is gonna want an alibi
        Brooke: **well** → I can't give you that │and if you put me on the stand │ I'll lie
                                                                          (*BLONDE* 00.51.38)

Cinema	DVD
Jag kan inte ge dig ett. Om du kallar mig som vittne ljuger jag. [I can't give you one. If you call me as a witness I'll lie.]	**Men** det kan jag inte ge dig. Vid ett förhör kommer jag ljuga. [**But** I can't give you that. At a questioning I'll lie.]
SVT	**TV4**
Det kan jag inte ge dig. Och om du kallar mig som vittne ljuger jag. [I can't give you that. And if you call me as a witness I'll lie.]	Jag kan inte ge er det. Om ni tvingar mig att vittna, ljuger jag. [I can't give you that. If you force me to testify, I'll lie.]

The character Brooke in (90) is the aerobics instructor mentioned in example (88). In the above example she is in a meeting with her solicitors. One of the solicitors, Callahan, knows Brooke has an alibi for the night she supposedly killed her husband and is asking her for this alibi. Brooke refuses to give it to him for various reasons (she had a liposuction on the day in question, something she is very ashamed of and refuses to inform her solicitors of) and mitigates the direct refusal *I can't give you that* with *well*. The Cinema, TV4, and SVT subtitles do not translate the mitigating function of *well*. The DVD subtitles translate *well* into *men*, which does not present a **MIT** function, but more a contrast and a reinforcement of the refusal.

The modal particle *väl* is used six times as a translation of *well*. Four of these are translations of the same ST entry, seen as (91) below.

(91)   Conrad: no no no we land we take him from the plane we put him in the ambulance Airforce
                jet lands we take somebody else from that jet │wha-what what **well** → what the fuck
                do I care somebody in a hospital gown
                                                                          (*WAG* 01.12.41)

Cinema+DVD+ SVT	TV4
Ett militärplan landar med nån ersättare. [A military plane will land with some replacement.]	Nej, vi landar och sätter honom i en ambulans. [No, we'll land and put him in an ambulance.]
Det skiter **väl** jag i. Nån i en sjukhusskjorta, bara. [**Surely** I don't give a shit. Just someone in a hospital gown.]	Nån annan får ta hans plats. [Someone else will take his place.]
	Det skiter **väl** jag i. Nån i sjukhuskläder. [**Surely** I don't give a shit. Someone in hospital clothes.]

In (91), the character Conrad is on a plane and is speaking on the phone. He is briefing somebody about his travel arrangements and how to help a man on the plane get some mental care. As Conrad is speaking on the phone, it is impossible to know exactly what the person at the other end is saying. We can assume, however, that the other speaker asks Conrad about a detail in the arrangements, whereupon Conrad quite angrily replies *wha-what what **well** what the fuck do I care somebody in a hospital gown* (the stutter in Conrad's reply is due to disturbance and stress in the plane more than any type of hesitation). The utterance *what the fuck do I care* is harsh, and Conrad mitigates this by using *well*. All subtitles have translated this mitigation into *väl* ('surely'), putting across the down-toning function of *well* in the ST.

The adjective *lite* ('a little') is used four times as a translation of *well* with a **MIT** function. All of these translations are in the same ST entry. Consider (92), below.

(92) Oz: my friends call me Nova as in Casanova
College Girl: that's pathetic
Oz: jeez you don't have to laugh at me
College Girl: **well (1)** → there's <u>just some</u> things you need to learn <u>that's all</u>
Oz: like what
College Girl: **well (2)** → you gotta tone it down │ you don't need to come to a place like Lookout Point and spout off cheese ball lines to be romantic

(*AMPIE* 00.09.56)

Cinema+DVD	SVT	TV3
Du har ett och annat att lära. [You have some things to learn.] Tona ner det **lite**. [Tone it down **a little**.]	Du har **nog** en del att lära. [You **probably** have some things to learn.] Tona ner det **lite**. [Tone it down **a little**.]	Du behöver bara lära dig. [You just need to learn.] Du måste tagga ner **lite**. [You gotta calm down **a little**.]

In this example, Oz, a high school student, is flirting with a college girl. Oz is trying to impress the girl but his attempts are not working very well: the girl laughs at him and calls him pathetic. When he realises he has made a fool of himself, Oz seems hurt and so the girl tries to console him by advising him on how to behave with girls. When performing the FTA of suggesting to Oz how he should behave, the girl uses *well* twice to tone down the message of the suggestions. The first instance of *well* is accompanied by the down-toning expressions *just*, *some*, and *that's all* to further mitigate the face threat of the girl's suggestion. Because of the many features of mitigation in the utterance, the subtitles are difficult to analyse, i.e. it is not easy to know whether elements in the subtitles are translations of *well* or of other features in the ST utterance. This is another case of the translation strategy doubling of function (cf. 4.3.3). The Cinema+DVD subtitles include *ett och annat* ('some things'), but this somewhat downtoning expression is not considered to be a translation of *well* here but of *some things* in the ST. TV3 uses *bara* ('just') which is also a down-toning word and could possibly be a translation of *well*, or of all the down-toning elements in the ST combined. It is not considered a (clear) translation of *well* here, however, but more likely of *just* or *that's all*. The second instance of *well* in (92) is more easily analysed as there are no other mitigating elements in the utterance (nor in the intonation or body language) and is translated by all four TTs into *lite* ('a little'). *Lite* is, among other uses, applied in situations of disagreement when a speaker is cautious, "ensuring that no one in a group loses face or status: a so-called strategy of solidarity" (Norrby & Wirdenäs 2001:13, my translation). The use of *lite* in the subtitles clearly renders the down-toning effect of *well* in the ST. Both the use of *nog* in the SVT subtitles, and of *lite* in all four TTs are examples of the translation strategy *paraphrase*. Example (93) includes 3 instances of *well* with a **MIT** function. These instances are translated to a larger or lesser degree in the TTs.

(93)

Henry: I think the phone landed in the brush

Jack: **well (1)** → you're wrong it landed over here in the trees I saw it │I'll look like shit if I
go to that cocktail party I'm Ozio's warm-up act and don't you think he didn't know it
but somehow we didn't know it get out of the God damn brush I told you it landed in the
trees Jimmy Ozio's probably on the phone telling his pa he's got nothing to worry about

Susan: **well (2)** → that'd been the case even if Henry hadn't screwed up here's the phone │ it
was in the brush

Jack: **well (3)** ↓ │shit │you wouldn't have found it if I hadn't thrown it out the car

(*PRIMARY* 00.30.30)

Cinema	DVD+TV3	SVT
(1) Nej, vid träden här. [**No**, by the trees here.] (…) **(2)** Det hade han **säkert** gjort ändå. Här är telefonen. Den låg bland slyet här. [He had probably done that anyway. Here's the phone. It was in the brush here.] **(3)** Du hade aldrig hittat den om jag inte hade slängt ut den. [You had never found it if I hadn't thrown it out.]	**Nej**, här bland träden. [No, here among the trees.] (…) Det hade han gjort vilket som. Här är den. Den låg i buskaget. [He would've done that anyway. Here it is. It was in the bush.] Du hade inte hittat den om jag inte hade kastat ut den. [You hadn't found it if I hadn't thrown it out	**Nej**, den landade här bland träden! [**No**, it landed here among the trees.] (…) Det skulle han göra även om Henry inte gjorde bort sig - här är mobilen. [He would've done that even if Henry hadn't messed up – here's the phone.] Ni skulle aldrig ha hittat den om jag inte kastat bort den… [You'd never have found it if I hadn't thrown it away…]

The character Jack is arguing with his wife Susan and his political assistant Henry about a thrown-away phone and a political dilemma. The first instance of *well* is uttered by Jack who disagrees with Henry's suggestion that Jack's mobile phone has landed in the brush after he himself threw it out of a car window. Jack accuses Henry of being wrong (*you're wrong*), a direct disagreement which he mitigates with *well*. In the translations, this instance of *well* seems to be considered as combined with *you're wrong*, and this whole phrase is translated into *nej* ('no') in all four TTs. The **MIT** function of *well* is not transmitted to the TTs in this example as *nej* has a negative as well as concluding meaning in the translations. All TTs focus on the disagreement in the utterance more than on the mitigation thereof. The SVT subtitles reinforce the disagreement of Jack's utterance even more by including an exclamation mark, further emphasising the conflict in the dialogue. The second instance of *well* (*well* (2)) in (93) is uttered by Susan who is not as upset as Jack and only partially disagrees with what he has just said, even though she defends Henry and is thus not of the same opinion as Jack. *Well* (2) is not clearly translated into any of the TTs, but the Cinema subtitles use the adverb *säkert* ('surely') which here has a mitigating function not present in the other subtitles. The third and final instance of *well* in (93) is again uttered by Jack. He has now realised that his initial belief on the whereabouts of his phone is wrong and he is clearly lacking good arguments, thus resorting to the immature utterance following *well* (3). This instance of *well* is not translated into any of the TTs, but perhaps indicated in the three dots at the end of the subtitles in the SVT version.

The final example of a translation of *well* as a **MIT** marker is (94), below.

(94)

David Mills: I'm telling you there's no way he would just turn himself in it doesn't make any
sense

Police Captain: **well** → there he sits │ it's not supposed to make any sense

(*SEVEN* 01.32.14)

Cinema+DVD	SVT	TV4
Det verkar inte vettigt att han överlämnar sig själv.	Han skulle aldrig överlämna sig själv, det stämmer inte.	Han skulle aldrig ge sig frivilligt. Det stämmer inte.

[It doesn't seem allright that he turns himself in.]	[He would never turn himself in, it doesn't make any sense.]	[He would never give in freely. It doesn't make any sense.]
Nu sitter han här. Glöm vettigt. [Now here he sits. Forget about allright.]	Det ska inte stämma heller. [It's not supposed to make any sense either.]	**Men** där sitter han **i alla fall**. [**But** here he sits **in any case**.]

In this scene, David Mills and the Police Captain are standing watching a questioning of a mass-murderer (they are watching through a glass window). The murderer has just turned himself in and David is surprised and suspicious about this, saying it does not make any sense. The Captain partially disagrees by presenting hard facts (*here he sits it's not supposed to make any sense*), which he mitigates prefacing them with *well*. The Cinema+DVD and TV4 subtitles all communicate the core function of *well*, i.e. a re-evaluation of (some part of) the situation which the speakers are in. The Cinema+DVD subtitles use *Nu* ('now'), which indicates that the Captain thinks it is the here and now they should discuss and not what may have taken place before. The TV4 subtitles use *men* ('but') in collocation with *i alla fall* ('in any case'). The conjunction *men* illustrates the disagreement on the Captain's part and the adverb *i alla fall* the contrast (Nilsson 2005:152) between what has occurred before and what is occurring now.

There are more translations of the **MIT** function of *well* than of the **MIT** function of *you know* (the latter to be discussed in 6.5.4). However, there are many examples of non-translations of *well* as a marker of **MIT**. Some of these are given below with added discussions.

Example (95) is taken from a scene where the characters Sam and Maggie have just woken up after having spent the night together, something which has surprised them both and made them embarrassed. Maggie is dealing with this by suppressing that it even happened, while Sam wants to talk about it, putting himself in a face threatening situation.

(95)   Maggie: can you go clean up the kitchen cos we really should get out of here
Sam: **well (1)** → ⌐ ⌐ I think we should talk
Maggie: nothing to talk about
Sam: **well (2)** → yes there is something happened and I would like to talk about it
Maggie: nothing happened Sam okay nothing happened

(*ADDICTED* 00.39.40)

DVD	SVT	TV3
Jag tror vi borde prata. [I think we should talk.] Inget att prata om. [Nothing to talk about.]	Jag tycker vi ska prata om det här. [I think we should talk about this.]	Jag tror att vi borde prata [I think we should talk.]
	Det finns inget att prata om. [There's nothing to talk about.]	Vi har ingenting att prata om. [We have nothing to talk about.]
Jo, det är det. Något hände. Jag skulle vilja prata om det. [Yes, there is. Somehting happened. I'd like to talk about it.]	Jag vill prata om det som hände. [I want to talk about what happened.]	Jag vill prata om det som hände. [I want to talk about what happened.]

In Sam's first turn in (95), he suggests to Maggie that they should talk about what happened, mitigating his suggestion by introducing it with *well*. He also makes a longer pause between *well* and the suggestion, indicating embarrassment more than hesitation on his part. The TTs do not translate *well*, but they handle the ST differently. The subtitlers of the DVD and TV3 subtitles seem to understand ST *think* in *I think we should talk* differently than the subtitlers of

the SVT subtitles. English *think* has more than one correspondence in Swedish, e.g. *att tro* ('to believe/suppose') and *att tycka* ('to be of the opinion'). The DVD and TV3 subtitles use the former of these two in *Jag tror (att) vi borde prata* ('I believe/suppose we should talk'), while the SVT subtitles use the latter in *Jag tycker vi ska prata om det här* ('I am of the opinion that we should talk about this'). Because the DVD and TV3 versions use the more hedging *think*, it puts across the mitigation of *well* more than the SVT version does. It is impossible to know whether the ST *think* refers to 'believe/suppose' or to 'be of the opinion', or whether it is a conscious decision of the translator to use the function of one or the other in the subtitles. The second *well* uttered by Sam in (95) is another FTA in the form of a disagreement following Maggie's view that there is nothing to talk about. The DVD subtitles include a *jo* ('yes') which transfers the disagreement part of Sam's utterance, but no translation of the mitigation of this disagreement. The TV3 and SVT subtitles do not include either a clear sign of disagreement or of any mitigation taking place. The contrast between the two speakers' way of dealing with this embarrassing situation is thus lost in the subtitles.

Below follows two more examples of arguments between characters who are couples, both examples taken from *PULP*. These examples are quite similar as the characters have lost something and are fighting over this. The uses of *well* are also comparable as one character uses the DP right after the first character has used it. Neither of the examples include translations of *well*. In (96), Butch and Fabienne are arguing over a watch Fabienne was supposed to have collected from Butch's flat, but it seems she has forgotten about it.

(96)   Butch: where's my watch
Fabienne: it's there
Butch: no it's not
Fabienne: have you looked
Butch: yes I've fucking looked what the fuck do you think I'm doing
        are you sure you got it
Fabienne: yes bedside table drawer
Butch: on the little kangaroo
Fabienne: yes it was on your little kangaroo
Butch: ye- **well (1)** → │ it's not here now
Fabienne: │ │ **well (2)** → it should be
Butch: yes it most definitely should be here but it's not here now so where the fuck is it
                                                              (*PULP* 01.21.17)

Cinema+DVD+TV4+SVT
(1) Den är inte här nu.   [It's not here now]   (2) Det borde den vara.   [It should be.]

Butch in (96) is increasingly angry about the fact that his watch appears to be missing (if he cannot find it, it means he has to go back to his flat to get it, risking his life in the process). Just as Butch and Fabienne both use *well*, they start realising that Fabienne has in fact forgotten the watch. Butch complains about the fact that the watch is not there, mitigating this complaint by using *well*. Fabienne disagrees with Butch's complaint even though she starts realising he is actually right, and she mitigates her disagreement with *well*. Neither of these instances of *well* is translated into any of the subtitles (all four TTs are identical for this extract). The mitigation of the FTAs has completely disappeared in the translations.

A similar pattern can be seen in (97) below, where the couple Jody and Lance are arguing over a lost medical book. Lance is distressed because he needs it in order to give an injection to a woman who has just taken an overdose of cocaine and is now dying on the floor in the living-room.

(97)
Jody: what are you looking for
Lance: a little black fucking medical book it's like a- a text book they give to nurses
Jody: I never saw no medical books
Lance: **well (1)** → trust me I have one.
Jody: **well (2)** → if it's so important why didn't you keep it with the shot
Lance: I don't know stop bothering me

(*PULP* 00.56.05)

Cinema+DVD+TV4	SVT
(1) Jag har en. [I have one.]	Jag har en. [I have one.]

(2) Om den var så viktig,
    kunde du ha den vid adrenalinet.
    [If it's that important,
    you could have it with the adrenaline.]
	Då kunde du ha den vid adrenalinet.
	 [Then you could have it with the adrenaline.]

The couple in (97) is having an intense argument as Lance is looking frantically for the medical book. *Well* (1) is used by Lance before his defence of him actually possessing the medical book Jody has never seen. *Well* (2) is used by Jody before questioning Lance's sense of organisation. Both instances of *well* mitigate the speakers' face threats in the discourse, but neither of them are translated.

It seems that the more aggressive the FTAs are (indicated by swearwords used in the dialogues, as well as intonation and tone of voice used in the dialogues, and body language of the characters) the less likely *well* as a **MIT** marker is to be translated. In the corpus, there is a tendency for *well* to be translated more under certain conditions, including the following: (i) less face threatening situations (even though they are all FTAs) such as reinforcement (see e.g. (89)), suggestions (see e.g. (92)), and partial disagreements (see e.g. (88); (94)); (ii) situations where the speaker using *well* is quite composed (see e.g. (87); (90)); and examples where there are additional features in the STs indicating a certain function of *well* (see e.g. (92)). One possible reason for the tendency of not translating *well* in more aggressive FTAs, may be a belief that a clash would appear between the aggressiveness of an utterance and the sign of acceptance signalled by *well* (much like Carlson (1984:42) argues, cf. short discussion above) if *well* were to be translated. It is, however, this clash which many times makes *well* as a **MIT** marker interesting: it illustrates the speaker's ability to communicate a down-toning of an insensitive utterance, trying to maintain some kind of common ground with the hearer, and not causing a complete communication meltdown. When the **MIT** function of *well* in highly face-threatening FTAs is not translated, the face-threat mitigation of the utterance, as well as the attempt of the speaker(s) to uphold some kind of common ground, is not conveyed in the subtitles. The subtitles may then present a message that is in conflict with what is seen and heard on the screen. In order to process this contradictory message, a viewer will need more time than is ususally available in the fleeting medium of subtitled films (cf. Hatim & Mason's (1997:89) views on this in 2.6.2).

127

5.6 Summary

According to Collins Cobuild English Dictionary (1995:1898) "[y]ou say *well* to indicate that you are about to say something". Hopefully, the examination of *well* in this chapter has shown that *well* in fact can have a variety of different functions in discourse, and that it is not merely an indication of a speaker's initiation of an utterance.

In this chapter, an attempt has been made to decipher the many functions of *well* found in the corpus, and to classify them according to a functional continuum of textual functions (*well* as a frame-marker (**FRAME**), or clarification marker (**CLAR**)), and interpersonal functions (*well* as a marker of insufficiency (**INS**), or face threat mitigation (**MIT**)). The classification of the altogether four functions is based on the following seven parameters (first introduced in 4.3.1): (i) intonation of *well*; (ii) pauses used in connection to *well*; (iii) collocations of *well*; (iv) position of *well* in an utterance; (v) type of utterance of which *well* is part; (vi) body language of speaker; and (vii) larger social context of *well*. In addition, the classification of the functions of *well* is influenced by a number of cross-theoretical previous studies of the DP, relevant to the classification presented in the present study. The translations of *well* have then been viewed in relation to the four functions found, quantitatively as well as qualitatively.

In total, there are 555 occurrences of *well* in the film corpus, 117 of which are translated into at least one of the four TTs Cinema, DVD, the public service TV channel SVT and the commercial TV channels TV3+TV4, making a total of 264 translations in all four subtitling versions combined. 49 individual translation types are used in all four TTs combined.

The most common function of *well* in the soundtrack of the films is **FRAME**, followed by **INS**, **MIT**, and lastly **CLAR**. The order of frequency of the translated functions of *well* is the same as the order of frequency of the functions in the STs.

There are some quantitative and qualitative differences between the TTs' ways of translating *well*. Quantitatively, the DVD and SVT subtitles demonstrate similar totals of translation tokens, while the TV3+TV4 and the Cinema subtitles have a few tokens less. All four TTs treat the functions of *well* in similar ways, i.e. they each translate the functions a fairly equal number of times. Qualitatively, the DVD and SVT subtitles include a few more types of translations than the other two TTs. The number of translation tokens in the Cinema subtitles, on the one hand, and in the other subtitles, on the other, do not suggest that the different constraints put on these media (cf. 3.4.4) influence the number and types of translations of *well* in the corpus of the present study.

All in all, the quantitative results show that the function of *well* most regularly translated in the subtitle TTs is the textual one, although there are more occurrences of *well* with an interpersonal function in the film STs. Similar conclusions have been drawn by e.g. Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen (2003) and Cuenca (2008) who found that *well* as a textual marker is more often translated than *well* as an interpersonal marker.

The qualitative results show a great variety in the types of translations used. The core function of *well*, i.e. a re-evaluation of a part of a previous discourse, is transferred to the subtitles in many different ways. The five most common translations of *well*, in descending order of frequency, are *ju* ('as you know'), *då* ('then'), *men* ('but'), "[…]" (quotation marks);

128

and *tja* ('well'). The remaining translations (e.g. *och* ('and); **…** (three full stops); *då så* ('allright then/then so'); and *jo* ('yes')) have fewer occurrences. The variety of functions that *well* has in the film soundtracks is illustrated in the subtitles. All four functions are translated, and the translations often reflect the way each function relates to the core function of *well*. However, when *well* is used as a mitigator of highly face threatening situations in the films, for example disagreements, complaints, or refusals (rather than less face-threatening situations such as suggestions or reinforcements), *well* is not translated at all. This lack of translations of face-threat mitigators may cause the subtitles to be in conflict with what is seen and heard on screen, and to contain "a discordance […] which may need more processing time to resolve than the Cinema [or TV] audience has available to it" (Hatim & Mason 1997:89; cf. 2.6.2).

In conclusion, there is a great variety of Swedish linguistic means used as translations of *well*, and they often creatively reflect the various functions of *well*. However, when some functions, e.g. the mitigation of highly face threatening situations, are not translated, important parts of the film discourse, characterisations, and the main plot, may be lost, thus possibly confusing the viewer.

6 *You know*

6.1 Introduction

The results of the corpus analysis of the DP *you know* (as in e.g. *he might hear you, you know*) and its translations will be presented in this chapter. My definition and classification of *you know* will first be presented and discussed together with various parameters and previous classifications of *you know* from a few different studies. A quantitative as well as qualitative examination of *you know* and its translations in the corpus will then be presented. The quantitative analysis includes an overview of the distribution of the occurrences of *you know*, as well as its pragmatic functions, and translations. In the qualitative analysis, which is the main part of the chapter, the translations of *you know* found in the corpus are considered.

6.2 Definition and functional distribution of *you know*

One of the most frequently used DPs in spoken interaction is *you know* (Östman 1981:16; Fox Tree & Schrock 2002:727). Its literal meaning suggests "knowledge on the part of the hearer" (Fuller 2003:27), and the core meaning of DP *you know* is often said to be 'shared knowledge' between speaker and hearer. This 'shared knowledge' is not always reciprocal, however, but the speaker may want the hearer to believe that it is in order to establish common ground: "[t]he speaker strives towards getting the addressee to cooperate and/or to accept the propositional content of his utterance as mutual background knowledge" (Östman 1981:17). *You know* may also present the hearer with new information (Brinton 1996; Fuller 2003; Macaulay 2002), which is clearly not known to the hearer. In this case, the 'you' does not in fact know at all.

As most DPs, *you know* has undergone pragmaticalisation (cf. 2.2.1), i.e. it has lost (most of) its referential meaning (Watts 2003:179). When analysing *you know*, it is important to make a clear division between its referential non-discourse use and its non-referential discourse use. (98) – (100), below, are examples of the non-discourse use of *you know*. In these examples, *you know* cannot be removed without changing the original meaning of the utterances radically, or making the utterances ungrammatical.

> (98) how did **you know** that (*ADDICTED* 00.35.24)
>
> (99) he just had lunch with his grandmother │y**ou know** he got the rock (*BLONDE* 00.03.40)
>
> (100) **you know** what │I think maybe we should take your truck (*WHILE* 00.36.21)

In the above three examples, *you know* co-occurs with the verb *do*, either explicitly as in (98) or implicitly as in (99) and (100). In (99) and (100), *do* can be added to *you know* to form *You do know he got the rock* and *Do you know what?*, respectively. All three examples also have one object each: *that* in (98), *he got the rock* in (99), and *what* in (100). In example (101), below (a fabricated example), the object *what* is removed, changing the meaning of *you know*. In (101), *you know* is a DP and does not have referential meaning.

(101)   **You know**, I think maybe we should take your truck (fabricated example)

The function of *you know* in (101) is quite close to its non-discourse use in (100) as they both have attention-seeking qualities. Instances such as the one in (100) are not analysed in this thesis, however, while examples demonstrating the use of *you know* in (101) are. Again, removing *you know* from (100) renders the sentence ungrammatical or changes its meaning drastically. The removal of *you know* in (101) does not make the utterance ungrammatical (but it may change the meaning of the proposition following it).

In the following, I will not consider the non-discourse *you know* in examples such as (98)-(100), but only the discourse use of *you know* exemplified in (101).

6.2.1 Some previous multifunctional studies of *you know*

The classification of *you know* in the present study is my own, but a variety of studies have influenced and contributed to the analysis of *you know* presented here (e.g. Östman 1981; Holmes 1986; Erman 1987; Schriffrin 1987; Quirk et al. 1985; Bazzanella & Morra 2000; Fox Tree & Schrock 2002; Watts 2003). A few of them will be discussed in the following. The focus is mainly on how the functions of *you know* are classified in the various studies. Isolating the functions of *you know* has always been a complicated task for linguists. In the 1970s and early 1980s, *you know* was commonly categorised as having a single function of e.g. interjection, hedge, or turn-taking device (Östman 1981:16). Östman, through investigating *you know* in spontaneous (about 15 tape-recorded adult and children conversations/interviews) American English, was one of the first to view *you know* and other DPs as not being able to perform one function only, but a variety of functions depending on the surrounding context. Östman provides *you know* with a core function (in Östman's words: 'meaning') and the sub functions of this core function (in Östman's words: 'function'). The core function of *you know* according to Östman is the following (as repeated from above):

> The speaker strives towards getting the addressee to cooperate and/or to
> accept the propositional content of his utterance as mutual background
> knowledge (1981:17)

What Östman refers to here is the fact that *you know* is often used when a speaker wants the hearer to believe that s/he 'knows', many times to "give the addressee a feeling of greater power" (1981:19). This power causes the hearer to feel part of the conversation and the speaker will most likely receive the hearer's attention. Using *you know* is thus a "plea for cooperation" (1981:18), according to Östman. In Östman's words: "it is the pretence of shared knowledge on the part of the speaker that achieves intimacy and facilitates verbal interaction in conversation". Östman views the core function of *you know* as being a politeness function.

Fox Tree & Schrock draw on Jucker & Smith (1998) suggesting that the core meaning of *you know* is "to invite addressee inferences" (2002:727), i.e. *you know* is used in their view as an invitation for the hearer to draw conclusions from what the speaker says. Fox Tree & Schrock view *you know* and *I mean* together because of "their surface similarities"

(1998:728), and suggest that the multifunctionality of both *you know* and *I mean* can be traced from their respective core.

Östman (1981) and Fox Tree & Schrock (2002) have in common a view of *you know* as a signal of some kind of shared knowledge. It is, however, not so much the actual shared knowledge between speaker and hearer as an assumption of (in Fox Tree & Schrock's view) a shared knowledge or even pretence of (in Östman's view) a shared knowledge. In the present study, the core function of *you know* is seen as being a *supposed shared knowledge* between speaker and hearer. This means that the speaker and hearer (most often) do not in fact share knowledge, but the speaker using *you know* wants the hearer to somehow be included in what the speaker is saying, thus making him/her suppose or believe that s/he is in fact included. The shared knowledge is consequently simulated to a larger or lesser degree. In the present study, *you know* is understood as indicating this supposed shared knowledge either textually or interpersonally. As will be clear below, certain previous studies also divide the core function of *you know* into several interrelated textual and/or interpersonal functions, depending on what kind of supposed shared knowledge is being signalled in a particular context.

Multifunctional classifications of *you know* are adopted in quite a few studies on this DP, e.g. Östman 1981; Holmes 1986; Erman 1987; Fox Tree & Schrock 2002; Watts 2003. Four of these, namely Östman's, Holmes', Erman's, and Fox Tree & Schrock's classifications of *you know* will be discussed here and related to the functional distribution of *you know* in the present study. Östman and Fox Tree & Schrock have briefly been discussed above in relation to their views on the core function of *you know*. A more thorough account of their ideas is provided below.

Östman's (1981) material consists of a number of American English conversations and interviews made with both adults and children. Östman argues that two main characteristics of natural conversation produce *you know* (and other DPs, e.g. *well*, *I mean*, and *like*), namely (i) the act of planning the discourse (through floor-holding, etc.) and (ii) the speaker's indirectness, through which s/he uses politeness strategies, mitigates the consequence of an utterance and avoids confrontation. Östman uses the Hallidayan terms textual and interpersonal to analyse the multifunctionality of *you know*, but he labels these two levels of meaning 'the coherence level' and the 'politeness-modality-level' (Östman 1981:39-41; Holmes 1986:5). Östman emphasises that these two levels can be used simultaneously, to varying degrees (1981:39).

The "striving" that Östman suggests speakers undertake in order to obtain hearers' cooperation and acceptance of a propositional content, can take different shapes. A speaker may for instance try to organise his/her utterance to make it as clear as possible to a hearer, or attempt to obtain a hearer's attention, or appeal to a hearer's solidarity. When distinguishing between various subfunctions of *you know*, Östman draws on the core meaning of the DP, the different intonation contours it may have, and its position in an utterance (1981:21).

Östman finds some structural functions of *you know* that are turn-taking (this can be paraphrased into 'you know what?'), and floor-yielding (related to 'don't you know'), often used after a fairly long pause. Östman states that *you know* "very definitely has a turn-taking function" (1981:24), which he views as a function operating on the 'the coherence level'. The

turn-taking function is not in opposition to the functions on the 'politeness-modality-level', as the two levels blend together. Example (102) below illustrates Östman's view of *you know* as a turn-taking marker, here an attention-seeking marker introducing a new topic (transcription simplified, two dashes indicating a pause).

(102)

A: Maybe we should fetch the rice
B: Yeah!
A: **You know** -- a -- oh I don't know when it was Sunday

According to Östman, the context of the above example shows that a new topic is probably about to be introduced, and *you know* thus has the function of an attention-seeker. Östman's floor-yielding function is exemplified in (103) below (transcription simplified, two dashes indicating a pause).

(103)

Well I'd really like to know about that that's marvellous
ok well -- **you know** -- I'll be glad to meet […]

Östman states that *you know* functioning as a floor-yielder usually is preceded by a long pause, making it possible for the speaker to enter the conversation.

On the 'politeness-modality-level', Östman finds two subfunctions of the core function of *you know*, and he correlates these functions with their respective intonation contours: first, the 'as you know' function which is utterance-initial, and usually has a declarative intonation; second, the 'don't you know' function which is utterance-medial or final, and usually has a declarative or an interrogative intonation. He emphasises the fact that this division shows tendencies of the behaviour of *you know* and is not an absolute truth. The first subfunction, the declarative 'as you know' function, is used "to express (presumed) certainty" (1981:22), and is what Östman refers to as a speaker-oriented and face-saving *you know* (ibid.). This function can be used either as a signal of the speaker's wish not to be argued against, or as a signal of the speaker giving the hearer "the higher power, acting in effect as if the addressee did know" (ibid.). One example Östman gives of the 'as you know' function is (104), below. In (104), the last three occurrences of *you know* signal that the speakers/hearers in the example all have (supposed) knowledge of housing and related problems (1981:22, transcription simplified, two dashes indicating a pause).

(104)

What's mindboggling is you know I could see this if there was like farther -- **you know** the -- the people who didn't have a lot of money or something **you know** and and -- housing they don't wanna -- **you know** they they they don't wanna they don't wanna live in apartments

Östman's second subfunction of *you know* on the 'politeness-modality-level' is the declarative or interrogative 'don't you know' function. This function is used to express "more unknown, or questioned […] information , saying in effect 'are you attending', 'do you agree', or ' do you see what I mean'" (1981:23), indicating more uncertainty on the part of the speaker than the "as you know' function does. There may be an appeal for hearer solidarity in this type of *you know*. Östman gives (105) below as an example of the 'don't you know' function. Here, the speakers/hearers do possibly not have knowledge of the subject-matter, as it is very personal (transcription simplified, two dashes indicating a pause).

(105)   I never know when I might be wrong -- **you know** -- if she's wrong than I'm wrong too

In addition to the above functions referred to, Östman mentions a 'speech-habit *you know'*, i.e. an overuse of the word.

In her study of spontaneous spoken New Zealand English, Holmes (1986) focuses on the difference between women's and men's use of *you know*, and discusses the multifuntionality of the DP. Her corpus consists of approximately 50,000 words (20,000 words collected from formal contexts, i.e. television and radio interviews, and 30,000 words collected from informal, relaxed contexts in private homes). She finds two broad categories of functions of *you know*, namely one category expressing speaker certainty, and another expressing speaker uncertainty. For each main category, a number of subcategories are established.

A few examples of Holmes' account of the many functions of *you know* are provided below. All in all, Holmes finds five subcategories, exemplified here. The first three express speaker certainty and the final two express speaker uncertainty.

The first function is referred to as 'Conjoint knowledge', indicating an almost literal interpretation of *you know*. It suggests that "the speaker knows the addressee already knows the information being asserted in the proposition" (1986:8). This function is similar to Östman's "as you know" function, exemplified in (104) above. Exemple (106), below, illustrates the Conjoint knowledge function. The context given is the following: "female radio interviewee introducing a discussion point" (1986:8, transcription altered somewhat)

(106)   **you know** ↓ │ very often you have presidents er who are men │ │ well in this place…

Holmes states that *you know* with the function exemplified in (106) often has a falling intonation, and sometimes is followed by a pause. The latter characteristic can make it difficult to distinguish the discourse use of *you know* from the non-discourse use ('you know that…').

Holmes' second subfunction of *you know* is the 'Emphatic' function, shown in (107), below. The context given is "young woman to flatmate discussing smoking (1986:8, transcription somewhat altered).

(107)   It's worse than eating **you know** ↓

The function of *you know* in (107) is to emphasise the proposition preceding it, thus reassuring the addressee "concerning the validity of the proposition asserted" (1986:8). In contrast to (106), there is no assumption that the hearer already knows the information. This type of *you know* typically occurs in final position with a falling intonation.

The third and final subfunction expressing speaker certainty is what Holmes refers to as the 'Attributive' function. This function has to do with shared knowledge in the sense that the speaker has confidence that the hearer has had similar past experiences, although not the precise experiences described. Consider (108), below (1986:9, transcription somewhat altered).

(108)   They obviously thought he was a bit stupid **you know** ↓

In (108), *you know* as well as the word *obviously* indicate the speaker's assurance of the hearer's similar past experience. In Holmes' data, *you know* with the 'Attributive' function is always utterance-final with a falling intonation, often preceded and followed by a pause (the first pause usually being short).

The first of Holmes' subfunctions expressing speaker uncertainty is the 'Appealing' function, exemplified below (1986:10, transcription somewhat altered).

> (109)   And it was quite │ │ well │ it was it was all very embarrassing **you know** ↑

This type of *you know* is used when the speaker appeals to the hearer's reassurance. According to Holmes, *you know* with an 'Appealing' function usually appears in utterance-final position with a rising intonation. Most often, Holmes states, this type of *you know* is not preceded by a pause, although it may be followed by one.

The second of Holmes' subfunctions expressing speaker uncertainty, and the final subfunction of the five functions in total, is 'Linguistic imprecision'. This category includes instances of *you know* that "express the speaker's uncertainty concerning aspects of the linguistic expression of the proposition" (1986:10). This function reflects the speaker's awareness of the flaws in his/her utterance. Holmes sees this function as an appeal for hearer tolerance as the speaker is (i) searching for an appropriate lexical item, (ii) introducing more precise information, and (iii) indicating a false start. Number (ii), an introduction of more precise information, is exemplified below (1986:11, transcription somewhat altered).

> (110)   The house │ up above the one I was telling you │ you about │ **you know** the one your dad used to live in

According to Holmes, *you know* in the example above signals the speaker's awareness of the fact that a clarification of the propositional content is needed.

Another account of *you know* is given by Erman (1987). Her material consists of twelve face-to-face conversations of a combined number of 60,000 words, extracted from *A Corpus of English Conversation* (CEC, Svartvik & Quirk 1980). In Erman's model (1987:114-115), *you know* is classified as functioning on a 'micro-level' and on a 'macro-level' (cf. Erman's classification of *I mean*, 7.2.1).

On the micro-level, *you know* is found within the sentence and used mostly in order to fulfil four different functions. These four functions are briefly mentioned here, and examples from Erman (1987) are given.

The first function of *you know* on the 'micro-level' is to introduce "the consequence or the reason for a fact presented in the previous discourse". This function is exemplified by Erman as follows (1987:81, transcription simplified):

> (111)   Takes about three or four minutes │ to get the door open │ for them to get in │ **you know** the chairs have to be right up │ all the way round

In (111), the speaker gives the reason for the statement made in the first part of the utterance, i.e. the reason for the first proposition is given in the second.

The second 'micro-level' function of *you know* is to connect the theme and the rheme in a thematic structure. This is illustrated by (112) in Erman's account (1987:102, transcription simplified).

(112)   Depending how you look on language │and then │he says │**you know** literature should be experienced │and not studied│ well this is fine │until you've got them

According to Erman, *you know* in the above example is used in connection to a main clause "in the form of a reporting clause in the past or the historic present" (1987:102).

Erman's third function of *you know* at the 'micro-level' is as an introduction of "an exemplification of some part of a previous statement" (1987:114), illustrated in (113) below (1987:230, transcription simplified).

(113)   I think in Socrates│ I'll have to take longer stretches │probably **you know** like Ajax's speech before death │and things of that kind │and uh or Electra's speech

You know in (113) above has the function of signalling that what is to come is an exemplification of the previous part of the utterance, i.e. in this case *Ajax's speech before death and things of that kind and uh or Electra's speech* are examples of *the longer stretches* that the speaker believes s/he has to take. The DP *like* also adds to the exemplification function of *you know*.

The fourth and final function of *you know* at the 'micro-level'in Erman's account is as a "clarification of some part of a previous statement", exemplified by (114), below (1987:109, transcription simplified).

(114)   Uhm well I have had things up on my walls│ │**you know**│ just small things

In (114), the speaker clarifies what s/he means by *things*, i.e. the fact that the things are small is emphasised.

On the macro-level in Erman's model, *you know* is used in order to fulfil three different functions. These three functions are briefly mentioned here, and examples from Erman (1987) are given.

The first of Erman's 'macro-level' functions of *you know* is to "introduce background information" (sometimes as a parenthetical comment). This function is exemplified in (115), below (1987:230, transcription simplified).

(115)   But he has increased the pace enormously he was new here then │new back here **you know** │he'd been here as a lecturer │then he'd gone up to Durham │he came back here as a professor │and uh he certainly stirred the place

You know in (115) is used as a signal of the fact that what is to come is a piece of background information to what is previously mentioned.

The second 'macro-level' function of *you know* is to "mark the boundary between two modes of discourse" (1987:115), illustrated in (116), below (1987:85, transcription simplified).

(116)　　　I mean │to have a student come to you and oh I read a book │and it's moved me so much I can't talk about it **you know** ↑ │I should immediately say phoney because if it it had moved him so much │in one way by himself │all quiet │and not come and made │his dramatic statement like this

Erman states that in (116) above, the function of *you know* is "to terminate a sequence of reported speech after which the speaker returns to the narrative mode" (1987:85). The sequence of reported speech in (116) starts with *oh I read a book* and ends with *you know*.

Erman's third and final 'macro-level' function of *you know* is to "terminate an argument in descriptive discourse" (1987:230, transcription simplified).

(117)　　　Frightfully neat │they all pack in together **you know** │and you just have a cube and light it │it's meths really │but it's far more than well it lasts

According to Erman, *you know* ends an argument in the descriptive discourse of (117).

Due to the similarities between *you know* and *I mean*, Fox Tree & Schrock (2002) suggest a division of both DPs into five identical categories. The categories are "based on a wide array of disparate claims made by many researchers using different corpora" (2002:728) and include "interpersonal, turn management, repairing, monitoring, and organizing" (ibid.). In their classification, *you know* and *I mean* are next considered individually and a number of basic meanings are given to them.

Fox Tree & Schrock draw on various previous studies, and examples from *A Corpus of English Conversation* (CEC, Svartvik & Quirk 1980), when categorising the functions of *you know*. Fox Tree & Schrock state that "*you know* could be viewed […] as inviting addressee inferences, which could be either at the word level or the interpersonal level, with differing effects at each" (2002:737). According to Fox Tree & Schrock, y*ou know* can signal turn management, repair, monitoring (checking the addreessee's understanding etc.) and organisation (including topic shifts, emphasis and reference), as well as interpersonal functions (conveying politeness, shared views, or used at the end of arguments to communicate "I won't say anything more" (Östman 1981:27 as quoted by Fox Tree & Schrock 2002:738) etc.). A few of these functions, i.e. repair, monitoring, and organisation will be exemplified below. The remaining functions are not exemplified in the original and it is consequently impossible to do so here. The detailed account of the multifunctionality of *you know* put forward in Fox Tree & Schrock (2002) is nevertheless worth discussing.

The function of repair, in Fox Tree & Schrock's view, is used by speakers who have problems expressing themselves, and by using *you know* they encourage the hearer to conclude the (intention of the) utterance. Example (118) below, illustrates this (2002:739, transcription simplified, asteriks indicate overlap as in original).

(118)　　　A: but │ I really couldn't face the film festival thing with with all the │ *****you know*****
　　　　　　　B: *slips*
　　　　　　　A: filling up thanks

In (118), speaker B fills in speaker A's utterance. *You know* is thus a signal of the speaker's need for help with finding the right word.

The main use of what Fox Tree & Schrock refer to as a monitoring function of *you know* is to check hearer understanding. They state that this function may be signalled just as well without *you know*, but with a rising intonation, eliciting backchannels from a hearer (2002:740). However, *you know* with a rising intonation and a final position in an utterance often causes the addressee to use backchannels, as in (119), below (2002:740).

(119)   A: Faulkner's uh relaxed, but not too relaxed, **you know**
           B: m

Fox Tree & Schrock's organisational functions of *you know* are labelled *topic shifts*, *emphasis* and *reference*. A short account of these functions is given in the following. Topic shifts include "closing off prior discourse, foreshadowing a cause, effect or clarification, introducing background information or justification, and presaging reported speech as enquoting devices"; emphasis include "highlighting a particular point or the thrust of the narrative"; and reference signifies introducing given information or requesting a referent "to be searched for in the common ground" (2002:740);. *You know* in example (2002:120) below is said to be an example of a clarification type of *you know* with an organisational function (2002:740, transcription simplified).

(120)   I don't really know why Cambridge turned it down, -- I mean it's got to be done by a
           university press because it's not going to be a remunerative -- thing │**you know** it │well it's
           not a best-seller

The part *well it's not a best-seller* in (120) above, is a clarification of the fact that what the speaker has produced is not going to be a remunerative. In this utterance, *you know* has the function of indicating that what is to come is a clarification.

As is clear from the above discussion, many studies of *you know* view this DP as both a textual device signalling turn-taking, topic change, repair, etc., as well as an interpersonal device demonstrating the speaker's attitude towards the communicative situation through showing shared knowledge, face threat mitigation, etc. Below follows my own classification of *you know*. This is based on the parts of the multifunctional approaches discussed above, as well as on the parameters (cf. 4.3.1) and on the cross-theoretical framework (cf. 2.4 and 2.5) used in order to analyse the DPs of the present study.

6.2.2 Classification of *you know* in the present study

The functional classification of *you know* in the present study is my own, but it is influenced by various previous classifications. Below, my classification is compared to previous classifications to bring to light similarities and differences between the classifications. I have based my classification of *you know* on the seven parameters used for analysing all four DPs in the study (cf. 4.3.1), as well as on the cross-theoretical framework (also cf. 2.4 and 2.5) including the categorisations of *you know* discussed above: Östman (1981: 21-27), Holmes (1987), Erman (1987: 113-115), and Fox Tree & Schrock (2002). In addition, various other studies and comments on DP functions in general and *you know* in particular are employed

(Leech 1980; Quirk et al. 1985; Bazzanella & Morra 2000; Watts 2003). The functional classification of *you know* in the corpus of the present study is narrowed down to the following four functions, where the first two are located in the textual area of a functional continuum and the final two are located in the interpersonal area of a functional continuum: Frame marker (**FRAME**); Clarity marker (**CLAR**); Solidarity marker (**SOL**), and Mitigation marker (**MIT**). It should be emphasised that these functions are not exhaustive in any way and that other studies may find additional or fewer functions. The list below is an attempt to classify the functions of *you know* found in the corpus of the present study only.

(121)   FRAME **you know** → at band camp we have dances like this only
                they're way funner (*AMPIE* 01.08.55)

(122)   CLAR   A: what back end
                B: yeah **you know** → percentage points money (*WAG* 00.20.33)

(123)   SOL   she held me so tight I-I **you know** ↑ I couldn't I couldn't tell her (*WHILE* 00.13.19)

(124)   MIT   you're kind of putting the whole campaign in her hands
                now **you know** ↓ (*PRIMARY* 00.46.24)

The actual labels of the four functions are either taken directly from the studies discussed above or regarded somewhat differently. Below follows a brief discussion of the four functions and how they relate or not relate to Östman's (1981), Holmes' (1986), Erman's (1987), and Fox Tree & Schrock's (2002) classifications of *you know*. The functions of all previously mentioned classifications of *you know*, as well as the functions of the classification of *you know* in the present study, blend in with each other at different points of a functional continuum. What follows is not a detailed account of the overlap concerning the labelling of the functions, but a mere insight into the various functional distributions and their labels. This overview is carried out in order to provide a clearer view of the multifunctionality of *you know*. Each function will be considered in more detail throughout this chapter, and further examples will be given.

   FRAME and **CLAR** are the two textual functions that *you know* signals in the corpus. What is labelled **FRAME** here is similar to what Östman (1981) and Fox Tree & Schrock (2002) refer to as an organisation of an utterance (through e.g. turn-switching (Östman), floor-holding, and floor-yielding (Östman), turn management (Fox Tree & Schrock), or to obtain a hearer's attention (Östman). It is also comparable to what Erman (1987) calls an introduction of background information (at times used as a parenthetical comment) or marking the boundary between two modes of discourse (often done through terminating reported speech). This also connects to the **FRAME** function of the present study. *You know* in example (121) above has an attention-seeking function as the speaker organises her utterance by seeking attention from the hearer and making him listen to her anecdote about band camp. Erman (1987) and Fox Tree & Scrock (2002) find that *you know* may signal reported speech. This function is not among the functions found in the corpus of the present study, but had the material been larger there is a great possibility such a function would have been found.

   The label **CLAR** is similar to what Erman (1987) refers to as introducing an exemplification or a clarification of some part of a previous statement (cf. examples (113) and

(114), respectively), or what Schffrin calls "a preface to background explanatory clauses in narratives" (1987:274). This label is also comparable to Holmes' function 'Linguistic imprecision', where *you know* can signal an introduction of more precise information (cf. (110) and indicate a false start. In example (122) above, *you know* introduces a clarification as well as an exemplification of the expression *back end* (which A does not comprehend and needs to have explained further). Two other types of **CLAR** found in the corpus of the present study are brought up by Fox Tree & Schrock, namely the repair function and the monitoring function (cf. examples (118) and (119)). The repair function of *you know* in the present study differs somewhat from Fox Tree & Schrock's repair function, i.e. *you know* as a repair signal in Fox Tree & Schrock's classification is used to encourage the herarer to conclude the utterance, whereas in the present study, the hearer does not aid the speaker, but the speaker uses *you know* to clarify a (part of a) previous statement by signalling that a rephrasing of this statement is to come. The monitoring function, as mentioned by Fox Tree & Schrock (cf. example (119)), is used when a speaker requests feedback from a hearer that s/he has understood the previous (part of the) utterance.

SOL and MIT are the two interpersonal functions of *you know* found in the corpus. **SOL** is referred to by Östman as an appeal to a hearer's solidarity (cf. example (105), and by Holmes as an appeal to a hearer's reassurance (cf. example (109)). It is used by speakers in need of some sort of understanding from the hearer. Watts (2003) also discusses the solidarity marking function of *you know* and other linguistic features: "linguistic expressions which appeal to mutual knowledge shared by the participants, or support and solidarity from participants, e.g. you know" (2003:169). In example (123) above, the speaker tries to explain why she behaved in a certain way in a difficult situation and appeals to the hearer's understanding by using *you know*. Included in the **SOL** function is also a more emphatic use of *you know* used to express "I won't say anything more" (Östman 1981:27). This function is also found by Fox Tree and Schrock (2002) to be an interpersonal function. In addition, the emphatic function is found by Holmes (cf. example (107)) who states that, among other functions of *you know*, "speakers use *you know* to emphatically stress their confidence in their assertion. Thereby reassuring the recipient that the proposition is valid" (1986: 8).

The **MIT** function is mentioned by Östman as used when a speaker in some way gives the hearer "the higher power, acting in effect as if the addressee did know" (1981:22). Fox Tree & Schrock also stress *you know*'s interpersonal function of politeness. In addition, the politeness function of *you know* is discussed by Watts (2003) who states that if *you know* is missing in certain utterances it may lead to "an evaluation of a participant's behaviour as 'impolite', 'brash', 'inconsiderate', abrupt', 'rude', etc" Watts (2003: 168). *You know* in example (124) above is used to mitigate the face threatening act of the speaker questioning his superior's decision.

To sum up, in the present study, the functions of *you know* are classified as **FRAME**, **CLAR**, **SOL**, and **MIT**. The two functions **FRAME** and **CLAR** are seen as operating textually, while the two functions **SOL** and **MIT** are seen as operating interpersonally. The functions are not mutually exclusive or constant, but one instance of *you know* may signal two or more of the functions simultaneously. All four functions appear in a functional continuum, and blend into each other at various points. However, when considering the seven parameters

used for the alanysis of all DPs in the present study (cf. 4.3.1), in combination with the cross-theoretical approach taken, one function of *you know* most often stands out more in the context in question than the remaining functions do.

Each of the four functions of *you know* will now be considered in more detail and with further examples.

The textual functions of *you know*, **FRAME** and **CLAR**, give *you know* certain qualities that are the same for both functions: e.g. (i) they both structurally signal that there is an amount of supposed shared knowledge in the discourse; (ii) they most often entail a pause before *you know*, or if *you know* is utterance-initial, they frequently entail a pause after *you know* (if there is a vocative after *you know*, the pause follows this); (iii) they usually present *you know* with a rising intonation (mainly for the **FRAME** attention-seeker, and the monitoring **CLAR** function), or a declarative or falling intonation (mainly for the parenthetical **FRAME**, and the repairing **CLAR**); and (iv) they are most often used for utterance-initial or utterance-medial *you know*.

FRAME is the function with most clear textual features. Included in this function are organisational devices such as attention-seeking and parenthetical commentary. The attention-seeking function of *you know* is exemplified in (125) below.

> (125) Vivian: **you know** ↑ Elle │ I still can't believe you didn't tell Callahan the alibi
> (*BLONDE* 01.03.15)

The attention-seeking function is used when a speaker wants to attract attention from a hearer, as a turn-taking device, and it can almost always be paraphrased into "you know what?" or "do you want to know?" (Östman 1981:25). *You know* in example (125) above, indicates that the speaker wants the hearer's attention. and this utterance can be paraphrased into *You know what, Elle, I can't believe you didn't tell Callahan the alibi.* The attention-seeking **FRAME** function is often used with vocatives such as the name *Elle* in (125), and with a subsequent pause. This type of *you know* almost always has a rising intonation, and is often utterance-initial.

You know signalling a parenthetical comment is shown in (126), below.

> (126) Stanley: years ago when I first went off to Hollywood │ they said to me it's too theatrical **you know** → I was from the theatre so everything was over their heads it's too theatrical
> (*WAG* 00.54.42)

This function of *you know* is also mentioned by Erman as introducing background information in the form of a parenthetical comment (1987:115, cf. example (115), above). In (126), the speaker uses *you know* to structure his utterance, initiating a parenthetical comment in the middle of a section of reported speech. In addition, the parenthesis is indicated here by the character's monotonous voice. *You know* also has a clarifying function in this example as it initiates an explanation of the previous part of the utterance. However, the label **FRAME** was chosen over **CLAR** due to the continuation of the utterance subsequent to the inserted explanation. When the part initiated by *you know* (*I was from the theatre so everything was over their heads*) ends, the previous part (*they said to me it's too theatrical*) continues with a repetition of the end of the previous utterance (*it's too theatrical*). The key function of *you*

know in (126) is thus a cohesive device initiating a parenthetical comment. The intonation of *you know* signalling a parenthetical comment is often declarative, and as a rule, there are no pauses before or after this function of *you know*. The position of *you know* with a parenthetical **FRAME** function is always medial.

CLAR most often behaves as a textual device connecting clarifications, repairs, and monitoring functions of (a part of) an utterance to a previous or subsequent (part of) an utterance. This definition positions **CLAR** functionally quite close to **FRAME** as both of these functions connect parts of utterances with each other or with the preceding discourse. For both **FRAME** and **CLAR,** *you know* has the function of connecting (parts of) utterances, but where the chief function of **FRAME** is to structure the discourse by connecting *you know* with a previous or subsequent utterance (as a cohesive device or a turn-taking device), **CLAR** has a more salient function of clarifying (as a repair device, a clarifying device or a comprehension securing device) than of purely structuring.

Example (122) is repeated in (127), below, to illustrate the **CLAR** function.

(127)

Stanley:	is there gonna be a back end on this thing
Conrad:	what │ back end
Stanley:	yeah **you know** → percentage points money
Conrad:	yeah count on it

(*WAG* 00.20.30)

In (127), Conrad Brean, a political spin-doctor, does not understand the expression "back end", and asks Stanley Motss, a Hollywood producer, what this is. Stanley gives the explanation *percentage, points, money*, introduced by the clarification marker *you know*. Motss' utterance could be rephrased as e.g. *yeah, that is, percentage, points, money*. In formal written language *that is* could in turn be paraphrased into *i.e.*, which demonstrates the quite unmistakable textual function of this subfunction of *you know*.

The repairing **CLAR** function has a hesitant effect in that it demonstrates indecision on the part of the speaker, but where a hesitation marker is more related to the interpersonal side of the functional continuum, the repair marker has more of a textual nature. *You know* with this function connects that part of an utterance which the speaker wants to repair with the "renovated" version. This is illustrated in (128) below where detective David Mills is retelling the story of how a police colleague was shot. Trying to describe what the shooting looked like, he changes his choice of words from *spun him like a top* to *slow-motion* using the repair marker *you know*, as well as the repair marker *I mean* (in this scene, *I mean* is uttered very quickly and is hardly audible, thus making *you know* the main marker of repair in comparison) and the down-toning expression *more like*.

(128)   David: anyway we bust open the door looking for this junkie and er the fucker just
                    opened fire at us one cop got hit in the arm Christ what was his name │ │ spun
                    him like a top │ **you know** → I mean more like │ slow-motion

(*SEVEN* 00.47.51)

A pause before *you know* is common for this function, as is a declarative intonation. In addition, in the corpus, repairing *you know* is always medial. Erman says that "the more

complex the repair, the more likely it is to be marked" (Erman 1987:172-173), suggesting that complex repairs are more often signalled by *you know* than less complex repairs.

The repairing **CLAR** function of *you know* is not frequent in the corpus, and neither is monitoring **CLAR**. However, they are both included as functions of *you know* to show the variety of the functions of this DP. (129), below, is an example of the monitoring **CLAR** function of *you know*.

(129)

	Stanley:	big mistake big mistake you gotta bring them in by stages big mistake revealing Schumann before the election
	Winifred:	how so
	Stanley:	sweetheart Schumann is the shark okay │Schumann is Jaws **you know** ↑ you have to tease'em you gotta tease'em you don't put Jaws in the first reel of the movie it's the contract sweetheart the contract for the election whether they know it or not is vote for me Tuesday Wednesday I will produce Schumann see that's what they're paying the seven bucks for know what I mean

(*WAG* 01.06.19)

In (129), Stanley, a Hollywood producer creating a fake war, is enlightening Winifred, a presidential adviser, on how a set of events is best arranged to achieve the best possible effect, i.e. bringing this set of events in by stages. Stanley explains this idea with an analogy: he compares Schumann (the main "character" of the fake war, who is just about to be introduced to the "audience", i.e. the American people) to the shark in the film *Jaws*. In (129), he requests some feedback from Winifred to confirm that she has comprehended this analogy. He uses various means: first, the marker *okay* with the rising intonation; second, *you know*, also with a rising intonation; and third, after a longer explanation of his idea, a sentence with a monitoring and comprehension securing function, *know what I mean*, this too ending with a rising intonation. This function of *you know* is always utterance-medial or utterance-final. The monitoring **CLAR** is somewhat bordering on the interpersonal side of the continuum as it has to do with a speaker referring to a hearer's understanding, and this referring to the understanding connects this textual **CLAR** to the interpersonal functions of *you know*. The type of understanding referred to by the monitoring marker is, however, of a cognitive nature, while the understanding appealed to by the interpersonal functions is of a more emotive nature. With *you know* as a monitoring **CLAR** marker, the speaker is trying by textual means to make an utterance clearer by securing a hearer's cognitive comprehension of this utterance. With *you know* as a **SOL** marker, as will be clear below, the speaker is trying by more interpersonal means to secure the hearer's emotive comprehension of the utterance.

On the interpersonal side of the functional continuum are the functions **SOL** and **MIT**. These functions give *you know* certain features that are the same for both functions: e.g. (i) they both interpersonally signal that there is an amount of (supposed) shared knowledge in the discourse; (ii) they most often entail a pause after *you know*, or no pause at all; (iii) they usually present *you know* with a declarative or falling intonation (mainly for **MIT**), or sometimes with a rising intonation (mainly for the appealing **SOL** function); (iv) they are most often used for utterance-medial or utterance-final *you know*.

You know with a **SOL** function is used by a speaker who is assuming that the hearer probably knows what is referred to, but if not, the speaker tries to make the hearer feel included in order for the speaker to create rapport with the hearer. In addition, this function

marks the speaker's appeal for the hearer's understanding. Solidarity markers in general are described by Watts as "linguistic expressions which appeal to mutual knowledge shared by the participants, or support and solidarity from participants, e.g. *you know*." (2003:169). *You know* with a supposed shared knowledge, used in order to build rapport, is illustrated in (130), below. This is a conversation taking place in a bar where the artist José Feliciano is performing. Carl is appealing to the "mutual knowledge shared by the participants" (Watts 2003:169).

(130)
    Carl: er you've been in the Celebrity rooms before with other er clients
    Escort: I don't think so it's nice
    Carl: yeah well │depends on the artist │**you know** ↓│ José Feliciano you got no complaints

                                                          (*FARGO* 01.03.24)

You know in (130) predominantly has a function of an appeal for shared knowledge and solidarity, even if the hearer in this example may not know who José Feliciano is. This instance of *you know* also has a clarifying function since the phrase *José Feliciano you got no complaints* explains what Carl means by *yeah well depends on the artist*, but in this context the possible textual function of *you know* is considered subordinate to the interpersonal function of Carl trying to build rapport with the hearer. The hearer is a female escort who Carl is spending his evening with. He is trying to be a gentleman and to make conversation that makes the escort feel included, thus using the **SOL** function of *you know*. The intonation of *you know* in (130) is falling, giving this particular occurrence of *you know* emphatic qualities in addition to the appealing features (cf. example (132) below for the emphatic **SOL** function of *you know*).

    You know with a **SOL** function can have a more clear function of appealing to a hearer's solidarity and understanding, and is often used by speakers in some kind of trouble, in need of a friendly ear. *You know* as an appeal for solidarity is exemplified below.

(131)
    Lucy: what am I gonna do
    Nurse: I don't know
    Lucy: she held me so tight I-I **you know** ↑ I couldn't I couldn't tell her
    Nurse: I know I know

                                                         (*WHILE* 00.13.17)

In this example, Lucy is confiding in a nurse at a hospital. Without really knowing how it happened, she has silently agreed to being engaged to a man whom she does not know. In (131), she explains this misunderstanding to the nurse as something that happened when the man's mother gave her a hug, believing Lucy was in fact her son's fiancée. Lucy is appealing to the nurse's understanding and solidarity by using *you know* with a rising intonation. This is an appeal which the nurse hears and mirrors in her reply *I know, I know*. *You know* in (131) can thus be paraphrased into the quite literal "you know how it is" (indicating "please understand me/agree with me"), which in this case is answered by the hearer's *I know, I know* (*how it is*).

    Another **SOL** function found in the corpus is a more emphatic type of *you know*, used in final position. The emphatic **SOL** function has a declarative or falling intonation in the

corpus, demonstrating the speaker's wish not to obtain hearer feedback. Östman (1981:23) finds this function to chiefly have a declarative intonation, as opposed to the more appealing *you know*, which primarily has an interrogative contour. The emphatic function suggests that the speaker means "you should have understood" or "'I'm not going to say anything more about this', 'don't ask me anymore' [or] even 'it's obvious'" (Östman 1981:23). The speaker is thus emphasising his/her authority (Erman 2001:1347) in a given context, and informs the hearer of that which should be known to him/her. Consider (132) below.

(132) Ox: what the hell has he got a TV for he's in a coma for Christ's sake
       Midge: Ox shh he might hear you **you know** ↓
       Ox: then get him a radio

(*WHILE* 00.37.12)

In (132), Ox asks how his son, who is in the hospital in a coma, could possibly make use of a TV in his state. On hearing this, Ox's wife shows irritation believing their son may be able to hear Ox. She tries to stop him talking by hushing him, and using the emphasising function of *you know*, here with the meaning "you should understand (that he might hear you)" or "it is obvious (that he might hear you)". The intonation and facial expressions of the speaker indicate the emphatic **SOL** function: the intonation is falling and the speaker both sounds and looks irritated.

The final function of *you know* introduced here is **MIT**, which has the function of the speaker giving a certain power to the hearer: "even if the hearer does not 'know', the speaker gives him the higher power, acting in effect as if the addressee did know" (Östman 1981:22). As other DPs demonstrating **MIT** functions, *you know* serves as a hedge toning down the message in order for the speaker to avoid conflict. The **MIT** function is shown in (133).

(133) Richard: oh that's good that she's stabile cause **you know (1)** ↓ you're kind of
                  putting the whole campaign in her hands now **you know** ↓ **(2)** .
       Susan: yes │ I know

(*PRIMARY* 00.46.24)

In (133), Richard, a political assistant, questions a decision made by the Governor's wife Susan. He politely questions Susan's choice on who to employ for a certain delicate mission, using *you know* twice to mitigate the face threat of questioning Susan's authority. Political hierarchy plays a role in this example as Richard in effect has a subordinate position to Susan. Richard's position possibly influences his choice of words and his hedging in (133). As with the example of the appeal for solidarity in (131) above, *you know* is reflected in *yes I know* in the reply from the other speaker. The **MIT** function of *you know* is almost always falling or sometimes declarative, and its position in an utterance is medial or final.

Like the three other DPs and their functional distribution, the functions of *you know* discussed above are not definite, but overlap at times. This has been evident in the examination of the four functions. Various problems assigning functions to *you know* have been brought up in the previous discussion. Below follows some further examples of difficulties in assigning *you know* one function over another, as well as reasons behind final classification choices. *You know* in example (134) could have a number of functions, depending on the context it is in.

146

(134)   Vicky: so does it hurt
         Jessica: what
         Vicky: **you know →** │ sex │does it hurt
                                                    (*AMPIE* 01.05.16)

You know in (134) could have a **SOL** function with an appeal for solidarity (if Vicky, by using *you know*, was appealing to Jessica's solidarity and understanding). In the corpus, based on the context, *you know* in (134) is categorised with a **CLAR** function. In the scene in question, the two girls are sitting in the school library studying when Vicky suddenly asks whether 'it' hurts. There has been some more implicit talk about this 'it' previously in the scene and after a discussion focussing exclusively on homework, Vicky connects to the previous subject, making it more explicit. As the subject is almost new, however, Jessica does not understand and so Vicky has to clarify what she means by 'it'. Jessica thus uses the **CLAR** marker *you know* followed by the word that 'it' refers to, i.e. 'sex'. This instance of *you know* is not exclusively applicable to the **CLAR** function, however, but the **SOL** function also plays a part in the utterance (Vicky is appealing both to the knowledge she is sharing with her friend and to the friend's solidarity). The **CLAR** function was assigned to this example because it is the most noticeable function considering the context.

Example (135), below, is taken out of its context to illustrate the importance of allowing for the larger context carefully when analysing *you know*.

(135)   Anton: I'm walking through Washington Square and there's this stupid man **you know ↑**
                   some guy with a monkey
                                                    (*ADDICTED* 00.32.59)

From the short extract above, it seems clear that *you know* is functioning as a **CLAR** marker: Anton explains what he means by *this stupid man* by inserting *you know* and then giving the clarification *some guy with a monkey*. If we consider more of the surrounding context, a somewhat different picture emerges, however. In (136), Anton's girlfriend Linda is introduced into the example. She is asking Anton what is on his collar, suggesting he has been seeing another woman. On hearing this implicit accusation, Anton tells the story of how some lipstick ended up on his collar and how it has nothing to do with another woman, but a monkey.

(136)   Linda: what's that on your collar
         Anton: what oh that you're not gonna believe this I'm walking through Washington Square
                   and there's this stupid man **you know (1) ↑** some guy with a monkey
         Linda: a street performer
         Anton: street performer the son of a bitch yeah the monkey jumps on me and it won't get off
                   my back **you know (2) ↓**
         Linda: you're kidding
         Anton: no no I'm not kidding the people all around they are laughing hahahoho **you know
                   (3) ↑** and the monkey is kissing me kissing me I think it peed on me it stinks
                                                    (*ADDICTED* 00.32.59)

In (136), Anton uses *you know* three times. The first instance, which was analysed in the context of (135) as having a **CLAR** function, still has a clarifying function to a certain extent in the context of (136). However, in view of the background of this example, i.e. the speaker's

147

girlfriend accusing the speaker of adultery, this occurrence of *you know* has a more emotive function. The speaker is appealing to the hearer's solidarity, badly wishing for her understanding of his situation (even though he thinks that she is *not gonna believe this*), using the rising intonation common for the appealing **SOL** function of *you know*. This instance of *you know* is consequently categorised as signalling the **SOL** function. The two following occurrences of *you know* are also categorised as predominantly showing **SOL** functions. Other possible functions for the second and third *you know* in (136) is **CLAR, MIT**, or other types of **SOL**, e.g. emphasis (this latter function is especially applicable to the second *you know*, due to the falling intonation and final position of the DP here). Considering the surrounding context, the second and third instances of *you know* in (136) are nevertheless categorised as markers of appeal for solidarity, i.e. **SOL**, in the present study.

Sometimes in the corpus, a ST example of *you know* is categorised as having one function, while a translation is analysed as having another. Example (137), below, attempts to illustrate this.

(137) Mike: i-i-it's not that uh it's not that things didn't work out it's uh uh │Linda uh had leukaemia **you know** ↓│she was uh she-she passed away

(*FARGO* 01.01.23)

Cinema, DVD, TV4	SVT
Det var inte så	Det var inte det
att det inte funkade mellan oss…	att vi inte älskade varandra…
[It wasn't	[It wasn't that
that it didn't work out between us…]	we didn't love each other…]
Linda led av leukemi, **förstår du**.	Linda hade leukemi, **du vet.**
Hon har gått bort.	Hon dog.
[Linda suffered from leukaemia, **you understand**.	[Linda had leukaemia, **you know**.
She has passed away.]	She died.]

Taking into account the context of (137), *you know* is analysed as chiefly having a **SOL** function. The speaker Mike is telling the hearer how his wife died from leukaemia, thus appealing to the hearer's solidarity. Another detail indicating a **SOL** function of this particular *you know*, is the fact that Mike is lying (he was never married to Linda and she is still alive). His use of *you know* illustrates his wish to make the hearer believe him by making rapport with the hearer. This example of *you know* could possibly also be categorised as a marker of **CLAR** (if *you know* and its subsequent utterance is analysed as a clarification of the part *it's not that things didn't work out*). The **SOL** function is, however, chosen here for reasons already given. Had the context of the use of *you know* in (137) not been acknowledged, it would have been increaslingly difficult to analyse the example.

The function of ST *you know* is treated differently in the translations. The Cinema, DVD and TV4 subtitles use *förstår du* ('you understand') as a translation of *you know*, while the SVT subtitles use *du vet* ('you know'). The phrase *förstår du* here chiefly functions as a **CLAR** marker, given that *Linda led av leukemi* ('Linda suffered from leukaemia') is an explanation of why the fact that it didn't work out between Mike and Linda is not the reason they are no longer married. The translation *du vet* ('you know') in the SVT subtitles is closer to the ST **SOL** function than to a **CLAR** function. The fact that the various subtitles treat the

ST function of *you know* differently is an indication of the difficulties involved in categorising *you know* and other DPs.

The above examination of three ambiguous examples of functions of *you know* is included here as an insight into the analysing of this DP and to show a few difficulties in categorising *you know*. Very few categorisations of *you know* into functions are clear-cut (albeit they are not always as difficult to analyse as examples (134)-(137), above) and the surrounding context of this DP and the various parameters used for the analysis are thus imperative.

Below follows a more quantitative perspective of *you know*, and its translations.

6.3 *You know* and its translations: quantitative aspects

Some basic quantitative results concerning *you know* will be considered in 6.3 and 6.4. Focus will be more on general quantitative tendencies, and the discussion will not always go into great detail with all aspects of the tables below.

There are 265 tokens[34] of *you know* in the corpus. 61 of these are translated into one or several of the TTs Cinema, DVD, SVT, and TV3+TV4, making a 23 % translation of all the occurrences of *you know* in the ST. In all four TTs combined, there are 130 translations of *you know*. All ten films have instances of *you know* and all but one of the films, *PULP*, have translations of this DP. The 265 ST instances of *you know* are quite unevenly distributed among the films, from high frequency to low frequency. Table 6.1, below, shows the total number of *you know* in each film, together with the (approximate) number of spoken words per film soundtrack, as well as the number of *you know* per 100 words.

Table 6.1. Occurrences of *you know* with number of words per film, and frequency per 100 words.

Film	*You know*	Number of words in each soundtrack	Frequency of *you know* per 100 words	Films ranked by frequency of *you know*
AMPIE	42	8764	0.48	1
WHILE	36	10192	0.35	2
WAG	35	14297	0.25	4
PRIMARY	32	18767	0.17	6
FARGO	28	7878	0.35	2
ADDICTED	25	8779	0.28	3
BETTY	22	10910	0.20	5
SEVEN	16	9700	0.16	7
BLONDE	15	8788	0.17	6
PULP	14	15456	0.09	8
Total	**265**	**113,555**	**2.5**	

On average, there is 1 instance of *you know* per 400 words in the corpus[35], although there are great individual differences between the films.

The film with the highest frequency of *you know* is *AMPIE* with 42 tokens (15.8 %) of the total 265 tokens, while the film with the lowest frequency of *you know* is *PULP* with 14 tokens (5.3 %) of the total ST tokens.

The number of *you know* in each film is not related to the number of words in the individual films. *AMPIE*, which holds the most tokens of *you know*, is one of the films with the least number of words. This film ends up at a total of 0.48 *you know* per 100 words, i.e. about 1 instance of *you know* per 200 words. The film *PULP*, which holds the lowest number of *you know*, has the highest number of words of all ten films at a total of 0.09 *you know* per 100 words, i.e. about 1 instance of *you know* per 1000 words.

---

[34] What is referred to as *translation tokens* in the present study is the combined number of translations, while the term *translation types* refers to the number of individually different translations (cf. 4.2.7).

[35] The total of 2.5 occurrences of *you know* is divided by the number of films (ten), with the result of approximately 0.25 occurrences of *well* per 100 words in each film.

There are some differences in frequency between the various genres. The most striking point is the low numbers for the Crime/Gangster genre. The two films from the Crime/Gangster genre are the ones with the lowest number of *you know* per 100 words: *PULP* with 0.09 and *SEVEN* with an average of 0.16 instances of *you know* per 100 words. The Romantic Comedy genre, in comparison, has quite a few occurrences of *you know*: *WHILE* has the second highest frequency of *you know* with 0.35 per 100 words and *ADDICTED* has the fourth highest frequency of *you know* with 0.28 per 100 words. The Political Drama genre with the films *WAG* and *PRIMARY* holds a position between the highest and lowest frequencies of *you know* per 100 words at a 0.25 and 0.17. The two remaining genres, College Comedies and Criminal Drama, do not show any particular tendencies in their frequencies of *you know* per 100 words.

The low numbers of *you know* in the Crime/Gangster genre compared to the higher numbers in the Romantic Comedy genre may illustrate the type of language used in these two very different genres. The language in Crime/Gangster films is usually quite harsh and aggressive and does not include much consideration for maintaining relationships between characters, something that *you know*, due to its core meaning of shared knowledge, is often used for in conversation. The language in Romantic Comedies, on the other hand, is often used for constructing and preserving relationships, and thus *you know* is used more often in these types of films. As we will see, however (cf. 6.4, and 6.5.4), there are examples of *you know* from the Crime/Gangster genre showing characters' desire to uphold relationships.

All films but one, *PULP*, include translations of *you know*. The number of DP translations in the films, as well as in all four TTs, individually and combined[36] are shown in table 6.2 below.

Table 6.2. The distribution of *you know* and its translations in each film, and in the four TTs.

Film	ST	Cinema	DVD	SVT	TV3+TV4	Total number of translations	Average number of translations per TT
AMPIE	42	5	5	7	9	26	6.5 (15 %)
WHILE	36	4	4	2	4	14	3.5 (10 %)
WAG	35	6	5	5	5	21	5.3 (15 %)
PRIMARY	32	2	3	3	3	11	2.8 (9 %)
FARGO	28	4	4	3	4	15	3.8 (14 %)
ADDICTED	25	*(2)	5	1	1	(9)	(2.3 (9 %))
BETTY	22	4	4	4	1	13	3.3 (15 %)
SEVEN	16	4	4	3	3	14	3.5 (22 %)
BLONDE	15	2	3	1	3	9	2.3 (15 %)
PULP	14	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	**265**	**31(33)**	**37**	**29**	**33**	**130 (132)**	

* The Cinema subtitles have not been found, and a hypothetical number is thus included, based on the average number of the other three TTs.

---

[36] The asterisk in the Cinema column for *ADDICTED* in table 6.2 indicates that this version has not been located and is thus not included in the total number of Cinema translations. A hypothetical number (2) is included for the Cinema TT for this film, based on the average number of translations in the other *ADDICTED* TTs. The figures in brackets in the *ADDICTED* and Cinema columns are all based on the hypothetical number and these numbers are the ones referred to in the discussion following table 6.2.

AMPIE, which includes the majority of the ST tokens of *you know*, also includes the majority of the translations with a total of 26 and an average of 6.5 translations per TT. *WHILE* and *WAG*, which have the second and third most instances of ST *you know*, also have quite a few translations (compared to the ST numbers of *you know*, these two films have more translations per tokens of *you know* than *AMPIE* has), as do *FARGO*, *SEVEN*, and *BETTY*. The fact that *SEVEN* has an average of 3.5 translations per TT of *you know* is quite surprising considering the film's relatively low frequency of *you know* in the ST.

When comparing the total number of translations of *you know* (the total numbers are divided by four to show the average number and percentage of each TT) with the total number of ST occurrences of *you know*, the percentages illustrate a rather similar distribution of translations of this DP. Some films stand out in comparison, e.g. *SEVEN* which has a higher percentage of translated occurrences than the other films, and *PULP* which has no translations at all, but on the whole the films show a comparable quantitative distribution of translations of *you know*.

There is no great discrepancy between the total numbers of translations in the different TT versions Cinema, DVD, SVT, and TV3+TV4[37] even though there are individual differences (individual differences across the TTs are mainly seen in the translations of *AMPIE*, *ADDICTED*, and *BETTY*). The DVD translation holds the largest part of the translations with 37 translation tokens, while the Cinema translation and the TV3+TV4 translation have 33 translation tokens each, and the SVT translation has 29 tokens. The quantitative distribution of translation types for *you know* in each of the TTs will be commented on in connection with table 6.5, below.

6.4 Distribution of functions in STs and TTs

The four functions of *you know* (**FRAME**, **CLAR**, **SOL**, and **MIT**) will now be looked at in more detail. First, the distribution of the functions in the STs will be considered, and then the distribution of the translations of the functions will be discussed. Table 6.3 shows the distribution of the four functions of *you know* in the ten films.

Table 6.3. The distribution of functions of *you know* in all ten STs

FUNCTIONS	*ADDICTED*	*AMPIE*	*BETTY*	*BLONDE*	*FARGO*	*PRIMARY*	*PULP*	*SEVEN*	*WAG*	*WHILE*	Total
FRAME	7	8	7	7	1	10	3	3	11	9	**66**
CLAR	1	9	5	2	5	5	3	4	14	6	**54**
SOL	16	18	7	3	18	11	3	8	9	17	**110**
MIT	1	7	3	3	4	6	5	1	1	4	**35**
TOTAL	**25**	**42**	**22**	**15**	**28**	**32**	**14**	**16**	**35**	**36**	**265**

---

[37] The numbers of TV3 (17 translations in total) and TV4 (15 translations in total) are combined to show the joint numbers of the two commercial channels.

SOL is the single most common function in the ST material (110 tokens). **FRAME** is the second most frequent function (66 tokens), while **CLAR** is the third (54 tokens), and **MIT** the fourth most frequent function (35 tokens). Functions of *you know* which may be quite common in authentic spoken dialogue, e.g. markers of repair and hesitation, are not frequent in this material. This is possibly due to the difference between authentic dialogue and film dialogue, i.e. less repair and hesitation is used in film dialogue than in authentic dialogue (cf. 2.7).

For six of the films, *ADDICTED, AMPIE, FARGO, PRIMARY, SEVEN*, and *WHILE*, the **SOL** function of *you know* is the most common function, despite individual differences concerning the total number of this function. *BETTY* has an equal amount of **SOL** and **FRAME**, while for *BLONDE* the **FRAME** function of *you know* is the most common one. *WAG* has a majority of **CLAR** tokens, and the most common function for *PULP* is the **MIT** function.

One reason for the distribution of functions may be certain genre differences. For example, the romantic comedies *ADDICTED* and *WHILE* have a clear majority of *you know* with a **SOL** function, whereas the two political drama films *PRIMARY* and *WAG* have more focus on the textual functions **FRAME** and **CLAR** in their soundtracks. The majority of *you know* tokens in *WAG* have either a **FRAME** or **CLAR** function, and *PRIMARY* shows a high frequency of the **FRAME** function. Each of the two political drama films has more **FRAME** functions of *you know* than any of the other films. *WAG* also has more **CLAR** markers than any of the other films. This difference in functions may illustrate the fact that the focus of romantic comedies is on the characters' attempts to communicate their feelings, by appealing more to other characters' understanding. The focus of political dramas, on the other hand, is on the character's attempts to communicate ideas via more formal conversations, speeches, television interviews, etc., i.e. using more frame-marking devices in order to attract attention. The two films in the crime/gangster genre, *PULP* and *SEVEN*, both have more tokens of *you know* with **SOL** and **MIT** functions than with **CLAR** and **FRAME** functions, i.e. *PULP* has more tokens of **MIT** than any other function and *SEVEN* has more tokens of **SOL** than any other function. *PULP* is the only film demonstrating a majority of *you know* with the function **MIT**. One reason for the use in these films of interpersonal markers may be the violent atmosphere in both. In *PULP*, in spite of the ruthless language sometimes used, the characters are trying to tone down the aggressive mood so as to not cause themselves further difficulties, and in *SEVEN*, *you know* is used a great deal as an appeal for solidarity when the characters are in distress.

One film that stands out in table 6.3 is *FARGO*, which shows a total of 18 instances with a **SOL** function out of a total of 28 tokens of *you know*. One hypothesis for the use of **SOL** in this film in particular is the technique its script-writers, the Coen brothers, employed for *FARGO*: most of the dialogue was included in the script from the beginning, including "the 'ums' and broken sentences" (http://www.amazon.co.uk/preview/) used in the dialogue. If all words, including DP *you know*, are indeed carefully considered in the writing process of the *FARGO* film script, it is perhaps not so surprising that *you know* with an interpersonal function is so much more frequent than *you know* with a textual function, bearing in mind the informal, polite, appealing language of *FARGO*. *You know* with an interpersonal function

reflects the plot and the characters in *FARGO* more than *you know* with a textual function does, making the interpersonal function more important to put across. This fact may have been behind the ((sub)conscious) choice of the script-writers when using *you know* in *FARGO*. The interpersonal function of *you know* in *FARGO* possibly contributes to the characterisation in the film as well as to the development of the actual plot.

The distribution of functions of the translated occurrences of *you know* can be seen in table 6.4, below. The numbers in the table refer to how many times the ST functions of the DPs are translated, and not in any way to the functions of the translations.

Table.6.4. The distribution of functions of translated *you know* (all four TTs combined for each film).

FUNCTIONS	ADDICTED	AMPIE	BETTY	BLONDE	FARGO	PRIMARY	PULP	SEVEN	WAG	WHILE	Total
FRAME	3	6	6	6	0	4	0	3	4	0	**32**
CLAR	0	11	1	3	0	1	0	7	13	8	**44**
SOL	4	7	6	0	15	6	0	4	4	6	**52**
MIT	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**2**
TOTAL	7	26	13	9	15	11	0	14	21	14	130

The distribution of the totals of the four functions in table 6.4 is somewhat different from the distribution of the ST occurrences of *you know* seen in table 6.3. The order of frequency of two of the translated functions is not the same as the order of frequency of these two functions in the STs: **CLAR,** which is the third most common function in the STs is the second most translated, and **FRAME**, the second most common function in the STs, is the third most translated function in the STs. The order of frequency for **SOL** and **MIT** is the same, i.e. **SOL** is both the most frequent function in the STs, and the most frequently translated function, and **MIT** is the least frequent function in the STs, as well as the least frequently translated function. The **MIT** function of *you know* is the least translated function of all the DPs' functions in the present study. The numbers in table 6.4 all refer to the total number of translations in the four TTs combined. These numbers are divided by four in table 6.5, below, and contrasted with the number of DPs in the STs. Table 6.5 does not focus on the individual films, but on the functions of the translations of *you know* in the four TTs Cinema, DVD, SVT, and TV3+TV4.

Table 6.5. The distribution of functions (tokens and types) and translations of *you know* in all four TTs.

FUNCTIONS	ST	Cinema tokens/types	DVD tokens/types	SVT tokens/types	TV3+TV4 tokens/types	Total tokens	Average tokens	(Average tokens as) % of ST
FRAME	66	8/6	11/8	7/7	6/6	**32**	8.3	**12.4%**
CLAR	54	12/9	10/7	13/7	9/5	**44**	11.0	**20.4%**
SOL	110	11/7	16/12	9/5	16/10	**52**	13.0	**11.9%**
MIT	35	0	0	0	2/2	**2**	0.5	**1.4%**
Total	**265**	31/21	37/23	29/16	33/18	**130**		

The table above shows the number of translations of the functions **FRAME**, **CLAR**, **SOL**, and **MIT**, as well as the number of translation types in the various TTs. It says nothing about the functions of the Swedish translations of *you know*, but considers the functions of the ST occurrences of *you know* only, as well as how many times each function is translated into each TT. In order to give a more accurate account of the translations, the total TT numbers are divided by four to show the average number of translations in each TT, as well as the average percentages of the functions translated into each TT.

In view of the average percentages of table 6.5, the most frequently translated function is **CLAR** and the least translated function is **MIT**, the latter with only two tokens, and a percentage of 1.4. The **SOL** and **FRAME** functions have more similar average percentages of translation and are the second and third most translated functions, respectively. As far as the number of translation types is concerned, the DVD subtitles have the most individually different types and the SVT subtitles the least, while the Cinema and TV3+TV4 both have intermediate totals of translation types.

Table 6.6 below shows the combined numbers of the textual functions **FRAME** and **CLAR**, on the one hand, and the interpersonal functions **SOL** and **MIT**, on the other. This division is made in order to illustrate the distribution of the 265 occurrences of *you know* among textual and interpersonal functions in the ST, and also to see how many tokens of *you know* with either function are translated (again, table 6.6 says nothing about the functions of the Swedish translations of *you know*). For a more accurate picture of the translations, the total TT numbers for both the textual and the interpersonal functions are divided by four to show the average number of translations in each TT.

Table 6.6. Functions of *you know* in the STs, with number of translations

Functions	STs	Number of translations in all four TTs	Average number of translations in each TT	Average % translated into each TT
Textual function	**120** (45.3 %)	**77** (63.6 %)	19.3	16.0 %
Interpersonal function	**145** (54.7 %)	**54** (37.5 %)	13.5	9.4 %
Total	**265**	**130**		

As the table shows, there are more occurrences of *you know* in the STs with an interpersonal function than with a textual function. The interpersonal functions **SOL** and **MIT** are thus more frequent in the film soundtracks than the textual functions **FRAME** and **CLAR**. However, when considering the translations of these functions, a different pattern emerges: the translated occurrences of *you know* more often have a textual function than an interpersonal function. An average of 9.4 % of the instances of *you know* with an interpersonal function, and an average of 16 % of the instances of *you know* with a textual function are translated into each TT. The difference is not great between the textual and interpersonal functions, but table 6.6 nonetheless points to the fact that the majority of the translated occurrences of *you know* in the corpus have a textual function, although most of the

ST occurrences of *you know* have an interpersonal function. Possible reasons for this will be discussed in 9.4.2.

6.5 Translations of *you know*

All in all, there are 130 translations of the ST instances of *you know* (61 of the ST tokens are translated into one or several TTs). Table 6.7, below, shows these translations and their occurrences in relation to the descending order of frequency of their various pragmatic and grammatical realisations. The categories in table 6.7 are loosely based on translation categories used by Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen for DP *well* (2003), and are merely to be seen as a suggestion of a division of the translations.

Table 6.7. Translation categories and translations of *you know* in all 4 TTs

Category	Translations (+occurrences)	Tokens/types
DP/Modal particle	du vet+ du vet…+du vet - (22); ju (17); ni vet+ …ni vet (8); vet du +vet du… (7); nog (7); menar jag (3); förstår du (3); väl (2); tja…(1); …ni förstår (1)	71/10
Adverb	alltså (12); faktiskt (3); liksom (2)	17/3
Punctuation mark	! (9), − (5), -[…]- (2)	16/3
Conjunction	fast (4); men (3); eftersom (2); vad (1); ja […] och (1)	11/5
DP+other	vet du vad? (3); vet ni vad? (2); ja, ni vet…(2); du vet väl hur det är (1); vet du att (1); du vet väl (1)	10/6
Miscellaneous	hörni (1); men du (1)	2/2
Pronoun	du (2)	2/1
Abbreviation	t.ex. (1)	1/1
Total tokens/types		**130/31**

Not all categories in table 6.7 are mutually exclusive. The table is just an indication of how the translations are distributed among pragmatic and grammatical categories. For instance, the line drawn between adverb *alltså* ('that is', 'so') and DP *alltså* is not always clear. Because of the difficulty of drawing the line between the two categories DPs and modal particles, these are combined to form one category. The most frequent category in the Swedish subtitles is the DP/modal particle (with or without added punctuation). Examples of this category is *du vet* ('you know'), *ju* ('as you know'), *nog* ('probably'). The second most frequent translation category is the adverb. Examples include *liksom* ('like'), *faktiskt* ('actually'), and *alltså* ('that is', 'so'). The punctuation marks (e.g. exclamation marks (!) and dashes (−)) are almost as frequent as the adverbs in the corpus. The conjunctions found in the four TTs include e.g. *fast* ('although'), *men* ('but'), and *eftersom* ('because'), while the DP+other category includes phrases of which a DP is part (e.g. *ja, ni vet* ('yes, you know') and *du vet väl hur det är* ('you

know how it is, surely'). The miscellaneous category includes (attention-seekers) *hörni* ('hey') and *men du* ('but/hey you'). In addition, pronouns and abbreviations are sparingly used as translations of *you know*.

The most common translations of *you know* in the corpus, *du vet/ni vet/vet du* (with or without three dots), *ju*, *alltså*, and *nog*, will briefly be examined individually below. The rest of the translations will be considered successively as they are introduced in this section.

The most frequent translation of *you know* in the four TTs is the group of *du vet/ni vet/vet du*. This group is divided into *du vet + du vet...+ du vet-* (22 instances), *ni vet + ...ni vet* (8 instances), *vet du + vet du...*(7 instances). This group combined forms a total of 37 instances of translations of *you know*. *Du vet* literally means *you know* (*du* here referring to the 2ⁿᵈ person singular *you*) and is the most common translation with its total of 21 instances. *Ni vet* literally means *you know* (*ni* here referring to the 2ⁿᵈ person plural *you*) and is used 8 times as a translation of *you know*. *Vet du* literally means 'know you' and is used 7 times as a translation of *you know*. This quite large group of translations of *you know* corresponding directly to *you know*, shows a tendency of the subtitles to use a closely corresponding Swedish translation of *you know* whenever this is possible.

The most common single translation of *you know* in the corpus, i.e. one that cannot be associated with other related translations like the large group of *du vet/ni vet/vet du* above, is the modal particle *ju* ('as you know') with 17 instances. The function of this modal particle is not easy to pin-point as it changes with the context as well as with the relationship between the speakers, as do all modal particles and DPs to a larger or lesser extent. Typically, however, *ju* indicates the function of shared knowledge: "by emphasising that the speaker and hearer have some knowledge in common, *ju* may create a feeling of intimacy and rapport" (Aijmer 1996:402), hence the paraphrase 'as you know'. The knowledge that speaker and hearer have in common either appears as a factual mutual understanding between speaker and hearer (*solen går **ju** upp i öster och ner i väster* ('**as you know**, the sun rises in the East and sets in the West'*)) or as an attempt by the speaker to establish an intimate link with the hearer. By using *ju* to establish rapport with the hearer, the speaker may try to persuade the hearer that the speaker has valid reasons for his/her claim. This last function of *ju* is often used in political debates when a speaker wants to make a claim seem self-evident. *Ju* can also be used as a hedge, to tone down the message and make it seem of less importance, often applied in face-threatening situations to avoid conflict. *Ju* is thus a feature of "both agreement and conflict" (Josephson 2005:10 (my translation)). After the translations *du vet/ni vet/vet du*, modal particle *ju* is the most frequent translation of *you know* in the corpus, illustrating the fact that *you know* and *ju* are quite closely related. Both *ju* and *you know* have the function of the speaker suggesting that the hearer in fact knows and agrees with the proposition put forward by the speaker. Aijmer also finds this connection: "[t]he interpersonal function of *ju* is to demand a hearer's approbation and to establish rapport and harmony. In this respect *ju* is similar to the interpersonal *you know* in English." (1996b:421).

The second most common single translation of *you know* in the corpus is *alltså* ('that is') with 12 instances. *Alltså* usually functions as an adverb denoting turn-taking, emphasis, clarification or repair (Nilsson 2005:146-150), thus indicating a chiefly textual function. When *alltså* functions as a DP, as opposed to an adverb, it demonstrates more of an

interpersonal function (*Hon är toppen, alltså* (Nilsson 2005:149)) assisting the speaker in showing his/her "emotions towards a proposition (Lehti-Eklund 1997:81-82.). Aijmer (2007) finds that *alltså* either develops into a question marker or a reformulation marker. *Alltså* can also function as a conjunction providing a logical conclusive relation between two clauses, but as this function is more common in written language, it is not included as a translation of the spoken language in the corpus.

Nog ('probably') is a modal particle and the third most common single translation of *you know* with 7 instances. With its core function ('probably') "*nog* signals that the speaker weighs the validity of the proposition against what he knows or what is generally known" (Aijmer 1996b:406). According to Aijmer (1996b:404), who investigated correspondences of *nog* in English (here presented in a simplified version) *nog* may indicate weak or strong probability ('probably'), weak or strong reliability ('no doubt', 'perhaps'), weak or strong belief ('I think', 'I suppose', 'I expect'), weak or strong inference ('look as if', 'obviously'), expectation ('after all'), and weak or strong emphasis ('certainly', 'I guess'). Nilsson (2005:136) finds similar functions of *nog* in her study of young people's speech: *nog* here primarily demonstrates functions of probability, mitigation and uncertainty.

Below follows an overview of the translations of each of the four functions of *you know*, **FRAME**, **CLAR**, **SOL**, and **MIT**.

6.5.1 The frame-marker translated

FRAME is the second most common function in the ST, with a total of 66 occurrences in all ten films combined. It is the third most frequently translated function in the TTs with an average of 8.3 translations per TT. An average of 12.4 % of all ST tokens with a **FRAME** function are translated into each TT.

Table 6.8 below lists the translations of the **FRAME** function.

Table 6.8. Translations of the **FRAME** function

Translation	Total
vet du + vet du… ('know you'+'know you…')	6
vet du/ni vad ('you know what')	5
du vet + du vet… ('you know'+ 'you know…')	4
men ('but')	3
–	3
du ('you')	2
ni vet ('you know')	2
fast ('although')	2
men du ('but/hey you')	2
vet du att ('do you know that')	1
hörni ('hey you')	1
vad ('what')	1
Total tokens/types	**32/12**

The two most frequent translations of the **FRAME** function is DP *vet du* (with or without three dots), and its related attention-seeking phrases *vet du*/*ni vad*. DP *du vet* (with or without three dots) is also quite frequent. Other common translations are conjunctions *men* ('but') and *fast* ('although'), the hyphen (–), the pronoun *du* ('you'), and DP *ni vet*.

The most common **FRAME** function is the attention-seeker. Example (125) above is repeated as (138), below, now including three different translations of *you know* with an attention-seeking function: the two most frequent translations *Vet du* and *Vet du vad*, as well as the pronoun *Du*.

(138)   Vivian: **you know** ↑ Elle │ │ I still can't believe you didn't tell Callahan the alibi

(*BLONDE* 01.03.15)

Cinema	DVD
Vet du...jag kan fortfarande inte fatta att du inte avslöjade alibit. [**You know…**I still can't understand that you didn't reveal the alibi.]	**Vet du vad**, Elle, [**You know what**, Elle,] Jag fattar ännu inte att du höll inne med alibit. [I still don't understand that you kept the alibi from us.]
SVT	TV4
Elle, jag fattar bara inte att du inte avslöjade alibit för Callahan. [Elle, I just don't understand that you didn't reveal the alibi for Callahan.	**Du** Elle…jag fattar inte att du inte avslöjade alibit för Callahan. [**Hey ('you')** Elle…I don't understand that you didn't reveal the alibi to Callahan.]

Example (138) illustrates four different approaches to the translation of *you know* as an attention-seeker. The attention-seeking function of the ST is transferred into all four TTs, even though *you know* is translated (by a matching expression in the TTs) into only three. In the ST, *you know* together with the vocative *Elle* forms the attention-seeking function of the turn. The Cinema subtitles translate *you know* into *Vet du…*('You know…'), but leave out the vocative. The DVD subtitles use *Vet du vad* ('You know what'), as well as the vocative *Elle*. The SVT subtitles do not include a translation of *you know*, but they do include the vocative *Elle*. The TV4 subtitles translate *You know, Elle* into *Du, Elle* ('Hey (You), Elle'), thus using the pronoun *du* together with the vocative *Elle*.

There is a tendency in the corpus to translate *you know* with an attention-seeking function more often when *you know* is directly followed by a vocative being the name or designation of the hearer. Examples of this are seen in table 6.9, below.

Table 6.9. *You know* + vocatives and their translations

	ST	Translations
	You know, Sam (*ADDICTED*)	**Vet du**, Sam; **Vet du att**
	You know, Del (*BETTY*)	**Vet du…**
	You know, Elle (*BLONDE*)	**Vet du**…; **Vet du vad**, Elle; **Du**, Elle
	You know, honey-child (*PRIMARY*)	**Vet du**... ; **Du**, plutten
	You know, Smiley (*SEVEN*)	**Vet du**; **Vet du**
	You know, Connie (*WAG*)	**Du vet**; **Du vet**…; **Du vet**…; **Du vet**…
	You know, guys (*AMPIE*)	**Hörni**; **Vet ni vad**; **Vet ni vad**
Total	7	17

Names such as *Sam*, *Elle*, and *Connie* are used, as well as designations like *honey-child* and *guys*. A few of the translations include the vocatives (*Sam*, *Elle*, *plutten*), but most of them do

not. A total of 10 of the 66 instances of *you know* showing a **FRAME** function in the corpus have the form of *you know* + vocative, and 7 of these 10 are translated into one or several of the TTs. The majority of the translated instances of *you know* with an attention-seeking function have the *you know* + vocative combination in the ST.

Another translation of this type of **FRAME** is the conjunction. The two conjunctions *men* ('but') and *fast* ('although', 'however') function as paraphrases of the attention-seeking ST function of *you know*, and they show more of a cohesive function in the TT discourse. One example of this is (139), below.

(139)   Elle: uh has Warner Huntington III checked in yet
Man: uhm │ no │ **you know** → maybe you should check with the cruise director on the Lido deck
                  (*BLONDE* 00.21.11)

Cinema	DVD
Nej. Hör efter med kryssningsvärden på Lido-däck... [No. Check with the cruise director on the Lido deck…]	Nej. [No.] **Men** fråga kapten på soldäcket. [**But** ask the captain on the sun deck.]

SVT	TV4
Nej. **Men** hör efter med kryssningsvärden på Lido-däck… [No. **But** check this with the cruise director on the Lido deck…]	Nej, **men** kolla med kryssningsvärden på Lido-däck. [No, **but** check this with the cruise director on the Lido deck.]

In this example, the DVD, SVT, and TV4 subtitles use the conjunction *men* to translate *you know* (together with *maybe you should*), and to make the utterances in the dialogue more coherent. In this way, *men* is used as a turn-taking device and thus some of the attention-seeking function of *you know* is still there in the subtitles.

The parenthetical function of **FRAME** is exemplified below. In (140) below ((126) above repeated) there are no translations of the parenthetical comment.

(140)   Stanley: years ago when I first went off to Hollywood they said to me it's too theatrical **you know**→ I was from the theatre so everything was over their heads it's too theatrical
                  (*WAG* 00.54.42)

Cinema+DVD+SVT	TV4
När jag var grön i Hollywood- [When I was new in Hollywood-] -sa de att jag var för teatralisk. Jag var för svår för dem. [-they said that I was too theatrical. I was too difficult for them.]	När jag kom till Hollywood tyckte alla att jag var för teatralisk. [When I came to Hollywood everyone thought that I was too theatrical.]

The Cinema, DVD, and SVT subtitles have the same translation here. They change the direct speech in Stanley's utterance (*they said to me it's too theatrical*) into reported speech in the form of a that-clause ('they said that I was too theatrical'). The parenthetical part (*I was from the theatre so everything was over their heads*) used in the ST by Stanley as he changes focus from direct speech to contact with his hearers, is thus not really needed in the TTs. The translations still contain the sense of the parenthetical part as *Jag var för svår för dem* ('I was too difficult for them'), but they leave out the cohesive function of *you know*. This is possibly

because there is no use for a cohesive device when the sharp line between direct speech and the parenthetical part of the utterance found in the ST, is no longer there in the TTs. The TV4 subtitles do not use direct speech, nor do they include the parenthetical part of the ST utterance. A cohesive device is thus not needed here either.

The parenthetical **FRAME** function is translated only once in the corpus, into the dash (–). This is one example of the possibility to use features of written language to translate phenomena in spoken language, and of the use of the explicitation strategy in the subtitles (cf. 4.3.3). In (141) below, the Cinema, DVD, and SVT subtitles use the dash to put across the parenthetical function of *you know* in the ST.

(141)   Wesley: so I'm walking down Hollywood Boulevard checking out all the stars on the ground
you know ↓ Clint Eastwood Rock Hudson no people [inaudible]

(*BETTY* 01.12.49)

Cinema	DVD+SVT	TV4
Jag gick och kollade skådisarnas namn på trottoaren – Clint Eastwood, Rock Hudson... [I was checking out the actors' names on the pavement – Clint Eastwood, Rock Hudson...] Inte en enda svart skådis nånstans! [Not one single black actor anywhere!]	Jag kollade in skådisarnas namn på trottoaren – Clint, Rock Hudson… [I was checking out the actor's names on the pavement – Clint, Rock Hudson…] Inte en enda svart skådis nånstans! [Not one single black actor anywhere!]	Jag tittade på stjärnornas namn på trottoaren. [I was looking at the stars' names on the pavement.] Clint Eastwood, Rock Hudson. Inte en enda färgad skådis. [Clint Eastwood, Rock Hudson. Not one single colored actor.]

As in (140), *you know* in example (141) initiates a parenthetical part of an utterance, and there are no pauses before or after *you know*. In addition, the pace of these two utterances is fast in comparison to other utterances with *you know*, and *you know* is uttered more or less under the breath of the speaker. In (141), Wesley is telling the speaker how he was walking down Hollywood Boulevard, looking at the stars on the ground. He includes the parenthetical part *Clint Eastwood, Rock Hudson* and combines this part to the preceding part with *you know*. *You know* in this example also has a clarifying function: Wesley is clarifying what he means by *the stars on the ground* by using *you know* as initiating the clarification *Clint Eastwood, Rock Hudson*. The intonation of this utterance (especially the fact that *you know* is uttered very quickly, as a parenthesis in itself), as well as the lack of pauses and the medial position of *you know* does, however, point this instance of *you know* more towards the parenthetical **FRAME** function than the **CLAR** function.

6.5.2 The clarity-marker translated

The **CLAR** marker is the third most frequent function in the ST, with a total of 54 tokens in all ten films combined. It is the most translated of all four functions of *you know* with an average of 11 translations per TT. An average of 20.4 % of all ST tokens with a **CLAR** function are translated into each TT.

All 44 translations of the **CLAR** function of *you know* are listed below.

Table 6.10 Translations of the **CLAR** function.

Translation	Total
du vet + du vet…+ du vet + ni vet ('you know')	16
alltså ('that is')	12
–	4
menar jag ('I mean')	3
eftersom ('because')	2
fast ('although')	2
liksom ('like')	2
tja…('well…')	1
-[…]-	1
Ja […]och… ('yes […] and…')	1
Total tokens/types	**44/10**

The most frequent translation of the **CLAR** function is the DP *du vet* (with or without three dots, and with or without dashes) with 13 instances. It is shown in table 6.10, above, together with its 2ⁿᵈ person plural version *ni vet* for a total of 16 instances. *Alltså* ('that is') is the second most frequent translation of the **CLAR** function with 12 occurrences. All 12 occurrences of *alltså* in the TTs combined are used as translations of the clarification function of *you know*. Other translations worth mentioning are the dash (–) with 4 instances, *menar jag* ('I mean'), and *eftersom* ('because') with 2 instances.

ST example (127) above is repeated below with its TTs as (142). This example illustrates the two most frequent translations of *you know* as a **CLAR** marker, i.e. *du vet* and *alltså* (both are matching translations of *you know* in the example below).

(142)   Stanley: is there gonna be a back end on this thing
Conrad: what │ back end
Stanley: yeah **you know** → percentage points money
Conrad: yeah count on it

(*WAG* 00.20.33)

Cinema+DVD+SVT	TV4
Blir det några fringisar? [Will there be any fringe benefits?]	Blir det nåt i slutänden? [Will there be anything in the end?]
Fringisar? [Fringe benefits?]	I slutänden? [In the end?]
Procent, **alltså**. Stålar. [Percentage, **that is**. Cash.]	**Du vet…**provision, pengar… [**You know…**a commission, money…]
Visst. [Sure.]	

The second utterance by the character Stanley in (142) illustrates **CLAR**. Here Stanley explains what he means by "back end" by inserting the clarifying *you know* before the explanation itself (*percentage points money*). The Cinema, DVD, and SVT subtitles are identical here and all three use the matching translation *alltså*. The TV4 subtitles use a more literal translation of *you know*, i.e. *du vet…* ('you know…'), which also functions as a clarification marker. In example (142), all four TTs demonstrate clear translations of the

textual function of *you know*. (142) represents quite a common treatment of the textual function of ST *you know* in the corpus.

   There are four translations of the repairing **CLAR** function of *you know*, all of the same ST entry in *SEVEN*. This ST entry was given above as (128) and is shown again with accompanying TTs as example (143), below.

(143)   Mills: anyway we bust open the door looking for this junkie and uh the fucker just opened fire at us one cop got hit in the arm │ │ Christ what was his name │ │ spun him like a top │ **you know** → I mean more like slow-motion

(*SEVEN* 00.47.51)

Cinema+DVD	SVT	TV4
Vad fasen hette han? [What the heck was his name?] Han snurrade runt som en spole. I slow motion, **liksom**. [He spun round like a spool. In slow motion, **like**.]	Vad var det han hette? Han for runt som en snurra, **fast** mer i slow-motion. [What was his name? He spun round like a top, **but** more in slow-motion.]	Vad fasen hette han nu…? [What the heck was his name again…?] Han snurrade runt, runt. **Fast** det gick i slow motion. [He spun around, around. **But** it was in slow-motion.]

Two of the translations in (143), the Cinema and DVD subtitles (which are identical for this example), use the DP *liksom* as a translation of the repairing **CLAR** function of *you know*. The other two TTs, SVT and TV4, both use the conjunction *fast*. The Cinema+DVD translation is not so much a repair as a clarification, while the use of the conjunction in the SVT+TV4 translations presents more of a contrast between the character Mills' description of the man in question as spinning round and Mill's change of mind to describe it as being in slow-motion instead.

   The more monitoring **CLAR** function of *you know* is not frequent in the ST and is not translated once. As example (144) below shows, however, an adjacent phrase in the ST with the same monitoring function as *you know*, is translated (the same phenomenon occurs with other functions of *you know*, for example as a **SOL** marker (cf. example (149)).

(144)   Conrad: sweetheart Schumann is the shark okay Schumann is Jaws **you know** ↑ you have to tease'em │ you gotta tease'em you don't put Jaws in the first reel of the movie it's the contract sweetheart the contract for the election whether they know it or not is Vote for me Tuesday Wednesday I will produce Schumann see that's what they're paying the seven bucks for know what I mean

(*WAG* 01.06.19)

Cinema+DVD+SVT	TV4
Schumann är som Hajen. Man måste reta aptiten. [Schumann is like Jaws. You have to whet their appetite.] Man visar inte Hajen i den första rullen av filmen. [You do not show Jaws in the first reel of the film.] Det är underförstått. [That is understood.] "Rösta på mig på tisdag, så får ni se Schumann." ["Vote for me Tuesday, and you will see Schumann.] Det är det de betalar för. [That is what they are paying for.]	Schumann är hajen, precis som i filmen. [Schuman is Jaws, just like in the film.] Man måste reta folks aptit. [You have to whet people's appetite.] Man visar inte hajen i filmens första akt. [You do not show the shark in the first reel of the film.] Det är som ett kontrakt. Inför valet lyder det: [It is like a contract. Before the election it reads:] "Rösta på mig på tisdag

164

	så får ni Schumann på onsdag." ["Vote for me on Tuesday and you will get Schumann on Wednesday."] Det är det väljarna betalar för, **förstår du.** [That'ts what the voters pay for, **you understand**.]
Fattar du? [Do you understand?]	

The final underlined part of the ST utterance, *know what I mean* is translated in the Cinema, DVD, and SVT subtitles into *Fattar du?* ('Do you understand?'). The ST *Know what I mean?*, as well as the translation *Fattar du?* have the same connotation as the monitoring **CLAR** function of *you know* in the ST, i.e. the paraphrase "do you understand me?". The TV4 subtitles use *förstår du* ('(do)you see/understand') as a translation of *Know what I mean?* Had there been a question mark following *förstår du*, the monitoring and comprehension securing function would have been clear, but in this case *förstår du* has more a function of informing the hearer and closing the turn instead of opening it up and inviting the hearer to answer whether s/he does in fact comprehend or not. ST *know what I mean?* is not a DP but has referential meaning, which is a possible reason for its translations in the TTs.

6.5.3 The solidarity-marker translated

SOL is the most frequent of the functions of *you know* with its 110 instances in the ST. It has 52 translations altogether in the four TTs, and an average of 13 translations per TT, amounting to 11.9 % translations of this function in each TT on average.

All 44 translations of the **SOL** function of *you know* are listed below in table 6.11.

Table 6.11. Translations of the **SOL** function of *you know*.

Translation	Total
ju ('as you know')	15
!	9
nog + nog… ('probably')	6
du vet ('you know')	4
förstår du ('you understand')	3
…ni vet ('…you know')	3
ja, ni vet ('yes, you know')	2
väl ('surely')	2
faktiskt ('actually')	3
…ni förstår ('…you understand')	1
du vet väl ('surely you know')	1
t.ex ('e.g.')	1
du vet väl hur det är ('you probably know how it is')	1
vet du ('know you')	1
Total tokens/types	**52/14**

The incomparably most frequent translation of the **SOL** function is the modal particle *ju*. *Ju* is the most common single translation (as opposed to the larger group of DPs *du vet*/*ni vet*/*vet du*) of *you know* in the corpus. The modal particle *ju* typically has the function of shared knowledge and inclusion in Swedish (cf. 6.5 for a more extensive discussion of *ju*) and is an indisputable translation of the **SOL** function, which often has a meaning of shared knowledge and rapport making. Other translations of **SOL** include the exclamation mark (!); the modal particle *nog*; the DPs *du vet*, *förstår du*, and *ni vet*, etc. The 2 instances of modal particle *väl* are the only occurrences of *väl* in the corpus as a translation of *you know*.

Example (130), above, is repeated below as (145) with its TT subtitles.

(145) Carl: yeah well depends on the artist **you know** José Feliciano you got no complaints

<div align="right">(*FARGO* 01.03.24)</div>

Cinema+DVD+TV4	SVT
Det beror på artisten. José Feliciano kan man **ju** inte klaga på. [It depends on the artist. **As you know**, José Feliciano you cannot complain about.]	Det beror på vem som uppträder. [It depends on who is performing.] José Feliciano gör ingen besviken. [José Feliciano makes noone disappointed.]

The speaker's attempt to build rapport with the hearer put forward by *you know* in the ST in (145) is transferred to the Cinema, DVD, and TV4 subtitles as the Swedish marker of shared knowledge, *ju*. The SVT subtitles do not use *ju* or any other possible translation of *you know* in this example, thus presenting the character Carl as less interacting and more as a one-way communicator, stating facts which he doesn't necessarily need any response to. The "feeling of intimacy and rapport" (Aijmer 1996b:402) often suggested by modal particle *ju* is thus pretty well presented by the Cinema, DVD, and TV4 subtitles in the above example, but not by the SVT subtitles.

Example (146), below, is another example of the **SOL** function of *you know* where *you know* has a more persuasive function than in example (145), above.

(146) Wesley: ah Mrs Rogers how ya doing Dwight Campbell Mutual Life Insurance I'm
        looking for a Betty Sizemore.
        Sueann: I wish I could help you but I can't Go to your room now [38]
        Wesley: precious ain't they | **you know** ↑ she has a substantial death benefit coming at
        her from the tragic loss of her husband does she have any relatives in the area

<div align="right">(*BETTY* 00.27.09)</div>

Cinema	DVD+SVT	TV3
Hon har **ju** pengar från en livförsäkring att vänta efter makens tragiska bortgång. [**As you know** she has money from a life insurance to expect after the husband's tragic death.]	Hon har **ju** pengar från en livförsäkrning att vänta. [**As you know**, she has money from a life insurance to expect.]	Hon får ut stora pengar från hennes mans livsförsäkring. [She will get a large amount of money from her husband's life insurance.]

In this example, Wesley, a not-to-be trusted killer, takes on the identity of Dwight Campbell, an invented insurance company employee, to try and persuade Sueann to give him information on the whereabouts of the disappeared Betty. In this scene, Wesley is at the door of Sueann's house. By using *you know* here, Wesley is establishing rapport with Sueann,

---

[38] *Go to you room now!* is meant for Sueann's son who is playing loudly and disturbing the conversation.

making her believe that he is indeed telling the truth and that he has valid reasons for his claim, treating the information he is presenting as given. This instance of *you know* could possibly also be interpreted as having an attention-seeking function: the insurance company employee is using *you know* as a turn-taking device, meaning *you know what, she has a substantial death benefit coming at her*, treating the information as new. The line is not easy to draw between the persuading **SOL** function and the attention-seeking **FRAME** function here. However, given the context and the fact that it is not the main aim of the speaker to give information but to gain information, *you know* here seems to have more of a persuasive **SOL** function.

In three of the TTs above, the Cinema; the DVD; and the SVT subtitles, *you know* is interpreted as signalling an including, sharing function of *you know* by using *ju* as a paraphrasing translation. The TV3 subtitles do not use any translation of *you know*.

The vast majority of *you know* with an appealing **SOL** function are not translated. These occurrences of *you know* have in common the fact that the speaker is reaching out to the hearer, pleading for the hearer's sympathy. Example (131) above is repeated below as (147). Lucy's appeal for understanding is clear in this example as is the fact that the nurse indeed does understand Lucy's appeal for solidarity, as she reflects Lucy's *you know* in *I know, I know*.

(147)   Lucy: she held me so tight I-I **you know** ↑ I couldn't I couldn't tell her
Nurse: I know I know

(*WHILE* 00.13.17)

Cinema+DVD+ TV3	SVT
Hon kramade mig så hårt. Jag kunde inte säga sanningen… [She hugged me so hard. I could not tell the truth…]	Vad ska jag göra? Hon höll mig så hårt att jag inte kunde säga som det var. [What should I do? She held me so tight that I could not tell it like it was.]

None of the TTs translate *you know* here. The three dots (…) in the Cinema, DVD, and TV3 subtitles may indicate a function of appeal, but as this function is difficult to distinguish from other possible functions denoted by three dots, e.g. hesitation and pauses, it is not categorised as a translation here.

Another example of the appealing **SOL** function is (148), below. Here, the character Tracy is talking to her husband's colleague, Somerset, asking for advice on how to handle her new life and her marriage in a city she does not feel at home in. *You know* is used three times by Tracy in this extract.

(148)   Somerset: why don't you talk to him about it tell him how you feel
Tracy: I can't **you know (1)** → I can't be a burden │ especially now │ │ I'll get used
to things **you know (2)** ↑I think I just │I wanted to talk to someone who's
lived here for a long time │ │ I mean, upstate **you know (3)** ↓ it's a
completely different environment

(*SEVEN* 00.55.29)

Cinema+DVD+ TV4	SVT
Prata med honom. Berätta hur du känner dig. [Talk to him. Tell him how you feel.]	Varför talar du inte om för honom hur du känner dig? [Why don't you tell him how you feel?]
Jag kan inte ligga honom till last. Särskilt inte nu. [I can't be a burden.	Jag vill inte ligga honom till last. Särskilt inte nu. [I don't want to be a burden.

Especially not now]	Especially not now.]
Jag vänjer mig **nog...** [I'll get used to it **probably** …]	Jag vänjer mig. [I'll get used to it.]
Jag ville prata med någon som har bott här länge. [I wanted to talk to someone who's lived here for a long time.]	Jag vill bara prata med nån som har bott här länge. [I just want to talk to someone who's lived here for a long time.]
Jag menar, det är så annorlunda inåt landet. [I mean, it's so different upstate.]	Uppåt landet är det en helt annan miljö. [Upstate it's a completely different environment.]

The appealing **SOL** function is clear in the ST in example (148). Tracy is appealing for Somerset's solidarity and understanding by using *you know*. The three instances of *you know* are not clearly translated into any of the TTs. The Cinema, DVD, and TV4 versions show some kind of paraphrasing translation for the second occurrence of *you know*, but it is not a clear translation of the ST function of *you know*: the Swedish modal particle *nog* is used in the Cinema, DVD, and TV4 subtitles. *Nog* can here best be translated back into 'probably' or 'surely', together with the hesitating character of the added three dots, illustrating an uncertainty on the part of the speaker. This Swedish modal particle is thus not a translation so much of the appeal for solidarity as of the insecurity of the speaker. In the third instance of *you know* in example (148), the DP *I mean* is used in the ST. This DP is translated clearly in the Cinema, DVD, and TV4 subtitles, perhaps "making up for" the loss of translations of *you know* throughout the example. The SVT subtitles do not include any translation of *you know* in example (148). In comparison, the Cinema, DVD, and TV4 subtitles seem to exhibit more of the interpersonal function of *you know* than the SVT subtitles do. Not only the SVT subtitles, but all four TTs lose most of the appealing **SOL** function displayed in the use of *you know* in the ST.

The appealing **SOL** function of *you know* in the corpus reflects the nature of the characters in the films. Tracy in *SEVEN* (example (148)) is a pleasant and fairly timid character who is anxious about coming to terms with her new life. Stanley in *WAG* is also a quite pleasant character, somewhat bitter about the fact that he has produced a number of Hollywood films but never achieved much recognition for this. He takes a great deal of pride in his work and wants to be acknowledged for it. In *WAG* he is hired to do a job he knows no one will credit him for, and he resents this more and more. In (149), below, his pride in his work and his worry about not being able to "close up the thing in style" are starting to show. This example includes three instances of *you know* as an appeal for solidarity, as Stanley is appealing to the solidarity of the man who hired him for this particular assigment, Conrad Brean ("Connie").

(149)   Stanley: aw c'mon Connie let me close up the thing in style │ **you know (1)** ↑ I've
         come to think it's my thing if you take a job you take a job and many times
         it's just a job **you know (2)** ↑ and then <u>you know what I mean</u> ↑
    Conrad: a hell of a ride Stanley a hell of a ride
    Stanley: isn't it isn't it **you know (3)** ↑ you take the bitter with the sweet or the sweet with
         bitter what's that expression

(*WAG* 01.03.56)

Cinema+DVD+ SVT	TV4
Låt mig ge det här en flott avslutning. [Let me give this a stylish closure.]	Kom igen, låt mig avsluta det här med stil. [Come on, let me finish this in style.]
Det känns som min grej. Ibland känns ett jobb bara som ännu ett jobb. [It feels like my thing. Sometimes a job feels just like another job.]	Det här känns som min grej. Ofta är jobben bara jobb. [This feels like my thing. Often the jobs are just jobs.]
Du vet vad jag menar? [You know what I mean?]	Men ibland, du vet… [But sometimes, you know…]
Ja, visst är det? Man får ta vinet med vattnet eller hur man nu säger. [Yes, isn't it? You take the wine with the water or however one says.]	Visst är det. Man får ta det onda med det goda, eller hur säger man? [Sure it is. You take the bad with the good, or how does one say?]

None of the three instances of *you know* are translated into any of the TTs. The phrase *you know what I mean* is, however, translated into all four TTs as *Du vet vad jag menar?* in the Cinema, DVD, and SVT subtitles and *du vet…* ('you know…') in the TV4 subtitles, respectively. This can be compared to the translation of the monitoring **CLAR** function above (cf. (144)) where the phrase *know what I mean* is also translated into all four TTs while the instance of *you know* is not. *you know what I mean* in (144) illustrates the link between the monitoring **CLAR** function and the appealing **SOL** function in that both functions focus on the speaker's wish to make the hearer understand something. Where the monitoring **CLAR** function is more directed towards the cognitive side of the proposition ("Do you understand the content of what I am saying?"), the appealing **SOL** function is more focused on the emotional level ('Do you understand the underlying emotional content of what I am trying to say?"). In the scene of example (149), Stanley physically attempts to make Conrad listen to him and understand him by poking his back as they are getting into a car, and Conrad's back is against Stanley. The appealing **SOL** function of *you know* is not translated into any of the TTs in this example, whereas the same function of a longer phrase with a higher degree of propositional content is translated into all four TTs.

    One final example of the appealing **SOL** function of *you know* will be given. (150) is the one example in the corpus with the most instances of *you know* in one and the same utterance. *You know* in this example signifies characteristics of the speaker and her situation. Lucy is an involuntarily single woman who in this scene is talking to the man she thinks she is in love with, appealing to his understanding of her unsatisfactory life as a single woman. An unusual detail in this example is the fact that the hearer is in a coma and cannot hear the speaker's appeal for understanding, let alone offer any kind of feedback.

(150)

Lucy: it's just that **you know (1)** →when I was when I was a kid I always imagined what I would be like or where I would be or what I would have when I got older and **you know (2)** → it was the normal stuff **you know (3)** ↓ I'd have a house and family and things like that mm not **you know (4)** ↑ not that I'm complaining or anything cause I **you know (5)** ↑ I have I have I have a cat have an apartment um sole possession of the remote control │ │that's very important │ │ it's just I never met anybody that I could laugh with **you know (6)** ↑

(*WHILE* 00.17.42)

Cinema+DVD+TV3	SVT
När jag var liten - [When I was little-]	Som liten fantiserade jag alltid om hur det skulle vara… [When I was little I always fantasised about how it would be…]
- drömde jag alltid om hur jag skulle...bli - [I always dreamed about how I would…be-]	…och vad jag skulle ha när jag blev stor. […and what I would have when I grew up.]
- eller var jag skulle vara eller ha när jag blev större. Det vanliga... [-or where I would be or have when I grew up. The usual…]	Det var det gamla vanliga, hus, familj och sånt. [It was the normal things, a house, a family and things like that.]
Jag skulle ha hem och familj och sånt. [I would have a home and a family and things like that.]	Jag beklagar mig inte… för jag har en katt och en lägenhet. [I'm not complaining… because I have a cat and an apartment]
Jag klagar inte... [I'm not complaining...]	Jag bestämmer själv över fjärrkontrollen. [I'm in charge of the remote control.]
Jag har katt...och lägenhet... [I have a cat…and an apartment…]	Men jag har aldrig träffat nån jag kan skratta med. [But I have never met anyone I can laugh with.]
Har fjärrkontrollen för mig själv... Mycket viktigt. (Have the remote control to myself… Very important.]	
- Men... - [-But…-]	
...jag har aldrig träffat nån som jag kunnat ha roligt med. […I've never met anyone who I could have fun with.]	

The character Lucy uses *you know* quite extensively throughout the film *WHILE* and in a majority of cases, these instances of *you know* have an appealing **SOL** function. This function is not translated once in the TTs and so the appealing function of the six occurrences of *you know* in (150) is not present in the TTs.

The emphatic **SOL** function has quite a few translation tokens, but only 2 different types: there are 9 instances of exclamation marks (!) and 2 instances of the adverb *faktiskt* ('actually'). Both of these translation types illustrate the paraphrases of the emphatic **SOL** function, "you should know" and "it's obvious", as well as the speaker's possible authority in

the discourse, informing the hearer of that which should be known to him/her. (132) above is repeated as (151) below in a reduced version.

(151)   Midge: Ox shh uh he might hear you **you know** ↓
                                        (*WHILE* 00.37.12)

Cinema+DVD+ TV3	SVT
Han kan höra dig**!**	Tyst, han kan höra dig.
[He can hear you**!**]	[Quiet, he can hear you.]

In example (151), Midge tries to stop her husband talking by hushing him and using the emphatic **SOL** function of *you know*. Her utterance could be paraphrased into "you should understand (that he might hear you)", or "it is obvious (that he might hear you)". The Cinema, DVD and TV3 subtitles use the exclamation mark (!) as a translation, while the SVT subtitles do not translate the emphatic **SOL** function of *you know*, but do transmit an authoritative sense by translating *shh* into *tyst* ('quiet').

Example (152) below, shows the translation *faktiskt* in the SVT subtitles.

(152)   Jim: just drink your coffee Finch
         Finch: **you know** ↓ Jim it's moccachino
         Jim: what
         Finch: what I'm drinking it's moccachino it's not coffee
         Jim: what's the difference
                                        (*AMPIE* 00.04.10)

Cinema+DVD+ TV3	SVT
Det är mocccachino.	Det är **faktiskt** moccachino.
[It is moccachino.]	[It is **actually** moccachino.]

The character Finch in example (152) is quite a posh young man who reads Latin and likes to label his coffee somewhat more luxuriously as *moccachino*. Jim, on the other hand, is the average American high school student and has no idea what moccachino is. In (152), Finch informs Jim in an authoritative way that what he is drinking is not simply coffee but moccachino, and he emphasises this by using the emphatic **SOL** function of *you know*, indicating "You should know, Jim, it's moccachino". The Cinema, DVD, and TV3 subtitles do not translate this function of *you know*, but the SVT subtitles use the adverb *faktiskt*, which often has the function of denoting emphasis (Nilsson 2005:107-108).

6.5.4 The mitigation-marker translated

The **MIT** function of *you know* has 35 instances in the STs. Only two of these are translated, and both translations occur in the TV3 subtitles of the film *AMPIE* as *nog* ('probably') and *ju* ('as you know'). The **MIT** function is the least translated function of *you know*: an average of 1.4 % of all 35 ST instances are translated into any of the four TTs. Example (153) below is one of the two translated instances of *you know* with a **MIT** function.

(153) Kevin: **you know** → Finch it's │it's senior year I mean don't you think it's time you learned
            how to take a dump at school

<div align="right">(AMPIE 00.25.56)</div>

Cinema+DVD	SVT	TV3
Du går sista året. Är det inte på tiden att du lär dig skita i skolan? [You're doing your last year. Isn't it time you learned to shit at school?]	Det är sista ring. Är det inte dags att du lär dig skita på skolans mugg? [It's senior year. Isn't it time you learn to shit in the loo at school?]	Det är **ju** sista året. Borde du inte lära dig att skita på skolan nu? [**As you know**, this is the last year. Shouldn't you learn to shit at school now?]

In example (153), Kevin is telling his friend Finch that it is time he learned how to make use of the restroom facilities at their school instead of going home each time he needs to go to the bathroom. Kevin is trying to tone down the message of his utterance to save his own face, as well as Finch's, by using DPs *you know* and *I mean*. *You know* is translated in the TV3 subtitles into *ju*, here functioning as a down-toner of the message, but also as a marker of inclusion, indicating "You should know that it is senior year and that you ought to learn to use the school facilities". *Ju* may not be quite as hedging as *you know* in the subtitles, but still adheres to the **MIT** function of *you know* put forward in the ST.

Another example of the **MIT** function of *you know* is (154), below. There are two instances of *you know* in this utterance and neither of them are translated. Example (154) is taken from a scene in *PULP* where Susan, the wife of a Governor, is telling her assistant, Richard, who to take on to help the Governor hide some embarrassing incidents not suitable for the voters' eyes and ears. The woman Susan wants for the job, Libby, has a history of mental illness and Richard thus politely questions this choice. The political hierarchy plays a role in this example as Richard in effect has a subordinate position compared to Susan's. Richard's position possibly influences his choice of words and his hedging in (154).

(154) Susan: she seems very stable now she's been back home for 18 months you and
            Henry can fly back tomorrow and brief her
        Richard: oh that's good │that she's stable because **you know (1)** ↓ you're <u>kind of</u>
            putting the whole campaign in her hands now **you know** ↓ **(2)**
        Susan: yes I know
        Richard: well that's good

<div align="right">(PRIMARY 00.46.24)</div>

Cinema	SVT	DVD+TV3
Så bra...att hon är frisk. [Good…that she is well.] För då vilar kampanjen i hennes händer. [Because then the campaign is in her hands.]	Bra att hon är stabil. För vi lägger hela valkampanjen i hennes händer. [Good that she's stable. Because we're putting the whole election campaign in her hands.]	Vad bra att hon är stabil. [How good that she is stable.] Du lägger hela kampanjen i hennes händer. [You're putting the whole campaign in her hands.]

Richard's first comment, including the two instances of *you know*, also contains one instance of *kind of* (underlined in the example), adding to the toning down of the message. The TTs treat the ST differently, but all four have in common a non-inclusion of the **MIT** function of *you know*. The Cinema subtitles add three dots (*Så bra...att hon är frisk* ('Good…that she is well.')) and may have a down-toning effect, but this is not completely clear. The DVD+TV3 subtitles provide absolutely no mitigating function, and are stripped of all politeness. The SVT subtitles have a small sign of mitigation in the use of personal pronouns: the ST pronoun *you* (referring to Susan only) in *you're kind of putting the whole campaign in her hands* is

<div align="center">172</div>

changed into *we* in the SVT subtitles' *För vi lägger hela valkampanjen i hennes händer* ('Because we're putting the whole election campaign in her hands'). By using *we*, the SVT version of Richard includes himself in the group which is putting the election campaign in Libby's hands, and does not single out Susan as the only risk-taker.

The final example of the **MIT** function of *you know* is (155) below, which includes two instances of mitigating *you know*.

(155)   Jimmie: don't fucking Jimmie me Jules okay don't fucking Jimmie me there's nothing
that you're gonna say that's gonna make me forget that I love my wife is
there │ now look **you know (1)** ↓ she comes home from work in about an
hour and a half the graveyard shift at the hospital you gotta make some
phone calls you gotta call some people well then do it and then get the fuck
out of my house before she gets here
Jules: hey that's cool and the gang **you know (2)** ↓ we don't wanna fuck your shit up
all we wanna do is call my people and get'em bring us in that's all.

(*PULP* 01.54.50)

Cinema+ DVD+TV4	SVT
Sluta smöra för mig! [Stop buttering me up!]	Sluta smöra för mig! [Stop buttering me up!]
Vad du än säger glömmer jag aldrig att jag älskar min fru. [Whatever you say I will never forget that I love my wife.]	Vad du än säger glömmer jag aldrig att jag älskar min fru. [Whatever you say I will never forget that I love my wife.]
Hon kommer hem från jobbet om en och en halv timme. [She is coming home from work in one and a half hour.]	Hon kommer hem från jobbet snart. [She is coming home from work soon.]
Nattskiftet på sjukhuset. Måste du ringa några samtal? [The night shift in the hospital. You have to make some calls?]	Hon har haft nattskiftet. Måste du ringa några samtal? [She's had the night shift. Do you have to make some calls?]
Gör det, då, och stick sen innan hon kommer hem. [Do it, then, and then get out of here before she comes home.]	Gör det, då, och stick sen innan hon kommer hem. [Do it, then, and then get out of here before she comes home.]

This scene from *PULP* takes place just as the characters Jules and Vega have brought a dead body to Jimmie's house. Jimmie is not happy about this and wants them to dispose of the body before his wife comes home, sees the dead body and possibly divorces him. In (155), Jimmie uses quite a loud and angry voice up until *now, look, you know* where he slows down, takes a breath and looks less angry. Jimmie mitigates his anger here by using *now, look, you know* as well as a softer tone of voice. The speaker uses *you know* together with other mitigating features (attention-seekers *now* and *look*) to tone down the message and his own anger. In (155), Jules answers quietly *Hey, that's cool and the gang, you know*, also using *you know* as a **MIT** marker to tone down the hostility of the whole situation. None of these instances of *you know* are translated into the TTs. The Cinema, DVD, and TV4 subtitles, on the one hand, and the SVT subtitles on the other, are very similar and do not include any type of mitigation of the message.

6.6 Summary

The main aim of the present chapter has been to examine the functions *you know* has in the corpus, and to see whether or not the Swedish linguistic means used as translations reflect the different functions of the DP. I have decoded the many functions of *you know* found in the corpus, and classified them according to a functional continuum of textual functions (*you know* as a frame-marker (**FRAME**), or clarification marker (**CLAR**)), and interpersonal functions (*you know* as an appeal for hearer solidarity (**SOL**), or face threat mitigation (**MIT**)). The classification is based on the following seven parameters (first introduced in 4.3.1): (i) intonation of *you know*; (ii) pauses used in connection to *you know*; (iii) collocations of *you know*; (iv) position of *you know* in an utterance; (v) type of utterance of which *you know* is part; (vi) body language of speaker; and (vii) larger social context of *you know*. In addition, the classification of the functions of *you know* is contrasted with a number of cross-theoretical previous studies of the DP, relevant to the classification presented in the present study. The translations of *you know* have been viewed in relation to the four functions found, quantitatively as well as qualitatively.

There are 265 occurrences of *you know* in the film corpus. 61 of these are translated into at least one of the four TTs Cinema, DVD, the public service TV channel SVT, and the commercial TV channel TV3+TV4, making a total of 130 translations in all four subtitling versions combined. 31 individual translation types are used in all four TTs combined.

The most common function of *you know* in the STs is **SOL**, followed by **FRAME**, and **CLAR**. The least common function is **MIT**. The order of frequency of the translated functions of *you know* is somewhat different compared to the order of frequency of the functions in the STs: **CLAR,** which is the third most common function in the STs is the second most translated, and **FRAME**, the second most common function in the STs, is the third most translated function in the STs. However, the order of frequency of **SOL** and **MIT** is the same as in the STs.

There are some slight quantitative and qualitative differences between the TTs' ways of translating *you know*. Quantitatively, all four TTs show similar totals of translated tokens of *you know*, although the DVD subtitles include a few more translations than the other three TTs. There are some differences in the treatment of the functions of *you know* in the four TTs, i.e. the TTs do not always translate the functions an equal amount of times. These differences are not very striking, however. Qualitatively, there are some minor differences too. The DVD subtitles stand out somewhat in comparison to the others, by including a few more translation types. The Cinema subtitles have almost as many types as the DVD subtitles, while both the public service TV subtitles and the commercial TV subtitles have somewhat fewer translation types. The numbers of the Cinema subtitles, on the one hand, and the other subtitles, on the other, do not suggest that the different constraints put on these media (cf. 3.4.4) influence the number of translation tokens and types of *you know* in the corpus of the present study.

All in all, the quantitative results show that the function of *you know* most regularly translated in the subtitles is the textual one, although there are more occurrences of *well* with an interpersonal function in the films. One reason for the tendency of translating the textual function more may be the clear correspondence between *you know* and *du vet/ni vet/vet du*

(*vad*) ('you know (what) /'know you'). These Swedish corresponding translations are used far more often as translations of the textual functions than of the interpersonal functions, where other translation solutions are employed. *Du vet/ni vet/vet du(vad)* are more or less default translations of *you know* and possibly chosen intuitively as translations of the textual functions **FRAME** and **CLAR**. The attention-seeking **FRAME** function of *you know* has a high translation frequency and corresponds well with both *vet du (vad)* and *du vet*. *You know* with a **CLAR** function is also translated frequently, most often into corresponding *du vet/ni vet*. The fact that the **MIT** function is hardly translated at all obviously has an impact on the quantitative results.

The qualitative results show a variety in the types of translations used. The core function of *you know*, i.e. a supposed shared knowledge (cf. 6.2.1), is transferred to the subtitles in many different ways. The four most common translations of *you know*, in descending order of frequency, are *du vet/ni vet/vet du* ('you know'), *ju* ('as you know'), *alltså* ('that is'), and *nog* ('probably'). The rest of the translations (e.g. – (dash); *faktiskt* ('actually'), *men* ('but'), *menar jag* ('I mean'), and *förstår du* ('you see')) have fewer occurrences. The variety of functions that *you know* demonstrates in the film soundtracks is most often effectively illustrated in the subtitles. All four functions are translated, and the translations often reflect the way each function relates to the core function of *you know*. However, the mitigating function (**MIT**) is hardly ever translated. This is unfortunate as important interpersonal features of the films may be lost. *You know* is the only DP out of the four DPs included in the present study, which demonstrates hardly any translations of the **MIT** function.

In conclusion, there is a great variety of Swedish linguistic means used as translations of *you know*, and they creatively reflect the various functions of *you know*. However, when the **MIT** function and other functions (e.g. many occurrences of *you know* with a **SOL** function in the SVT subtitles) are not translated, important parts of the film discourse, characterisations, and the main plot, may be lost.

7 *I mean*

7.1 Introduction

In the present chapter, the results of the corpus analysis of the DP *I mean* (as in e.g. *David probably wouldn't come here I mean he's still getting over Lesley and everything*), and its translations will be presented. *I mean* will first be defined and classified functionally, using various parameters as well as previous classifications from a few different studies. A quantitative and qualitative account of *I mean* and its translations will then be presented. The quantitative analysis includes an overview of the distribution of the ST occurrences of *I mean*, its pragmatic functions, and translations. The qualitative analysis, which is the main focus of the chapter, is devoted to a discussion on the translations of *I mean* found in the corpus.

7.2 Definition and functional distribution of *I mean*

I mean has quite a few characteristics in common with *you know*. The main similarity is summarised by Schiffrin: "[*you know* and *I mean*] are two markers whose literal meanings directly influence their discourse use [but] both markers also have uses which are less directly related to their literal meanings" (1987:267). *You know* and *I mean* are also, as opposed to *well* and *like*, complete phrases with a subject and a verb. One difference between the two DPs, which is directly related to the literal meanings of their respective pronouns, is the fact that *you know* is more hearer oriented while *I mean* is more speaker oriented (Schiffrin 1987:299; Holmes & Stubbe 1995:70; Fox Tree & Schrock 2002:744). While *you know* often is used as a means to attain hearer feedback, "*I mean* is thought to be used to focus addressees' attention, but without explicitly expressing addressees' feedback, although speakers may monitor understanding in addressee replies" (Fox Tree & Schrock 2002:735). The core function of *I mean* is the speaker's modification of his/her own ideas and intentions (Schiffrin 1987:267). This core function can be divided into several interrelated functions.

Although *I mean* is one of the least semantically bleached (Fuller 2003:23) of the DPs under consideration in the present study (cf. 2.2.1 for a discussion on pragmaticalisation), it is still possible to separate its referential non-discourse use from its non referential discourse use. Examples (156)-(158) below are examples of *I mean* with a referential use, where a removal of *I mean* cannot be made without rendering the utterances ungrammatical and/or awkward.

> (156)   **I mean** this from the bottom of my heart (*WAG* 01.01.07)
>
> (157)   this shit's gotta stop and **I mean** it (*BETTY* 00.53.19)
>
> (158)   I-I wish everyone would just calm down a little and when I say everyone **I mean** the press and the TVcrews and all my colleagues (*PRIMARY* 01.37.22)

The three examples above have in common with each other, in addition to the referential use of *you know*, an object following the DP (*this*, *it*, and *the press and the TV crews and all my colleagues*). *I mean* in both (156) and (157) do not show the core function of DP *I mean*, as they do not specifically entail a modification of the speaker's ideas or intentions. The function of *I mean* in (158), however, is closer to the core function of DP *I mean* since this instance modifies the speaker's previous part of the utterance. In (158), the longer utterance *and when I say everyone I mean* is used to clarify and modify the previous part of the utterance. Were we to remove the part *and when I say everyone*, the phrase *I mean* could possibly function as a DP with the same meaning (i.e. a modification of the previous part of the utterance) as the original complete utterance. It would, nevertheless, be quite a clumsy utterance and it may well not be possible to remove *I mean* without making the utterance incomprehensible. (159), below, is thus questionable, but an illustration of the similarity in function between referential *I mean* in (158) and its non-referential counterpart in (159).

(159)   I-I wish everyone would just calm down a little **I mean** the press and the TV crews and all my colleagues (fabricated example)

A clearer (and authentic) example of DP *I mean* is given in (160), below. Here *I mean* has utterance-medial position, a common position for this particular DP (Erman 1987:51). The reason for the medial position of *I mean* is the function this DP has of signalling that a clarification of (a part of) a previous utterance or discourse is to come in the following (part of the) utterance/discourse. In (160), the utterance *David probably wouldn't come here* is specified further by *he's still getting over Lesley and everything*. Utterance-medial *I mean* here signals the introduction of this specification and as it is giving the reason for the previous utterance, it could be paraphrased into e.g. *because*, *since* or *as*.

(160)
David probably wouldn't come here **I mean** he's still getting over Lesley and everything.

(*BETTY* 00.43.53)

If *I mean* were removed from (160), the utterance would still be grammatically correct.

Referential *I mean*, as seen in examples (156)-(158), will not be discussed further in this chapter, but focus will be on the non-referential DP *I mean*, as exemplified in (160).

7.2.1 Some previous multifunctional studies of *I mean*

The classification made of *I mean* in the present study is my own. However, a number of studies have influenced and contributed to the analysis of *I mean* presented here (e.g. Schiffrin1987; Erman 1987; Fox Tree & Schrock 2002) some of which will be discussed below. As with all other DPs, it is difficult to define the various functions of *I mean*. Despite this, research on *I mean* seems to agree on its core function. *I mean* is said to "forewarn upcoming adjustments" (Fox Tree & Schrock 2002:728), modify the speaker's own ideas and intentions (Schiffrin 1987; Fuller 2003), "introduce utterances which make clearer the ideas and intentions of prior utterances" (Kaeser 2001:56), and to be used "in connection with change of the informational content […] in the text" (Erman 1987:119). Most scholars also

agree that the core function of *I mean* can be further subdivided, depending on what speakers want to clarify, as well as on how they choose to clarify this (e.g. Kaeser 2001:728).

Schiffrin discusses the core function of *I mean* in connection to the predicate *mean* (1987:296):

> *I mean* marks a speaker's upcoming modification of the meaning of his/her own prior talk. The predicate 'mean', however, has several different senses, and thus the modifications marked by *I mean* include both expansions of ideas and explanations of intention.

Schiffrin thus considers *I mean* to have a core function of modification, with different related senses, including expansions of ideas, on the one hand, and explanations of intention, on the other. The first sense, according to Schiffrin, can be defined as meta-linguistic, and the second as meta-communicative, "the former since it focuses on ideas, the latter since it focuses on the speaker's communicative act" (1987:304).

Fox Tree & Schrock draw on Schiffrin (1987:304), stating that the core (in their words "basic") meaning of *I mean* is "to indicate upcoming adjustments, from the word level on up to the negotiation of meaning". Included in the core meaning of *I mean* is also the fact that its meaning focuses on the speaker and not the addressee (in contrast, *you know* focuses on the latter), as *I mean* includes the pronoun 'I', and through this encourages hearers to focus mainly on speakers' thoughts (Fox Tree & Schrock 2002:744; Schiffrin 1987:299). Schiffrin compares *I mean* with *you know* and comes to the conclusion that "in propositions in which speakers predicate something about themselves, they use *I mean* more than they use y'know" (ibid.).[39]

There seems to be agreement among scholars that the core function of *I mean* is to signal that some sort of modification, clarification, or specification of a part of the preceding discourse is to come in the subsequent discourse. *I mean* is seen in the present study as a means of signalling modification, clarification, or specification either textually or interpersonally.

Three multifunctional classifications of *I mean*, namely Schiffrin (1987); Erman (1987); and Fox Tree & Schrock (2002), which all divide the core function of *I mean* into several interrelated functions, will be discussed here in relation to the functional distribution of *I mean* in the present study. These analyses view *I mean* as having a core function possible to divide into subfunctions and, together with the seven parameters used for the classification of all four DPs in the present study (see 4.3.1), they form the basis for the classification of *I mean*, presented below.

Erman's (1987:118-119) material consists of twelve face-to-face conversations of a total of 60,000 words, extracted from *A Corpus of English Conversation* (CEC, Svartvik & Quirk 1980). In Erman's model, *I mean* is classified as a "connective element", functioning on a 'micro-level' and on a 'macro-level' (cf. Erman's classification of *you know*, 6.2.1). She suggests that *I mean* functioning at the micro-level introduces a clarification or mitigation, while *I mean* at the macro-level introduces a justification, modification or mitigation. The difference between these two levels, Erman states, is that *I mean* at the micro-level introduces "a modification of one word or phrase", while *I mean* at the macro-level introduces "a more

---

[39] Schiffrin's definition of *you know* in her study (1987) is different from that of the present study, as the former has a more referential view of *you know* and its functions than the latter has.

substantial piece of discourse" (1987:119). The functions of *I mean* at the micro - and macro levels are discussed briefly below.

According to Erman, *I mean* at the micro-level is not very common, but when it is used it fulfils the functions of (i) introducing "a clarification of some part of a previous phrase (1987:118), and of (ii) introducing "a mitigation of some part of a previous phrase" (ibid.). The clarifying function of *I mean* is exemplified by Erman as follows: (1987:109, transcription simplified):

(161)   Uhm is there a doctrine about that │**I mean** a doctrine
             about uh disfavouring American applicants │should there
             not be one │

In (161), the speaker clarifies the previous part of the utterance: s/he further explains that what s/he means by *a doctrine about that* is actually *a doctrine about disfavouring American applicants*. *That* is thus clarified by including more specific information. *I mean* is used as a signal of the clarification taking place.

The second function of *I mean* at the micro-level, Erman states, is to mitigate some part of a previous phrase. Example (162) below illustrates this (1987:230, transcription simplified):

(162)   A: And all the transformation things
             B: [two or three sylls]
             A: **I mean** every transformation word that I've heard

Erman does not include an explanation of the particular example above, but says that *I mean* with this function, like *I mean* in example (161), refers to "only one word in the previous clause or phrase, which [is] then modified in some way in the succeeding discourse" (1987:118). In (161), the one word referred to and modified in some way is *that*; in (162) it is *(transformation) things*. In comparison, *you know* at the micro-level in Erman's model refers not only to one word, but occurs more often between longer information units.

I mean at the macro-level introduces a larger piece of discourse than *I mean* at the micro-level. It is used to fulfil three functions, i.e. (i) to introduce "a justification of a previous claim which typically conveyed a personal stance (1987:119), (ii) to introduce "a modification of a previous statement which made this more precise" (ibid.), and (iii) to introduce "a mitigation of a previous statement which made the speaker less committed" (ibid.). The first of these macro-level functions is shown in (163), below (1987:81, transcription simplified).

.

(163)   And I'm not in a main line paper │but I'm sure it'll take me all my time to
             do it in three weeks │**I mean** I've seen what it's been like for you I know
             you've had more │on the other hand I must allow myself the good

Erman states that the second part of the utterance in (163) is the speaker's justification for making the claim in the first part of the utterance, and that this justification is signalled by *I mean*. One quality of this function is that the speaker often refers to his/her own experiences (1987:81).

The second function of *I mean* at the macro-level is seen in (164) below (1987:95, transcription simplified).

.

(164)   A: The same at the board meetings │you know │**I mean** he takes over
B: Yes
A: The whole bloody thing

I mean in (164) co-occurs with *you know*, and the two DPs serve different functions according to Erman (1987:95). She says that *you know* serves the function of terminating a part of the utterance (the terminating function of *you know* is indicated by the pauses surrounding it), while *I mean* serves to "introduce the amplification of information" (1987:95), which makes the information more precise.

The third and final macro-level function of *I mean* presented by Erman is illustrated in the example below (1987:96, transcription simplified).

(165)   A: You like it there do you Monica
B: Well I love it there in a way **I mean** I don't want to stay there forever obviously or else it'll be terribly bad for me **I mean** it's been bad enough for me as it is I think […]

Example (165) introduces a mitigation of the statement *I love it there*, making the speaker less committed to this statement. This, Erman states, is a kind of modification through a correction of information, and the speaker "makes him/herself less committed to the truth and/or the strength of a previous claim […]" (1987:96).

In addition to the functions of *I mean* at the micro – and macro-level, Erman also argues that *I mean* can be used not only as a connective marker (which is the case with the five functions exemplified above), but also in incomplete structures as a "repair-marker". She further divides the repair function of *I mean* into four subfunctions (1987:135).

Schiffrin (1987:295-311) also finds various interrelated functions of *I mean* and she views these functions as "due to the polysemous meaning of the predicate 'mean'" (1987:295). Because of this polysemous meaning, modifications signalled by *I mean* "include both expansion of ideas and explanations of intention" (1987:296). Among the functions of *I mean* that Schiffrin locates are "clarification" (1987:297), "specification" (1987:298), "floor-gaining" (1987:308), "replacement repairs" (1987:301), and functions of "interactional relevance" (1987:305). The function of clarification is illustrated in (1987:156), where the speaker describes how her boyfriend proposed marriage to her (1987:297).

(166)   A: He says, 'Oh, I wish you could come with me!' And I said – I was very pro-proper, and prim! And I said, 'Oh, I couldn't go away with you.' And he says, '**I mean**, let's get married!' And I said, 'Oh, okay!'.

In (166), the quoted boyfriend's use of *I mean* functions as an explanation of his indirect previous suggestion (*I wish you could come with me*).

The function that Schiffrin labels as specification is exemplified below (1987:298).

(167)   A: She said, 'Y'know it was really very annoying t'sit here, during visitation while you people are rattling on.' **I mean** really indignant.

The speaker in (167) quotes another speaker, using *I mean* as a specification of how the speaker acted when she spoke, i.e. she was really indignant.

Example (168) shows a floor-gaining, attention-seeking function, as illustrated by Schiffrin (1987: 308, square brackets indicating overlapping speech).

(168)   […]
          A: It doesn't work that way.
          B: yeh that makes sense
          A: [Your cockroach…you wanna] step on a cockroach
          C: [**I mean** e-even if –even if –]
          […]

There are three speakers in (168), one of which (speaker C) has not said anything for a few turns. According to Schiffrin, when C decides to re-enter the discussion, she uses *I mean* to gain the floor (1987:308).

What Schiffrin labels "replacement repairs" is a type of self-repair where *I mean* signals that what is to come is a replacement of the previous part of an utterance. Schiffrin provides the following example with *I mean* as a replacement repair (1987:301):

(169)   A: Were your parents pretty strict or…
          B: Not at all. And not t'my disadvantage. **I mean** not t'my advantage as I-I
          see it now because I got everything I wanted then.

In (169), the speaker replaces *disadvantage* with *advantage* by using *I mean* as a marker of repair, and continuing the discourse rather than returning to the part which has been interrupted by the repair (1987:302).

Example (170), below, is an illustration of the interactional relevance function of *I mean* (this function mainly has to do with relationships between speakers in terms of (social) status), that Schiffrin finds in her corpus (1987:305, transcription simplified).

(170)   A: Um that's interesting. It's probably true.
          B: **I mean** what is your opinion? Or shouldn't we ask?
          A: Um no
          C: She's interviewing you, Jack
          B: She's of a younger element. I wanted to see what the younger element
          really think. **I mean** if you dare to eh offer an opinion.

The above example includes two occurrences of *I mean*, both uttered by speaker B as he is requesting an opinion from speaker A. Speaker A is an interviewer (Schiffrin herself), and speakers B and C are her interviewees, a fact that speaker C picks up on, and that influences the whole speech situation: speaker A is superordinate to speakers B and C in the sense that it is speaker A who has prepared and now monitors the discussion. Speaker B's request for speaker A's opinion is thus what Schiffrin calls a challenge, twice prefaced by *I mean*.

The third and final account of multifunctional *I mean* that will be brought up here is Fox Tree & Schrock's (2002). Fox Tree & Schrock draw on various previous studies, and examples from *A Corpus of English Conversation* (CEC, Svartvik & Quirk 1980), when categorising the functions of *I mean* (as well as of *you know*, cf. 6.2.1). They relate

multifunctional *I mean* to its core meaning as an indicator of upcoming adjustments from the word level to the negotiation of meaning, and relate all functions of *I mean* to this core function (based on Schiffrin's (1987) suggestion of the core meaning of *I mean*). They present a division of functions of *I mean* into five categories, based on "a wide array of disparate claims made by many researchers using different corpora" (2002:728): turn management, repairing, monitoring, organising, and interpersonal functions. Not all functions are exemplified in Fox Tree & Schrock's account of *I mean*. The functions which are not exemplified in the original are consequently not exemplified here either. The detailed account of the multifunctionality of *I mean* put forward in Fox Tree & Schrock (2002) is nevertheless worth discussing.

The turn management function is illustrated in Fox Tree & Schrock, and is repeated as (171), below (2002:741).

(171)　　A: They tend not to be so dramatic do they
　　　　　B: I I think it is true that a sort of
　　　　　A: **I mean** you're not going to get a sort of medal for uh drafting a
　　　　　beautiful new bill or something like that

Fox Tree & Schrock view the turn-initial *I mean* in (171) as the speaker's way of forewarning adjustments (which can be done turn-initially, turn-medially, and turn-finally). In (171), the speaker contributes "an adjustment to [his/her] prior turn, skipping over the other speaker's turn in-between" (2002:741).

According to Fox Tree & Schrock, *I mean* functioning as a repair may, among other things, signal a parenthetical remark or a change of mind. The monitoring function of *I mean* may be used when a speaker seeks an acknowledgement of understanding from the addressee after an adjustment has been made. Organisational functions of *I mean* are used in topic shifts, "such as introducing commentary, justification, phrasal level modification, and new information" (2002:742). Finally, what Fox Tree & Schrock refer to as the interpersonal function of *I mean* is exemplified in (172), below.

(172)　　How do you get on with this fellow Hart? **I mean** he's a nice fellow
　　　　　normally, but he's a hell of a – he's a big head in so many ways you know
　　　　　Reynard

This is an example of a politeness function of *I mean*. Fox Tree & Schrock state that "speakers might use *I mean* or *you know* to reduce their commitment to or distance themselves from a face-threatening utterance […] as a kind of interpersonal repair" (2002:733). The speaker in (172) above implies that *this fellow Hart* is not easy to get along with. In this example, *I mean* presages the less face-threatening rephrasing (as Fox tree & Schrock see it) *he's a nice fellow normally*.

The discussion above has shown that many studies of *I mean* view this DP as both a textual device signalling turn management, repairing, monitoring, organising, etc., as well as an interpersonal device demonstrating the speaker's attitude towards the communicative situation through showing interactional relevance, face threat mitigation, etc. Below follows my own classification of *I mean*. This classification is based on the parts of the

multifunctional approaches discussed above, as well as on the seven parameters used for analysing the DPs in the present study (cf. 4.3.1), and on the cross-theoretical framework (cf. 2.4 and 2.5) used in order to analyse the DPs of the present study.

7.2.2 Classification of *I mean* in the present study

My functional classification of *I mean* is based on the seven parameters used for analysing all four DPs in the present study (cf. 4.3.1), as well as on the cross-theoretical framework (cf. also 2.4 and 2.5) including the categorisations of *I mean* discussed above: primarily Erman (1987), Schiffrin (1987), and Fox Tree & Schrock (2002). The classification of *I mean* is my own, based on the material at hand, but it is compared to earlier classifications in the following to illustrate similarities and differences between the classifications.

The two-fold categorisation of *I mean*, mentioned by e.g. Schiffrin (1987:304), into meta-linguistic (including expansions of ideas) and meta-communicative (explanations of intention) is used here with the labels *textual* and *interpersonal*.

The different systems of interrelated subfunctions are narrowed down to the four functions seen below, with supplementary examples. These functions are not meant to include all the possible functions *I mean* can signal in discourse in general, but only the functions *I mean* conveys in the corpus relevant for the present study. The first two functions are positioned on the textual side of a functional continuum and the last two on the interpersonal side of a functional continuum: Frame marker (**FRAME**); Repair marker (**REPAIR**); Elaboration marker (**ELAB**); and Mitigation marker (**MIT**).

(173) **FRAME** A: can I get anyone more coffee
B: oh yes thank you
C: **I mean** → the way it is now │ you're taking the same risk as when you rob a bank
(*PULP* 00.01.02)

(174) **REPAIR** are you uh │**I mean** → are your parents with you
(*WHILE* 00.23.30)

(175) **ELAB** A: the spy satellites show it Mr Brean they show no war
B: then what good are they │ if they show no war **I mean**↑ │ w-what are we spending a quarter of a million dollars a year on the defence department what good are they if they show nothing and what are they useless or just broke or what
(*WAG* 00.39.59)

(176) **MIT** just tell him not to be abusive that's all **I mean** ↓ │ he kinda freaked out back there when he saw Marvin   (*PULP* 01.52.35)

It may seem surprising that there is no function labelled "Clarification" among the labels chosen here for *I mean*. The reason for this is the fact that the core meaning of *I mean* is a clarification/modification/specification of the previous (part of) an utterance and this function is integrated one way or another into all four functions above.

The labels of the four functions are either taken directly from the studies mentioned above, or approached in a slightly different manner. Below is a brief discussion of all four

functions and how they relate or do not relate with the three studies mainly influencing the classification (Erman (1987); Schiffrin (1987), and Fox Tree & Schrock (2002)), followed by a more detailed account of each function with additional examples. This is not meant to be a comprehensive description of the various labels, and how they are related per se, but simply a look into the different functional distributions of *I mean*, and how the functions are labelled. Each of the four functions will be discussed in more detail throughout this chapter, and additional examples will be provided.

FRAME and **REPAIR** are the two textual functions. What is referred to as **FRAME** in the present study is similar to what Schiffrin calls "floor-gaining" (1987:308) and what Fox Tree & Schrock name "turn management device" (2002:741). This function is seen as textual since it mainly structures the discourse and is often used utterance-initially as a transfer from one topic to the next within the discourse, or back to a topic discussed before the previous utterance(s). In example (173) above, character C refers back to a topic discussed by him and B before waitress A interrupted them. Character C thus reclaims the focus of the conversation by using *I mean*. *I mean* as a pure floor-gainer is usually quite far from the ideational meaning of *I mean* but means "I am now (re)claiming the floor".

The label **FRAME** also more or less covers what Fox Tree & Schrock refer to as an "organizational device used in topic shifts" (2002:742). This device is also textual, in that it organises discourse by introducing commentary and new information.

The label **REPAIR** is equal to what Erman, Schiffrin and Fox Tree & Schrock call "repair-marker", "replacement repairs", and "repair devices", respectively. This function is also textual as it structurally signals that what is to come is an alternative version of the previous part of an utterance. In the example of the **REPAIR** function above, example (174), the character starts out by saying *Are you*, then changes to *are your* via *uh*, a pause and DP *I mean*.

ELAB and **MIT** are the two interpersonal functions. The **ELAB** function is mentioned by Erman, who calls this function "justification" (1987:81). Erman's label "justification" is situated at the macro-level and "introduces a more substantial piece of discourse" (1987:119) rather than one word or phrase. The label **ELAB** introduces an elaboration and a clarification of a(n often) quite extensive piece of discourse, as does Erman's label "justification" (cf. example (163)), and in addition, it refers to a speaker's justification of his/her previous (part of an) utterance. It signals a clarification and further description of the reason behind the previous (part of a) speaker's utterance, as "one feature of this function is that the speaker often refers to his/her own experiences of life" (Erman 1987:81). It does not usually have a clear mitigating effect but more of an emphatic or persuasive function. In example (175) above, character B elaborates on and justifies his questioning of the spy satellites mentioned by character A, with a lengthy explanation signalled by *I mean*.

The **MIT** function is mentioned by Erman, Schiffrin, and Fox Tree & Schrock as "mitigation", "preface of request", and "a way of decreasing face threat", respectively. **MIT** equals mitigation of face threat and is used by speakers performing various face threatening acts (FTAs), such as requests, suggestions, commands, and disagreements. In example (176) above, the speaker performs the FTA of telling (commanding) the hearer what to say to a third

party. *I mean* is used here as a signal "presage[ing] a less face-threatening rephrasing as a kind of interpersonal repair" (Fox Tree & Schrock 2002:733).

To sum up, in the present study, the functions of *I mean* are classified as **FRAME**, **REPAIR**, **ELAB**, and **MIT**. The two functions **FRAME** and **REPAIR** are seen as operating textually, while the two functions **ELAB** and **MIT** are seen as operating interpersonally. The functions are not mutually exclusive, but one instance of *I mean* may signal two or more functions at the same time. The functions are situated in a functional continuum, and they all overlap with one another at times to a larger or lesser degree. However, when allowing for the seven parameters used for the analysis of all DPs in the present study (discussed in 4.3.1), alongside the cross-theoretical approach taken, one function of *I mean* is most often more salient in a given context than the remaining functions are.

Each of the four functions will now be looked at in more detail using examples with a surrounding context.

The two textual functions **FRAME** and **REPAIR** provide *I mean* with certain characteristics that are the same for both **FRAME** and **REPAIR**, but not necessarily so for the two interpersonal functions: e.g. (i) they both structurally signal that a clarification or modification of (one part of) an utterance is to come; (ii) they most often entail a pause before *I mean* or, if *I mean* is utterance-initial, they most often do not include a pause after *I mean*; (iii) they usually present *I mean* with a rising or declarative intonation; (iv) they are most often used for utterance-initial or utterance-medial *I mean*.

FRAME is the function with the most clearly textual characteristics. As mentioned before, included in this function are both clear floor-gaining functions and other organisational devices used in topic shifts, which structurally link utterances together. As opposed to the floor-gainer, the organisational device is most often not utterance-initial but utterance-medial. When the **FRAME** function of *I mean* is utterance-medial, there is often a pause before *I mean*. In a majority of cases, there is no pause after *I mean* with a **FRAME** function. Example (177) below, illustrates the floor-gaining function of *I mean*.

(177)

Daisy:	well we can offer her 200 000 not to print it
Richard:	and then kill her to make sure
Henry:	well **I mean** ↑│ the important thing is he didn't do anything wrong
	and he has nothing to be defensive about

(*PRIMARY* 00.49.39)

In (177), Henry interrupts Richard, a clear confirmation of the floor-gaining function of *I mean* (as well as of *well*) here. Like all floor-gainers, this example of *I mean* is (near-to) utterance-initial. As opposed to example (173) above, also a floor-gainer, *I mean* in (177) has a rising intonation which is common for this type of function in the corpus of the present study. The pause after *I mean* is very short and possibly there as a way of obtaining the other speakers' attention more than it is a sign of uncertainty (as Henry is interrupting, there is some overlapping speech between him and Richard, as well as some giggling from Daisy).

Example (178) below exemplifies *I mean* as a structural organisational device within a speaker's turn.

(178)

Del:	injins are stupid
Charlie:	Dale did you just say injins
Del:	indians indjins whatever │ │ **I mean** → they're always getting drunk and doing stupid shit

<div align="right">(BETTY 00.14.45)</div>

I mean in (178) is not a floor-gaining device since Del already holds the floor. It is, however, an organisational device, which textually refers back to a previous part of the discourse, i.e. the part before Charlie questions Del's politically incorrect choice of words. The main topic of this conversation is what type of people Del finds stupid. Charlie's turn breaks off this topic, but it is returned to through Del's use of quite a long pause followed by *I mean*. As most examples of textual functions of *I mean,* this example demonstrates a pause before but not after *I mean*.

REPAIR is the second of the textual functions of *I mean*. Because it is used for repairing parts of discourse, it is usually found in utterance-medial position, as in example (179), below. As with **FRAME**, in the corpus of the present study, there is usually no pause after *I mean* with a **REPAIR** function, but there is almost always a pause before. Pauses may also be common in the rest of the utterance, as are stuttering and words such as *uhm* (often used after *I mean*) or DP *well* (often used before *I mean*). Common collocates for *I mean* as a repair marker are pauses before and after *I mean*, stuttering and *umh*s, all of which are seen in (179).

(179)

| Girl: | so my friends they wanna know is it true you know that he's equipped |
| Kevin: | I have no idea Finch showers with his bathing suit on │ │ **I mean** ↑ │ │ uhm as a matter of fact i-it is true │ the guy is huge |

<div align="right">(AMPIE 00.26.21)</div>

The character Kevin in (179) begins answering the girl's question on the size of his friend Finch's private parts. He first says that he has no idea, then changes his mind as he remembers his friend asking him earlier to agree with anything anyone would ask him. Kevin signals his change of mind by using pauses on either side of *I mean*, and rephrases his answer to better suit his friend's request.

Even though *I mean* as a repair marker is most often utterance-medial, it may be utterance-initial as in (180) below.

(180)

Nadia:	hi James ready to study
Jim's dad:	oh he's always ready to study he's a real book worm this kid
Jim:	dad
Jim's dad:	**I mean** ↓ he's │ not not one of those nerdy │ guys but
Jim:	dad

<div align="right">(AMPIE 00.41.20)</div>

In this example, Jim's dad changes his mind and repairs his previous utterance after Jim has tried to stop him from embarrassing him too much. Jim's dad is proud of his son but Jim is very uncomfortable about being called a book worm in front of Nadia, whom he wants to impress. The dad quickly alters his previous utterance by using *I mean* as a signal of repair and tries to mend his mistake by saying to Nadia that Jim is not a nerdy guy.

On the interpersonal side of the continuum are the **ELAB** and **MIT** functions of *I mean*. These functions provide *I mean* with certain characteristics that are the same for both **ELAB** and **MIT**: e.g. (i) they both interpersonally signal that a clarification or modification of (one part of) an utterance is to come; (ii) they most often entail a pause after *I mean*; (iii) they usually present *I mean* with a rising (**ELAB**) or falling (**MIT**) intonation; (iv) they are most often used for utterance-medial *I mean*.

The **ELAB** function introduces a justification and as such a further clarification of the reason behind a speaker's previous (part of an) utterance. *I mean* with an **ELAB** function often has a rising intonation, and a pause after this type of *I mean* is common. It usually has either an emphatic (the emphatic function of *I mean* differs somewhat from the emphatic function of *you know*, cf. 6.2.2) or a persuasive function. The emphatic function is exemplified in (181) below.

(181)

| Vince: | it's legal to carry it but but but that doesn't matter cos get a load of this all right if you get stopped by a cop in Amsterdam it's illegal for them to search you │**I mean** ↑ that's a right that the cops in Amsterdam don't have |
| Jules: | oh man I'm going that's all there is to it |

(*PULP* 00.07.10)

The example above shows the character Vince telling his friend Jules about the legal aspects of drug possession in Amsterdam. He focuses on the fact that it is illegal for the police in Amsterdam to search people for drugs, highlighting the lack of power the police has by rephrasing *it's illegal for them to search you* into *that's a right the cops in Amsterdam don't have*, signalling the upcoming emphasis with *I mean*. As opposed to the other functions of *I mean*, the emphatic function does not signal an initiation of new information. The information in the part following *I mean* in (181) is essentially the same as the information in the part preceding *I mean*, i.e. "the police in Amsterdam are not entitled to search people for drugs". *I mean* is thus used here as an indication of the fact that what is to come is not new information but a further emphasis on what has already been said. In utterances where emphatic *I mean* is used, words of special importance for the utterance are usually stressed. In (181), stress is found in the prefix *il-* of *illegal* and in *don't*, suggesting that what Vince wants to emphasise is the contrast between the right of American police to search for drugs and the non-right of the Dutch police to do the same. As previously mentioned, speakers using *I mean* with an **ELAB** function, often refer to their own life experiences (cf. Erman 1987:81), as Vince in (181) does.

ELAB with a persuasive function is exemplified in (182), below.

(182)

| Jim: | c'mon Kev │tonight is the night │w-we are finally going to a post prom party on the lake **I mean** → we have been waiting for this for four years **I mean** → │ why else have we been friends with Stifler all this time right |

(*AMPIE* 01.13.04)

In example (182), the character Jim is trying to persuade his friend Kevin to come to a party. Kevin is not very enthusiastic about going to the party, but Jim gives him two reasons for going: *we have been waiting for this for four years* and *why else have we been friends with Stifler all this time*. Both reasons are initiated by *I mean*, here indicating that what is to come

is a justification of the previous utterance. Each *I mean* provides additional information to the utterance (unlike the emphatic **ELAB** function which does not present new information, cf. (181) above). Common collocations for this function in the corpus are *c'mon*, which is also a sign of persuasion, and the tag *right*, which signifies a wish for hearer feedback. Both *c'mon* and *right* are used in (182). The persuasive **ELAB** function of *I mean* is typically utterance-medial and a direct indication of the justification of the previous utterance. Again, Jim refers to his own life experience, which speakers using *I mean* with an **ELAB** function often do (cf. Erman 1987:81).

There are examples of the persuasive **ELAB** function which are not as clear as the one above, but which nonetheless are labelled with this function. The instances of *I mean* in example (183) below illustrate this.

<table>
<tr><td>(183)</td><td>George:</td><td>I think we just bring Betty down and just throw her into the set and see what happens</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Lyla:</td><td>I don't know</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>George:</td><td>**I mean (1)** → I-I tell the cast ahead of time and **I mean (2)** ↓ they'd all be prepped</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Lyla:</td><td>I'll think about it</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>George:</td><td>it'll be like live television │**I mean (3)** ↑ let's live on a the edge a little bit here c'mon Lyla we can break the mould</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Lyla:</td><td>I said I'll think about it</td></tr>
</table>

(*BETTY* 01.06.34)

The example above shows how actor George is trying to persuade Lyla, the producer of the soap he is starring in, to let him bring Betty to the set to see if she can act. Lyla is not keen on the idea (or at least she is pretending not to be), but George persists, giving her reasons both for why his idea will work (*I tell the cast ahead of time / they'd all be prepped*) and for going through with the idea in the first place (*let's live on a the edge a little bit here / we can break the mould*). The given reasons are prefaced by *I mean* functioning as a persuasive signal of the justification to come. The functions of the three instances of *I mean* in this example are not as clear-cut as in (182), but nevertheless categorised as part of the persuasive **ELAB** function. The first *I mean* in (183) is utterance-initial, which gives a more textual impression of the DP. If the interpersonal function of *I mean* was not considered here, the DP would seem to have the **FRAME** function of a floor-gainer. In contrast to the utterances in (177) above, there is an interpersonal link between George's first utterance and his second. This instance of *I mean* does structure the discourse, but it also provides additional information about what is going on between the two speakers, hence the interpersonal label of **ELAB**. The second example of *I mean* in (183) has qualities of emphatic *I mean* as seen in (181), as no new information is added to the second part of the utterance. It also has persuasive qualities, however, because of the overall persuasive purpose of George's utterances. The third and final *I mean* in (183) does not exactly signal a justification of the previous part of the utterance *It'll be like live television*, but has textual qualities in that it changes the topic somewhat. Nonetheless, this *I mean* is also labelled with a persuasive **ELAB** function as it introduces a third persuasive utterance in the discourse. As in (182), the persuasive *c'mon* is used in this utterance, as is the suggestive *let's*.

The final function of *I mean* found in the corpus is **MIT**. *I mean* with a **MIT** function is used in face threatening situations such as disagreements, requests and commands, and it

signals that what is to come is "a less face threatening rephrasing as a kind of interpersonal repair" (Fox Tree & Schrock 2002:733). The rephrasing may also be a longer specification of the part of the utterance prefacing *I mean*. There is quite often a pause after *I mean* with a **MIT** function, but there may also be a pause before. *I mean* signalling mitigation frequently has a falling or declarative intonation, but almost never a rising intonation. Common collocations for this function of *I mean* are various hedges (such as *kinda* in the example above), stuttering, hesitation, and words (or combinations of words) such as *but* and *yes/yeah*, and DPs *well* and *you know*.

Example (184) below, illustrates the **MIT** function of *I mean* with the type of interpersonal repair Fox Tree & Schrock discuss (in this example, Oz and Chris are two different names for one and the same character).

(184) Stifler: choir chick what the hell are you doing here
     Heather: well uh I was asking Chris to prom so do you wanna go
     Oz: ah yeah that'd be that'd be great
     Stifler: well just don't expect Oz to pay for the limo
     Oz: Stifler fuck│ **I mean** ↑ aaw │ │why do you have to be so insensitive
       all the time

                   (*AMPIE* 00.33.13)

In (184), Stifler is interfering as Heather is asking Oz to prom. Oz says yes to Heather and expresses his anger with Stifler's meddling by saying *Stifler fuck*. Oz quickly repairs his harsh choice of words with the less face threatening and specifying *why do you have to be so insensitive all the time*. This latter part of Oz's utterance is thus a kind of interpersonal repair and less face threatening rephrasing of *Stifler fuck*. The rising intonation of *I mean* with a **MIT** function in (184) is not so common in the corpus, but a declarative or a falling intonation is more widespread. The pause after *I mean* here is, however, a frequent feature of this function of *I mean*, as the stuttering and use of mumbling sounds such as *aaw*. The medial position of **MIT** *I mean* in (184) is common for all instances of **MIT** *I mean* in the corpus, but there are also examples of utterance-initial use of the DP. There are differences in the type of FTAs that *I mean* mitigates: examples of disagreement, requests, suggestions, etc. may include *I mean* as a mitigator.

There are also examples of *I mean* with a **MIT** function in the corpus where the interpersonal repair is a longer specification of the first part of the utterance. Consider (185), below

(185) Warner: well│ │Harvard is gonna be different Law School is a-a completely
       different world and │and I need to be serious
     Elle: of course
     Warner: **I mean** ↑ my family expects a lot from me
     Elle: right
     Warner: I expect a lot from me
     Elle: mhm.
     Warner: I plan on running for office some day

                   (*BLONDE* 00.06.38)

In this scene, Warner is breaking off his relationship with Elle, the break-up in itself being an FTA. Warner incorporates quite a few mitigating DPs in the process (e.g. *well*). Warner starts out giving Elle the reason he is breaking up with her, i.e. he needs to be serious. He uses *I*

mean as a clarification device which could possibly be paraphrased into "what is to come now is a specification of what being serious entails". He then gives three reasons: *my family expects a lot from me, I expect a lot from me* and *I plan on running for office some day*. Giving the reasons for the break-up is an FTA and Warner mitigates this FTA by using *I mean* as a marker of the interpersonal repair/specification that is to come.

The functions of *I mean* discussed above are not all clear-cut, but overlap at times. This is shown in the examination of the functions above. Below follows two more examples of difficulties in assigning *I mean* one function over another, as well as a brief discussion of reasons behind final classification choices.

Consider *I mean* in example (186).

(186)	Richard:	well we can't ignore it │ **I mean** → (1) you know they might have given him Chicago cos that was 30 years ago they might have given him Cashmere cos she was paid for the story │ but **I mean** ↑ (2) the two right on top of one another you see what I'm saying
	Someone:	yeah you're right
	Richard:	**I mean** → (3) people are gonna be saying do we really want a former radical hippie you know that messes with hairdressers

<div align="right">(PRIMARY 00.51.12)</div>

In this particular example, it is the third instance of *I mean* that is the most ambiguous. Considered out of context, this *I mean* seems to have predominantly frame-marking qualities, as it initiates an utterance. However, it does not initiate a new utterance as such, but merely a turn within a longer monologue that is broken off by someone's back channel *yeah, you're right*. Richard is trying to make a point, and to make the hearers understand this point and agree with him. The two previous occurrences of *I mean* are labeled **ELAB** as they signal the persuasion in Richard's utterance (the hearers seem to be persuaded as one of them says *yeah you're right*, and the others simultaneously mumble *yeah* in the background). Because of the context, the third *I mean* in the example is also labeled **ELAB**, even though it has clear frame-marking features too.

The next example illustrates an unusual use of *I mean* as the use of the DP itself is commented on, and the discourse use of the DP is turned into a non-discourse use of the verb phrase *I mean*.

| (187) | Martha (on TV): | I want to thank you I wanna thank all of you for your remarkable outpouring of affection it's obvious that my husband will not be able to continue his campaign for the presidency |
| | Charlie: | fantastic │ │ **I mean** ↓ │ aw you know what I mean |

<div align="right">(PRIMARY 01.29.57)</div>

In this example, the woman on TV, Martha, is thanking the viewers for their support at the time of her husband's death. Just prior to his death, the husband was running for president, and was competing against another governor, Jack Stanton. Charlie, a campaign worker working for Jack Stanton, is listening to the woman on TV. He understands his boss' worst competitor is literally gone, and shouts out *fantastic* without thinking. After a few seconds, Charlie realises his expression of joy is not appropriate, as someone has just died. He then starts repairing his utterance by saying *I mean*, taking a breath as to start explaining himself,

and then realises the hearers probably understand why he shouted *fantastic*. There is an obvious face-threat in the situation, and because of this, *I mean* is classified as having a **MIT** function. As with all instances of *I mean* with a **MIT** function, an interpersonal repairing is taking place.

The above two examples were meant to illustrate various problems arising when analysing and classifying the functions of *I mean* in the present study. The majority of the occurrences of *I mean* are more straightforward than the two examples above, but no instance of this DP is completely clear, functionally.

In the following, some quantitative aspects of *I mean* will be considered.

7.3 *I mean* and its translations: quantitative aspects

In sections 7.3 and 7.4, some basic quantitative results concerning *I mean* will be considered. Focus will be more on general quantitative tendencies, and the discussion will not always go into great detail with all aspects of the tables.

Out of the 146 tokens[40] of *I mean* in the corpus, 36 are translated into one or several of the TTs Cinema, DVD, SVT, and TV3+TV4, amounting to a 24% translation of all instances of *I mean* in the STs. All ten films have occurrences of *I mean* and all include translations of *I mean*. For half of the films, however, only one or two subtitle versions include translations of this DP. All in all, there are a total of 75 translations of *I mean* in the four individual subtitle versions combined.

The 146 ST tokens of *I mean* are not distributed equally among the ten films, but vary from a maximum of 35 tokens to a minimum of 3. The total numbers of *I mean* in each film are shown in table 7.1, below, distributed from high to low frequency. Alongside the (approximate) total numbers of words in each film soundtrack, is the frequency of *I mean* per 100 words.

Table 7.1. Occurrences of *I mean* with number of words per film and frequency per 100 words.

Film	I mean	Number of words in each soundtrack	Frequency of I mean per 100 words	Films ranked by frequency of *I mean*
AMPIE	35	8764	0.4	1
PRIMARY	28	18767	0.15	3
PULP	19	15456	0.12	5
BETTY	17	10910	0.16	2
WAG	12	14297	0.08	6
BLONDE	12	8788	0.14	4
SEVEN	8	9700	0.08	6
WHILE	6	10192	0.06	7
FARGO	6	7878	0.08	6
ADDICTED	3	8779	0.03	8
Total	**146**	**113 555**	**1.3**	

On average, there is one instance of *I mean* per 800 ST words[41] in the corpus, although there are great individual differences between the films.

As can be seen in the table, the film with the highest frequency of *I mean* is *AMPIE*, while the film with the lowest frequency of *I mean* is *ADDICTED*.

There is no clear correlation between the number of *I mean* and the total number of words in each film. Some films with a high total number of words have comparably few instances of *I mean*, while films with a low total number of words have a comparably large number of *I mean*. The latter is especially true for *AMPIE*, which is one of the films with the lowest total number of words, and yet it has more tokens of *I mean* than any of the other films. *AMPIE* has approximately 1 instance of *I mean* per 250 words. This can be compared

---

[40] What is referred to as *translation tokens* in the present study is the combined number of translations, while the term *translation types* refers to the number of individually different translations (cf. 4.2.7).
[41] The total of 1.3 occurrences of *I mean* is divided by the number of films (ten), with the result of approximately 0.13 occurrences of *well* per 100 words in each film.

to *ADDICTED*, which at approximately 1 instance per 2,900 words has the lowest number of *I mean*, even though its total number of words is very close to that of *AMPIE*.

The most noticeable point concerning the genre differences is the low numbers for the Romantic Comedy genre: the two Romantic Comedy films have the lowest frequency of *I mean* per 100 words. This can be compared to the much higher totals of *you know* in the same films (the Romantic Comedy films are ranked numbers 2 and 3 by frequency of *you know*). One possible reason for this discrepancy may be the difference in focus of *you know* and *I mean*: where the former is more focused on the hearer (**you** know), the latter is more focused on the speaker (**I** mean). Perhaps the higher number of *you know* compared to *I mean* in the Romantic Comedy genre, is caused by a more hearer-focused than speaker-focused discourse in this genre.

Table 7.2, below, illustrates the total number of translations of *I mean* in each film as well as in all four TTs, individually and combined[42].

Table 7.2. The distribution of *I mean* and its translations in each film, and in the four TTs.

Film	ST	Cinema	DVD	SVT	TV3+TV4	Total number of translations	Average number of translations per TT
AMPIE	35	5	4	6	4	19	4.7 (13 %)
PRIMARY	28	6	3	5	3	17	4.0 (14%)
PULP	19	1	1	1	1	4	1.0 (5 %)
BETTY	17	5	4	4	2	15	3.7 (22 %)
WAG	12	0	0	0	1	1	0.3 (3 %)
BLONDE	12	0	1	1	0	2	0.5 (4 %)
SEVEN	8	3	3	2	2	10	2.5 (31 %)
WHILE	6	0	0	2	0	2	0.5 (8 %)
FARGO	6	1	1	1	1	4	1.0 (16 %)
ADDICTED	3	*	1	0	0	1	0.3 (10 %)
Total	**146**	**21**	**18**	**22**	**14**	**75**	**18.5**

* The Cinema subtitles for *ADDICTED* have not been found.

For some of the films, i.e. *AMPIE*, *PRIMARY*, and *BETTY*, there is a correlation between numbers of tokens of *I mean* and numbers of translations of *I mean* in the subtitles. The film with the most tokens of *I mean* in the soundtrack, *AMPIE*, also includes most translations out of the ten films. However, apart from the above mentioned three films, there is no direct correlation between occurrences of *I mean* in the STs and number of translations in the subtitles. *SEVEN*, for instance, is among the films with the lowest number of ST *I mean* but this film has the fourth highest number of translations of this DP. The films *PULP* and *FARGO* have a very different distribution of ST *I mean* in their individual soundtracks (19 and 6 occurrences, respectively), but the same number of translations of *I mean* (4 translations for each film).

---

[42] The asterisk in the Cinema column for *ADDICTED* in table 7.2 indicates that this version has not been located and is thus not included in the total number of Cinema translations. A hypothetical number is included for the Cinema TT of this film for *well* and *you know*, based on the average number of translations in the other *ADDICTED* TTs. However, as the number of translations of *I mean* is so small for the other *ADDICTED* TTs, no hypothetical number is used in the discussion of *I mean*.

When comparing the total number of translations (the total numbers are divided by four to show the average number and percentage of each TT) with the total number of ST occurrences of *I mean*, the percentages illustrate a disparity of the quantity of translations for this DP.

Considering the four different subtitle versions, it is the TV3+TV4 subtitles[43] that are the most noticeable. Whereas the Cinema, DVD, and SVT subtitles have quite similar totals, the TV3+TV4 subtitles show a lower total. The SVT subtitles have slightly more translations than the other three TT versions. The quantitative distribution of translation types for *I mean* in each TT will be commented on in connection with table 7.5, below.

---

[43] The numbers of TV3 (9 translations in total) and TV4 (5 translations in total) are combined to show the joint number of the two commercial channels.

7.4 Distribution of functions in STs and TTs

The four functions of *I mean* (**FRAME**, **REP**, **ELAB**, and **MIT**) will now be studied more closely, from a quantitative perspective. First, the distribution of the functions in the STs will be looked at, and then, the distribution of the translations of the functions will be discussed. Table 7.3 below, shows the distribution of the four functions of *I mean* in the ten films.

Table 7.3. The distribution of functions of *I mean* in all ten STs

FUNCTIONS	*ADDICTED*	*AMPIE*	*BETTY*	*BLONDE*	*FARGO*	*PRIMARY*	*PULP*	*SEVEN*	*WAG*	*WHILE*	Total
FRAME	0	9	6	4	2	12	10	2	3	3	**51**
REP	0	3	3	0	2	2	0	3	1	1	**15**
ELAB	0	13	6	4	1	6	3	3	5	1	**42**
MIT	3	10	2	4	1	8	6	0	3	1	**38**
TOTAL	**3**	**35**	**17**	**12**	**6**	**28**	**19**	**8**	**12**	**6**	**146**

The most frequent function in the corpus is **FRAME** (51 tokens), followed by **ELAB** (42 tokens), **MIT** (38 tokens) and **REP** (15 tokens). Three of the films, i.e. *PRIMARY*, *PULP*, and *WHILE* have a majority of *I mean* with a **FRAME** function, while two of the films, i.e. *AMPIE* and *WAG*, have a majority of the **ELAB** function. The only function of *I mean* in *ADDICTED* is **MIT**. The rest of the films, i.e. *BETTY*, *BLONDE*, *FARGO*, and *SEVEN* include two or more functions with the same total. As with *well*, *you know*, and *like* (*like* will be discussed in chapter 8), functions of repair and hesitation are not very common for *I mean* (cf. 2.7 for a discussion on the tendency of film dialogue not to include many features of repair or hesitation). However, *I mean* has quite a few examples of the **REP** function compared to similar functions of *well*, *you know*, and *like*. It is thus worth presenting **REP** as an individual function of *I mean* in spite of its low total compared to the three other functions. The special significance of **REP** will also be clear as we consider the quantity of the translations of this function compared to the other functions.

The distribution of functions between the ten films in table 7.3 shows that there are no clear correlations between film genre and function of *I mean*. A few points may be raised, however. The political drama film *PRIMARY* includes a majority of *I mean* with a **FRAME** function. This is to be expected, considering the political discourse of this film, causing *I mean* and other DPs to many times have floor-gaining or otherwise discourse organising function. As was seen in table 7.1, the Romantic Comedy genre (including *WHILE* and *ADDICTED*) has the least occurrences of *I mean* in the corpus. There seems to be no clear correlation, however, between the functions of *I mean* in *ADDICTED* and *WHILE*, even though it is difficult to draw any conclusions based on the small number of occurrences in these two films. The film *ADDICTED*, which has the lowest total of *I mean*, is the only film demonstrating only one function of *I mean*, i.e. the **MIT** function. The film *WHILE* has a majority of *I mean* with a **FRAME** function.

The distribution of functions of the translated occurrences of *I mean* can be seen in table 7.4, below. The numbers in the table refer to how many times the ST functions of the DPs are translated, and not in any way to the functions of the translations.

Table 7.4. The distribution of functions of translated *I mean* (all four TTs combined for each film).

FUNCTIONS	*ADDICTED*	*AMPIE*	*BETTY*	*BLONDE*	*FARGO*	*PRIMARY*	*PULP*	*SEVEN*	*WAG*	*WHILE*	Total
FRAME	0	0	7	1	0	6	0	0	0	1	**15**
REP	0	8	7	0	4	4	0	8	0	0	**31**
ELAB	0	6	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	**12**
MIT	1	6	0	0	0	6	4	0	0	0	17
TOTAL	**1**	**20**	**15**	**2**	**4**	**16**	**4**	**10**	**1**	**2**	**75**

The distribution of the totals of the four functions in table 7.4 differs a great deal from the distribution of the ST occurrences of *I mean* seen in table 7.3. In the STs (cf. table 7.3), the most frequent function is **FRAME**, but the most translated function of *I mean*, as seen in table 7.4 is the function that is least common in the STs, i.e. **REP**. The total number of translations for the remaining three functions is distributed as follows: **MIT** (the third most common function in the STs) is the second most translated function, **FRAME** (the most common function in the STs) is the third most translated function, and **ELAB (**the second most common function in the STs) is the least translated function.

The numbers in table 7.4 refer to the total number of translations in the four TTs combined. These numbers are divided by four in table 7.5, below, and contrasted with the number of DPs in the STs. In addition, table 7.5 does not focus on the individual films, but on the functions of the translations of *I mean* in the four TTs Cinema, DVD, SVT, and TV3+TV4.

Table 7.5. The distribution of functions (tokens and types) and translations of *I mean* in all four TTs.

FUNCTIONS	ST	Cinema tokens/types	DVD tokens/types	SVT tokens/types	TV3+TV4 tokens/types	Total tokens	Average tokens	(Average tokens as) % of ST
FRAME	52	5/3	3/2	6/3	2/1	**16**	4.0	**8%**
REP	15	8/6	8/6	8/8	6/4	**30**	7.5	**50%**
ELAB	41	3/2	2/2	4/2	3/3	**12**	3.0	**7%**
MIT	38	5/2	5/4	4/4	3/3	**17**	4.3	**11%**
Total	**146**	21/10	18/9	22/12	14/7	**75**	18.8	

Table 7.5 illustrates the number of translations of the functions **FRAME**, **REP**, **ELAB**, and **MIT**, as well as the number of translation types, found in each TT. It says nothing about the functions of the Swedish translations of *I mean*, but takes into account the functions of the ST tokens of *I mean* only, as well as how many times the four functions are translated into each TT. In order to give a more accurate account of the translations, the total TT numbers (the totals of the Cinema, DVD, SVT, and TV3+TV4 combined) are divided by four to show the average number of translations in each individual TT, as well as the average percentages of the functions translated into each TT.

The clearly most frequently translated function of *I mean* is **REP**. Possible reasons for this is the ease at which this function can be identified in the STs, and the possibility of using the corresponding Swedish translation *jag menar*/*menar jag* ('I mean'/'mean I') in the

197

subtitles (to be further discussed in 9.3.1). The average amount of times the **REP** function is translated into one of the TTs is 7.5. Taking into account that there are only 15 occurrences of *I mean* with a **REP** function in the corpus, this is a high number. The effect of this high number is that an average of 50 % of *I mean* with a **REP** function are translated into each TT. **FRAME** and **ELAB** have equal average translation percentages of *I mean*, as the least translated functions, while **MIT** has a somewhat higher average percentage. Table 7.5 also gives the distribution of translation types among the TTs: The SVT subtitles include a few more individually different types than the other TTs, and the TV3+TV4 subtitles include the fewest types.

Table 7.6 below shows the combined ST and TT numbers of the textual functions **FRAME** and **REP**, on the one hand, and the interpersonal functions **ELAB** and **MIT**, on the other. This division is presented in order to illustrate the distribution of the 146 tokens of *I mean* among textual and interpersonal functions in the ST, and also to see how many tokens of *I mean* with either function are translated (again, table 7.6 says nothing about the functions of the Swedish translations of *I mean*). For a more accurate picture of the individual translations, the total TT numbers for both the textual and interpersonal functions are divided by four to show the average number of translations in each TT.

Table 7.6. Functions of *I mean* in the STs , with number of translations.

Functions	STs	Number of translations in all four TTs	Average number of translations in each TT	Average % translated into each TT
Textual function	67 (46%)	46 (61%)	11.5	17%
Interpersonal function	79 (54%)	29 (39%)	7.3	9%
Total	**146**	**75**	**18.0**	

As the table shows, there are more tokens of *I mean* in the STs with an interpersonal function than with a textual function. The interpersonal functions of *I mean* (**ELAB** and **MIT)** are thus more frequent in the film soundtracks than the textual functions (**FRAME** and **REP**) are. Considering the translations of these functions, however, a different pattern comes into view. The translated occurrences of *I mean* more often have a textual function than an interpersonal function: 46 translated tokens (61%) show a textual function, while 29 translated tokens (39%) show an interpersonal function. Table 7.6 also illustrates the average number of the translated textual or interpersonal functions of *I mean* in the four subtitling versions. There is an average of 7.3 occurrences of a translation of the interpersonal function and an average of 11.5 occurrences of a translation of the textual function of *I mean* in each subtitling version. These numbers result in a much higher average percentage of translations of the textual function (17%) than of the interpersonal function (9%).

The above quantitative discussion of the four functions of *I mean* in the STs and TTs illustrates the fact that the majority of the translated occurrences of *I mean* have a textual function even though most of the ST occurrences of *I mean* have an interpersonal function. Possible reasons for this will be discussed in 9.4.2.

7.5 Translations of *I mean*

There are 75 translations of *I mean* in all four subtitling versions Cinema, DVD, SVT, and TV3+TV4 combined (36 of the 146 ST occurrences are translated into one or several of the four versions). Table 7.7 below demonstrates all 74 translations in descending order of the frequency of their respective pragmatic and grammatical realisations. The categories are loosely based on the translation categories suggested by Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen for DP *well* (2003), and are to be seen as a mere proposal of a division of the translations rather than a static way of viewing these features in general.

Table 7.7. Translation categories and translations of *I mean* in all 4 TTs

Category	Translations + (occurrences)	Tokens/types
DP/Modal particle	ju (21); jag menar +jag menar… (16); menar jag (7); liksom (3); …nej (1); jo (1)	49/6
Conjunction	för (9); men (4); fast (4)	17/3
Adverb	alltså +alltså… (5); riktigt (1)	6/2
Punctuation marker	− (3)	3/1
Total		**75/12**

The table above is an indication of the distribution of the translations among pragmatic and grammatical categories. The most commonly used category in the subtitles is the DP/Modal particle with altogether 49 occurrences. This category includes modal particle *ju* ('as you know'), and DPs *jag menar* ('I mean') with or without three dots, *menar jag* ('mean I', i.e. an inverted version of *jag menar*, used after an object, reversing the word order in Swedish), *liksom* ('like', 'sort of'), the negation *...nej* ('...no'), and the affirmation *jo* ('yes'). The second most frequently used translation category is the conjunction with 17 occurrences. The conjunction category includes *för* ('because'), *men* ('but'), and *fast* ('although'). The rest of the translations include the adverbs *alltså* ('that is', 'so'), with or without three dots, and *riktigt* ('quite', 'really'), as well as the punctuation marker – (the dash).

The most common translations of *I mean* in the four subtitling versions combined are the modal particle *ju*, DPs *jag menar* and *menar jag*, the conjunction *för*, and the adverb *alltså*. These translations will briefly be looked at below. The rest of the translations will be commented on as they are introduced in various examples in the rest of this chapter.

The functions of *ju* change with the context it is in, just like the functions of all DPs changes with their various contexts. *Ju* has a core function of shared knowledge and of building rapport with the hearer (Aijmer 1996b). This function may be used by a speaker wanting to persuade a hearer into believing something or performing a certain act. *Ju* is also commonly used as a mitigator, toning down the message in face threatening situations (cf. 5.5 and 6.5 above for longer discussions on *ju*).

If considered in combination, the DPs *jag menar* and *menar jag* together form a group of the most frequently used translations of *I mean* in the corpus (all in all, there are 23 occurrences of *jag menar* and *menar jag*). This common use of a corresponding translation of

I mean shows an inclination of the subtitlers to use a closely corresponding Swedish translation of this DP whenever possible. As will be clear below, the majority of occurrences of *jag menar* and *menar jag* (in fact all 7 instances of *menar jag*) are used as translations of the **REP** function. *Jag menar* literally translates into *I mean* and is a logical translation choice for the subtitles. This is a commonly used sequence in Swedish informal dialogue and it is quite close in function to *alltså* ('that is') (Saari 1986:329-332). According to Saari (1986:334), *jag menar* is similar to *I mean* in various ways: e.g. (i) it can have both a referential and a discourse use; (ii) it is commonly used in medial position, between two propositions of which the latter adds something new to the argumentation; (iii) *jag menar* often signals a specification of the previous (part of an) utterance, sometimes with a new approach to the part preceding *jag menar*; (iv) it is speaker oriented more than hearer oriented; (v) it can be used as a turn-taker and as a repair marker; and (vi) *jag menar* is often used by speakers as a persuasion mechanism.

The third most frequently used translation of *I mean* is the conjunction *för*. This is an explanative conjunction indicating that what follows it explains or justifies the part preceding it. *För* is always used between two main clauses (Svenska akademiens grammatik 1999:730).

The adverb *alltså* is the fourth most common translation of *I mean*. *Alltså* is often used as a turn-taker, emphatic marker, and clarifying/repair marker (Nilsson 2005:146-150), and may also develop into a question marker or a reformulation marker (Aijmer 2007). As an adverb it is most often used textually, but can also have interpersonal uses when e.g. signifying emphasis and thus demonstrating more emotion.

Below follows a qualitative overview of the translations of each of the four functions of *I mean*: **FRAME**, **REPAIR**, **ELAB**, and **MIT**.

7.5.1 The frame-marker translated

The **FRAME** function has 52 occurrences in the STs and 9 of these are translated into one or several of the subtitling versions, making a total of 16 translation occurrences all together. An average of 8 % of all ST tokens with a **FRAME** function are translated into each TT. Table 7.8 below lists the translations of *I mean* with a **FRAME** function.

Table 7.8 Translations of the **FRAME** function

Translation	Total
för ('because')	9
men ('but')	4
–	2
ju ('as you know')	1
Total tokens/types	**16/4**

The most used translation of the **FRAME** function is the explanative conjunction *för* ('because'). This is hardly surprising since this type of *för* is used textually to signal an explanation or justification of a previous (part of an) utterance. In example (188) below, *I*

mean is translated into a dash (–) in the Cinema subtitles and into the conjunction *för* ('because') in the SVT subtitles. Both translations match *I mean* in the ST.

(188) Jack: now Governor Nelson's idea │ has got merit │**I mean** → we
        do need to provide jobs for those who need work │that is true

<div align="right">(PRIMARY 00.38.15)</div>

Cinema	DVD+TV3	SVT
Jag stödjer guvernör Nilson **–** vi måste kunna förse alla med jobb. [I support Governor Nelson – we must provide everyone with work.]	Nilsons idé är inte så dum. [Nilsson's idea is not bad.] Vi måste skapa jobb åt arbetslösa. [We need to create jobs for the unemployed.]	Governor Nilsons tanke är god. **För** vi måste ordna nya jobb. [Governor Nilsson's idea is good. **Because** we have to create new jobs.]

In the scene above, Governor Jack Stanton is taking part in a televised political debate, and uses *I mean* as a textual organisational device prefacing a specification (i.e. *we do need to provide jobs for those who need work*) of the previous part of his utterance (i.e. *Governor Nelson's idea has got merit*). DPs with textually organising functions are common in political debates (as are DPs with interpersonal persuading functions) since they move the discourse forward and let speakers signal turn-taking etc.

The Cinema subtitles use the dash as a translation of the **FRAME** function of *I mean*, signifying the textual function of *I mean* here. In addition, the textual function is realised in the SVT subtitles as the explanative conjunction *för*.

Example (189) below shows two occurrences of the **FRAME** function of *I mean*, the first one being an organisational device providing further information about the previous part of the utterance and the second being more of a floor-gaining tool. *I mean* (1) is not translated by any of the subtitling versions, but *I mean* (2) is translated in the Cinema and SVT subtitles.

(189) Elle: He's engaged he's got this six-carat Harry Winston on her
        bony unpolished finger what am I supposed to do
  Paulette: You're asking the wrong girl │ **I mean (1)** → I'm with my
        guy eight years and then one day it's │ I met someone else
        move out
  Elle: Oh no that's awful
  Paulette: Dewey kept the trailer and my precious baby Rufus│ │I
        didn't even get to throw him a birthday party
  Elle: No
  Paulette: │ │**I mean (2)** ↑ what's a girl to do

<div align="right">(LEGALLY 00.31.32)</div>

Cinema	DVD
Du frågar fel tjej. [You're asking the wrong girl.] Efter åtta år med min kille träffar han nån annan och kör ut mig. [After eight years with my guy he meets someone else and kicks me out.] Åh nej... Så fruktansvärt. Dewey behöll husvagnen och min lilla Rufus. Vad ska man göra? [What shall one do?]	Du frågar fel tjej. [You're asking the wrong girl.] Jag hade varit med min kille i åtta år, [I'd been with my guy for eight years] när han en dag säger "Jag har träffat nån annan. Flytta ut." [when he says one day: "I've met someone else. Move out."] Åh, nej. Vad förfärligt. Vad ska man göra? [What shall one do?]

SVT	TV4
Du frågar fel tjej. [You're asking the wrong girl.]	Du frågar fel tjej. [You're asking the wrong girl.]
Efter åtta år med min kille träffar han nån annan och gör slut.	Jag var ihop med min kille i åtta år. Då träffade han plötsligt en ny. [I was with my guy for eight years. Then he suddenly met a new one.]
[After eight years with my guy he meets someone else and breaks it off.]	Åh, nej. Vad hemskt. Dewey behöll husvagnen och min lilla ögonsten, Rufus.
Åh nej…! Så hemskt.	Jag hann inte ens ordna hans födelsedagsfest.
Men vad gör man? (…) [**But** what does one do? (…)]	Vad ska en stackars tjej göra? [What's a poor girl to do?]

The first *I mean* in the example is labelled **FRAME** for various reasons: (i) there is a pause before *I mean*; (ii) *I mean* has a declarative intonation; and (iii) the speaker utters *I mean* quite rapidly and with no other aim, it seems, than to use it as a signal of continuation and clarification. These parameters indicate that *I mean* here is a more textual than interpersonal device. This *I mean* is not translated into any of the four subtitling versions, but the previous and subsequent parts are.

The second *I mean* in (189) is a blend between a floor-gaining device and an organisational device. Its initial position and rising intonation are clear evidence of the floor-gaining function. The speaker also uses *I mean* to signal that what is to come is something not completely connected to the past utterance(s). This occurrence of *I mean* is translated in the SVT subtitles into the conjunction *men* ('but'), illustrating the contrast between the previous utterance(s) and the one following *I mean* in the ST.

7.5.2 The repair-marker translated

The **REP** function has 15 occurrences in the STs and 11 of these are translated into one or several of the subtitling versions, making a total of 30 translation occurrences all together. An average of 50 % of all ST tokens with a **REP** function are translated into each subtitling version. This is a high number of translations, and in fact the highest for any function of any of the four DPs in the present study, making a closer look at this function imperative, in spite of its relatively low number of occurrences in the STs.

Table 7.9 below lists the translations of *I mean* with a **REP** function.

Table 7.9. Translations of the **REP** function

Translation	Total
menar jag ('mean I')	7
ju ('as you know')	5
fast ('though')	4
jag menar + jag menar… ('Imean'+ 'I mean…')	7
alltså + alltså… ('that is'+'that is…')	4
jo ('yes/well')	1
…nej ('…no')	1
för ('because')	1
Total tokens/types	**30/8**

Menar jag is the most frequent translation of *I mean* with a **REP** function, exemplified below.

(190)   Somerset: smells good
          Tracy: what
          Somerset: uh the
          Tracy: ah yeah │ **I mean** ↑ thank you uh │ │ uhm │ please have a
                seat if you like would you like something to drink
                                                    (*SEVEN* 00.32.39)

Cinema	DVD
Jaha! Tack, **menar jag**. [Oh! Thank you, **I mean**.]	Jaha…Tack, **menar jag**. [Oh… Thank you, **I mean**.] Sätt dig…Vill du ha ett glas? [Have a seat…Do you want a drink?]
SVT	**TV4**
Ja. Tack, **menar jag**. Slå dig ner. Nånting att dricka? [Yes. Thank you, **I mean**. Have a seat. Anything to drink?]	Tack, **menar jag**. Slå dig ner. Vill du ha nåt att dricka? [Thank you, **I mean**. Have a seat. Do you want something to drink?]

In (190), Detective Lt. Somerset is at a dinner party and he compliments the hostess Tracy on the food, saying *Smells good*. Tracy is miles away and not paying attention to what Somerset is saying. She absent-mindedly replies *ah yes* to Somerset's compliment, then realises the rudeness of her respons and repairs it by saying *thank you*, signalling the repair with *I mean*. Tracy's sudden move from being unfocused to being attentive, in combination with stuttering and *uhm*s, as well as the pause before *I mean* and the rising intonation of the DP indicate the repairing function in (190). All four subtitling versions, despite being otherwise different, translate *I mean* into *menar jag* in this example.

There are examples in the corpus of subtitling versions with different translations of the **REP** function of *I mean*. Consider (191), below, which was first given as (179).

(191)   Girl: so my friends, they wanna know is it true │you know that he's
                │equipped
          Kevin: I have no idea Finch showers with his bathing suit on│ │ **I
                mean** ↑│ │uhm │as a matter of fact i-it is true │ the guy is
                huge
                                                    (*AMPIE* 00.26.21)

Cinema	DVD
Jag vet inte. Finch duschar med badbyxorna på. [I don't know. Finch showers with his bathing shorts on.] **Fast** det är sant. Han är enorm. [**But** it is true. He is enormous.]	Ingen aning. Finch duschar med badbyxorna på. [No idea. Finch showers with his bathing shorts on.] **Fast** det är sant. Han är enorm. [**But** it is true. He is enormous.]

SVT	TV3
Det har jag ingen aning om. Han duschar alltid i badbrallorna. [I have no idea. He always showers in his bathing shorts.] **Jo**, det är sant. Killen är enorm. [**Yes,** it is true. The guy is enormous.]	Jag har ingen aning. Han duschar med badbyxor. **Jag menar…** [I have no idea. He showers with bathing shorts. **I mean…**] Det är faktiskt sant. Han är enorm. [It is actually true. He is enormous.]

In this example, the girl and her friends want to know whether the rumours they have heard about Kevin's friend Finch are true. Kevin first says the truth, then remembers his promise to Finch to agree with anything anoyne asks him, and thus quickly changes his mind. He is prefacing his change of mind with the repair signal *I mean*. Again, the rising intonation of *I mean*, in combination with *uhm*s, pauses and stuttering, provide further evidence of the **REP** function of this particular occurrence of *I mean*.

The Cinema, DVD, TV3, and SVT subtitles all differ to some extent for this ST example. There are three different methods of treating this ouccrrence of *I mean*, i.e. conjunction *fast* ('but', 'although'), affirmative *jo* ('yes'), and DP *jag menar...*('I mean…'). The Cinema and DVD versions both use *fast* to illustrate Kevin's change of mind. The TV3 subtitles translate *I mean* with *Jag menar...*, including three dots to enhance the pause given in the ST. In addition, TV3 translates *as a matter of fact* into *faktiskt* ('actually'), providing the subtitles with an emphasis on the actual "truth" behind the rumour. The SVT version uses *Jo* ('yes') as a translation of *I mean*. All four subtitling versions thus present the subtitles with the contrast between the first part of the utterance and the second, manifested by *I mean* in the ST.

As was illustrated in (180), *I mean* with a **REP** function does not have to be utterance-medial, but can be utterance-initial. (192) below is an example of this, where the adverb *alltså* ('that is', 'so') is used as a translation. *I mean* in this extract is an example of a DP bordering on its referential counterpart. As Ellen is questioning Betty's story of never having been to Kansas before this current stop, Betty defends herself by saying *except for then*, prefaced by *I mean* (and *well*).

(192) Betty: yeah I'm getting back with my ex fiancée he proposed to me
      right around here so I guess this is kind of a sentimental stop
    Ellen: I thought this is the first time you've been out of Kansas
    Betty: well **I mean** ↓ except for then │ I'm trading in a car dealer
      for a heart surgeon now that's not too bad huh

<div align="right">(BETTY 00.31.35)</div>

Cinema	DVD
Var inte det här din första resa...? [Wasn't this your first trip…?] Förutom då, **alltså...** [Except for then, **that is…**]	Var inte det här din första resa…? Förutom då, **alltså...**

SVT	TV3
Var inte det här din första resa?	Du hade ju aldrig lämnat Kansas?
[Wasn't this your first trip…?]	[You had never left Kansas?]
Förutom då, **alltså...**	Förutom den gången.
[Except for then, **that is…**]	[Except that time.]

One interpretation of *I mean* in (192) may be that Betty literally refers to what she meant when she told Ellen she had never been out of Kansas. With this interpretation *I mean* cannot be removed without rendering an ungrammatical utterance. However, the facial expressions of Betty (making it clear that she is repairing her initial statement by looking down and not at Ellen as she utters *well I mean except for then*) and the use of *well* preceding *I mean*, point to the fact that this possibly is a DP use of *I mean* and it is thus analysed as such in the corpus. It should be kept in mind, though, that the line is very thin in this particular example between the referential and non-referential use of *I mean*.

The minor difference between *I mean* with a discourse use and a non-discourse use in this example may have influenced the translations. It is likely that, since this *I mean* could have referential meaning, a translator would find it more important to translate. *I mean* in (192) is translated in the Cinema, DVD, and SVT subtitles into the adverb *alltså*. As *alltså* is often used as a repair marker (Nilsson 2005:146-150), it is an undisputable translation of *I mean* here.

Another example of *I mean* with a **REP** function is (193) below. The translations reflect different possible interperetations of the function(s) of *I mean* in this extract.

(193)   Susan: tell me tell me it's four in the morning let's just tell the truth
         Henry: ││okay well │I was always curious about how it'd be to
              work with someone who actually cared about ││**I mean**
              →││it couldn't always have been the way it is now │it must
              have been very different when my grandfather was alive
                                                  (*PRIMARY* 00.17.10)

Cinema	DVD+TV3	SVT
Okej. Jag har undrat hur det skulle vara att jobba för nån som brydde sig om... [Okay. I've wondered what it would be like to work for someone who cared about…]	Okej... [Okay…]	Okej, jag har jämt undrat- [Okay, I've always wondered-]
	Jag har alltid varit nyfiken på att jobba åt en som verkligen bryr sig... [I've always been curious about working for someone who really cares…]	-hur det skulle vara att jobba för nån som faktiskt bryr sig. [-how it would be to work for someone who actually cares.]
Det kan **ju** inte alltid ha varit som det är nu. [**As you know**, it can't always have been the way it is now.]	Jag menar... [**I mean…**]	**För** det kan inte jämt ha varit som nu - inte när farfar levde. [Because it can't always have been like now – (…)]
	Så har det inte alltid varit. Det var annorlunda på farfars tid. [It hasn't always been so. (…)]	

Due to certain qualities of *I mean* in (193), it is classified in the corpus as having a **REP** function. The main reason for the **REP** label is the fact that the character Henry interrupts himself half way through his utterance: the part *I was always curious about how it'd be to work with someone who actually cared about* is cut off abruptly as he utters the preposition *about*. This closing of the utterance is followed by *I mean*, here showing that what is to come

is a new attempt to explain what he means. Henry is re-starting his utterance, which is a rare feature of film language: "[u]nlike real speech, movie dialog is seldom repetitive or vague (unless there is reason)" (Lucey 1996:167). The pauses before and after *I mean* also indicate a **REP** function.

The subtitling versions interpret the ST somewhat differently. The Cinema subtitles use three dots after the preposition *om* ('about'), which reflects the pause made after *about* in the ST. The actual repair function of *I mean* is not transferred to the subtitles, but *ju* in the Cinema subtitles can be seen as a paraphrasing translation of *I mean* as more of an interpersonal feature (e.g. a marker of persuasion). The DVD+TV3 subtitles use *Jag menar…* as a matching translation of *I mean* as well as of the pause following *I mean* in the ST. The SVT subtitles clearly translate the textual function of *I mean* (even though the **REP** function is not expressed) into the conjunction *för*. The SVT subtitles do not indicate the pauses in the ST.

7.5.3 The elaboration-marker translated

The **ELAB** function has 41 occurrences in the STs, and 8 of these are translated into one or several of the subtitling versions, making a total of 12 translation occurrences altogether. An average of 7 % of all ST tokens with an **ELAB** function are translated into each TT, making this function the least translated of the four functions.

Table 7.10 below lists the translations of *I mean* with an **ELAB** function.

Table 7.10 Translations of the **ELAB** function

Translation	Total
ju ('as you know')	7
jag menar ('I mean')	3
alltså… ('that is…')	1
–	1
Total tokens/types	**12/4**

The most employed translation of the **ELAB** function is the modal particle *ju*. Consider example (194) below where four of the seven occurrences of *ju* appear. It is the second instance of *I mean* that is to be mainly discussed here.

(194)   Oz: Kevin what's with the attitude
         Kevin: attitude │ me │ **I mean** ↑ **(1)** I think you guys should be a
             little bit more enthusiastic this is the night we've been
             waiting for │ we're in this together you guys can't back out.
         Jim: Kevin you don't need us to get laid are you afraid or something
         Kevin: no │ c'mon **I mean** → **(2)** we made a pact │ you can't break
             that you guys are just gonna have to
         Jim: have to what Kev huh

                                   (*AMPIE* 01.09.31)

Cinema	DVD
Nej. Kom igen. Vi hade **ju** en pakt.	Kom igen. Vi hade **ju** en pakt.
[No. C'mon. We had a pact, **as you know**.]	Ni kan inte bryta den. Ni måste…
	[C'mon. We had a pact, **as you know**.

Ni kan inte bryta den. Ni måste...	You can't break it. You have to…]
[You can't break it. You have to…]	

SVT	TV3
Nej, men vi ingick **ju** en pakt. Ni kan inte bryta den. Det är bara att… [No, but we made a pact, **as you know.** You can't break it. It is just to…]	Nej. Kom igen. Vi gick **ju** in i en pakt. [No. C'mon. We made a pact, **as you know**.] Ni kan inte bryta den. Ni måste… [You can't break it. You have to…]

The characters in this example are arguing about a pact they made which involves them all losing their virginity on prom night. By prom night, only one of them (Kevin) seems to be focused on the pact, while the others question his attitude. The first occurrence of *I mean* in (194) is labelled **MIT** in the corpus, due to Kevin's use of *I mean* as an interpersonal repair, clarifying and mitigating his straightforward questioning (*attitude me*) of Oz's turn (*Kevin what's with the attitude*). The second occurrence of *I mean* is, however, labelled **ELAB**, because of the persuasion taking place in the turn. Kevin is trying to make his friends see his point of view, endorsing it by the fact that they previously made a pact he believes they should all stand by. The persuasive function of the verb phrase *c'mon*, which is combined with *I mean* in (194), also links this instance of *I mean* to the **ELAB** function.

All four subtitling versions use *ju* ('as you know') as a translation of this occurrence of *I mean* in (194). The modal particle *ju* is often used in persuasive discourse and to build rapport with the hearer(s) (Aijmer 1996; Josephson 2005) so it is a self-evident choice of translation, transmitting the **ELAB** function of *I mean* in the ST to the TTs. Three of the TTs, the Cinema, DVD, and TV3 subtitles also include a translation of *c'mon* ('kom igen'), which further accentuates the persuasive function of Kevin's turn.

The emphatic type of the **ELAB** function is found in the example below.

(195)   George: oh right right well you're uh you talking about uh Fred there
         Betty: Del
         George: Del Del yeah uh Del he was amazing │he was **I mean** ↓
              this guy │talk about salesman he could sell anything to
              anybody at anytime │amazing

                                                          (*BETTY* 00.57.20)

Cinema	DVD+SVT	TV3
Del, ja. Han var otrolig. Den killen... [Del, yes. He was amazing. That guy…] Snacka om försäljare. Han kunde sälja vad som helst till vem som helst... [Talk about salesman. He could sell anything to anybody...]	Del, ja. Han var otrolig. Den killen… [Del, yes. He was amazing. This guy…] Snacka om försäljare. Han kunde sälja vad som helst till vem som helst… [Talk about salesman. He could sell anything to anybody...]	Del, just det. Han var helt otrolig. Den här killen, **alltså…** [He was totally amazing. This guy, **that is (I mean)** …] Vilken försäljare. Han kunde sälja vad som helst till vem som helst. [What a salesman. He could sell anything to anybody.]

In the scene above, George is making up a story of how he used to know a character named Del. He focuses on Del's positive qualities, such as his ability to sell cars. *I mean* in (195) is used as an empahtic marker, stressing just how amazing Del is. From a first glance of the example, it may seem that *I mean* should be labelled **REP** because of the interrupting effect *I mean* has here (*I mean* cuts off *he was*). *I mean* is not labelled **REP** here, however, as George

is not in any way changing his mind or repairing his previous utterance, but more justifying his praise of Del, emphasising his greatnesss as a car salesman.

The Cinema, DVD, and SVT subtitles are the same for this occurrence of *I mean*, and do not include a translation of *I mean*. The TV3 subtitles use *alltså*…as a matching translation of *I mean*. *Alltså* with a falling intonation is commonly used as a marker of emphasis when "a speaker is emotionally signalling that a word or statement applies to a great degree" (Nilsson 2005:146, my translation). As in the subtitles in (195), *alltså* as an emphatic marker is most often placed utterance-finally.

I *mean* with an **ELAB** function translated into *jag menar* is exemplified below (cf. example (148) of *you know*, above). Below, the **ELAB** function is of a persuasive/appealing type.

(196)   Somerset: Why don't you talk to him about it tell him how you feel
         Tracy: I can't you know I can't be a burden especially now I'll get
              used to things you know I think I just │ I wanted to talk to
              someone who's lived here for a long time **I mean** ↓ upstate
              you know it's a completely different environment

                                                          (*SEVEN* 00.55.29)

Cinema+ DVD+TV4	SVT
Jag vänjer mig nog... [I'll get used to it probably …] Jag ville prata med någon som har bott här länge. [I wanted to talk to someone who's lived here for a long time.] **Jag menar**, det är så annorlunda inåt landet. [**I mean**, it's so different upstate.]	Jag vänjer mig. [I'll get used to it.] Jag vill bara prata med nån som har bott här länge. [I just want to talk to someone who's lived here for a long time.] Uppåt landet är det en helt annan miljö. [Upstate it's a completely different environment.]

The character Tracy in example (196) is sharing her discomfort with Somerset. Tracy is not satisfied with her life where she lives, and she is thus appealing to Somerset's solidarity and understanding in the extract above. There are quite a few occurrences of *you know* in Tracy's turn, all used as markers of solidarity (cf. 6.5.3). The instance of *I mean* also demonstrates an appealing function. In addition, this *I mean* has an **ELAB** function as Tracy is justifying her desire to *talk to someone who's lived here for a long time* by the fact that upstate *it's a completely different environment*. Tracy signals the justification of the latter part of the utterance by using *I mean*.

The Cinema, DVD, and TV4 subtitles all translate *I mean* into *jag menar*, while the SVT subtitles do not include a translation here.

Finally, consider (197), below, in which there are three instances of *I mean* with an **ELAB** function. George is trying to persuade the producer of the TV soap he is himself starring in, to let Betty act in the series. The subtitle versions deal with these three occurrences of *I mean* differently. None of them clearly translate *I mean*, but they nonetheless embrace features that have a persuasive character.

(197)

George: I think we just bring Betty down and just throw her into the set and see
        what happens
Lyla: I don't know
George: **I mean → (1)** I-I tell the cast ahead of time and **I mean ↓ (2)** they'd all
        be prepped
Lyla: I'll think about it
George: it'll be like live television **I mean ↑ (3)** <u>let's</u> live on a the edge a little bit
        here <u>c'mon</u> Lyla we can break the mould
Lyla: I said I'll think about it

(*BETTY* 01.06.35)

Cinema	DVD
Jag kan förbereda de andra i god tid. [I can prepare the others ahead of time.]	Jag förbereder de andra i god tid. [I'll prepare the others ahead of time.]
Då blir det ju som en dokusåpa! [Then it would be like live television, as you know!]	Det blir som en dokusåpa! [It'll be like live televsion!]
Vi kan väl vara lite vågade. Kom igen, vi kan introducera nåt nytt! [Can't we live a bit on the edge. C'mon on, we can introduce something new!]	Vi kan väl vara lite vågade. Kom igen, vi kan introducera nåt nytt! [Can't we live a bit on the edge. C'mon on, we can introduce something new!]
SVT	**TV3**
Jag förvarnar ensamblen. [I'll tell the cast ahead of time.]	Jag förbereder de andra. [I'll prepare the others.]
Det blir som en dokusåpa! [It'll be likelive televsion!]	Det blir som direktsänd tv. Vi chansar lite och bryter mönstret. [It'll be like live TV. We'll take a chance and break the mould.]
Vi kan väl vara lite vågade - lite nyskapande. [Can't we live a bit on the edge- be a bit creative.]	

In the ST, there are quite a few features of persuasion. George is using *I mean* three times to signal a justification of his idea. He also includes the expressions *let's* and *c'mon* to enhance his arguments since Lyla is not easily convinced. The Cinema subtitles use *ju,* a modal particle often used as a persuasive device (cf. 5.5 and 6.5). In addition, they use an exclamation mark which accentuates the persuasion taking place, as well as the modal particle *väl* which has a similar function to *ju* here, and *Kom igen*, which is a direct translation of *C'mon*. The DVD subtitles also use an exclamation mark, *väl* and *Kom igen,* while the SVT subtitles use an exclamation mark and *väl* in the same way. The TV3 version is the only one not incorporating any type of feature with a persuasive **ELAB** function. It is a very concise translation. Example (197) was included here to illustrate the diversity the subtitle versions sometimes show in their methods of translating DPs and other pragmatic features. Additionally, the various subtitle versions demonstrate the difficulty of drawing the line between a translation and a non-translation of a DP.

7.5.4 The mitigation-marker translated

The **MIT** function has 38 occurrences in the STs and 7 of these are translated into one or several of the subtitling versions, making a total of 17 translation occurrences all together. An

average of 11 % of all ST tokens with a **MIT** function are translated into each subtitling version.

Table 7.11 below lists the translations of *I mean* with a **MIT** function.

Table 7.11. Translations of the **MIT** function

Translation	Total
ju ('as you know')	7
jag menar+jag menar… ('I mean'+'I mean…')	6
liksom ('like'; 'sort of'')	3
riktigt ('quite')	1
Total tokens/types	**17/4**

As was the case with **ELAB**, the most common translation of *I mean* with a **MIT** function is *ju*, and the second most common translation is *jag menar* with or without three dots. The DP *liksom* is also used a few times as a translation of this function. The modal particle *ju* as a translation of **MIT** is exemplified below.

(198)   Marsellus: well say she comes home what do ya think she'll do ││
                   no no fuckin' shit she'll freak that ain't no kinda answer
                   │I mean ↓ you know her I don't how much a lot or a little
                                                             (*PULP* 01.35.51)

Cinema+ DVD+TV4	SVT
Klart som fan att hon får spel.	Klart som fan att hon får spel.
Det är inget svar.	Det är inget svar.
[Sure as hell she'll freak.	[Sure as hell she'll freak.
That's no answer.]	That's no answer.]
Du känner **ju** henne.	Du känner **ju** henne.
Hur pass? Mycket eller lite?	Mycket eller lite?
[You know her, **as you know**	[You know her, **as you know**
How much? A lot or a little?]	A lot or a little?]

In this example, the character Marsellus is talking on the phone with one of his hitmen employees who is asking him for help in a delicate matter. The hitman and his accomplice have accidently killed a man and brought him to a friend's house. They are now in desperate need of disposing of the body before the wife of the friend comes home and finds it in the garage. Marsellus asks the hitman what he thinks the wife will do if she finds the body. The hitman says something (inaudible) at the other end of the phone and Marsellus goes on saying *no fuckin' shit she'll freak that ain't no kinda answer*. This impolite utterance is then mitigated by Marsellus' rephrasing *you know her I don't how much a lot or a little*, prefaced by the mitigation marker *I mean*.

All four TTs translate this mitigating *I mean* into the paraphrasing *ju*, which here functions as an attempt to establish rapport with the hearer and mitigate the face threat brought in by the previous utterance. The use of *ju* in the subtitles does not preface the interpersonal repair, however, but is utterance-medial (*ju* is always utterance-medial or utterance-final) and thus not as clear a signal of the mitigation taking place as *I mean* is in the ST (or perhaps *jag menar* would have been in the subtitles).

The second most frequent translation of *I mean* with a **MIT** function is *jag menar*, exemplified below. The ST of this example was given as (184) above.

(199)   Stifler: well just don't expect Oz to pay for the limo
             Oz: Stifler fuck │ **I mean** ↑ aaw │ │ why do you have to be so insensitive all
               the time

                                                    (*AMPIE* 00.33.13)

Cinema+ DVD+TV4	SVT
Fan ta dig, Stifler! [Fuck you, Stifler!] **Jag menar…** varför måste du jämt vara så okänslig? [**I mean….** why do you always have to be so insensitive?]	Fan! Måste du vara så okänslig jämt? [Fuck! Do you always have to be so insensitive?]

In Oz's final turn in (199), *I mean* signals the mitigation of the previous part of Oz's utterance, i.e. the line *why do you have to be so insensitive all the time* is an interpersonal repair and less threatening version of the previous part *Stifler fuck*, signalled by *I mean*. In the scene in question, it is quite obvious that the character Heather is upset on hearing Oz swear (saying *Stifler fuck*). This is a possible reason for his mitigation of this utterance.

    The Cinema, DVD, and TV4 subtitles translate *I mean* into matching *Jag menar…*, thus including both the mitigation marker and its successive pause. The SVT subtitles do not translate *I mean* and do consequently not illustrate the interpersonal repair taking place.

    The DP *liksom* ('like'; 'sort of') is used three times as a translation of *I mean* with a **MIT** function. All three translations are included in the example below together with another instance of *ju*.

(200)   Eddie: Cocaine he loved the shit hell we all loved the shit │but he's
                the only one of us who's a candidate for sainthood
             Henry: <u>I'm- I'm- I'm afraid</u> that's <u>a little</u> hard to buy **I mean** → │ │
                it just doesn't fit
             Eddie: Maybe not now │ but 20 years ago │almost everyone was
                doing everything right Libby

                                            (*PRIMARY* 01.48.00)

Cinema	DVD+TV3	SVT
Det där har jag svårt att tro. Det stämmer **ju** inte alls. [That's hard for me to believe. It doesn't fit at all, **as you know**.]	Det är lite svårt att tro. Det stämmer **liksom** inte. [It's a little hard to believe. It **sort of** doesn't fit.]	Det är lite svårt att tro på, det passar **liksom** inte in. [It's a little hard to believe, it **sort of** doesn't fit.]

Henry in example (200) is questioning the reliability of Eddie, who is informing political advisers Henry and Libby about the cocain addiction of a current presidential candidate. Henry starts saying *I'm afraid that's a little hard to buy*, then using *I mean* as a preface of the mitigating and explaining subsequent utterance *it just doesn't fit*. Henry makes a pause after *I mean* to think for a while before he mitigates the previous utterance. There is a difference between this example and the previous two ((198) and (199)). In (200), the part before *I mean* is not as face threatening as in the above examples: the use of *I'm-I'm-I'm afraid* and *a little* in the part preceding *I mean* is also a sign of mitigation. Henry thus mitigates and hedges all through his utterance, but *I mean* is still a signal of the interpersonal rephrasing following it.

The Cinema subtitles (possibly) include *ju* as a paraphrasing translation of *I mean*, thus transferring the persuasive or rapport-building function *I mean* could be said to have in the example. The DVD, TV3, and SVT subtitles all translate *I mean* into *liksom*, communicating the hedging function of ST *I mean*.

A similar example, taken from the same film, *PRIMARY*, and again including the character Henry, is given below.

(201)　　　Susan: hey I thought you were supposed to be telling us to hurry
　　　　　　Henry: ah uhm │ │Susan │ Mrs Stanton I'm not sure **I mean (1)** I-
　　　　　　　　　I-I don'tknow │**I mean (2)** │I've never helped run a
　　　　　　　　　presidential campaign before
　　　　　　Susan: well│neither have we but that's how history is made Henry
　　　　　　　　　by the first-timers

(*PRIMARY* 00.19.32)

Cinema	DVD+TV3	SVT
Susan, mrs Stanton...jag har inte bestämt mig än... [Susan, Mrs Stanton…I haven't decided yet…] Jag vet inget om presidentkampanjer [I don't know anything about presidential campaigns.]	Susan...mrs Stanton, jag vet inte... [Susan, Mrs Stanton…I don't know.] Jag har aldrig deltagit i en presidentvalskampanj förut. [I've never taken part in a presidential campaign before.]	Susan…mrs Stanton, jag vet inte **riktigt**. [Susan…mrs Stanton, I'm not **quite** sure.] Jag har aldrig jobbat med en presidentvalskampanj.

The scene above shows Henry who has recently agreed to be a political assistant, but has started to regret this decision. He is trying to tell Susan (the Governor's wife and Henry's employer) that he is having second thoughts. Both instances of *I mean* in (201) are thus mitigations of the FTA of resigning from a job. The first instance of *I mean* has some qualities of the **ELAB** function as it signals that an emphasis and rephrasing of *I'm not sure* is to come, this rephrasing being *I-I-I don't know*. This occurrence of *I mean* is, however, labelled **MIT** here because the **MIT** function is the most palpable considering the face threatening context. The second *I mean* in (201) is also labelled **MIT** as Henry is interpersonally repairing his previous attempts to tell Susan he is having doubts, prefacing this repair with *I mean*.

The mitigating effect of the first *I mean* in (201) is translated into the SVT subtitles as the adverb *riktigt* ('quite'). The other three subtitling versions put across the hesitant stuttering of the extract (by using three dots), but do not translate *I mean* as such. The second *I mean* is not translated in any of the subtitling versions.

The majority of the face threatening situations in the corpus where *I mean* is used are not very aggressive or argumentative. The most common FTAs include suggestions, questioning, defence, and partial disagreement, with or without translations. There is no tendency of *I mean* to be translated more frequently in certain FTAs than others (cf. *well*, which is translated more often in certain FTAs than others: 5.5.4).

The final example given here is one where the **MIT** function of *I mean* is not translated.

(202)

> Susan: if we're gonna get someone to dig around and find the dirt we have to
> have someone who knows us someone we trust completely
> Lucille: but **I mean (1)** → what │ is she out of the hospital
> Susan: yes
> Lucille: and she's you know │ okay
> Henry: who is she
> Susan: she was Jack's chief of staff 20 years ago │ she had a breakdown
> Lucille: uh **I mean (2)** ↓ she just suddenly became incoherent in the middle
> of a press conference it was awful │ **I mean (3)** → she's been in and
> out of mental hospitals for years
> Susan: she seems very stabile now she's been back home for 18 months you
> and Henry can fly back tomorrow and brief her

(*PRIMARY* 00.45.59)

Cinema	DVD
Är hon utskriven...? Och frisk...? [Is she out of the hospital…? And well…?] Blev virrig mitt på en presskonferens. [Became incoherent in a press conference.]	Är hon utskriven? Ar hon frisk? [Is she out of the hospital? Is she well?] Jacks f.d. stabschef, hon bröt ihop. [Jack's ex chief of staff, she broke down.] Mitt under en presskonferenes. Hon har fått psykiatrisk vård i åratal. [In the middle of a press conference. She's received psychiatric care for years.]
TV3	**SVT**
Ar hon utskriven? Ar hon frisk? [Is she out of the hospital? Is she well?] Mitt under en presskonferenes. Hon har fått psykiatrisk vård i åratal. [In the middle of a press conference. She's received psychiatric care for years.]	Är hon utskriven från hispan? Och hon är frisk? [Is she out of the loony bin? Is she well?] Hon bara klappade ihop under en presskonferens. Det var hemskt. [She just broke down during a press conference. It was awful.]

The speaker Lucille in the example above is questioning her superior Susan's decision to employ a woman who has had mental problems. Lucille uses *I mean* three times (and *you know* once) as a way of lessening the face threat of her disagreement. In comparison, Susan's utterances include no DPs, pauses, or any form of semantically bleached words, but are clear and to the point. Susan has made her decision, and is not really communicating with Lucille, or the other people present, but simply stating facts. In the translations, the difference between Lucille's and Susan's utterances, and the amount of interpersonal signals in them, is not very different. The Cinema subtitles transfer some of Lucille's face threat mitigation by the inclusion of three dots, twice in the same utterance (*Är hon utskriven...? Och frisk...?*). Apart from this, the difference between the speakers' approach to the speech situation is not clear in the subtitles.

7.6 Summary

In the present chapter, I have tried to decipher the functions of *I mean* found in the corpus, and to classify them according to a functional continuum of textual functions (*I mean* as a frame-marker (**FRAME**), or repair-marker (**REP**)), and interpersonal functions (*I mean* as a elaboration-marker (**ELAB**) or face threat mitigating marker (**MIT**)). The classification is based on the following seven parameters (first introduced in 4.3.1): (i) intonation of *I mean*;

213

(ii) pauses used in connection to *I mean*; (iii) collocations of *I mean*; (iv) position of *I mean* in an utterance; (v) type of utterance of which *I mean* is part; (vi) body language of speaker; and (vii) larger social context of *I mean*. The classification of the functions of *I mean* is also influenced by a number of cross-theoretical previous studies of the DP, relevant to the classification used in the present study. The translations of *I mean* have been studied in relation to the four functions found, quantitatively as well as qualitatively.

There are 146 tokens of *I mean* in the film corpus, 33 of which are translated into at least one of the four TTs Cinema, DVD, the public TV channel SVT and the commercial TV channels TV3+TV4, making a total of 75 translations in all four subtitling versions combined. All in all, 12 individual translation types are used in all four TTs combined. Quantitatively, there is a difference between the translations of *I mean* in the TTs. The Cinema and SVT subtitles have a similar amount of tokens, the DVD has fewer, and the TV3+TV4 subtitles have the fewest translation tokens of all TTs. As far as the variation in translation types is concerned, the subtitles of the public service TV channel SVT have the highest number of individual types, whereas the subtitles for the commercial TV channels TV3+TV4 have the lowest number of translation types.

It is often said that, due to the different time and space constraints experienced by different media, DPs are translated more often in cinema subtitling than in other forms of subtitling, especially TV subtitling (cf. 3.4.4). For *I mean*, the quantitative difference is clearer when comparing the subtitles from the commercial TV channels TV3+TV4, with the rest of the subtitle versions, than when comparing TV subtitles, on the one hand, with the Cinema subtitles, on the other. The fact that the Cinema subtitles in the corpus of the present study include more words in total than the DVD and TV subtitles do (cf. 4.2.7), does not seem to affect the translation of *I mean* to a large extent. However, the fact that the commercial TV channels include considerably fewer translation tokens and types than the public service TV channel, may point to the effect the different working conditions at commercial and public TV possibly have[44] on the final subtitling product. The more privileged position of subtitlers working at the public TV channel, as far as permanent jobs, wages, lower workloads, academic merits, etc. are concerned (Pedersen 2007:24; Johansson 2005: p.c.), may have an impact on the translations of *I mean* in the corpus of the present study.

The most common function of *I mean* in the STs is **FRAME**, followed by **ELAB**, **MIT**, and **REP**, in descending order of frequency. The order of frequency of the translated functions of *I mean* differs greatly from the order of frequency of the functions in the STs: **REP** is the most commonly translated function, followed by **MIT**, **FRAME**, and **ELAB** in descending order of frequency.

All in all, the quantitative analysis of *I mean* shows that there are more occurrences of *I mean* with an interpersonal function in the film soundtracks, but that the function most often translated is the textual one. One reason for the predominance of translations of the textual function may be the transparency of the textual **REP** function, and the relative ease of translating it into the Swedish corresponding DP *jag menar/menar jag* ('I mean'/'mean I'),

---

[44] The past tense should perhaps be used here, since the conditions have changed after 2006. However, the working conditions for subtitlers at public and commercial TV before 2006 are relevant for the present study, cf. 3.4.4.

which is done to a large extent in the corpus. The ST total of *I mean* with a **REP** function is quite low, but almost all of these ST tokens are translated into at least one TT each time they occur, making it the most translated function of all functions of the four DPs in the corpus.

The qualitative results of the subtitling of *I mean* show a fairly wide variety of translation types used. The core function of *I mean*, i.e. a modification or clarification of (a previous part of) an utterance, is transferred to the subtitles in several ways. The most common translations of *I mean* are the modal particle *ju* ('as you know'), and the DP *jag menar*/*menar jag* ('I mean/mean I'). These translations are equally frequent. Other reasonably common translations are *för* ('because'); *alltså* ('that is'); *men* ('but'); and *fast* ('although'). The rest of the translations (e.g. *liksom* ('like'); – (dash); *riktigt* ('quite', 'really'); and *jo* ('yes'/'well')) have fewer occurrences. All four functions of *I mean* are translated, and the translations often reflect the way each function relates to the core function of *I mean*. However, *I mean* has the lowest total number of translation types of the four DPs in the present study. Again, this may be due to the clear correspondence between *I mean* and *jag menar*/*menar jag*, causing *jag menar*/*menar jag* to be used more or less by default.

To conclude, there is a variety of Swedish linguistic means used as translations of *I mean*, and they reflect the various functions of this DP. However, the range of translation types is not as great for *I mean* as for *well*, *you know*, and *like* (*like* is discussed in chapter 8). One possible reason for this is the clear correspondence between *I mean* and the Swedish DP *jag menar*/*menar jag*, and the subtitlers' tendency to use this default translation to a great extent.

8 *Like*

8.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the results of the corpus analysis of the DP *like* (as in e.g. s*he hasn't conditioned her hair for like a week*) and its translations will be introduced. First, *like* will be defined and classified functionally, using various parameters and earlier classifications from various studies as a background. A quantitative as well as qualitative account of *like* and its translations in the corpus will then be given. The quantitative analysis includes an overview of the distribution of the ST occurrences of *like*, its functions, and translations. In the qualitative analysis, which is the main part of the chapter, the translations of *like* found in the corpus are examined.

8.2 Definition and functional distribution of *like*

Like has been described as a filler with no real meaning (Landy 1971:120), "a verbal tic" (www.guardian.cu.uk) used in informal situations only, and is considered by "many speakers of English to be incorrect" (*Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary* 1987:842). The informal use is unarguable: discourse particle *like* is, unlike other uses of the same linguistic form (for instance conjunction or preposition *like*) mainly used in informal spoken discourse. The "filler" status of *like* is similar to the status of other informally used DPs in that it is regarded as a redundant and meaningless device (Andersen 2001:216), often used ungrammatically. The stigma of *like* is possibly even stronger than that of other DPs, mainly due to the prejudice deriving from the impression that *like* is found most often in lower social class adolescent female speech (cf. 8.2.1)[45]. *Like* is, however, possibly the one DP that is closest to expressing propositional value (Andersen 1998:163) and as such, it is often far from being superfluous.

As other DPs, *like* has experienced a pragmaticalisation process (cf. 2.2.1), but unlike other DPs, *like* is seen as still being in this process, a fact that "explains the co-existence of non-discourse and discourse uses and the overlap and fuzziness between the different types of use" (Hasund 2003:13). What Hasund refers to as the *discourse use* of *like*, i.e. the non-truthconditional, more syntactically flexible use that *like* as a DP demonstrates, originates from its *non-discourse use*, i.e. the prepositional, conjunctional or other truth-conditional use of *like*. Underhill (1988:234) refers to the same phenomena as *grammatical* and *non-standard like*, respectively, reflecting the earlier views of DP *like* as being an ungrammatical, redundant entity, a belief that most scholars (e.g. Romaine & Lange 1991; Andersen 2001; Hasund 2003; Fuller 2003) do not support any longer. I will approach *like* the same way I have previously approached *well*, *you know*, and *I mean*, i.e. by using Hasund's term *discourse use* when referring to DP *like*, and *non-discourse use* when referring to the truth-conditional *like* functioning as verb, preposition, conjunction, etc.

---

[45] Also, see Dailey-O'Cain (2000) for a study on the sociolinguistic distribution of and attitudes towards *like*.

The ongoing pragmaticalisation of *like* results in overlaps between the discourse use and the non-discourse use of *like*, making it a notoriously problematic DP to classify. Below, I have listed examples of the non-discourse uses of *like*. All but one of these examples, *like* as an adjective, are taken from the corpus of the present study. Some are clear-cut uses of *like* while others are more difficult to classify. After each example are (suggested) labels of categorisation: preposition, conjunction, verb, adjective, or ambiguous.

(203)   they just put you on the spot **like** that PREP (*BLONDE* 00.27.57)

(204)   and she seems to me **like** she's hiding something (*BLONDE* 00.59.41) CONJ

(205)   well if you **like** burgers give 'em a try sometime (*PULP* 00.15.33) VERB

(206)   A chance to meet people of **like** mind (*Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* 2000) ADJ

(207)   it's **like** a life's work (*SEVEN* 01.18.47) AMBIG

Examples (203) and (204) illustrate *like* as a preposition and a conjunction, respectively. According to Quirk et al. (1985:660), preposition *like* takes a nominal complement, while conjunction *like* takes a clausal complement, this classification not being an absolute one but more of a gradient. If *like* was removed from (203) and (204), both examples would be ungrammatical. Example (205) is a clear case of *like* functioning as a verb, and would also be ungrammatical without *like*. The same ungrammaticality would occur if *like* in (206) was removed. This example shows an entry of *like* as an adjective, taken from the *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (2000). (207) is an ambiguous example and an illustration of the importance of considering the context surrounding *like* and, the intonation pattern of the utterance of which *like* is part. (207) is grammatical even without *like*. If we did not have access to the context or intonation of the utterance, it would be impossible to analyse *like* as having either a discourse or a non-discourse use. With the aid of both context and intonation it is, however, possible to see that *like* in this sequence indicates a non-discourse use. When the collocation *it is + like* has as a discourse use, the phrase usually signals a quotative function (cf. (209), below), which is not the case in (207).

Consider the two examples below for both non-discourse and discourse uses of *like*.

(208)   Do they just put you on the spot **(a) like** that **(b) like** all the time (*BLONDE* 00.27.57)
         a)PREP + b)DP
(209)   Oh sure I know what people think it's **like** Oz he's just this kick ass lacrosse player
         (*AMPIE* 00.29.18) DP

In (208), there are two instances of *like*: the first one is a preposition (cf. (203)) and the second a DP, the latter functioning as an approximator of *all the time*. *Like* in example (209) is an example of a DP functioning as a quotative, used to cite reported speech, thought, or action (this form of *like* is often found in phrases such as *I was like, what are you doing here?,* in which the speaker is citing his/her own utterance, thought, or action in a previous situation). In (209), *like* and *be* together, forming *it's like*, have the function of citing what *people think*, i.e. that *Oz he's just this kick ass lacrosse player*.

In the following, I will not consider the functions of *like* in examples such as (203)-(207). I will, however, consider examples such as (208b) and (209), where *like* behaves like a DP. Ambiguous instances of *like* will be commented on throughout.

8.2.1 Some previous multifunctional studies of *like*

The classification of *like* used in the present study is my own (c.f 8.2.2), but is influenced by a number of previous studies (e.g. Schourup 1985; Underhill 1988; Blyth et al. 1990; Romaine & Lange 1991; Dailey-O'Cain 2000; Andersen 2001; Hasund 2003). Most of these studies view *like* as a DP with a variety of interrelated functions, while some of them focus on one function more than others (e.g. Blyth et al. 1990 and Romaine & Lange 1991 focus on the quotative function of *like*).

The core function of *like* is approached in two main ways in the above studies: *like* is seen as having a core function of either focus or looseness. These two differing views of *like* may seem contradictory, but are actually an indication of its twofold function (Hasund 2003:21): the focus marking function refers mainly to the textual level (a case in point being the quotative function in e.g. *I know what people think it's like Oz he's just this kick-ass lacrosse player* (*AMPIE*), where *be + like* mark quotative thought), and the looseness (or hedging) marking function refers mainly to the subjective/interpersonal level (one example of *like* with a hedging function is *I guess you think you're uh you know like an authority figure* (*FARGO*), where the speaker uses *like* to mitigate his negative opinion of the hearer). *Like* as a focus marker indicates where the focus of an utterance lies (the quotative use of *like* is one clear example of this) and is thus more textual, whereas the interpersonal *like* illustrates looseness or hedging in an utterance. However, both the textual and the interpersonal functions are seen in previous work, as well as in the present study, as marking the discrepancy or "non-equivalence between a statement and what the speaker has in mind" (Andersen 2001:218).

Schourup (1985) finds, from investigating transcripts of radio talk shows as well as informal conversations, examples of both the focus and the looseness function of *like*. He claims that *like* has an overall function of being 'evincive', i.e. of demonstrating something particular in an utterance, or focusing on something, but it is also "used to express a possible unspecified minor nonequivalence of what is said and what is meant" (Schourup 1985:42).

In the present study, *like* is viewed as being able to indicate a discrepancy in an utterance, either textually or interpersonally, much like Andersen (2001:230) states:

> [*Like*] provides a signal of a certain psychological distance to the following lexical material, either in terms of its conceptual or its formal properties. The discrepancy between the utterance and the thought it represents presents itself in two different guises, either as a conceptual discrepancy or a linguistic form discrepancy […].

Fuller (2003:27) states in his account of *like* that:

> [w]hile the scope of *like* may vary – it can have scope over a word, phrase, quotation, or whole proposition – it indicates that whatever it modifies is a rough approximation, and not an exact number, concept, or quote.

The two quotes above point to the fact that *like* may have a number of different functions in discourse, but that these functions are all related to a core function of discrepancy or approximation. *Like* often marks the discrepancy between what a speaker says and has in mind, although the speaker may not be fully aware of this discrepancy him/herself.

Other previous studies have also found *like* to have various interrelated functions linked to a core function. Two of these (Andersen 2001; and Hasund 2003) are discussed below. In addition, one sociolinguistic study of *like* will be introduced (Dailey-O'Cain 2000). First, however, three studies focusing more on the textual function of *like* will be considered briefly: Underhill (1988); Blyth et al. (1990); and Romaine & Lange (1991).

Underhill (1988), Blyth et al. (1990) and Romaine & Lange (1991) all look chiefly at the textual function of *like*. Underhill considers the core function of *like* to be a marker of focus and new information, i.e. what follows *like* in an utterance is often a piece of new information which is the focus of the utterance. Underhill gives the example *her car was **like** stuck on top of a block of ice*, where *like* signals that what is to come (*her car was stuck on top of a block of ice*) is the main focus of this part of the story. Blyth et al. (1990) and Romaine & Lange (1991) focus solely on the textual quotative function of *like*, where *like* is used to signal that what is subsequent to it is a part of reported speech or thought.

Andersen (2001) and Hasund (2003) bring up not only the textual function of *like,* but also other functions. Both of these studies make out three main functions of *like*, i.e. a textual, a subjective, and an interactive/interpersonal function. Because of the detailed account of *like* that both Andersen and Hasund make, their functional classifications will be discussed at some length below as a background to the functional distribution of *like* in the present study.

Andersen (2001) performs an empirical investigation of the adolescent variety of London English, drawing on data from the Bergen Corpus of London Teenage Language (COLT), comparing this data with adult talk from the British National Corpus (BNC). Andersen describes *like* as a marker of "non-identical resemblance between utterance and underlying thought" (2001:233). He views *like* mainly as a subjective marker, but also finds "its capacity to provide textual structure and coherence [to be] salient".

Andersen mentions a few discourse-linking functions of *like*, e.g. discourse link and self-repair. Consider (210), which is an example of a discourse link (2001:270), and (211) which is an example of self-repair (2001:270).

(210)   He had to come from America and look after her, and **like,** then, from then on, he…

(211)   And he listed **like** reeled off a load of blokes

In (210), *like* functions as a link in the discourse (together with *and* and *then*), and in (211) *like* serves as a repair-marker, aiding the speaker in the rephrasing of his/her utterance so that *listed* is changed into the more specified *reeled* via *like*. Andersen adds to these examples that they both have a degree of hesitation besides the linking and repairing functions.

Andersen also finds a quotative function of *like*, where reported speech is indicated by *like*, either with or without the verbs *be*, *go*, *say*, or another verb. *Be+like* and *go+like* are illustrated below (2001:269).

(212)   And I'm **like**, and I'm **like** scum!

(213)   And then he goes **like**, sorry man, close the door and get out.

Both (212) and (213) are examples of *like* as a marker of reported speech. In (212), the speaker is repeating what he said at some point, i.e. *scum*, and in (213), the speaker is repeating what somebody else said at some point, i.e. *sorry man, close the door and get out*.

Another function that Andersen pin-points is approximation, a function he divides into numeral, lexical, and measurable approximation. One example of each approximation function is seen below (2001:267)

> (214) I would have got there **like** four minutes past ten.
>
> (215) Well they did **like** a talk thing.
>
> (216) He's **like** that high.

In the examples above, *like* as an indicator of numeral, lexical, and measurable approximation signals that the phrases *four minutes past ten*, *a talk thing*, and *that high* are all approximate.

A further function Andersen finds is exemplification, illustrated by (217) below (2001:267).

> (217) I just normally buy **like** water bombs things like that.

In Andersen's study, the function of *like* as a marker of exemplification signals, as the name indicates, that an exemplification is about to come. In (217) above, the exemplification itself is *water bombs and things like that*.

Andersen does not give as detailed an analysis of other functions of *like*, but states that in addition to the functions mentioned here, *like* "has an important metalinguistic function of marking non-incorporation of, and psychological distance towards, the following linguistic expression, essentially a subjective/attitudinal function" (Andersen 2001:219).

Hasund (2003) performs a corpus-based, cross-linguistic investigation of the English DP *like* and the Norwegian DP *liksom*. She uses the Bergen Corpus of London Teenage Language (COLT), and a Norwegian corpus of Oslo teenage language from the Scandinavian research project *Språkkontakt og Ungdomsspråk i Norden* ('Language contact and teenage language in Scandinavia', UNO).

Like Andersen, Hasund divides the functions of *like* into a textual, a subjective, and an interpersonal level. In addition, she bases her analysis of *like* (and Norwegian *liksom*) on the position of *like* (and *liksom*) in initial, medial, or final position for each of the three main functions. She finds that on the textual level *like* indicates "the relation between two units of discourse" and that the DP typically occurs in connection with explanations, elaborations, and clarifications. Hasund uses various paraphrases to illustrate the functions of *like*, e.g. *for example* for the explanatory function. According to Hasund, the textual level is often indicated by *like* in initial position, such as the example below where the speaker is using *like* as a turn-taker, referring to the number of minutes left on the tape (2003:104).

> (218) **Like** it's only been ninety-six minutes now.

Another example of Hasund's textual function is (219) below, where *like* introduces an elaboration of a description of a handball player (2003:121):

> (219) Or not very big. But she's quite big isn't she? **Like**, she's so tall isn't she?

On the textual level, Hasund also places *like* as a quotation marker and gives an example (220, below) for illustration (2003:105).

(220)   Sooner or later you get to know anyway. **Like** no I didn't get into that university.

In (220), *like* introduces a quoted thought without being part of what Hasund refers to as a "larger quotative construction […] such as *be like*, *go like* or *say like* (cf. discussion on Andersen's treatment of quotative *like* above).

On the subjective level, Hasund finds a hedging function of *like*, as well as functions of speaker planning. She compares these functions with Andersen's suggestion that *like* may signal a speaker saying "I have something on my mind, but don't know (exactly) how to put it", and places *like* as an approximator on this level. Hasund also suggests that *like* as a hedge for negative politeness purposes should be included on this functional level. This function is used "when the speaker does not wish to sound too categorical, or in order to soften a potential face-threat" (2003:93). She concludes that *like* in this use is closely related to the interpersonal function.

Another function of *like* which Hasund places under the heading 'subjective level', but states is clearly related to the interpersonal function, is the use of *like* as a marker of positive politeness "in order to emphasise common ground or strengthen the expression of agreement between speaker and listener" (2003:94). The subjective function of *like*, Hasund finds, is more salient in initial or medial position than in final position. An example of *like* as an approximator in medial position is given below.

(221)   That's what it is. It's **like**, fifty square meters or something like that.

In (221), *like* is an approximator of the number *fifty* in *fifty square meters*.

On *like* as a hedge used for politeness purposes in "connection with sensitive topics and potentially face-threatening acts" (2003:172), Hasund gives the following example, where the speakers are talking about a girl who is mentally handicapped (ibid.).

(222)   A: Are you sure she's not working?
            B: I don't think so I erm, she's erm, she's, she's **like** erm, she has to go to a special
            school.

In (222), speaker B is trying not to be offensive when describing the mentally handicapped girl. Hasund states that there are many signs of the speaker's hedging, e.g. the use of *like* and the repetition of *erm* and *she's*.

Hasund views the interpersonal function of *like* as "a side effect of the […] functions on the textual and/or the subjective level" (2003:94), giving further information to a hearer on how an utterance, including *like* as e.g. a marker of explanation or elaboration, should be interpreted. Hasund states that the interpersonal function seems to be used more often in clause-medial position than in initial position. Example (223) below is an example of the interpersonal function of *like* in Hasund's view (2003:180).

(223)   Cos you know, you know how she's always **like** going to the toilet yeah with the
            door open and **like** showing her tits to people.

The above is seen as an example of the interpersonal, involving function of *like*.

An additional study will be mentioned here due to its more sociolinguistic account of DP *like*, namely Dailey-O'Cain (2000). This study focuses on *like* in combination with sociolinguistic stereotypes, something which is of interest for the present study, especially for the film *BLONDE*. Dailey-O'Cain's study compares the actual age and gender distribution of *like* in a corpus of spoken informal US English, with the perceived age and gender distribution concluded by a questionnaire analysis. The questionnaire shows mostly negative attitudes towards the use of DP *like*: "the most common reason mentioned for disliking it was the notion that it makes people sound uneducated or lazy […] and several informants also wrote that they associate it with southern Californian 'Valley Speak'" (2000:70). The Californian 'Valley Girl' phenomenon was a "popular cultural creation in the 1980s: [a] softening reaction by women to the hard-edged political activism of the baby boom generation" (Croucher 2004:43). According to Croucher (2004), certain TV programmes and films in the 1980s and 1990s, with a largely adolescent audience (e.g. *Beverly Hills 90210*, *Melrose Place*, and *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*) "fuelled the 'Valley Girl' phenomenon" (Croucher 2004:43). The informants in Dailey-O'Cain's study said that they perceived people using *like* as being attractive, cheerful, friendly, and successful. These are all positive traits, but it was believed at the same time that "it is perceived as less important to be seen as 'cheerful' or 'friendly' than it is to be perceived as 'educated'" (2000:74). These and similar attitudes and stereotypes will be further discussed in connection with the use of *like* and its translations in the film *BLONDE*, below (cf. 8.5.2 and 8.5.3).

The above discussion of a number of studies on DP *like* is meant to be an illustration of the difficulty in classifying the functions of *like*, as well as of the variety in functional classifications made of this DP. Both textual and interpersonal functions have been considered in the literature on *like*. Below follows my own classification of *like*, based on parts of the multifunctional approaches discussed above, as well as on the seven parameters (cf. 4.3.1) and the larger cross-theoretical framework (cf. 2.4 and 2.5), used as tools for the DP analysis performed in the present study.

8.2.2 Classification of *like* in the present study

I have based my functional classification of *like* on the seven parameters used for analysing all four DPs in the present study (cf. 4.3.1), as well as on the cross-theoretical framework (cf. also 2.4 and 2.5) including the categorisations of *like* discussed above: primarily Dailey-O'Cain (2000), Andersen (2001), and Hasund (2003). The twofold categorisation of *like* into a focus marker and a looseness marker (Schourup 1985, etc.), as well as the three-fold categorisation, closely related to the former, into textual, subjective, and interpersonal/interactional functions (Andersen 2001; Hasund 2003), will be used in the present classification with the labels *textual* and *interpersonal*. In addition, various other studies and comments on DP functions in particular and *like* in general are employed (e.g. Östman 1981; Bazzanella & Morra 2000).

The functional classification of *like* in the corpus of the present study is narrowed down to the following four functions, where the first two are located in the textual area of a functional continuum, and the final two in the interpersonal area of a functional continuum:

Frame-marker (**FRAME**); Approximation marker (**APPROX**); Rapport building marker (**RAPP**); and Mitigation marker (**MIT**). These four functions are not to be seen as a taxonomy of all possible functions *like* may have in discourse in general, but only the functions *like* has in the corpus relevant for the present study. The labels of the four functions are either taken directly from the studies mentioned above, or viewed somewhat differently.

(224)   FRAME So **like** → what else do you do (*AMPIE* 00.29.50)

(225)   APPROX Yeah it's only **like** → seven hours (*AMPIE* 00.03.05)

(226)   RAPPORT Do │do you believe in love at first sight │ nah I bet you don't you're probably too sensible for that │ │or have you ever **like** ↓│ │seen somebody and you knew that if only that person really knew you, they would│ │well they would of course dump the perfect model that they were with   (*WHILE* 00.18.22)

(227)   MIT   I guess you think you're uh │you know **like** ↓ an authority figure (*FARGO* 00.55.43)

The core function of *like* as a marker of discrepancy between what a speaker says and has in mind is incorporated into all four functions above. Neither the previous studies of *like*, nor the present one, find that the various functions of *like* are mutually exclusive. On the contrary, the functions co-exist and many times overlap. The functional classification of *like* in the present study is based on the most salient function of *like* in a given context. Each occurrence of *like* is categorised according to its most salient function, obtained from the parameters and the theoretical approach in the various studies mentioned above.

Below follows a brief overview of the four functions of *like*, and how they are related or not to Blyth et al.'s (1990), Romaine & Lange's (1991), Dailey-O'Cain's (2000), Andersen's (2001), and Hasund's (2003) accounts of the same DP. This is not meant to be an exhaustive description of the various labels, and how they are related per se, but simply a look into the different functional distributions of *like*, and how the functions are labelled. Each of the four functions will be discussed in more detail throughout this chapter, and additional examples will be included.

FRAME and **APPROX** are the two textual functions. **FRAME** includes various discourse structuring functions, and is similar to what Andersen (2001) refers to as discourse-linking functions (Andersen includes *like* as a repair marker as well. This function is not found in the corpus of the present study, probably due to the small number of occurrences of *like* here), and what Hasund (2003) calls turn-taking functions, where *like* usually has an initial position. Included in the **FRAME** category is also the quotatitive function of *like* as a signal of reported speech. This function is mentioned by both Andersen and Hasund, and also by Blyth et al. (1990), and Romaine & Lange. In example (224) above, the speaker uses initial *like* (together with *so*) as a turn-taking device, changing the subject somewhat and moving on in the discourse.

The **APPROX** function is found in both Andersen's and Hasund's accounts of *like*. Andersen's division into numeral (*like* placed before a numeral), lexical (*like* placed before a noun phrase), and measurable (*like* placed before a measurable entity) approximation is not made explicitly in the present study, but there are examples of each of the three types. Hasund finds what she calls approximation to be a function *like* signals especially in initial and medial

position in an utterance. In the present study, **APPROX** also includes a more exemplifying function of *like*, although this function is not frequent in the corpus. In example (225) above, the speaker uses *like* to signal that the subsequent numeral *seven (hours)* is an estimation of the distance between two cities in North America. The **APPROX** label is used for *like* as a chiefly textual approximation. There are examples in the corpus where *like* is used as an approximation of a more interpersonal kind (e.g. as a face threat mitigator), and thus not labelled **APPROX,** but **RAPP** or **MIT**.

RAPP and **MIT** are the two interpersonal functions of *like* in the corpus. The **RAPP** label is used for occurrences of *like* that "emphasise common ground or strengthen the expression of agreement between speaker and listener" (Hasund 2003:94), and is used by Hasund in what she calls a subjective function, clearly related to what she refers to as the interpersonal function of *like*. *Like* with a **RAPP** function is a marker of informality that is used by speakers wanting to build rapport with hearers. In example (226) above, the speaker wants to build rapport with the hearer (even though this particular hearer is in a coma and probably cannot hear what the speaker says). In the remaining part of the quite lengthy monologue in the scene in question, the speaker uses a great quantity of the DP *you know* (cf. 6.5.3), which has a function of an appeal for solidarity, closely related to the rapport building function of *like*.

Included in the **RAPP** function in the present study is also an additional function of *like*, not brought up in the previous studies mentioned above: *like* as a marker of stigma. (An overuse of) *like* is often seen as a feature of a certain type of speaker, e.g. the Californian valley-girl, and this DP seems to be more stigmatised than (an overuse of) the DPs *well*, *you know*, and *I mean*. The stigma is particularly reflected in one film in the corpus of the present study, i.e. *BLONDE*, where *like* with an interpersonal function is used to indicate a negative attitude towards characters (over)using *like*. This function is incorporated in the **RAPP** function because in the examples of *like* as a stigma marker in the corpus, the speakers are trying to build rapport with hearers listening in on a dialogue between speaker and (over)user of *like*, and at the same time excluding the (over)user of *like*.

The final function of *like* proposed here is the **MIT** function. This is found by Hasund who calls it a hedge for negative politeness, used e.g. "in order to soften a potential face-threat" (Hasund 2003:93). **MIT** is exemplified above in (227) with a speaker performing the face-threatening act of complaining, as well as insulting the hearer. The speaker uses *like* in order to mitigate this face-threatening act. The DP *you know* preceding *like* also has a mitigating function in this example, adding to the mitigating function of *like*.

To sum up, in the present study, the functions of *like* are classified as **FRAME**, **APPROX**, **RAPP**, and **MIT**. The two functions **FRAME** and **APPROX** are seen as operating textually, while the two functions **RAPP** and **MIT** are seen as operating interpersonally. The functions are not mutually exclusive, but one instance of *like* may signal two or more functions at the same time. The functions are situated in a functional continuum, and they overlap at certain points. However, when allowing for the seven parameters used for the analysis of all DPs in the present study (cf. 4.3.1), alongside the cross-theoretical approach taken, one function of *like* most often manifests itself as more salient in a given context than the remaining functions do.

All four functions will now be considered in more detail with additional examples.

On the textual side of the functional continuum are the **FRAME** and **APPROX** functions of *like*. These two functions have certain qualities that are the same or similar for both of the textual functions: e.g. (i) they both structurally signal that there is some sort of discrepancy between what the speaker says and what s/he has in mind; (ii) they most often entail a pause after *like* (especially for turn-taking **FRAME** and the quotation function) or no pause at all surrounding *like* (especially for the **APPROX** function); (iii) they usually present *like* with a rising intonation (especially for the turn-taking **FRAME** function) or a declarative intonation (especially for the **APPROX** function); (iv) they most often occur in utterance-initial position (for the turn-taking **FRAME** function) or utterance-medial position (for the quotative **FRAME** function and the **APPROX** function).

FRAME is the function showing the most clear textual qualities of all four functions of *like*. Included in this function are both transitions in discourse, such as turn-taking and floor-gaining, and markers of reported speech. The floor-gaining **FRAME** function is exemplified in (228) below.

(228)   Woman: so yeah **like** ↓│ │I noticed this guy going out a lot when them murders was happening

<div align="right">(SEVEN 01.13.02)</div>

In (228), a woman is giving a statement to a police officer about a man who is a suspect in a murder trial. The utterance in (228) is not connected to a previous (part of a) discourse, but *like* (together with *so* and *yeah*) signal the floor-gaining function in the utterance. The pause after *like* is common for this type of **FRAME** function, whereas the falling intonation is not so common.

The quotative **FRAME** function of *like* is illustrated in (229), below.

(229)   Oz: oh sure I know what people think │it's **like** → │Oz he's just this kick ass lacrosse player
<div align="right">(AMPIE 00.29.18)</div>

Like with a quotative **FRAME** function indicates that a quote is part of reported speech, thought, or action. Frequent collocations for *like* as a quotation marker, found by Andersen (2001), are *be* (e.g. *it's like*), *go* (e.g. *she goes like*), and *say* (e.g. *he says like*). In the corpus of the present study the most common collocation is the one in (229) above, i.e. *be* (*it's like)*. Other common collocations of quotative *like* in the corpus are other DPs such as *well* (cf**.** (58)) and *you know*. In the example above, the character Oz is quoting what he believes people are thinking and saying about him behind his back, i.e. they are thinking that *Oz he's just this kick ass lacrosse player*.

The **APPROX** function is the second of the textual functions. This function is closer to the interpersonal functions than the **FRAME** function is, but it is still considered to be a textual function in the present study because what it signals is an approximation of a piece of discourse which is not rapport-building, face-threatening or in any other way interpersonally marked. This label includes numeral, lexical and measurable approximation, as well as a few examples of *like* as an exemplifier. Example (230) is similar to Andersen's illustration of a lexical approximator in (215), above.

(230)   Elle: oh is this **like** → an RSVP thing (*BLONDE* 00.35.44)

The character Elle in (230) asks a group of people whether joining their study group is an RSVP thing. She uses *like* as an approximator together with *thing* to signal that the group meeting does possibly not require a proper reply to an RSVP request for people to join, but it seems to require *approximately* this.

Consider (231) below for an illustration of the exemplifying **APPROX** function of *like* (number (2) in the example below).

(231)   Oz: so **like (1)** what else do you do
        Heather: Well │ the same things you do │ │ **like (2)** hang out with friends and stuff
                                                                            (*AMPIE* 00.29.49)

The first *like* in this example is a floor-gaining **FRAME** marker (similar to (228)), while the second is an exemplifying **APPROX** marker. Heather replies to Oz's question on what else she likes to do in her spare time, using *like* as an indicator of the examples that are to come (*hang out with friends and stuff*). This occurrence of *like* is thus used to signal the exemplification in the utterance.

On the interpersonal side of the functional continuum are the **RAPP** and **MIT** functions of *like*. These two functions have certain qualities that are the same or similar for both of the interpersonal functions: e.g. (i) they both interpersonally signal that there is some sort of discrepancy between what the speaker says and what s/he has in mind (ii) they most often entail no pause at all surrounding *like* (especially for the **RAPP** function) or a pause after *like* (for both **RAPP** and **MIT**); (iii) they usually present *like* with a rising intonation (especially for the **RAPP** function) or a falling intonation (especially for the **MIT** function); (iv) they are most often used in utterance-medial *like*.

The **RAPP** function of *like* indicates the desire on the part of the speaker to build rapport with the hearer. Consider (232) below.

(232)   George: David Ravell │ │ is getting boring.
        Lyla: we know that
        George: well couldn't I have **like** ↑ a │ │ sister who's │ a-a twin who's evil or
        Lyla: no we did that with Lonnie remember the blind one last year
                                                                            (*BETTY* 01.06.15)

George in (232) is an actor, here talking to Lyla, the producer of the soap he is starring in. George is bored with his character David and is trying to persuade Lyla to add something to his character in order to make it more interesting. George proposes bringing in a new character, an evil twin, to add a little something to the plot of the soap. When proposing this, George includes *like* as a marker of **RAPP**, used to build rapport with Lyla and toning down the message somewhat. In this particular example, *like* also has a mitigating function since George is putting himself in a face-threat mitigating situation of suggesting something to his superior. The label **RAPP** is, however, chosen here due to the persuading function of George's utterance and the need for him to build rapport with Lyla in order to get what he wants.

Consider the second occurrence of *like* in (233) below, for a **RAPP** function with a certain degree of stigma connected to it[46].

> (233)   Elle: I've come to join your study group look I brought sustenance who's first
>   Vivian: nh-nhn nh-nhn our group is full
>   Elle: oh is this **like (1)** → an RSVP thing
>   Vivian's friend: no it's **like (2)** ↓ │ a smart people thing │ and as Viv said we're full.
>   (*BLONDE* 00.35.36)

In the scene in (233), Elle is approaching a study group at her new college, asking whether she can join them. Vivian does not want Elle to join and Elle replies jokingly *is this like an RSVP thing*, using *like* with an **APPROX** function (cf. (230) above). Vivian's friend then mimics Elle's utterance, saying *no it's like a smart people thing*, repeating *like* to emphasise the fact that Elle is not considered to be one of the smart people and that her (over)use of *like* is a sign of her lack of intelligence. *Like* is used by Vivian's friend in this example to exclude Elle from the study group and to build rapport with Vivian and the others in the group. The facial expressions and tone of voice of Vivian's friend, as well as the pause after *like*, to accentuate the importance of this word in the utterance, point to the fact that this speaker both wants to intimidate Elle and build rapport with the rest of the group.

      The **MIT** function is the second of the interpersonal functions of *like* and the final function of *like* which will be mentioned here. **MIT** stands for face-threat mitigator, meaning it is used to signal a mitigation or down-toning of an utterance to make a situation less face-threatening for either speaker or hearer (or both). In the corpus of the present study, *like* is mostly used to mitigate (parts of) utterances in embarrassing situations. Example (234) below, is one such situation.

> (234)   Kevin: so how do you wanna be **like (1)** ↓ │ │ how do you wanna do it
>   Victoria: I dunno │ │ how do you
>   Kevin: **like (2)** ↑ │ │ normal style the missionary position
>   Victoria: okay
>   (*AMPIE* 01.19.06)

Kevin and Victoria in (234) are about to lose their virginity at a high school party. They are discussing how to go about this as Kevin uses *like* twice: first, when asking Victoria how she wants to do it; and second, when suggesting a way of doing it. Both asking his girlfriend and giving a suggestion are face-threatening acts, which Kevin mitigates by using *like*. The first *like* is utterance-medial, has a falling intonation and is followed by a pause, and thus fits the general behaviour of *like* as a **MIT** marker in the corpus. The second *like* is positioned initially in the utterance and shows a rising intonation, making this occurrence of *like* similar to the behaviour of **FRAME** marking occurrences of *like* in the corpus. This *like* has features

---

[46] The inclusion of *like* as a stigma marker in the **RAPP** function may not be ideal, as it is not clearly connected to other types of **RAPP** (as in e.g. example (232)). Nevertheless, the examples of this particular function of *like* are best incorporated into the **RAPP** function as the speaker seeks to build rapport with over-hearers. In addition, the occurrences of this function are few and do not influence the quantitative results to a great deal, but they are still functionally interesting to discuss.

of the **FRAME** function, but due to the face-threatening act which it precedes, it is labelled **MIT**.

The above examination of the functions of *like* should make clear that none of these functions are definite, but as all DP functions they are somewhere on a gradient scale and sometimes intertwined with each other. The above account of *like* is a way of trying to decode the functions and limit their use as much as possible. The reader should bear in mind, however, the complexity of DP *like* and the fact that its functions, as we have seen, often overlap. Below are two additional examples of problems arising when analysing *like* in the corpus of the present study.

Consider example (235), below.

(235) Nadia: you have seen me now it's my turn to see you │ │strip
       Jim: strip
       Nadia: slowly
       Jim: uh │you-you mean **like** ↓│strip strip

<div align="right">(<i>AMPIE</i> 00.46.32)</div>

In example (235), *like* has both an **APPROX** function and a **MIT** function. Jim uses *like* before the verb *strip*, thus signalling the approximation of the verb (even though the repetition of *strip* is an emphasis of the fact that it is literally a strip that Nadia wants Jim to do). After considering the context, however, the **MIT** function is more salient. In the context of the example, *like* mitigates the FTA of Jim questioning Nadia's command. Nadia is making Jim strip in front of her (and, in addition, in front of all Jim's friends, as he is airing the meeting between himself and Nadia live on the Internet). Jim finds the situation embarrassing and this is clear from both intonation and body language. There are quite a few similar examples in the corpus where *like* has an **APPROX** and a **MIT** function simultaneously, but where a clear FTA in the context makes the **MIT** function more prominent.

Another example of *like*, where the DP at first glance appears to have a clear **APPROX** function, is (236) below.

(236) Teacher: you've filed a claim│ │what next │Ms Woods
       Elle: don't you need to have evidence
       Teacher: meaning
       Elle: meaning you need reasonable belief│ │ that your claim should have
                 │**like**│ evidenciary support

<div align="right">(<i>BLONDE</i> 00.41.41)</div>

The above instance of *like* is complex. On the surface, it has an **APPROX** function, i.e. *like* is signalling that *evidentiary support* is an approximate term. This instance is labelled **MIT** in the present study, as Elle is put on the spot in this example: the teacher is asking her a question and she is not completely sure about the answer, hence the down-toning of the term *evidentiary support* to save her face (and the pauses in her utterance signalling her uncertainty). In addition to the **MIT** function and the **APPROX** function, this instance of *like* also has another, more intricate, function: *like* symbolises the contrast between the character Elle's old and new use of language. Elle, as a stereotype Californian valley-girl (cf. 8.2.1) overuses *like* in comparison to her Harvard Law School peers, who make fun of her because

of her language (cf. (233)). The scene in example (236), is the first time in the film *BLONDE* that Elle uses language appropriate for a class-room situation of a Harvard Law School student, and the inclusion of the occurrence of *like* shows the contrast of the two sides of Elle. This last function of *like* is very difficult to pin-point, and as it is the only instance of its kind in the corpus, it is not labelled with an individual function, but **MIT** is chosen as the most salient function.

We will leave the intricate functions of *like* for a while, and focus on more quantitative aspects of *like* and its translations.

8.3 *Like* and its translations: quantitative aspects

In sections 8.3 and 8.4, some quantitative results relating to *like* will be discussed. Focus will be more on general quantitative tendencies, and the discussion will not always go into great detail with all aspects of the tables.

There are 66 occurrences of the DP *like* in the corpus. 19 of these are translated into at least one of the four TTs Cinema, DVD, SVT, and TV3+TV4. This amounts to a 29 % translation rate of the total of DP *like*. In all four TTs combined, there are a total of 46 translation tokens[47] of *like*.

All ten films have instances of *like* in their soundtracks, but two of them, *AMPIE* and *BLONDE*, stand out in comparison. More than 50 % (35 instances) of the 66 occurrences of *like* in the STs are found in *AMPIE* and *BLONDE*, covering 17 and 19 instances of *like*, respectively. The 31 remaining tokens are divided more evenly, although *PRIMARY* and *BETTY* include a few more than the remaining six films. Table 8.1 below shows the distribution of *like* in the films, compared with the (approximate) number of words in each soundtrack and the number of *like* per 100 words.

Table 8.1. Occurrences of *like* with number of words per film and frequency per 100 words.

Film	*Like*	Number of words in each soundtrack	Frequency of *like* per 100 words	Films ranked by frequency of *like*
BLONDE	19	8788	0.2	1
AMPIE	17	8764	0.2	1
PRIMARY	6	18767	0.04	3
BETTY	6	10910	0.05	2
WHILE	4	10192	0.04	3
WAG	4	14297	0.03	4
SEVEN	3	9700	0.03	4
PULP	2	15456	0.01	6
FARGO	2	7878	0.03	4
ADDICTED	3	8779	0.02	5
Total	**66**	**113 555**	**0.65**	

On average, there is one occurrence of *like* per 1,600 ST words in the corpus[48], but there are great individual differences between the films. This DP is much less common in the films than *well*, *you know*, and *I mean*.

BLONDE and *AMPIE* are two of the films with the lowest number of words in their respective STs, and yet they include the highest number of tokens of *like*. One reason for the difference in quantity between *BLONDE* and *AMPIE*, on the one hand, and the rest of the films, on the other, is the fact that *BLONDE* and *AMPIE* are two College Comedies with predominantly young characters' language. *Like* is known for being used essentially "in the colloquial, everyday discourse of adolescents and young adults" (Buchstaller 2001:21) and so

---

[47] What is referred to as *translation tokens* in the present study is the combined number of translations, while the term *translation types* refers to the number of individually different translations (cf. 4.2.7).

[48] The total of 0.65 occurrences of *like* is divided by the number of films (ten), with the result of approximately 0.065 occurrences of *well* per 100 words in each film.

the use of *like* in the film soundtracks mirrors the use of this DP in authentic discourse. *AMPIE* and *BLONDE* both include one token of *like* per 500 words, to be compared with the average number of one token of *like* per approximately 1,600 words in all ten films combined. The use of *like* in *PRIMARY*, which is the film with the third most occurrences of *like* (together with *BETTY*), also illustrates the genre differences of the use of this DP. All six instances of *like* in *PRIMARY*, labelled Political Drama in the present study, are textual quotatives, used for the sake of making discourse easier to follow structurally. The film with the lowest frequency of *like* in its soundtrack is *PULP*, which has one token of *like* per 10,000 words. This is the lowest frequency of any of the four DPs in any of the films in the present study.

Four of the ten films have translations of *like*. The total number of translations of *like* in each film as well as in all four TTs, individually and combined[49], are shown in table 8.2, below.

Table 8.2. The distribution of *like* and its translations in each film, and in the four TTs

Film	ST	Cinema	DVD	SVT	TV3+TV4	Total number of translations	Average number of translations per TT
BLONDE	19	2	3	4	3	**12**	3.0 (16 %)
AMPIE	17	3	3	3	1	**10**	4.0 (24 %)
PRIMARY	6	5	3	3	3	**14**	3.6 (60 %)
BETTY	6	3	3	3	1	**10**	3.8 (63 %)
WHILE	4	0	0	0	0	**0**	
WAG	4	0	0	0	0	**0**	
SEVEN	3	0	0	0	0	**0**	
ADDICTED	3	*	0	0	0	**0**	
PULP	2	0	0	0	0	**0**	
FARGO	2	0	0	0	0	**0**	
Total	**66**	**13**	**12**	**13**	**8**	**46**	**15.2**

* The Cinema subtitles for *ADDICTED* have not been found.

There is a correspondence between the number of *like* in each soundtrack and the number of total translations in each film. Only four of the films, namely *BLONDE*, *AMPIE*, *PRIMARY*, and *BETTY*, the four films with the most tokens of *like* in their soundtracks, have translations of *like*. All four films have a similar total of translations in spite of their different number of ST occurrences. It thus seems that the translations in a sense even out the quantitative differences found in the STs: *AMPIE* and *BLONDE* do not include more translations than *PRIMARY* and *BETTY* even though the former two have many more ST tokens than the latter two. This means that when comparing the total number of translations (the total numbers are divided by four to show the average number and percentage of each TT) with the total number of ST occurrences of *like*, there is a higher percentage of translations of *like* in *PRIMARY* and *BETTY* than in *BLONDE* and *AMPIE*.

---

[49] The asterisk in the Cinema column for *ADDICTED* in table 8.2 indicates that this version has not been located and is thus not included in the total number of Cinema translations. A hypothetical number is included for the Cinema TT of this film for *well* and *you know*, based on the average number of translations in the other *ADDICTED* TTs. However, as there are no translations of *like* in the other *ADDICTED* TTs, no hypothetical number is used in the discussion of *like*.

When comparing the total numbers of translations for each TT, we see that the SVT, Cinema, and DVD subtitles include approximately the same number of translations of *like*, while the TV3+TV4 subtitles[50] have somewhat fewer translations. The difference between the distributions of translations between the four TT versions is not considerable, and any individual differences between the TTs are also small. The quantitative distribution of translation types for *like* in each TT will be commented on in connection with table 8.5.

8.4 Distribution of functions in STs and TTs

The quantitative distribution of the four functions of *like* (**FRAME**, **APPROX**, **RAPPORT**, and **MIT**) will now be considered more closely. First, the distribution of the functions in the STs will be examined, and then, the distribution of the translations of the functions will be discussed. Table 8.3 below, illustrates the distribution of the four functions of *like* in the ten films.

Table 8.3. The distribution of functions of *like* in all ten STs

FUNCTIONS	*ADDICTED*	*AMPIE*	*BETTY*	*BLONDE*	*FARGO*	*PRIMARY*	*PULP*	*SEVEN*	*WAG*	*WHILE*	Total
FRAME	0	5	0	1	0	6	0	2	0	0	**14**
APPROX	3	4	1	8	0	0	1	1	3	1	**22**
RAPP	0	1	1	7	1	0	1	0	0	2	**13**
MIT	0	7	4	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	**17**
TOTAL	**3**	**17**	**6**	**19**	**2**	**6**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**4**	**66**

The most common function in all ten STs combined is **APPROX** (22 tokens). **MIT** is the second most common function in the STs (17 tokens). The third most common function is **FRAME** (14 tokens), while the least common function is **RAPP** (13 tokens).

Some of the films show a tendency to include certain functions over others, e.g. *PRIMARY*, which includes *like* with a (quotative) **FRAME** function only, and *ADDICTED*, which includes *like* with an **APPROX** function only. The Political Drama films, *WAG* and *PRIMARY*, include most tokens of *like* with textual functions **APPROX** and **FRAME**. This may reflect the language in these films, consisting of political debates and discussions where speakers often use structural markers to support communication. The two films with the highest number of *like* tokens, the College Comedies *AMPIE* and *BLONDE*, include all four functions. However, *AMPIE* favours **MIT** and *BLONDE* favours **APPROX** and **RAPP**. *BLONDE* has a number of *like* with a **RAPP** function. This illustrates the function *like* sometimes has in this film as a marker of stigma through which rapport between speaker and hearers is built, ridiculing a character who (over)uses *like*, and excluding this character in the process.

---

[50] The numbers of TV3 (5 translations in total) and TV4 (3 translations in total) are combined to show the joint number of the two commercial channels.

The distribution of functions of the translated occurrences of *like* can be seen in table 8.4, below. The numbers in the table refer to how many times the ST functions of the DPs are translated, and not in any way to the functions of the translations.

8.4 The distribution of functions of translated *like* (all four TTs combined for each film).

FUNCTIONS	*ADDICTED*	*AMPIE*	*BETTY*	*BLONDE*	*FARGO*	*PRIMARY*	*PULP*	*SEVEN*	*WAG*	*WHILE*	Total
FRAME	0	4	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	18
APPROX	0	1	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
RAPP	0	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
MIT	0	2	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
TOTAL	0	10	10	12	0	14	0	0	0	0	46

There are some differences between the distribution of the totals of the four functions in table 8.4, and the distribution of the ST occurrences of *like* seen in table 8.3. In the STs (cf. table 8.3), the most frequent function of *like* is **APPROX**, but as seen in table 8.4, this function is only the third most translated. The most translated function of *like* is **FRAME**. In turn, **FRAME** is only the third most common function in the STs. The functions **MIT** and **RAPP** are the second and the least frequent function in the STs, respectively, and these functions keep their positions as second most and least translated functions of *like*.

Some individual differences concerning the films are the large amount of translations of the **FRAME** function for *PRIMARY*, and for the **MIT** function for *BETTY*. All occurrences of translated *like* in *PRIMARY* have a quotative **FRAME** function (cf. 8.5.1). The translated occurrences of *like* with a **MIT** function in *BETTY* are discussed further in 8.5.4.

The numbers in table 8.4 refer to the total number of translations in the four TTs combined. These numbers are divided by four in table 8.5, below, and contrasted with the number of DPs in the STs. Table 8.5 does not focus on the individual films, but on the functions of the translations of *like* in the four TTs Cinema, DVD, SVT, and TV3+TV4.

Table 8.5. The distribution of functions (tokens and types) and translations of *like* in all four TTs.

FUNCTIONS	ST	Cinema tokens/types	DVD tokens/types	SVT tokens/types	TV3+TV4 tokens/types	Total tokens	Average tokens	(Average tokens as) % of ST
FRAME	14	6/2	4/1	4/2	4/1	18	4.5	32%
APPROX	22	1/1	3/3	4/4	0/0	8	2.0	9 %
RAPPORT	13	2/2	1/1	2/2	2/2	7	1.8	14 %
MIT	17	4/4	4/4	3/3	2/2	13	3.3	19%
Total	66	13/9	12/9	13/11	8/5	46	11.5	

Table 8.4 illustrates the number of translations, as well as the number of translation types, of the functions **FRAME**, **APPROX**, **RAPP**, and **MIT** found in each TT. It says nothing about the functions of the Swedish translations of *like*, but takes into account the functions of the ST tokens of *like* only, as well as how many times the four functions are translated into each TT. In order to give a more accurate account of the translations, the total TT numbers (the totals of the Cinema, DVD, SVT, and TV3+TV4 combined) are divided by four to show the average

number of translations in each individual TT, as well as the average percentages of the functions translated into each TT.

If we consider the average percentages in table 8.5, it is clear that the most frequently translated function in the subtitles is **FRAME**, and the least frequently translated function is **APPROX**. The difference between the average percentages is quite noticeable, but this may have to do with the small number of ST tokens of *like* and the scarcity of its translations.

Due to the small number of both ST and TT tokens, it is difficult to draw any definite conclusions about the distribution of each function in the four TTs. However, the distribution of the functions among the TTs is fairly even. One notable detail in table 8.5 is the fact that the **APPROX** function is not translated once in the TV3+TV4 subtitles, whereas it is translated four times in the SVT subtitles. Another point in table 8.5 is the low number of translation types of *like* in the TV3+TV4 subtitles. The SVT subtitles have more translation types than the other three TTs.

Table 8.6 below shows the combined ST and TT numbers of the textual functions **FRAME** and **APPROX**, on the one hand, and the interpersonal functions **RAPP** and **MIT**, on the other. This division is presented in order to illustrate the distribution of the 66 tokens of *like* among textual and interpersonal functions in the ST, and also to see how many tokens of *like* with either function are translated (again, table 8.6 says nothing about the functions of the Swedish translations of *like*). For a more accurate picture of the individual translations, the total TT numbers for both the textual and interpersonal functions are divided by four to show the average number of translations in each TT.

Table 8.6. Functions of *like* in the STs, with number of translations.

Functions	STs	Number of translations in all four TTs	Average number of translations in each TT	Average % translated into each TT
Textual function	36 (55 %)	26 (55 %)	6.5	18 %
Interpersonal function	30 (46%)	20 (43%)	5.0	17%
Total	**66**	**46**	**11.5**	

The table shows that there are slightly more occurrences of *like* in the STs with a textual function than with an interpersonal function. The textual functions **FRAME** and **APPROX** are thus more frequent in the film soundtracks than the interpersonal functions **RAPPORT** and **MIT**. The remaining three DPs focused on in the present study all show the opposite numbers, i.e. the interpersonal function of these DPs is more frequent in the STs than the textual function (to be discussed in 9.3.2). The difference between the textual and interpersonal totals for *like* is, however, not considerable. As far as the translations are concerned, there are slightly more translations of the textual function than of the interpersonal function. When considering the ST functions and the TT functions we can see that an average of 17 % of the tokens of *like* with an interpersonal function, and an average of 18 % of the tokens of *like* with a textual function are translated into each TT. The difference is slight, but table 8.6 still shows a tendency of the textual function to be somewhat more frequently translated than the interpersonal function. Possible reasons for this will be discussed in 9.4.2.

8.5 Translations of *like*

There are 46 translations of *like* in all four subtitling versions Cinema, DVD, SVT, and TV3+TV4 combined (19 of the 66 ST occurrences are translated into one or several of the four subtitle versions). Table 8.7 below, shows all 46 translations in descending order of the frequency of their respective pragmatic and grammatical realisations. These categories are loosely based on the translation categories suggested by Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen for DP *well* (2003), and are to be seen only as a proposal for a division of the translations. This division of the translations is not necessarily a common way of viewing the translation features in general.

Table 8.7. Translation categories and translations of *like* in all 4 TTs

Category	Translations (+ occurrences)	Tokens/types
Quotation marks	" " (16); ungefär: "[…] " (1); t.ex. "[…]" (1)	**18/3**
DP/Modal particle	typ (7); liksom (1); ju liksom (1) väl bara (3)	**12/4**
Miscellaneous	nån (3); måste ha (2), eller nåt åt det hållet (2); nån slags (1); ett slags (1);	**9/5**
Adverb	bara (3), drygt (3); snart (1)	**7/3**
Total tokens/types		**46/15**

The categories in table 8.7 are not always mutually exclusive. For instance, *liksom* ('like'), can possibly be both a DP and an adverb, depending on the context. The table is to be seen as an indication of how the translations are distributed among pragmatic and grammatical categories.

The most frequent category in the Swedish subtitles is the quotation marks, and this is also the most frequently occurring translation type. There are two more instances of quotation marks in combination with another feature, i.e. one *ungefär: "[...]"* ('sort of/approximately: "[…]"'), and one *t.ex. "[...]"* ('for example "[…]"). The total of 18 instances of quotation marks in the subtitles illustrate the common function of *like* to signal that what is to come in the dialogue is a quote of reported speech, thought, or action. Translating *like* into quotation marks is a concrete way of presenting spoken dialogue in written form. In addition, it is a clear example of the use of the explicitation strategy (cf. 4.3.3), a translation strategy widely used for *like* in the form of quotation marks. According to Andersen (2001), common verbs collocating with quotative *like* are *be*, *go*, and *say*. In the corpus of the present study, *like* most often collocates with *be*, as in *it's like*. Another collocation of quotative *like* in the corpus is *you know*, as in *you know like*.

The second most common translation category of *like* is the DP/Modal particle with 12 tokens. This category includes e.g. *typ* ('like/sort of'), *liksom* ('like/sort of'), and *ju liksom* ('as you know like').

The two translation categories labelled Miscellaneous (e.g. *nån* ('some'), *nån slags* ('some kind of')), and Adverb (e.g. *bara* ('only/just'), *drygt* ('amply')), are equally common in the corpus at 9, and 7 tokens, respectively.

The second most frequently occurring translation type of *like* (after the quotation marks) in the corpus is *typ*. *Typ* is a commonly used Swedish DP. As *like*, *typ* is stigmatised and considered to be used mainly by adolescents (Andersson 2000:150; Wirdenäs 1999). Both its use and social status are thus similar to the use and social status of *like*. Just as *like*, *typ* is or has been part of a pragmaticalisation process. Originally, *typ* (translated as *type* or *category*) was a characterising noun (Ohlander 1983), which still exists in the Swedish language, and it has also been used as a preposition (Andersson 2000:150). One function of *typ* (as well as of *liksom* ('like') and other DPs) is to signal that the proposition *typ* precedes or follows "should not necessarily be understood as exact and presice information (Andersson 2000:150, my translation). Another function is to signal that what precedes or follows *typ* is a quotation (Kotsinas 2003:91). *Typ* thus has many qualities in common with *like*. Another Swedish DP which has similar qualities to *like* is *bara/ba* ('just'/'like'). As *like* and *typ*, this DP is considered to be used mainly by adolescents (Erman & Kotsinas 1993:76; Kotsinas 2003:77), and it often has the function of quotation marker (Kotsinas 2003:81). *Bara* is used three times as a translation of *like* in the corpus of the present study, and so is *väl bara* ('surely just'). However, it does not seem to be the DP function of *bara* that is used in the subtitles, but an adverb function meaning 'only'or 'exclusively' (cf. 8.5.4 for a discussion of these occurrences). As the DP function of *bara/ba* is not used as a translation of *like* in the corpus of the present study, it will not be further discussed here[51].

In the following, I will discuss the translations of *like* further by providing examples of ST occurrences of the four functions of *like* (**FRAME**, **APPROX**, **RAPP**, and **MIT**) with accompanying subtitle translations.

8.5.1 The frame-marker translated

The function **FRAME** has 14 ST tokens in all ten films combined. There are 18 translations of **FRAME**, making an average of 4.5 translations per TT. 14 of these 18 translations are found in the same film, i.e. *PRIMARY*, where they are used as translations of quotative *like*. 10 of the translations are found in one and the same scene in *PRIMARY*, a scene where the speakers, three political advisors of a Governor, are discussing what the Governor should reveal to the press about a delicate matter (one example being *it should be more like well that's too bad but we don't take it seriously*, where *like*, and to a certain extent also *well*, is used to signal quoted thought). The three speakers in these four ST examples of quotative *like* are thus quoting what they imagine a fourth person will or should say, and this is translated each time into at least one TT. **FRAME** is the most translated of all four functions of *like*, and the examples in the film *PRIMARY* greatly contribute to this.

Below is a list of translations of *like* with a **FRAME** function.

---

[51] For a discussion on *bara/ba*, see Erman & Kotsinas 1993, and Kotsinas 2004: 77-84 (the latter in Swedish).
For a discussion on both *bara/ba* as well as *typ*, se Svensson 2009 (in Swedish).

Table 8.8. Translations of the **FRAME** function

Translation	Total
"[…] "	16
ungefär: "[…]" ('sort of: "[…]"')	1
t.ex. "[…]" ('e.g. "[…]"')	1
Tokens/types	**18/3**

There are two types of **FRAME** function in the STs, i.e. a floor-gaining function (cf. example (228)), and a quotative function (cf. example (229)). These are equally frequent in the STs in the corpus, but only one of them, the quotative function, is translated.

The most common translation of the quotative **FRAME** function of *like* are the quotation marks ("[…]"). Each instance of the quotative **FRAME** function is translated by at least one of the TT versions Cinema, DVD, SVT, and TV3+TV4, and many times by all four TTs. This illustrates the fact that *like* with a clear textual function is translated more often than other functions of *like* (however, the interpersonal **MIT** function is also quite frequently translated, see 8.5.4 below). It also illustrates the tendency of the subtitles to use a short and clear translation whenever possible, and for the subtitlers to prefer an explicitation strategy when translating. Quotative *like* has a number of Swedish corresponding words, e.g. DPs *bara*/*ba* ('only'/'just') and *typ* ('like'/'sort of') (Kotsinas 2003), which could possibly have been used instead of the quotation marks. However, quotation marks clearly put across the function of quotative *like* in the ST, and do not take up very much space.

Example (237) below is (229) above repeated. The second occurrence of *like* (2) is an example of its quotative **FRAME** function, rendered as quotation marks in all four TTs.

(237)   Heather: aren't you supposed to be out **like (1)** ↓ trying to decapitate someone with your lacrosse stick or something
Oz: oh sure I know what people think │ it's **like (2)** → │ Oz he's just this kick ass lacrosse player │ you know I also play football by the way but that's **like (3)** ↑ it's not all that I am you know

(*AMPIE* 00.29.18))

Cinema+DVD	SVT	TV3
Jag vet mycket väl vad folk tror. [I know what people think.]	Visst, jag vet vad folk tycker. **"Oz - den där kaxige lacrosse-spelaren."** [Sure, I know what people think. "Oz – that cocky lacrosse player."]	Visst. [Sure.]
"Oz är bara en stöddig lacrosse-spelare.". ["Oz is just a cocky lacrosse player."]	Jag spelar faktiskt fotboll också [I actually play football too] […]	Jag vet vad folk tänker. **"Oz är en hård lacrosse-spelare."** [I know what people think. "Oz is a tough lacrosse player."]
Jag spelar football också. [I play football too.]		Jag spelar fotboll också [I play football too.] […]

The characters Heather and Oz in (237) are discussing the prejudice they are experiencing at high school. Oz says he knows what people think of him, and then he uses reported speech to illustrate what it is he believes people are saying. *Like* collocates with *be* in this example (*it's like*), and the reported speech/quote directly follows *like*. The pause after *like* and the pause

after the quote (in combination with *you know*), signal the beginning and end of the quote. The four TTs use quotation marks to present the same effect *like* presents in the ST.

In (238) below, *like* is again translated in all four TTs, either as quotation marks (in the Cinema+DVD, and TV3 subtitles) or as *t.ex.* ('e.g.') plus quotation marks (in the SVT subtitles).

(238)   Dewayne: Dr Dalembretti is calling out the names on the diplomas │and er and and and
              what each kid done │ │you know **like** ↓ Sharonna Harris honours │uhm Tyrone
              Kirby │Regent's Diploma

(*PRIMARY* 00.04.27)

Cinema+DVD	SVT	TV3
-och rektorn ropade upp alla, och sa nåt om var och en. [and the headmaster called everyone and said something about each person.] **"**Sharonna Harris, väl godkänd.**"** **"**Tyrone Kirby, skolstyrelsens beröm.**"** [**"**Sharonna Harris, honours.**"** **"**Tyrone Kirby, Regent's Diploma.**"**]	Så läste rektorn upp namnen som stod på avgångsbetygen. [Then the headmaster called out the names on the diplomas.] Plus vad eleverna har presterat. **T.ex**. "Sharonna Harris, toppbetyg." [Plus what the students had done. **E.g.** "Sharonna Harris, honours."] "Tyrone Kirby, skolstyrelsens diplom" ["Tyrone Kirby, Regent's Diploma."]	Vi satt där och dr Dalembretti ropade upp namnen på examensbevisen. [We sat there and Dr Dalembretti called out the names of the diplomas.] Med utmärkelser. Ja, ni vet… "Sharonna Harris, hedersstudent." [With distinction. Yes, you know… "Sharonna Harris, honours"] "Tyrone Kirby, med beröm." ["Tyrone Kirby, with distinction."]

Dewayne in the example above is retelling an episode from his school years, where the headmaster called out the names of the students who had done well during the year. As Dewayne is recalling what the headmaster said, he is using *like* to signal that what is to come is a kind of a quote or reported speech.

As always when *like* is used as a quotative marker, it does not signal that what follows is a verbatim quote, but it shows that this is more or less the way it was actually said. Because of this approximate function of quotative *like*, it often has an **APPROX** function together with the quotative function. As *like* in (238) is exemplifying what the teacher said, it has an **APPROX** function in addition to the quotative **FRAME** function. The quotative **FRAME** function is, however, more salient here as Dewayne is recapping what the headmaster said and somewhat modifying his voice when quoting him.

The Cinema+DVD subtitles use quotation marks and explicitly put across the quotative function of *like*. The TV3 subtitles include a translation of *you know* (*Ja, ni vet…* ('Yes, you know…')) before signalling the beginning and end of the quote with quotation marks. The SVT subtitles illustrate more than the other TTs the exemplifying function of this instance of *like*, by including *t.ex.* ('e.g.') before the quotation marks. The SVT subtitles thus transfer both the quotative **FRAME** function and the **APPROX** function of *like* in the ST.

8.5.2 The approximation-marker translated

The **APPROX** function has 22 ST tokens in all ten films combined, making it the most frequent function of *like* in the film soundtracks. This function has a comparatively small number of translations, at 8 tokens altogether. One TT, the TV3+TV4 subtitles, does not include any translations of the **APPROX** function, a fact that possibly influences the low

239

number of translations. On average, there are 2 translations of the **APPROX** function per TT, i.e. an average of 9% of all *like* tokens with an **APPROX** function are translated.

Table 8.9 below, shows the translations of *like* with an **APPROX** function.

Table 8.9. Translations of the **APPROX** function

Translation	Total
drygt ('amply'/at least')	3
måste ha ('must have')	2
typ ('like/sort of')	1
snart ('soon/almost')	1
liksom ('like/sort of')	1
Tokens/types	**8/5**

The **APPROX** function includes *like* signalling numeral, lexical, and measurable approximation, as well as a few instances of *like* as an exemplifier. The numeral and lexical approximations are most common in the corpus. The measurable approximation and exemplification are not as frequent. The numeral approximation is the one **APPROX** function which is most often translated in the films: out of the 8 total translations seen in the table above, 7 are translations of this function, and 1 is a translation of *like* as an exemplification marker.

The most frequently used translation of *like* with an **APPROX** function is *drygt* ('amply'/at least'). All three tokens are from one and the same example, (239), below.

(239)   Elle: (…) she's amazing
         Callahan: amazing │ how
         Elle: she can make you lose **like** → three pounds in one class │ she's completely gifted
                                                                  (*BLONDE* 00.50.06)

Cinema	DVD
Man går ner ett **drygt** kg på ett pass. [You lose at least a kilo in one class.] Hon är helt genial. [She is a total genius.]	Man gick ner ett **drygt** kilo på hennes pass. Hon är så begåvad. [You lost at least a kilo in her class. She is so talented.]
SVT	**TV4**
Man gick ner ett **drygt** kilo. Hon är genial. [You lost at least a kilo. She's a genius.]	Man gick ner 1,5 kg på hennes pass. [You lost 1.5 kilos in her class.]

Like in (239) is a numeral approximation, referring to *three pounds* in the ST. Elle is explaining to her boss how her old gym instructor could make people lose a substantial amount of weight (three pounds) in a short period of time (one class). *Like* is used here to signal that three pounds is not the exact number of pounds people lost in one class, but an approximate number.

Three of the subtitles, the Cinema, DVD, and SVT subtitles, use *drygt* ('amply/at least') to translate this instance of *like*. These three TTs also translate pounds into kilos (1 pound = approximately 0.5 kilos), using the **APPROX** function of *like* to make an approximate

translation of 3 pounds, i.e. *ett kg/kilo* ('one kilo') instead of the more exact *1,5 kg* (1.5 kilos) in the TV4 subtitles. The TV4 subtitles do not include any form of approximation, but translate *like 3 pounds* into the fairly precise *1,5 kilo*.

The second most common translation of *like* with an **APPROX** function is *måste ha* ('must have'), which is shown below.

(240) Vivian: are you done with that deposition yet
Elle: oh yeah here take it │ I've read it **like** → 20 times.

(*BLONDE* 01.03.01)

Cinema	DVD
Ta det, jag har läst det 20 gånger. [Take it, I've read it 20 times.]	Ja, visst. Ta det. Jag **måste ha** läst det 20 gånger. [Yes, sure. Take it. I **must have** read it 20 times.]
SVT	**TV4**
Ja, ta det du. [Yes, you take it.] Jag **måste ha** läst det tjugo gånger. [I must have read it twenty times.]	Jag har läst det tjugo gånger. [I have read it twenty times.]

In (240), Elle is telling Vivian that she has finished reading a deposition, and that she has read it *like 20 times*. Elle has probably not counted the exact number of times she has read the deposition, and so she estimates it to be about 20 times. Most likely, the number 20 is also an exaggeration and *like 20 times* implies that Elle believes she has read the text too many times.

The DVD and SVT subtitles use *måste ha* ('must have'), to put across the approximation function of *like* in the ST. The Cinema and TV4 subtitles do not include any form of approximation, but, like the TV4 subtitles in (239) above, they give a more precise number, i.e. *tjugo gånger* ('twenty times').

Example (241) below illustrates *typ* as a translation of *like* with an exemplifying **APPROX** function. *Like* (1) is a clear example of a turn-taking **FRAME** function, whereas *like* (2) has an **APPROX** function.

(241) Oz: so **like (1)** what else do you do
Heather: well │ │the same things you do │ │**like (2)** → │hang out with friends and stuff why what do
you think I do

(*AMPIE* 00.29.49)

Cinema+DVD	SVT	TV3
Det du gör. Träffar kompisar och så. [What you do. See friends and such.] Vad trodde du? [What did you think?]	Samma saker som du gör. **Typ** umgås med kompisar och så. [The same things you do. **Like** spend time with friends and such.] Vad trodde du? [What did you think?]	Sånt som du gör. [Whatever you do.] Jag umgås med vänner och så. Vad trodde du? [I spend time with friends and such. What did you think?]

In the above example, Heather is trying to explain to Oz that she does the same things he does in her spare time. She gives the examples *hang out with friends and stuff*, signalling with *like* that this part of the utterance is an example.

The SVT subtitles include a clear matching translation of the exemplifying **APPROX** function of *like*, i.e. *typ*. *Typ* is frequently used to signal approximation and exemplification in

Swedish (Andersson 2004). In addition, as it is considered to be used mainly by adolescents, it is a logical translation of *like* in the context above.

The final example of the **APPROX** function is (242) below.

(242)

Margot: honey │ you have to leave this room │ it's been **like** → a week
(*BLONDE* 00.11.19)

Cinema	DVD
Du måste gå ut, du har varit här en vecka. [You have to leave, you've been here a week.]	Du måste lämna rummet, gumman. Det har **liksom** gått en vecka. [You have to leave the room, honey. It's **like** been a week.]
SVT	TV4
Du måste gå ut, du har legat här i **snart** en vecka. [You have to go out, you've been lying here for **almost** a week.]	Du måste komma ut nu, gumman. Det har gått en vecka. [You have to get out now, honey. It's been a week.]

In (242)*, like* is a numeral approximation, signalling the estimation of *a week*. The speaker Margot is talking to Elle, who has spent days in bed feeling sad because her boyfriend has broken up with her. Margot is trying to make Elle realise it is time she left her bed and her room. The example is taken from *BLONDE*, a film mostly focussed on young people's college lives with a clear use of young people's language. The speaker Margot is a young, blonde valley-girl (cf. discussion on the valley-girl phenomenon in 8.2.1) who uses a language clearly illustrating the typical attributes of this type of girl, i.e. attractive, cheerful, friendly, but uneducated (Dailey-O'Cain 2000).

The subtitles handle the translation of *like* quite differently in this example. Two of them, the Cinema and TV4 subtitles, do not translate *like* at all, but treat *it's been like a week* as if Elle has been in the room for exactly a week (*du har varit här en vecka/det har gått en vecka*). The DVD and SVT subtitles both transfer *like* into matching translations, but where the former focuses on the pragmatic discourse function of *like*, the latter brings up the non-discourse use of *like*, which has clearer lexical meaning. The DVD subtitles translate *like* into *liksom* ('like/sort of'), which is a widespread DP, used by most Swedes, here transmitting a typical adolescent use of DP *like*. The SVT subtitles, however, translate *like* into *snart* ('almost/soon'), expressing a clear approximate function of *like*, and using a word with a clearer lexical meaning.

Overall, the **APPROX** function is generally translated when *like* signals a numeral approximation, and is used as a clear signal of characteristic traits (cf. example (242)). However, the **APPROX** function is the least translated of the four functions of *like*.

8.5.3 The rapport-building marker translated

The **RAPP** function has 13 ST tokens in all ten films combined, making it the function with the fewest occurrences. This function also has the lowest number of translations at 7 tokens altogether. On average, there are 1.8 translations of the **RAPP** function per TT, i.e. an average of 14 % of all occurrences of *like* with a **RAPP** function are translated.

Table 8.10, below, shows the translations of *like* with a **RAPP** function.

Table 8.10. Translations of the **RAPPORT** function

Translation	Total
typ ('like/sort of')	**4**
eller nåt åt det hållet ('or something like it')	**2**
ju liksom ('(as)you know like')	**1**
Types/tokens	**7/3**

The **RAPP** function includes *like* signalling a speaker's desire to build rapport with a hearer, many times in order to persuade the hearer to do something. In addition, it signals a speaker's desire to build rapport with over-hearers of a conversation and to exclude another speaker/hearer in the process. In the corpus of the present study, the latter function of *like* is associated with the stigma surrounding *like*, and the fact that this DP is considered to be used mainly by a certain type of people, i.e. the young, blonde Californian valley-girl (cf. 8.2.1).

All instances of the translation *typ* in table 8.10 above are translations of the **RAPP** function associated with some kind of stigma. Example (243) below illustrates this. There are five instances of *like* in (243), four of which have a function of building rapport with over-hearers (number (1) has an **APPROX** function while (2-5) have **RAPP** functions).

(243)   Elle: I've come to join your study group look I brought sustenance who's first
Vivian: nh-nhn nh-nhn our group is full
Elle: oh is this **like (1)** → an RSVP thing
Vivian's friend: no it's **like (2)** ↓ │a smart people thing │and as Viv said we're full.
(…)
Elle: oh okay I'll just leave then
Someone: bye
Enid: hey │maybe there's **like (3)** ↑ a sorority you could **like (4)** ↓ join instead
        like (5) →

(*BLONDE* 00.35.36)

Cinema	DVD
(…) Nej, man ska vara smart. [No, you should be smart.] Som sagt...gruppen är full. [As we said…the group is full.] (…) Gå med i nån studentförening istället, **typ**. [Join a sorority instead, **like**.]	(…) Nej, den är för snillen. [No, it's for smart people.] Och som Viv sa, den är full. [And as Viv said, it's full.] (…) Det kanske finns ett systerskap du kan gå med i. [Maybe there's a sorority you can join.]
SVT	**TV4**
(…) Nej, man måste vara smart. [No, you have to be smart.] Som sagt, det är fullt. [As we said, it's full.] (…) Gå med i nån studentförening istället, **typ**. [Join a sorority instead, **like**.]	(…) Nej, det är bara för smarta. [No, its only for smart people.] Som Viv sa, vi är nog för många. [As Viv said, we are probably too many.] (…) Det kanske finns nån **typ** studentförening att **typ** gå med i. [Maybe there's **like** a sorority to **like** join.]

In (243), Elle is at the Harvard Law School students' library, asking some peers whether she can join their study group. In this scene, there is a clear difference between Elle and the students in the study group. Elle is an archetypical Californian valley-girl with blonde hair, a pink shiny dress, and a valley-girl's language and intonation[52]. The four other students in the group all have darker hair, are more conservatively dressed, and use what they think is a language more suited for Harvard Law School. This scene focuses on the fact that the character Elle, with her valley-girl attributes, does not quite belong at Harvard. A clear illustration of this is her use of *like* at the beginning of the example (*like* (1)), and the ironic imitation of her by the characters 'Vivian's friend' (*like* number (2)), and Enid (*like* number (3-5)). *Like* (1) is labelled (lexical) **APPROX** due to the fact that its most salient function is to signal that the study group is 'approximately' an RSVP thing (cf. examples (230) and (233)). *Like* (2) in Vivian's friend's reply is labelled **RAPP** because it signals an exclusion of Elle in the group by repeating *like* to stress that Elle is less intelligent than the others, thus building rapport with the rest of the group. *Like* (2) is not translated in any of the subtitles (neither is *like* (1)) and so the **RAPP** function is lost.

   Like (3-5) in the example above are possibly the three tokens of DPs most clearly included in a film soundtrack in the corpus of the present study for a reason. The character Enid stops Elle as Elle is leaving the library, and she ironically and callously suggests that Elle should join a sorority, suggesting that this in itself is a ridiculous thing to do. The inclusion of three tokens of *like* in this single utterance clearly shows the script writer's/director's/actors decision to include an excess of instances of *like* in order to put a message across. The message here is that Elle's language, which includes quite a few DPs in general, and numerous cases of *like* in particular, symbolises her Californian origin and the fact that she is not viewed as being suited for Harvard Law School. The character Enid thus makes fun of Elle's use of *like* by overusing it in her own utterance. The scene in question can be related to Dailey-O'Cain's study on attitudes towards the use of *like*. Informants in this study were generally opposed to using this DP, except under certain circumstances "such as when 'imitating an airhead'" (2000:70).

   Three out of four subtitle versions take into account the special function of the tokens (3-5) of *like* in (243), translating *like* into matching *typ*. The Cinema and SVT subtitles have an identical translation, translating one of the three ST tokens. The TV4 subtitles translate two of the tokens, thereby transmitting the overload of *like* in the ST. The only TT not translating any of the *like* tokens is the DVD translation. This version completely leaves out the **RAPPORT** function, as well as the illustration of the stigma that Californian speak in general, and *like* in particular, has, and which is put across in Enid's utterance.

   The rest of the translations of the **RAPP** function can be seen in (244) below. In this example, the translation strategy *doubling of function* (cf. 4.3.3) is used. This means that it is not completely clear whether what seems to be a translation of *like* in fact is a translation, or whether it is a translation of another feature in the ST.

---

[52] What is commonly considered to be the typical intonation of a valley-girl is the intonation referred to as *upspeak*, i.e. a rising intonation at the end of an utterance, which does not function as an interrogative but as a statement (urbandictionary.com).

(244)

Kevin: so basically prom is our last chance
Oz: ah dude prom sucks
Kevin: I know but you gotta think about it this way <u>I mean</u> all the parties afterwards chicks
    are gonna wanna do it
Jim: yeah he's right it's **like** ↓uh │ it's **like** ↓ tradition <u>or something</u>.

(*AMPIE* 00.19.14)

Cinema+DVD	SVT	TV3
Han har rätt. Det är tradition **eller nåt åt det hållet**. [He's right. It's tradition **or something like it**.]	Det är **ju liksom** tradition. [It's **you know like** tradition.]	Ja, han har rätt. Det är en tradition. [Yes, he's right. It's a tradition.]

In (244), Kevin and Jim are trying to persuade Oz that going to their high school prom will benefit all of them even though it may be somewhat boring initially. Kevin uses *I mean* as an **ELAB** (elaboration) marker, signalling a clarifying and persuasive function (cf. example (194)). Jim then agrees with Kevin, using *like* mainly to build rapport with the other boys, and to persuade Oz to go to the prom. In this example, Jim also hesitates somewhat when saying *like* and thus repeats the DP twice. The two words *or something* ending Jim's utterance have a similar function to *like* here as *like* always signals some sort of discrepancy between what a speaker says and has in mind, and as there is some hesitation included in the utterance.

The subtitles treat *like* and its context differently. The Cinema+DVD subtitles use *eller nåt åt det hållet* ('or something like it'), which is possibly a translation of both the two tokens of *like* and the words *or something*. The fact that the phrase *eller nåt åt det hållet* is longer than *or something* (and could have been shortened to *eller nåt*, which is a literal translation of *or something*) may suggest that the subtitlers of the Cinema+DVD subtitles aspire to include both the instances of *like* and the phrase *or something*. The SVT subtitles have another type of translation, i.e. the modal particle *ju* ('(as) you know') and DP *liksom* ('like'). The SVT version picks up more on the adolescent language used in *AMPIE* than the Cinema+DVD subtitles do, and uses two Swedish particles common in spoken language. The TV3 subtitles do not translate *like*, *or something*, nor the hesitation in Jim's utterance.

8.5.4 The mitigation-marker translated

The **MIT** function has 17 ST tokens in all ten films combined. This is the second most common function of *like* after the **APPROX** function. This function also has the second highest number of translations after the **APPROX** function, at 13 translation tokens altogether. On average, there are 3.3 translations of the **MIT** function per TT, and an average of 19 % of the 17 ST tokens of *like* are translated into each TT.

Table 8.11, below, shows the translations of *like* with a **MIT** function.

Table 8.11. Translations of the **MIT** function

Translation	Total
bara ('just')	3
nån ('some'/like a')	3
väl bara ('surely just')	3
typ ('like/sort of')	2
ett slags ('a kind of')	1
nån slags ('some kind of')	1
Tokens/types	**13/6**

The **MIT** function includes *like* signalling a speaker's mitigation or down-toning of an utterance in order to reduce the potential face-threat of a situation for speaker and/or hearer. There are three equally frequent translations in table 8.11, i.e. *bara* ('just'), *nån* ('some/like'), and *väl bara* ('surely just'), with three tokens each in all four TTs combined. Two of these, *bara* and *nån*, as well as the translation *typ*, will be discussed further now.

The following two examples, (245) and (246), are taken from the same scene in the same film (*BETTY*), and they both include *like* with a **MIT** function. Consider (245), below, where the translation strategy *doubling of function* (cf. 4.3.3) is used, i.e. either of two words in the ST (*like* and/or *just*) have a similar function and we do not know which of these is translated into *bara* ('just').

(245)   David: oh are you c'mon ah it's <u>only</u> four lines so <u>I thought</u> I'd just <u>kind of</u> spring it on you <u>I hope</u> <u>that's okay</u> all right we're not gonna do any blocking or anything like that I'm <u>just</u> gonna put you here near the nurses' station okay I'll be right there okay │ thanks and I <u>just</u> wanna do **like** ↓ a quick run through <u>all right</u> │ relax you look great and here we go in a sec hold on

(*BETTY* 01.15.02)

Cinema	DVD+SVT	TV3
Det är bara fyra repliker, så jag tänkte att vi tar dem direkt. [It's only four lines, so I thought we'll do them right away.]	Det är bara fyra repliker, så vi tar dem direkt. [It's only four lines, so we'll do them right away.]	Det är bara fyra repliker, så vi tar dem direkt. [It's only four lines, so we'll do them right away.]
Inget slutgiltigt, vi ställer dig bara här vid sköterskeexpeditionen... [Nothing final, we'll just put you here by the nurses' station…]	Vi ställer dig bara här vid sköterskeexpeditionen… [We'll just put you here by the nurses' station..]	Jag ställer dig bara vid sköterskornas expedition. [I'll just put you by the nurses' station.]
Jag kommer på momangen. - Vi gör en snabbgenomgång **bara**. Det blir jättebra. [I'll be right there. – We'll **just** do a quick run through. It'll be great.]	Jag kommer. - Vi gör en snabb-genomgång **bara**.Det blir jättebra. [I'm coming. – We'll **just** do a quick run through. It'll be great.]	Jag kommer strax. [I'll be right there.] Vi gör en snabb genomgång. Slappna av, du är jättefin. [We'll do a quick run through. Relax, you look great.]

In (245), David is trying to help Betty give a few lines at a hospital soap opera set. Betty is oblivious to the fact that she is playing a part in a soap opera, and believes the scene in question is part of reality. Betty is thus greatly confused about the fact that there are indeed lines she has to say, something which David senses and therefore tries to soften the message to make Betty feel more at ease. David uses the DPs *like* and *all right* (the latter has a rising

intonation, used for enquiring whether Betty is all right), and he also uses the verb phrase *I hope that's okay*, as well as the down-toning *kind of*, *only*, and *just* (the latter used twice).

The Cinema and the DVD+SVT subtitles translate *like* or *just* into *bara* ('just'). It is impossible to know whether the translator considered *like* or *just*, or both when using the translation *bara*. The TV3 subtitles do not include a translation of *like* or *just* in the position in question. However, all three different subtitles, including TV3, contain translations of other words, i.e. *only* (*bara)*, *just* (*bara*), and a verb phrase with a similar mitigating function, i.e. *I thought* (*jag tänkte*).

Another example from the same scene is (246), below. Here, it is clearer that *nån* ('some'/like a')is in fact a translation of *like*.

(246)
David: if you-if you need **like** ↓ a-a minute just to kind of get your instrument straight that's fine if you wanna just
Betty: can I talk to you

(*BETTY* 01.17.23)

Cinema	DVD+SVT	TV3
Om du behöver öva rösten **nån** minut... [If you need to practice your voice for **like a** minute…]	Behöver du öva rösten **nån** minut…? [Do you need to practice your voice **like a** minute…?]	Om du behöver samla dig… [If you need to collect yourself…]

In (246), David is yet again trying to help Betty at the soap opera set. In this example, David once more has a hedging approach and uses the down-toning *kind of* and *just*. In addition, the phrase *If you need* is used, giving Betty a choice and thus also adding to the mitigating function of David's utterances.

The Cinema and DVD+SVT subtitles all include *nån* ('some/like a') as a translation of *like*, signalling the **MIT** function of *like* in the ST. As in the previous example, (245), the TV3 subtitles do not contain a translation of *like*.

The DP *typ* is used twice as a translation of *like* with a **MIT** function. Consider (247) below.

(247)
Jim: hey do you think I should wear this shirt for Stifler's party
Kevin: you've worn that shirt for **like** ↓ three days in a row man
(*AMPIE* 00.02.52)

Cinema+DVD	SVT	TV3
Du har haft den i tre dagar, **typ**. [You've had it for three days, **like**.]	Du har ju redan haft den i tre dar. [As you know, you've already had it for three days.]	Du har haft den skjortan i 3 dar. [You've had that shirt for 3 days.]

In (247), Jim is asking his friend Kevin whether he should wear the shirt he is currently wearing, for a party in a few days. Kevin implicitly tells him that this is probably not a good idea, since he has been wearing the same shirt *for like three days in a row*. This instance of *like* is a numeral approximation as it refers to the number three as an approximate number. However, in the present context, *like* has a more prominent function as a marker of the **MIT** function. Kevin tells his friend that using the same shirt again is a bad idea, this utterance in itself being an FTA which needs to be mitigated if the face of both Kevin and Jim will be saved. *Like* in (247) functions as a mitigation of the FTA.

The Cinema+DVD subtitles include *typ* as a clear translation of *like*. *Typ* is positioned at the end of the utterance, while *like* in the ST is positioned medially. This changes the focus somewhat, and *typ* signals a mitigation of the whole utterance, as opposed to *like* in the ST

which focuses more on mitigating *three days in a row* only. The SVT subtitles are rather complex. It is impossible to know whether *ju* here is a translation of *like* or of something else, or maybe included for other reasons. *Ju* is not considered to be a translation in this example, although this is debatable. The TV3 subtitles do not translate *like*, but simply keep *Du har haft den skjortan i 3 dar* ('You've had that shirt for 3 days').

8.6 Summary

The main aim of the present chapter has been to study the functions of *like* in the corpus, and to establish whether or not the Swedish linguistic means used as translations reflect the different functions of the DP. An attempt has been made to decode the number of functions *like* has in the corpus, and to classify these functions according to a functional continuum of textual functions (*like* as a frame-marker (**FRAME**), or approximation marker (**APPROX**)), and interpersonal functions (*like* as a rapport-building marker (**RAPP**), or face threat mitigating marker (**MIT**)). The classification is based on the following seven parameters (first introduced in 4.3.1): (i) intonation of *like*; (ii) pauses used in connection to *like*; (iii) collocations of *like*; (iv) position of *like* in an utterance; (v) type of utterance of which *like* is part; (vi) body language of speaker; and (vii) larger social context of *like*. In addition, the classification of the functions of *like* is viewed in conjunction with a number of cross-theoretical previous studies of the DP, relevant to the classification introduced in the present study. The translations of *like* have been studied in relation to the four functions found, quantitatively as well as qualitatively.

66 occurrences of *like* are found in the film corpus, 19 of which are translated into at least one of the four TTs Cinema, DVD, the public TV channel SVT, and the commercial TV channels TV3+TV4, making a total of 46 translations in all four subtitling versions combined. There are 15 individual translation types in all four TTs combined. Quantitatively, there is a small difference between the translating of *like* in the four TTs. Three of the TTs, i.e. The Cinema[53], DVD, and SVT subtitles, have an equal number of translation tokens, while the TV3+TV4 subtitles have somewhat fewer tokens. As far as the variation in translation types is concerned, the SVT subtitles include a couple of more types than the Cinema and DVD subtitles do. The TV3+TV4 subtitles have a few different translation types only.

It is often said that, due to the different time and space constraints experienced by different media, DPs are translated more often in cinema subtitling than in other forms of subtitling, especially TV subtitling (cf. 3.4.4). For *like*, this quantitative difference is clearer when comparing the TV3+TV4 subtitles, with the rest of the subtitle versions than when comparing TV subtitles, on the one hand, with the Cinema subtitles, on the other. The TV3+TV4 subtitles include less translation tokens and translation types of *like* than the other three TTs. The remaining three TTs, Cinema, DVD, and public service TV, include a similar number of both tokens and types. The fact that the Cinema subtitles in the corpus of the

---

[53] One film (*ADDICTED*) is missing from the Cinema subtitles, maybe affecting both the quantitative and qualitative totals for this TT (the other TTs do not include any translations of *like* in this film, however, and the possibility of the Cinema subtitles doing so is small).

present study include more words in total than the DVD and TV subtitles do (cf. 4.2.7), does not seem to affect the translation of *like* to a large extent.

The most common function of *like* in the STs is **APPROX**, followed by **MIT**, **FRAME**, and **RAPP,** in descending order of frequency. The order of frequency of the translated functions of *I mean* is somewhat different to the order of frequency of the functions in the STs: **FRAME,** which is the third most common function in the STs is the most translated, followed by **MIT**, **APPROX**, and **RAPP**.

Like is one of the most stigmatised DPs in the English language. The stigma can possibly be explained by the prejudice deriving from the impression that *like* is used mostly by uneducated adolescents, in general, and so-called Californian valley-girls, in particular. This may be one reason for the low frequency of *like* in eight of the films in the corpus of the present study, and the comparatively high frequency of this DP in the College Comedies *AMPIE* and *BLONDE*.

All in all, the quantitative analysis of *like* shows that there are more occurrences of *like* with a textual function in the film soundtracks than with an interpersonal function. This is at variance with the same analysis of *well*, *you know*, and *I mean*, which all show a larger number of ST tokens with an interpersonal function than with a textual function. However, the function most often translated in the subtitles is the same for both *like* and the other three DPs, i.e. the textual one. One reason for the large number of *like* with a textual function in the film soundtracks may be the high number of quotative *like* in the films, especially in the Political Drama film *PRIMARY*. In addition, the quotative function of *like* experiences a high percentage of translations.

The qualitative results show a wide variety in the types of translations used, taking the comparatively small number of ST occurrences into consideration. The core function of *like*, i.e. a discrepancy between the proposition a speaker utters and what the same speaker has in mind, is transferred to the subtitles in a number of ways. The most common translation of *like* is the quotation marks ("[…]"), which is a case of explicitation as it makes the quotative function of *like* explicit; and the second most common translation is *typ* ('like'/'sort of'). The rest of the translations (e.g. *nån* ('some'/'like a'); *bara* ('just'); and *drygt* ('amply'/at least')) have fewer occurrences and more equal totals. Despite the rather low number of translations of *like* in the subtitles, the variety of functions that *like* demonstrates in the film soundtracks is illustrated in the subtitles. All four functions are translated, and the translations often reflect the way each function relates to the core function of *like*.

There is, however, a discrepancy between translated functions and non-translated functions, i.e. some are translated quite often, and/or with a great variety of translation types, whereas others are hardly translated at all, and/or without a variety of types. For example, the quotative **FRAME** function is translated to a great extent, but the variety of translation types for this function is meagre (the quotation marks are almost exclusively used), and in contrast, the **APPROX** function has a low translation rate, but quite a few different translation types.

In conclusion, there is a variety of Swedish linguistic means used as translations of *like*, and they creatively reflect the various functions of this DP. However, when some functions, e.g. the stigma **RAPP** function, are not translated, important parts of the film discourse,

249

characterisations, and the main plot, may be lost (this is particularly unfortunate in *BLONDE* as the stigma **RAPP** function of *like* often seems to play a part of its own in this film).

9 Discussion

9.1 Introduction

In the preceding chapters, the four DPs *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like*, and their Swedish translations, have been viewed separately. In this chapter, both the DPs and their translations will be viewed together, and compared with one another in various ways. First, an overview of the quantitative results will be given as a background to the more qualitative discussion to follow. Next, a more detailed view of the DPs will be presented: *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like* will be discussed in terms of their Swedish translations in order to see if and how the DPs may tell us something about the translations, and vice versa. Finally, a more general account of the results, and what may be learnt from them, will be given. In addition, possible reasons for the fact that some functions are translated more than others, and that the majority of DPs are not translated in subtitling, are considered.

9.2 A quantitative overview of the results

All in all, there are 1032 occurrences of the four DPs *well* (555 occurrences), *you know* (265 occurrences), *I mean* (146 occurrences), and *like* (66 occurrences) in the corpus. Table 9.1, below, gives a quantitative overview of all four DPs and their translations. In the present study, what is referred to as *translation tokens* is the number of translations, while *translation types* make up the number of different translations.

Table 9.1. Number of DPs, number of DP tokens translated in one or more TT, number of translation tokens in four TTs, number of translation types found for each DP, and number of tokens per type.

DP	Number of DPs in STs	Number of DPs Translated in one or more TTs	Number of translation tokens in all four TTs	Number of translation types for each DP	Number of token/type
Well	555	117	264	49	5.4
You know	265	61	130	31	4.2
I mean	146	36	75	12	6.3
Like	66	19	46	15	3.1
	1032	233	515	106	

Altogether, the 1032 occurrences of *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like* are translated 515 times in the four TTs Cinema, DVD, SVT (the public service TV channel), and TV3+TV4 (the commercial TV channels) combined. Just over 1/5 (233) of the 1032 ST occurrences are translated in one or several of the four TTs. There are a total of 87 individual translation types used for all four DPs (some types are shared by two or three DPs, e.g. *ju*, cf. table 9.8)

The table below illustrates the total number of *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like*, in each film, compared to the (approximate) number of words in each soundtrack, and a ranking of the films by their DP frequency.

Table 9.2. The number of DPs (*well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like*) in each film, number of words in each soundtrack, DP frequency per 100 words, and films ranked by DP frequency.

Film	Number of DPs	Number of words in each soundtrack	Frequency of all four DPs per 100 words	Films ranked by DP frequency
PRIMARY	158	18767	0.8	6
AMPIE	145	8764	1.7	1
WHILE	114	10192	1.1	3
WAG	105	14297	0.7	7
FARGO	103	7878	1.3	2
BETTY	97	10910	0.9	5
PULP	95	15456	0.6	8
BLONDE	88	8788	1.0	4
ADDICTED	69	8779	0.8	6
SEVEN	58	9700	0.6	8
Total	**1032**	**113 531**	**9.5**	

On average, there is approximately one instance[54] of *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like* per 100 words in the film soundtracks. However, the films show clear individual differences (to be discussed below).

The film with the highest DP frequency per 100 words is the College Comedy *AMPIE*, followed by the Criminal Drama *FARGO*, the Romantic Comedy *WHILE*, and the College Comedy *BLONDE*, all three with similar frequencies. The two Crime/Gangster films *SEVEN* and *PULP* share the lowest DP frequency per 100 words. Other films with a comparatively low DP frequency are the Political Drama films *WAG* and *PRIMARY*, and the Romantic Comedy *ADDICTED*. The DP frequency of the Criminal Drama film *BETTY* is intermediate. These frequencies point to the fact that DPs occur more often in some film genres than in others. For instance, the dialogue of the College Comedy genre has more DPs than the dialogue of the Crime/Gangster genre and the Political Drama genre.

The distribution of the DP translations among the individual films, as well as among the four TTs Cinema, DVD, the public service TV channel SVT, and the commercial TV channels TV3+TV4, is illustrated in table 9.3, below.

Table 9.3. The distribution of DPs (*well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like*) in the STs; their translations in each film, as well as in the four TTs altogether.

Film	Number of DPs	Cinema	DVD	SVT	TV3+TV4	Total number of translations	Average number of translations in each TT (with percentage of ST)
PRIMARY	158	25	22	16	22	85	21 (13 %)
AMPIE	145	16	15	29	22	82	21 (14 %)
WHILE	114	13	13	13	13	52	13 (11 %)
WAG	105	13	12	12	10	47	12 (11 %)
FARGO	103	9	9	11	9	38	10 (10 %)
BETTY	97	19	18	19	9	65	16 (16 %)
PULP	95	7	6	6	6	25	6 (6 %)
BLONDE	88	8	23	10	10	51	13 (15 %)
ADDICTED	69	* (7)	7	10	5	29	7 (10 %))
SEVEN	58	14	15	9	10	48	12 (21 %)
Total	**1032**	**131**	**140**	**135**	**116**	**522**	

---

[54] The total of 9.5 DPs per 100 words is divided by the number of films (ten), with the result of 0.95 occurrences of *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like* per 100 words in each film.

The table above shows the distribution of the four DPs in the films, and the distribution of the DP translations in the four TTs. The fact that the Cinema subtitles for the film *ADDICTED* have not been located, and consequently are not included in the total number of Cinema translations, obviously affects the total number of the Cinema translations (124). For this reason, a hypothetical number (7) is included for this film, based on the average number of translations in the other *ADDICTED* TTs. With this hypothetical calculation, the total of the translations of the Cinema subtitles amounts to 131. The hypothetical result of the Cinema TT is applied to the discussion below (however, the hypothetical number is not used for tables concerning the pragmatic functions of the DPs (i.e. tables 9.4, 9.5, 9.6, and 9.7, below), as it is impossible to know the functions of the DPs in the missing Cinema TT for *ADDICTED*).

As far as the distribution of translated DPs in the films is concerned, when comparing the average number of DPs translated into each TT with the number of DPs in each ST, some differences emerge. The percentages (illustrating how many per cent on average of the DPs in each ST are translated), vary from 6 % to 21 %. However, eight of the ten films have similar percentages (varying from 10 % to 16 %), and only two deviate strongly from this norm. The two deviating films are the two Crime/Gangster films: *PULP* has a low average percentage of translation (at 6 %), while *SEVEN* has a high average percentage (at 21 %). Reasons for the deviations are to be found in the DPs' individual distributions (cf. table 5.2 for *well*, table 6.2 for *you know*, table 7.2 for *I mean*, and table 8.2 for *like*): the fact that *PULP* has no translations at all of *you know* and a rather low number of translations of both *well* and *I mean*, while *SEVEN* has quite a few translations of *well* and *you know*, and especially of *I mean* (none of these two films include translations of *like*) affects the total number of DP translations. These differences will be further commented on in connection with tables 9.4 and 9.5, below. In sum, apart from *PULP* and *SEVEN*, the films have a similar percentage of translated DPs on average. The quantitative differences found between the STs concerning DP frequency, often in correlation to film genre, are thus not as clear in the TTs.

Based on the distribution in table 9.3 of DP translations among the four TTs Cinema, DVD, SVT, and TV3+TV4, some conclusions can be drawn. The two TTs with the highest number of DP translations are the DVD and the SVT subtitles. The Cinema subtitles include fewer translations than the DVD and SVT subtitles, and the TV3+TV4 subtitles include the fewest translations. The difference between the TTs is not great, but it points to two interesting facts, namely (i) that the Cinema subtitles do not include more DP translations than the other TTs, and (ii) that the TV3+TV4 subtitles include considerably fewer translations than the other TTs. Given that cinema subtitles usually are less constrained regarding subtitling space than DVD and TV subtitles, there is room for more DP translations in cinema subtitles (cf. 3.4.4). In the corpus of the present study, the Cinema TT indeed includes more words than the other three TTs (0.08 % more than the DVD subtitles, 2.5 % more than the TV3+TV4 subtitles, and 5.5 % more than the SVT subtitles, cf. 4.2.7). However, no additional DPs are actually translated in the Cinema subtitles.

Possible reasons for the small number of DP translations in the TV3+TV4 subtitles will be further discussed in 9.4.3, below. In addition, the quantitative distribution of translation types in the four TTs will be commented on in connection with table 9.6.

We will now move on to the quantitative distribution of the textual and interpersonal functions in the STs and TTs (for a discussion on the functional distribution of DPs in the present study, see 2.4.3, and for a quantitative discussion on each DP's functions and their translations, see 5.4 for *well*, 6.4 for *you know*, 7.4 for *I mean*, and 8.4 for *like*). The four DPs each show a textual frame-marking (**FRAME**) and an interpersonal mitigating function (**MIT**), as well as two additional functions: one textual and one interpersonal. The additional textual function of *well* and *you know* is a clarifying function (**CLAR**), while *I mean* has a repair function (**REP**), and *like* an approximation function (**APPROX**). The additional interpersonal function of *well* is an insufficiency-marking function (**INS**), while *you know* has a solidarity-marking function (**SOL**), *I mean* an elaboration function (**ELAB**), and *like* a rapport-building function (**RAPP**).

Below, the distribution of the functions of the four DPs in the films, i.e. in the STs, will first be considered (table 9.4), and next, the distribution of the translations of the functions in the films will be discussed (table 9.5). Table 9.4, below, shows how the functions of the DPs are distributed in the STs. The textual functions **CLAR/REP/APPROX**, on the one hand, and the interpersonal functions **INS/SOL/ELAB/RAPP**, on the other, are combined in the table.

Table 9.4. The distribution of functions of the four DPs in all ten STs.

FUNCTIONS	*AMPIE*	*WHILE*	*WAG*	*PRIMARY*	*FARGO*	*ADDICTED*	*BETTY*	*SEVEN*	*BLONDE*	*PULP*	Total
FRAME	42	37	35	69	34	18	29	26	33	35	**358**
CLAR/REP/APPROX	21	15	20	12	9	7	14	9	10	6	**123**
INS/SOL/ELAB/RAPP	50	43	39	45	41	29	35	17	28	26	**353**
MIT	32	19	11	32	19	15	19	6	17	28	**198**
TOTAL	**145**	**114**	**105**	**158**	**103**	**69**	**97**	**58**	**88**	**95**	**1032**

The most common function in the STs combined is the textual **FRAME** function, but the interpersonal **INS/SOL/ELAB/RAPP** functions are almost as frequent. The third most common function is the interpersonal **MIT**, while the least common function in the STs is the textual **CLAR/REP/APPROX**. This distribution is similar for all ten films, with a few exceptions, and the functions of the DPs are thus used quantitatively similarly in the films, in spite of differences concerning film genres, etc. Table 9.4 will be further discussed in relation to table 9.5, below.

The distribution of the functions of the translated DPs in each film can be seen below. The reader should bear in mind that the numbers refer to how many times the ST functions of the DPs are translated, and not to the function of the translation.

Table 9.5.The distribution of functions of the translated DPs (all four TTs combined for each film).

FUNCTIONS	*AMPIE*	*WHILE*	*WAG*	*PRIMARY*	*FARGO*	*ADDICTED*	*BETTY*	*SEVEN*	*BLONDE*	*PULP*	Total
FRAME	16	12	16	41	13	10	16	14	27	13	**178**
CLAR/REP/APPROX	23	13	13	12	4	0	12	18	11	0	**106**
INS/SOL/ELAB/RAPP	28	17	14	19	21	7	14	12	9	8	**149**
MIT	15	10	4	13	0	5	23	4	4	4	**82**
TOTAL	**82**	**52**	**47**	**85**	**38**	**22**	**65**	**48**	**51**	**25**	**515**

The most commonly translated function is the textual **FRAME**, followed by the interpersonal **INS/SOL/ELAB/RAPP** functions. The third most commonly translated functions are the textual **CLAR/REP/APPROX**, while the least frequently translated function is **MIT**.

The distribution of **FRAME** and **INS/SOL/ELAB/RAPP** in table 9.5 follows the order of the same functions' distribution of ST occurrences in table 9.4. However, the distribution of **CLAR/REP/APPROX** and **MIT** has the opposite order of frequency, i.e. the textual functions **CLAR/REP/APPROX** are more frequently translated than the interpersonal **MIT**, even though the latter is more common than the former in the STs. In sum, when comparing table 9.4 with table 9.5, we see that DPs in the STs with a textual **FRAME** function or **CLAR/REP/APPROX** function are more prone to be translated than DPs with an interpersonal **INS/SOL/ELAB/RAPP** function or **MIT** function. This discrepancy is especially clear when comparing the **CLAR/REP/APPROX** function with the **MIT** function.

Table 9.6 below shows the distribution of functions of the translated DPs among the four TTs Cinema, DVD, SVT (public service TV), and TV3+TV4 (commercial TV). Again, the table says nothing about the functions of the Swedish translations, but considers the functions of the ST occurrences of the four DPs only, as well as how many times each function is translated into each TT. In addition, table 9.6 illustrates how many per cent of the various functions of DPs in the STs are translated. To identify each individual TT's percentages, the total number of tokens is divided by four and shows the average number of translated functions in each TT. The table also shows the distribution of translation types in each TT. Again, what are referred to as *tokens* are the number of translation occurrences, and what are referred to as *types* are the individually different translations.

Table 9.6.The distribution (tokens and types) of functions of the translated DPs in all four TTs

FUNCTIONS	ST	Cinema tokens/types	DVD tokens/types	SVT tokens/types	TV3+TV4 tokens/types	Total tokens	Average tokens	Average % tokens translated in each TT
FRAME	358	44/21	50/21	49/25	35/15	**178**	44	**12%**
CLAR/REP/APPROX	123	28/16	27/15	30/18	21/8	**106**	26	**21%**
INS/SOL/ELAB/RAPP	353	31/14	42/18	35/13	41/15	**149**	37	**10%**
MIT	198	21/14	21/15	21/18	19/14	**82**	20	**10%**
Total	**1032**	124/50	140/53	135/59	116/39	**515**		

As is clear from table 9.6, the difference between the distribution of the tokens of the functions between the four TTs is not great, indicating that there is not much difference between the way the DP functions are considered in the four subtitling environments.

In the table, we can also see that the textual functions **CLAR/REP/APPROX** have the highest (average) percentage of translated DPs, followed by the textual function **FRAME**. The interpersonal **INS/SOL/ELAB/RAPP** functions and the interpersonal **MIT** function have the lowest (average) percentages of translated DPs (these numbers are repeated in table 9.7,

below, to show the combined numbers of the textual functions, on the one hand, and the interpersonal functions, on the other).

Included in table 9.6 are also the numbers of translation types used in each of the TTs Cinema. DVD, SVT, and TV3+TV4. The most noticeable difference concerning the number of different types, is the discrepancy between the public service TV channel SVT and the commercial channels TV3+TV4: the SVT subtitles include 20 more individual translation types than the TV3+TV4 subtitles (to be further discussed in 9.4.3 and 10.1, below).

Table 9.7, below, shows the combined numbers of the textual functions (**FRAME** and **CLAR/REP/APPROX**) and interpersonal functions (**INS/SOL/ELAB/RAPP** and **MIT**) in the STs, and how many times either the textual or the interpersonal functions are translated.

Table 9.7. Functions of all DPs (tokens) in the STs and number of translations

FUNCTIONS	STs	Number of translations in all four TTs	Average number of translations in each TT	Average % translated into each TT
Textual function	481	284	71	15%
Interpersonal function	551	231	58	11%
Total	**1032**	**515**	**129**	

In the table, the number of translations in all four TTs is divided by four to provide the average number of translations in each TT. The percentages shown refer to how many per cent of the translated DPs in each TT have a certain function (these numbers refer to the functions of the DPs in the ST and have no connection with the functions of the translations). As can be seen in table 9.7, there are more DPs in the STs with a more salient interpersonal function than a textual function. In contrast, more DPs with a textual function are in fact translated than DPs with an interpersonal function. Possible reasons for the results in table 9.7 will be discussed in 9.4.2, below.

9.3 A comparison of the DPs and the translations

The DPs and their translations will now be examined more closely with a focus on various points of contact between English and Swedish pragmatic functions. First, the DPs in the STs will be studied in connection with their translations in order to examine the different levels of translation versatility of the DPs, and next, the most common DP translations in the corpus will be discussed. The comparison will start with a brief overview of the division made in the present study of the four DPs and their textual and interpersonal functions.

9.3.1 Differences and similarities between the four DPs and their translations

The division of all occurrences of DPs *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like* in the corpus into either textual or interpersonal functions is discussed in 2.4 (in particular 2.4.3). This division was made for two main reasons. First, a classification of the DPs was necessary to make an analysis of them at all feasible, and to find similarities and differences between the four DPs concerning their functions; second, a division was needed in order to see which of these ST functions was translated most often, and to find possible reasons for the differences in translation frequency.

The division into textual and interpersonal functions is based on the three Hallidayan (1994) metafunctions: the ideational; the textual; and the interpersonal metafunctions, as well as on Brinton's (1996) division of DP functions into textual and interpersonal (a division which itself was greatly influenced by the Hallidayan classification). The DPs under study all have two textual and two interpersonal functions[55] (cf. 2.4.3 and 9.2). Each DP shows a textual frame-marking (**FRAME**) and an interpersonal mitigating function (**MIT**), as well as two additional functions: one textual (**CLAR/REP/APPROX)** and one interpersonal (**INS/SOL/ELAB/RAPP**) function.

The two functions shared by *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like*, i.e. frame-marking (**FRAME)** and mitigation-marking (**MIT)**, seem to be omnipresent for these four DPs in the corpus of the present study, and may be so for other DPs too[56]. The remaining two functions found for each DP, one textual and one interpersonal, vary more from DP to DP. However, the remaining textual function (**CLAR/REP/APPROX)** relates mostly to direct and straightforward clarifications, repairs, and approximations, used mainly to structure discourse, and the remaining interpersonal function (**INS/SOL/ELAB/RAPP**) relates to more complicated discourse structures and underlying meanings in a communication situation. All four DPs share functions with one another. In the following, this fact will be further explored through a closer investigation of the differences and similarities between the DPs and their translations.

A variety of Swedish linguistic means are used as translations of the DPs (cf. table 5.7 for *well*; table 6.7 for *you know*; table 7.7 for *I mean*, and table 8.7 for *like*). The translations vary from Swedish DPs/modal particles (e.g. *du vet* ('you know'); *ju* ('as you know'); etc.), which comprise half of the total number of translations in the corpus, to conjunctions (*och*; ('and') *men* ('but'); etc.), punctuation marks ("[…]"; –; etc.), and adverbs (*drygt* ('amply') *riktigt* ('quite'); etc.). Other translation categories, such as adjectives, pronouns, abbreviations, and longer phrases, are used less extensively.

One of the reasons behind choosing *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like* as the objects of study for the thesis, was the fact that the degree of translation difficulty differs between these four DPs. Roughly put, *you know* and *I mean* both have clear correspondences in Swedish,

---

[55] These functions can often be further divided into additional subfunctions, but the line is drawn at four functions for each DP. Possible extra subfunctions are, however, commented on throughout the thesis.
[56] More study is needed before drawing any conclusions about this, however, as some DPs are less liable than the DPs of the present study to have both textual and interpersonal functions. This is true of e.g. more textually marking DPs (often labelled *discourse markers*, cf. 2.3 and 2.5.2) such as *however*, *anyway*, *all right*.

like has correspondences to a degree, and *well* has no clear correspondences. Below, all four DPs and their multifunctionality, as seen through their translations, are discussed. First, the similarities and differences between *you know* and *I mean* will be considered, because of the many qualities these two DPs have in common. Next, *well* and *like* will be discussed.

You know and *I mean* are similar in various ways. For instance, they are both two-word phrases, compared to e.g. *well* and *like*, which are single words; and they share a historical affinity (Fox Tree & Schrock 2002:728) as they have some functions in common (for example, a more apparent clarifying function than *well* and *like* have). Both *you know* and *I mean* have more or less direct correspondences in the Swedish translations *du vet*/*ni vet*/*vet du* (*vad*) ('you know'/'know you'), and *jag menar*/*menar jag* ('I mean/mean I'), respectively. These translations do not always correspond directly to all functions of *you know* or *I mean*, but *du vet* and *jag menar* are both indisputable translations of (most functions of) *you know* and *I mean*, and are often used more or less by default as translations of these English DPs in the subtitles.

Despite the fact that both *you know* and *I mean* have clear corresponding Swedish translations, and that these correspondences are used to a large extent in the subtitles, there is a considerable difference between *you know* and *I mean* in the corpus. When the corresponding translation solutions are not employed, *you know* has a wider variety of translation types than *I mean*. If we consider the number of translation tokens per translation types of all translations of *you know* and *I mean* (cf. 6.5 for *you know*, 7.5 for *I mean*, and table 9.1 for the individual tokens/types numbers), including the corresponding translations *du vet*/*ni vet*/*vet du*(*vad*) and *jag menar*/*menar jag*, it is clear that *you know* has more individual types per tokens than *I mean*: for *you know*, just over every fourth token is a new type, whereas for *I mean*, just over every sixth token is a new type (in comparison, the numbers for *well* are in-between *you know* and *I mean*, whereas *like* has more types per tokens than *you know* and thus the highest frequency of types per tokens of all four DPs. The numbers of *well* and *like* will be discussed further below). The results for *you know* and *I mean* concerning how many types per tokens they show, point to the fact that *you know* may indeed have a wider variety of potential translations in Swedish than *I mean* has. There thus seems to be a stronger connection between the English and Swedish languages concerning the multifunctionality of *you know* than the multifunctionality of *I mean*. One reason for this may be that *you know* possibly has a wider variety of functions in English than *I mean* has, and that this affects the number of translations possible in Swedish. In the present study, only four functions for each DP are analysed, but from this it seems that *you know* is more versatile than *I mean*.

Well is the one DP out of the four studied here that has the lowest number of clear correspondences in Swedish, and it is well-known for being difficult to translate (Johansson 2006; Aijmer 2008). Unlike *you know* and *I mean* (and their Swedish correspondences *du vet*/*ni vet*/*vet du* (*vad*), and *jag menar*/*menar jag*), *well* does not have a default translation that can be used more or less at all times, but each translation illustrates one facet of the many functions of *well*. The present study has shown that *well* has an array of possible translations, and that the multifunctionality of this DP is great. However, when comparing the number of translation types with the number of translation tokens (cf. table 9.1), we see that the

versatility of *well* is not greater than that of *like* or *you know* (translations of *well* are, however, more versatile than translations of *I mean* in this comparison). In the corpus of the present study, *well* has many more ST occurrences than any of the other DPs, a fact which influences the total number of translations and translation types used for translating *well* in the subtitles.

Compared to *well*, *you know* and *I mean*, *like* is a unique DP in many ways. First of all, unlike most other DPs, it is seen as still undergoing a pragmaticalisation process, so separating the discourse use from the non-discourse use of *like* is more difficult than separating these uses of DPs *well*, *you know*, and *I mean*. Another difference between *like, well*, *you know*, and *I mean*, is the stigma surrounding *like*. Generally, (over)using DPs is stigmatised as people (over)using them are often seen as being insecure, less educated, from a lower social class, etc. (e.g. Dailey-O'Cain 2000; Kotsinas 2004), but the difference in stigma between *well*, *you know*, *I mean* and *like* is striking. The least stigmatised DP of the four is *well*. No one would question the intelligence or confidence of a person using *well*, most likely because this DP has been used for so long that it is now employed by most people in English-speaking societies, and in a variety of contexts. In addition, it is almost impossible to overuse *well*: the present study shows very few examples of utterances with more than one *well*. The same is probably also true for *I mean*, which is not often over-used either. In comparison, *you know* and *like* are seen as more commonly used by certain people (even if this is not the case, the belief that it is influences the stigma surrounding them), and are more often used repeatedly in one and the same utterance. A further reason for the stigma surrounding *like* is the prejudice that it is used more by less educated adolescents than by older and more sophisticated speakers (Dailey-O'Cain 2000).

There is a correlation between the position of a DP in the pragmaticalisation process, and its level of stigma. This is especially clear when comparing *well* and *like*: the less stigmatised *well* has already gone through a pragmaticalisation process and has been used as a DP for a longer time than *like*; while the more stigmatised *like* is still in the middle of a pragmaticalisation process, and its DP use is present today alongside conjunction and preposition uses of the same word. In all probability, *like* is still seen by many people as a conjunction or a preposition, and its discourse function is thus viewed as less important and/or completely redundant. DPs *you know* and *I mean* are positioned somewhere between *well* and *like* on both the scale of pragmaticalisation and the scale of stigmatisation.

The variety of translations of *like* in the corpus of the present study shows that this is a versatile DP. *Like* has the largest variety of translation types of all four DPs in the study, compared to their number of translation tokens (cf. table 9.1): about every third translation token of *like* is an individually different translation type. This can be compared most clearly to the results of *I mean*, which has more tokens than *like*, but which nevertheless has fewer translation types than *like*. One translation type is used more than any other for *like*: i.e. the quotation marks ("[…]"). This illustrates clearly the tendency of subtitlers to translate the textual function whenever feasible and to make a DP in the ST as explicit as possible in the subtitles (to be further discussed in 9.4.2). Besides the quotation mark, a variety of translations are used that show how versatile and multifunctional *like* is.

To sum up, the translations of the DPs under study reflect a clear multifunctionality of all four DPs. The functions of the DPs depend on the context in which they are found. When comparing the number of translation types with the number of translation tokens for each DP, the DPs show a scale of translation versatility, where *like* is most versatile, *you know* the second most, *well* the third most, and *I mean* the least versatile of all four DPs. These differences more than likely point to a tendency of *like* and *you know* to have a larger variety of functional correspondences in Swedish, and more points of contact with pragmatic functions in Swedish, than *well* and *I mean* have. They may also indicate a tendency for *like* and *you know* to, on the whole, be more multifunctional than *well* and *I mean*. This last fact is interesting above all in connection with the particular stigma on *like* and *you know*: both DPs clearly signal numerous central functions in spoken discourse, and should thus not be discarded as "bad language" (Kotsinas 2004) or as being redundant features of language.

As the ST totals of each DP may influence the final result, and as some possibly translatable functions of the DPs (e.g. certain mitigating functions of *well* and *you know*) are not translated, more research is needed before drawing any absolute conclusions on the functionality of these DPs, and the relation between pragmatic functions in English and Swedish.

9.3.2 Common translations shared by the DPs

Out of the 515 translation tokens in the corpus, 259 are shared by two or more DPs (cf. table 9.8, below). This means that just over half of the total number of translation tokens in the corpus are shared by two or more DPs. There are a total of 87 individual translation types used for all four DPs. Only just under 1/5 of these are shared by two or more DPs, illustrating a tendency of each DP to have certain functions that the other DPs do not have: both *well* and *like* share approximately 1/5 of their translation types with one or more of the other three DPs; *you know* shares 1/3 of its translation types with one or more of the other three DPs; and *I mean* shares almost as much as 2/3 of its translation types with one or more of the other three DPs. The differences show that the (translated) functions *well* and *like* have in the corpus are quite specific to these two DPs, respectively, whereas the (translated) functions of *you know* and *I mean* are more general.

Some of the most common translation types in the corpus of the present study that are shared by two or more DPs, will now be discussed. Attention will be given to how the translations relate to the functions of the DPs in the STs, and/or how the functions of the DPs relate to the functions of the translations.

Table 9.8 summarises all translations shared by two or more DPs (i.e. approximately 1/5 of all individual translation types used for all four DPs, as discussed above), as well as how many occurrences of each translation type there are.

Table 9.8. Translations shared by two or more DPs

Well	You know	I mean	Like	Total
ju ('as you know')	ju ('as you know')	ju ('as you know')		87
"[…]"			"[…]"	33
men ('but')	men ('but')	men ('but')		24
	alltså ('that is')	alltså (+…) ('that is')		17
tja (+…) ('well')	tja…('well…')			15
–	–	–		13
väl ('surely')	väl ('surely')			10
nog ('probably')	nog ('probably')			10
jo…('yes…'/'well…')		jo ('yes'/'well')		10
	menar jag ('mean I')	menar jag ('mean I')		10
	fast	fast		8
nej ('no')		(+…) nej ('no')		6
	liksom ('like/sort of')	liksom ('like/sort of')	liksom ('like/sort of')	6
du ('you')	du ('you')			4
bara ('only/just')			bara ('only/just')	4
men du ('but/hey you')	men du ('but/hey you')			2
				259

All in all, the most widely used translation in the whole corpus is the modal particle *ju* ('as you know'). *Ju* is used as a translation of *well*, *you know*, and *I mean* (in addition, there is one instance of *ju* in combination with *liksom* ('like') as a translation of *like*, but *like* is never translated into a single *ju*). *Ju* is mostly used to translate interpersonal functions of *well*, *you know*, and *I mean* in the corpus, but there are examples of textual functions being translated by *ju* as well (i.e. the frame-marking function of *well*, and the frame-marking and repair marking functions of *I mean*). It is the most frequent translation of the interpersonal functions, and of some of the textual functions (i.e. the frame-marking and repair marking functions of *I mean*) of *well*, *you know*[57], and *I mean*, a fact demonstrating that *ju* primarily has an interpersonal function, and that its general functional versatility and use in the Swedish language is great. Indeed, the function of *ju* is notorious for being difficult to pin-point. Previous studies (e.g. Aijmer 1996b; Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen 2003; Josephson 2005), as well as the present one, have, however, assigned functions to *ju* of signalling shared knowledge, intimacy, and rapport, as well as of being a method of persuasion or down-toning. As *well*, *you know*, and *I mean* are frequently translated into *ju*, all three DPs seem to be able to communicate (most of) the functions *ju* communicates.

Two more Swedish expressions are used as translations of all three DPs *well*, *you know*, and *I mean*, namely the conjunction *men* ('but') and the punctuation mark – (the dash). *Men* and – the dash) are both among the ten most frequently used translations in the corpus. *Men* is used to translate both textual and interpersonal functions, but is most common as a translation of the textual frame-marking function. The dash is used as a translation of textual functions (once it also translates the interpersonal elaboration function of *I mean*). Both *men* and – (the dash) thus show functions applicable to three of the four DPs of the present study, and *well*, *you know*, and *I mean* all prove to have functions of signalling contrast (i.e. *men*), and to be able to be transformed into features only present in written language (i.e. –, the dash).

Well and *you know* share more translation types than the other DPs do. Apart from *ju*, *men*, and – (the dash), already discussed as translations of *well*, *you know*, and *I mean*, *well*

---

[57] The mitigating function of *you know* only has two translations, one of them being *ju* (the other one is *nog*).

and *you know* are both translated by *tja* ('well') (with or without three dots, almost exclusively used as a translation of *well*), *väl* ('surely', almost exclusively used as a translation of *well*), *nog* ('probably'), *du* ('you'), and *men du* ('but you/hey'). *Nog* serves as a translation of the interpersonal function only, whereas *du* and *men du* are translations of the textual frame-marking functions of *well* and *you know*. As both *well* and *you know* are translatable into *nog*, they seem to be able to signal the functions most frequently demonstrated by *nog* in the corpus of the present study, i.e. probability, mitigation, and uncertainty. The fact that *well* and *you know* are also translated into *du* and *men du* shows the ability of both DPs to function as attention-seekers. When studying the numerous translations *well* and *you know* have in common, it is clear that these two DPs share functions and that these functions are reflected in the Swedish translations.

Well also shares two additional translations with *I mean* (apart from the already mentioned translations shared by *well*, *you know*, and *I mean*); i.e. *nej* ('no'; with or without three dots indicating hesitation) and *jo* ('yes'; with or without three dots indicating hesitation). Regarding the translations shared by *well* and *I mean*, it is clear that both DPs are able to signal (hesitant) affirmatives as well as (hesitant) negatives in utterances.

You know and *I mean* have a few translations in common, besides the ones shared by both DPs with *well*: *menar jag* ('mean I'), *alltså* ('that is', with or without three dots), and *fast* ('although') are all used as translations of *you know* and *I mean*. All three are quite unsurprisingly translations of the clarifying and repairing functions of *you know* and *I mean* (in addition, *alltså* is used once as a translation of the elaboration function of *I mean*, and *fast* is used as a translation of the frame-marking function of *you know*). The translations used for *you know* and *I mean* show that these two DPs both have a clear function of clarifying and repairing, and of expanding some previous (part of an) utterance.

The final DP considered here is *like*, which shares few translations with the other DPs, although it does share translations with all three. *Like* and *well* are both translated quite extensively by quotation marks ("[…]"), which are not used for either *you know* or *I mean*. The abundance of quotation marks as a translation of *like* and *well* (this is the fourth most frequent translation of all in the corpus) demonstrates the clear function that both of these DPs have as signals of reported speech or thought, a function that *you know* and *I mean* are less likely to have. Another translation shared by *like* and *well* is *bara* ('just'). This translation is not as common as the quotation mark, but the mitigating function of both *well* and *like* is translated a few times by *bara*, showing that *well* and *like* share mitigating strategies. There is one translation shared by *like*, *you know*, and *I mean*, namely *liksom* ('like'/'sort of')). *Liksom* is used as a translation of a variety of functions (the approximation function of *like*, the mitigating function of *I mean*, and the clarification function of *you know*), showing that this Swedish adverb (*liksom* can also be a DP, but in the corpus of the present study it is mainly used as an adverb) is multifunctional, but seems to have a core function of approximation or down-toning.

On the whole, *like* does not share many translation types with *well*, *you know*, and *I mean*, a fact that confirms that *like* has certain functions not shared by the other three DPs. In addition, *like* is not translated into any of the interpersonal Swedish modal particles *ju*, *väl*, and *nog*, but the majority of translations of *like* are textual quotation marks. This may be an

indication that *like* overall is a more textual than interpersonal feature in spoken discourse, used to a large extent as a quotative marker and as a turn-taker. A reason for this preference of indicating structural functions could be that *like* is still undergoing a pragmaticalisation process, whereas *well*, *you know*, and *I mean* have been through this process already and have had more time to establish both textual and interpersonal functions. Perhaps these differences between *like* and the other three DPs can explain the fact that *like* is the only DP out of the four relevant for the present study that has more ST occurrences with a textual function than with an interpersonal function.

Finally, the overall choice of translations in the subtitles will be briefly mentioned. The translations in table 9.8 are among the most frequent in the corpus and represent the range of translations used. As has been previously emphasised, the translation solutions of *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like* are often surprisingly varied and creative. However, certain functions are sometimes neglected or not considered enough. Possible reasons for such non-translation will be discussed below (e.g. time and space constraints, norms, working conditions, use of explicitation strategies, etc., see 9.4.2 and 9.4.3). An additional problem with the choice of translations may be the fact that the orthodoxy and tradition influencing the non-translation of DPs (to be discussed in 9.4.3) possibly also influence the type of translations used when DPs are in fact translated. There is a tendency for more traditional Swedish translation options to be used over more innovative ones. One example of this phenomenon is the abundant use of quotation marks ("[…]") as a translation of the quotative function of *well* and *like*. Quotation marks are a linguistic feature only used in written language[58], and understandably employed as a translation of the quotative function in the subtitles as these are written, and the quotation marks take up very little space. Nevertheless, there is another translation option for the quotative function of both *well* and *like* (in particular of *like*), namely the Swedish particle *ba/bara* ('just'/'like'). This is a frequent feature in spoken Swedish, often used by adolescents (but also by adults) when incorporating reported speech, thought, and/or reported action in their talk (Erman & Kotsinas 1993; Eriksson 1995; Kotsinas 2004; Svensson 2009). Since *ba* is known for being used predominantly by younger people, it may be more genre dependent than other translation solutions, and thus a better choice for e.g. College Comedy genre films such as *BLONDE* and *AMPIE*, than for Political Drama films such as *PRIMARY* and *WAG*. The fact that *ba/bara* and other, in written language similarly unorthodox, expressions are not used in the subtitles even when the film genre permits this, is possibly another example of the explicitation that subtitlers seem to pursue in their work (to be discussed in 9.4.3) as well as of the written-language translation norm generally adhered to. Using less conventional translation solutions may not be the answer to the problem of a non-translation of relevant DP functions, or any other problem concerning subtitling today. However, it could be worth exploring other translation solutions than the traditional and safe ones, to make the language in the subtitles more alive and even more creative than it is now, and to allow for the diversity of characters in the films.

---

[58] Except for the body language use of the same phenomenon, often exercised to indicate irony in spoken language. The body language version is signalled by a movement in the air of two fingers on each hand, illustrating that a word is enclosed by quotation marks

To briefly sum up this section, translations shared by two or more DPs make up just over half of all the translation tokens in the corpus (the rest of the translation types are used by one DP only). About one fifth of all individual translation types used are shared by two or more DPs, the five most commonly shared translation types in descending order of frequency being *ju* ('as you know'), "[...]" (quotation mark), *men* ('but'), *alltså* ('that is'), and *tja* ('well'). No translations are shared by all four DPs, but some (e.g. *ju* ('as you know'), *men* ('but'), and *liksom* ('like')) are shared by two DPs, and some (e.g. "[...]" (quotation mark), *alltså* ('that is'), and *fast* ('although')) are shared by three DPs. The fact that certain translations are shared by some DPs but not by others indicates that some DPs share functions that the other DPs may not have.

9.4 General observations

A more general discussion of the results is provided below. First, the question of what we can actually learn from the translation of DPs is raised. Next, possible reasons for the prevalence of translating the textual function over the interpersonal function are given, followed by an attempt to explain the low number of DP translations found in subtitling.

9.4.1 What can we learn from the translation of DPs?

Before drawing any conclusions about what we can learn from the translation of DPs, from a practical point of view as well as from a more theoretical point of view, a few words will be said about the more or less subconscious knowledge subtitlers seem to have of DP functions, and how this knowledge is reflected in the translations made.

Unlike more easily definable linguistic features such as verbs, nouns, etc., which have a more well-defined semantic content, DPs cannot easily be put into neat categories, and are thus difficult to explain and define in a straightforward manner. Some dictionaries, for example, attempt to include explanations of DPs and their functions, but dictionary entries on DPs are generally either insufficient or simply confusing (Kaeser 2001). It is thus not likely that any subtitler has conscious knowledge of the various functions DPs may have in different contexts, especially as all subtitlers' time is scarce, and contemplating the functions of DPs is normally not an option. Nevertheless, whenever the DPs *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like* are in fact translated in the corpus of the present study, the translations to a large extent reflect the most salient function of each DP in the ST, and as a consequence the multifunctionality of the DPs. The knowledge that subtitlers have of English DP functions thus seems to be more or less intuitive. The fact that the subtitlers have access to the speakers' intonation, body language, etc. through the film medium, possibly assists the intuitive understanding further. This intuitive and subconscious knowledge also depends on subtitlers' individual degrees of language competence: grasping the pragmatic functions of a language is only possible after thorough study and, above all, active use of that language (Kaeser 2001).

By studying DPs in a multimodal corpus like the one used in the present study, and furthermore their translations, we become more aware of the elusive functions of DPs, and

may map out certain translation solutions for the various functions of DPs. Observing these different translation solutions can teach us ways of translating them, in subtitling as well as in other forms of translation. Consequently, by studying how translation problems are in actual fact solved, the translation of DPs on the whole may be facilitated.

Apart from learning practically how best to go about translating DPs, we can learn a great deal about the pragmatic functions of different languages through studying the translation of DPs. It is the actual lack of corresponding translations, i.e. the gap between two languages, that can teach us more about the pragmatic functions shared or not shared by the languages. As Bazzanella & Morra (2000) and Aijmer (2008) conclude, it is most often not possible to translate a DP directly as there are rarely satisfying correspondences in other languages. In the corpus of the present study, whenever there is no corresponding translation in Swedish for an English DP, a translator must use other means available in Swedish (see 9.3.2 above for a more detailed discussion of how the DP functions and the translations reflect one another). Most often, as already pointed out, there are no directly corresponding Swedish translations of the functions of the English DPs (except e.g. *du vet* for *you know*, and *jag menar* for *I mean*), but the variety of more dynamic translation solutions employed shows that translation of the functions is nevertheless possible.

The rendering of the functions of the English DPs *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like* in Swedish words and expressions reflecting the DP functions, may give us a more profound knowledge of these four DPs and their multifunctionality. The fact that the pragmatic functions are transferrable from one language into another shows that two different languages can express the same/similar pragmatic functions, even though they may do so in different ways[59]. As all four functions of all four DPs are translated in the corpus (some functions are translated more than others, however), English and Swedish seem to contain the same/similar pragmatic functions, although the two languages (often) express these functions differently.

The qualitative results of the present study show that the subtitlers tend to use translation strategies (cf. 4.3.3) rendering both translations that are as close as possible to the original DP (e.g. the matching translation *du vet* for *you know*), and translations that do not correspond directly to the DP in the ST, but that still transmit the pragmatic function of the DP (e.g. the modal particle *nog* ('probably') as a paraphrase of *well*). These two ways of translating DPs can be discussed in connection with the differences found in the present study between the subtitling of the textual and the interpersonal functions.

9.4.2 Translation of textual and interpersonal functions

The analysis of the textual and interpersonal functions in the present study (cf. 2.4.3 for the classification of DP functions in the present study, and tables 9.6 and 9.7 above for an overview of the distributions of the DP's textual and interpersonal functions and the translations of these) shows that the majority of DPs that are translated have a textual function, even though most of the DPs in the STs have an interpersonal function (except *like*,

---

[59] English and Swedish are closely related languages with many linguistic and cultural aspects in common. A comparison between less related languages would possibly have provided other results.

which has more textual occurrences in the STs, something which can perhaps be explained by the fact that *like* overall seems to be a more textual than interpersonal feature, cf. 9.3.2). Several previous studies (e.g. Hatim & Mason (2000); Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen (2003); Chaume (2004a); and Cuenca (2008)), draw similar conclusions, i.e. that there is a loss of interpersonal meaning in the translations compared to the STs (the studies mentioned examine the translation of pragmatic features in literary translation, subtitling, and dubbing). There thus seems to be an overall tendency in all forms of translation to translate the textual function of pragmatic features more often than the interpersonal function (some of the above mentioned studies also show that semantic meaning is generally more frequently translated than pragmatic meaning, and the same seems to be true for the present study).

Why is it then, that in translation in general, and in the subtitling in the corpus of the present study in particular, the interpersonal function is neglected more often than the textual one? A few possible reasons for this tendency are discussed in the following.

Chaume (2004a:855) suggests that one reason for the loss of interpersonal meaning in audiovisual text (in this case subtitling and dubbing) is the time and space constraints on subtitling. This is a possible reason, but, as has been previously discussed (cf. 3.4; to be discussed further in 9.4.3), the time and space constraints are not the only reason for non-translation of DPs, nor of a particular function of DPs.

As with the overall non-translation of DPs, there is a combination of possible explanations of the fact that fewer DPs with an interpersonal function are translated in the corpus. One reason is a tendency in most subtitlers to use the strategy of explicitation when translating DPs, i.e. the subtitlers are trying to make the functions of the DPs in the STs as clear as possible for the viewer. This is in line with the subtitling guidelines (produced by SVT and *Subtitling International Sweden, Svensk Text AB*), which emphasise the importance of providing a product as clear and comprehensible as possible. DPs per se are not clear or easily comprehensible, and the interpersonal function of DPs is even more elusive than the textual one, hence the inclination of subtitlers to translate the latter more often than the former.

In relation to this must be mentioned the relative ease with which a DP with a textual function can be identified in the ST, as compared to a DP with an interpersonal function. For example, the frame-marking function of *well, you know, I mean*, and *like* is often less problematic to spot in the ST than the mitigating function. A larger context is usually needed to analyse the mitigating function of the DPs than to analyse the frame-marking function, as the mitigating function is less clear at a first glance (cf., for instance, examples (57) and (96) for a frame-marking and a mitigating *well*, respectively).

Some textual functions are especially easy both to spot in an ST, and to translate by using the explicitation strategy. The quotative function of *well* and *like* is one example of this. When *well* or *like* (sometimes combined, or in combination with *you know*) are found just before a section of reported speech or thought in the STs in the corpus, they almost always have a textual quotative function in the discourse. This function is easy to make explicit in the subtitles by using quotation marks, which is the most explicit of all translation types in the corpus and which takes up very little space in the subtitles.

Besides the quotation marks, which are used to a great extent in the subtitles, the Swedish expressions *du vet*/*ni vet*/*vet du*(*vad*) ('you know'/'know you'), and *jag menar*/*menar jag* ('I mean/mean I'), which have both been discussed earlier (cf. 9.3.1), correspond to *you know* and *I mean*, respectively, and are used more or less by default by the subtitlers, because of their obvious similarity to *you know* and *I mean*. *Du vet*/*ni vet*/*vet du*(*vad*) and *jag menar*/*menar jag* are both used more often as translations of the textual function than of the interpersonal function of *you know* and *I mean*, adding to the large number of translations of the textual function in the corpus. Both of these translation solutions may have interpersonal functions too, but for some reason they are less often used to translate this function.

An additional reason for the non-translation of the interpersonal function may be the fact that the (non-linguistic) context of the film dialogue (e.g. intonation and body language) often hints at the interpersonal effect of a DP, and not so often at the textual function. Subtitlers may thus consider the interpersonal function less important to translate as it is already indicated in the dialogue. However, the textual function of DPs is many times also indicated through speakers' intonation and body language (e.g. frame-marking DPs signalling transition are often indicated by hand movements etc. of speakers). Also, as discussed by Hatim & Mason (1997), not translating certain interpersonal functions because they are signalled in the context of the film dialogue may confuse the viewer as s/he gets a mixed message from the polysemiotic whole provided by film and subtitle (cf. 2.6.2, above, and 9.4.3, below).

Summing up the above discussion, the main reason for the over-representation of the textual function in the TTs seems to be a general striving towards creating a subtitling product that is as clear and comprehensible as possible. This is the reason why the explicitation strategy is used to a great extent for the translations of DPs in the corpus of the present study. As DPs with a textual function are easier to locate intuitively in the STs, and as their functions are easier to transfer into clear translations (through explicitation) in the subtitles, the textual function is more often translated than the interpersonal one. Also, certain default translations are often used as translations of the textual function.

9.4.3 Non-translation of DPs

Not all DPs can or should be translated in film subtitling. First of all, there is not enough space or time on either a cinema or TV screen to fit in translations of all DPs found in a film ST. Second, even if there were enough space and time on a screen, the excess of information caused by translating all DPs would in all likelihood wear out most film viewers, and interfere with other aspects of the film experience. Third, the polysemiotic whole of which the subtitles are part may include signals compensating for the loss of DP translations.

Despite the fact that not all DPs can or should be subtitled, DPs in feature films are often included for a reason, and can be of importance for the characterisations of speakers, and for the overall interactional aspects of a film. As Gottlieb (1994:70-71) argues, feature films may generally lose more through reduction than other genres of subtitled material (e.g. news, documentaries, satire, song programmes, etc.). This is because the characterisations of the speakers are more central in feature films than in other subtitled material. Sahlin (2001)

draws on similar ideas when she states that the omission of DPs and other comparable features in (intralingual) film subtitling may "lead to a loss of an intentionally communicated signal, from the perspective of the playwright and/or director" (2001:644, my translation), a signal that is most often not as significant in other genres of subtitled material (both Gottlieb and Sahlin's ideas are discussed further in 3.4.2 and 3.2.3, respectively).

The present study has shown that all DPs are multifunctional and context-dependent, and that not translating certain DP functions in certain contexts in the films in question may deny viewers important information, primarily concerning speaker characteristics and interactional aspects of the plot. Moreover, when some DP functions are not translated, the discordance between what is going on on the screen and what the subtitles say may confuse the viewer, causing the polysemiotic clues provided by the film to hinder more than help the viewer (Hatim & Mason 1997). When subtitling DPs, it is thus important to consider the fact that one single DP may have many different context-dependent functions, and that one function can be vital to put across in subtitling for the sake of speaker characterisation or for the understanding of the plot of the film, whereas another function may not be as central to the film in general or to speaker characterisation in particular.

Only just over one fifth of the DPs in the ten films in the corpus of the present study are translated. A figure to be compared to the number of all ST words being translated into the subtitles in the corpus, i.e. approximately two thirds. At first glance, the most obvious reason for the non-translation of DPs in subtitling is the time and space constraints on this form of translation. When comparing the omission rate of the present study with studies on DPs (*well*) in literary translation, which does not have the same constraints, it is clear that more DPs are translated in literary translation than in subtitling, even though the omission rate is quite high in literary translation as well. Bazzanella & Morra (2000), and Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen (2003) found that approximately three fifths and four fifths of the ST occurrences of *well* were translated into Swedish, in their respective studies.

The time and space constraints do play an important part in the non-translation of DPs, but they do not play the only part. This is to a large degree demonstrated in the present study through a comparison of subtitling in different media, i.e. in cinema, DVD, public service TV and commercial TV. The time constraints on cinema subtitles, on the one hand, and the DVD and TV subtitles, on the other, are different as there generally is a higher frequency (Ivarsson 1998: 71) of subtitles viewed at the cinema (i.e. there are more subtitle lines per minute), and as a consequence more words in all subtitles combined, than in the DVD and TV subtitle versions of the same film. In the present study, the Cinema subtitles in fact have more words in total than the other TTs do (cf. table 4.4). There should thus technically be room for more DP translations in the Cinema subtitles than in the DVD and TV subtitles, and this is indeed believed by many subtitlers to be the case. However, this discrepancy is not found in the present study (cf. tables 9.3 and 9.6). The different time constraints imposed on the different media do not seem to affect either the number of tokens or types of translated DPs in the subtitles.

As the time and space constraints on subtitling are not the only reasons behind non-translation of DPs, then what other explanations are there for the low translation rate found in the present study? I believe that the time and space constraints to a large extent are

accompanied by various norms governing translation in general and subtitling in particular. It has been said before (e.g. Fawcett 2003; Gambier 2008) that norms possibly influence a target text more than constraints do, i.e. subtitlers, consciously or not, adhere more to subjective norms than to objective material constraints when translating a film. A strong norm governing subtitling in Sweden seems to be the formal written language norm, which most likely has been derived from formal written language norms governing both literary translations and Swedish original literary works. Spoken language does not generally enjoy high status in Swedish culture (or in any Western culture for that matter), and many of its features, such as DPs, are more often than not considered to be "bad language" (Kotsinas 2004). The orthodoxy and tradition concerning features mainly found in spoken language say that DPs are redundant and should make way for written language features. A "certain sanctity [is] attached to written discourse in our culture" (Gambier 1994:280), often causing a translation of DPs and other spoken features in subtitling to be discarded. In addition, the orthodoxy and tradition also influence the translation of DPs so that when a DP in the ST is in fact translated, more traditional Swedish translation options are used (cf. 9.3.2 for a short discussion on this).

The orthodoxy is reflected in the subtitling guidelines provided by the subtitling agencies or TV channels, and used by a majority of the subtitlers subtitling films for the corpus of the present study. Ivarsson & Carroll's (1998) momentous work, which has influenced the guidelines (many times leading to verbatim transfers of text) states that DPs (*well* and *you know*) can safely be omitted. In contrast, however, it also says that little words (such as *just* and *isn't it*), adding something to the characterisation of speakers, should not be overlooked. Ivarsson & Carroll, as well as the subtitling guidelines, discard DPs (*well* and *you know*) per se, possibly because of the stigma put on these words, but they bring up other words (e.g. focus particle *just*, question tag *isn't it,* and the Swedish modal particle *nog* ('probably'), as being worth a translation (the latter from Swedish to English). The fact that DPs, focus particles, question tags, and modal particles may in fact communicate the same or similar pragmatic functions in discourse is not considered in Ivarsson & Carroll or in the guidelines. This is, however, demonstrated in the present study, as a variety of words and expressions (including focus particles, question tags, and modal particles) are used to translate the DPs *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like*. Hopefully, the present study will have shed some further light on the multifunctionality of DPs, and on how important it can be to communicate (certain) DP functions in film subtitling.

One further reason for non-translation of DPs is the working conditions of the subtitlers. The present study has focused on the most commonly known differences in working conditions for subtitlers in Sweden, i.e. the differences between the public service TV channels and the commercial TV channels[60]. Conditions at the public service channel are generally considered to be better than at the commercial channels, as the subtitlers working at the public service channel usually have lower workloads and higher wages than subtitlers at the commercial channels. Moreover, the public service channel more often offers the subtitlers permanent jobs, and requires academic qualifications from its subtitlers, the former

---

[60] The differences in working conditions discussed here refer to how conditions were before 2006, when a re-organisation was carried out. These conditions affected the translators subtitling the films in the corpus of the present study as all films are subtitled before 2006.

possibly adding to a sense of security, and the latter to stronger language competence among the translators. It is clear from the results of the present study that the public service TV channel SVT translates DPs more often and in general uses a wider variety of translation types than the commercial channels TV3 and TV4. When correlating working conditions at the public service and commercial TV channels with the translation of DPs in the present study, the outcome seems to point to higher language competence among subtitlers at the public service channel than at the commercial channels. The fact that DPs are translated at all in subtitling despite their elusiveness, illustrates a more or less subconscious knowledge of their pragmatic functions (discussed further in 9.4.1, above). The knowledge of DP functions, which is highly connected to individual degrees of language competence, seems to be greater among subtitlers at the Swedish public service TV channel than among subtitlers at the Swedish commercial TV channels. This fact clearly needs further examination before any final conclusions can be drawn. However, the correlation is strong and it follows logically that better working conditions provide a more adequate subtitling result.

9.5 Summary

In this chapter, the four previous chapters were summarised and discussed, and the 1032 occurrences of *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like*, as well as their 515 translation occurrences, were viewed together and compared with one another both quantitatively and qualitatively.

The quantitative results show, for instance, that the Cinema subtitles do not include more DP translations than the DVD, SVT, and TV3+TV4 subtitles, despite the fact that the Cinema subtitles overall include more words than the other three TTs (cf. 4.2.7). Another aspect concerning the distribution of DP translations in the four TTs is the lack of DP translations in the commercial TV channels TV3+TV4 compared to the other three TTs. In addition, the commercial TV channels also include fewer individually different translation types than the other TTs do.

As far as the quantitative distribution of the pragmatic functions is concerned, there is in some cases a difference between what functions are used most in the STs and which of these are translated more in the subtitles. The textual **FRAME** and the interpersonal **INS/SOL/ELAB/RAPP** functions, which are the most common functions in the films, and at a similar total, are also the most frequently translated functions (**FRAME** is translated more often than **INS/SOL/ELAB/RAPP**, however). On the other hand, the textual **CLAR/REP/APPROX** functions and the interpersonal **MIT** function, are not treated the same in the subtitles as in the films: the former is used less then the latter in the films, but in the subtitles the order is changed. The **MIT** function is the least translated of all the DP functions in the corpus. Overall, more DPs with a textual function are translated than DPs with an interpersonal function, even though the latter is more common in the film soundtracks than the former.

The qualitative results of the chapter showed that the translations of *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like* reflect a clear multifunctionality of the DPs. There is a difference in the translation versatility of the DPs in the corpus, i.e. when comparing the number of translation

types with the number of translation tokens for each DP, it is clear that *like* is most versatile, followed by *you know* and then *well*. The DP *I mean* is the least versatile when it comes to translation types used in the corpus.

Various common translations shared by the four DPs were also discussed in the chapter. These translations make up about half of the translation occurrences in the corpus. The fact that some of the DPs share translations with each other while others do not shows that some of the DPs share certain functions that the others may not have.

Well, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like* were further discussed in the chapter on a more general level. For instance, it was concluded that studying the translation of DPs can teach us a great deal, both from a practical and from a theoretical point of view. Practically, studying various translation solutions of DPs can facilitate an understanding of DP functions and their translations, and thus suggest ways of translating them. Theoretically, we can learn a great deal about different languages' pragmatic functions by studying the translations of DPs.

The tendency of the subtitlers to translate more DPs with a textual function than with an interpersonal function, even though there are more of the latter than of the former in the films, was also discussed in the chapter. Various possible reasons are brought up, e.g. an overall striving towards making the subtitles as clear and intelligible as possible, as well as a use of the translation strategy *explicitation*, and the fact that DPs with a textual function are possibly easier to identify in the STs. Some reasons for the fact that most DPs are not translated in the corpus were also considered. These reasons include e.g. the time and space constraints put on subtitling; various translation norms; and the working conditions of subtitlers.

10 The subtitling of DPs: summary and concluding remarks

In this final chapter, a summary of the study and some concluding remarks are given. First, the main aims of the thesis are revisited. Then, the corpus and methodology used are discussed before the main findings of the thesis are summarised. After the summary, a brief evaluation of the study is given, focusing primarily on the corpus and the method of analysis. Finally, some ideas for future research are presented.

10.1 Summary

DPs are words and expressions that are usually semantically bleached (Fuller 2003), but each has a web of context-dependent pragmatic functions signalling how the utterance preceding or following the DP should be interpreted, both structurally and communicatively. The main aim of the present study was to see to what extent DPs are translatable in subtitling, as this is an extremely constrained form of translation. To facilitate the study and the aims, a multimodal corpus of subtitled material was needed, in combination with a cross-theoretical approach.

The intention of the study was primarily to investigate the four DPs *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like* and their Swedish subtitle translations in ten American films. The main reason for choosing these particular DPs is their difference in translation difficulty (i.e. *you know* and *I mean* have clear correspondences in Swedish, whereas *well* and *like* do not). In connection with the main aim, I posed some quantitative and qualitative questions (cf. 1.2) that I wished to answer at some point during the study. These questions will be summarised and discussed briefly here.

The quantitative questions posed concern the frequency of the DPs in the films/film genres (cf. 1.3 for a complete list of the films), and the amount of translations of these DPs, as well as the distribution of the translations in the ten films and the four TTs (Cinema, DVD, the public service TV channel SVT, and the commercial TV channels TV3+TV4). In addition, great consideration is given to the distribution of the pragmatic functions of the DPs: how the DP functions are distributed among the films, and how the translations of these are distributed in each film and in the TTs. The quantitative study of the pragmatic functions leads up to the question of whether certain pragmatic functions of the DPs are translated more often than others.

The qualitative questions to a large extent require deciphering the functions of the DPs in the STs, to see whether or not the functions of the DPs are reflected in the subtitles. In connection with this, the Swedish linguistic means used to translate the DPs are identified. Broader questions are also posed concerning the four DPs' different translation versatility, as well as possible reasons as to why certain pragmatic functions may be translated more often than others. Finally, the issue of whether DPs should in fact be translated in subtitling or not, is raised.

Not much previous research on DPs in subtitling has been carried out prior to this study, and (to my knowledge) no corpus of the size of the present one has as yet been used for any similar study.

In the present study, I have used a multimodal corpus in order to empirically describe the use of DPs *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like* in ten American films, as well as their Swedish translations in various subtitled versions of the films.

The corpus consists of the completely transcribed soundtrack of ten American films (the STs, cf. 1.3), in up to four different subtitle versions of each film (the TTs). I transcribed the corpus in its entirety. The films were selected on the basis of certain criteria concerning production, broadcast, type of dialogue, etc. All the films were produced in the US between 1994 and 2001, and they were all released for cinema and DVD (1994-2001), as well as broadcast on either of the Swedish public service TV channels SVT1 and SVT2, and/or either of the Swedish commercial channels TV3 and TV4 (all TV versions are broadcast in the year 2000 or later). All in all, the corpus contains approximately 420,000 words (both STs and TTs combined).

Each of the 1032 occurrences of the four DPs relevant for the study, was analysed according to a number of parameters, including e.g. intonation of the DP, pauses used in connection with the DP, and collocations of the DP (cf. 4.3.1). Each of the 1032 extracts including one of the four DPs was transcribed, using a basic method of transcription, which illustrated most of the parameters used for the analysis. In addition, a cross-theoretical approach was employed to facilitate the study of the DPs. This eclectic approach was chosen in order to include as many facets of the multifunctional DPs as possible in the analysis. I chose parts I thought to be relevant for an examination of DPs from three theories, namely Coherence-based theory (Schiffrin 1987), Relevance theory (Sperber & Wilson 1986), and Politeness theory (Brown & Levinson 1987). The study of the DPs' multifunctionality was made possible by classifying each occurrence in a continuum of textual and interpersonal functions, a division based on the Hallidayan (1994) three modes of functions and Brinton's (1996) classification of DP functions. The 515 translations of the DPs were studied in connection with various translation strategies used by the subtitlers (e.g. explicitation, paraphrase, doubling of function), as well as their pragmatic and grammatical realisations (e.g. DP/modal particle, adverb, conjunction, punctuation mark). The corpus and the analytical tools were used in order to answer the ten questions posed in 1.2.

The main findings of the present study were discussed at some length in chapter 9, but to give the reader a more concise overview of the main results, the most concrete findings are summarised and listed below (for a more detailed account of the individual DPs and their translations, see 9.3, above). The list follows the order of the questions posed in 1.2, with some added points:

- Roughly, less than 1/5 of all 1032 occurrences of DPs *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like* in the films are translated. This can be compared with the total number of words in the STs that are translated in the subtitles, i.e. approximately 2/3.

- There is a tendency for *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like* to occur more frequently in film genres such as the College Comedy and the Romantic Comedy genres, than in the Crime/Gangster and Political Drama genres. This tendency is also reflected in the number of DP translations in various film genres, even though most films have a similar percentage of DP translations. Genre thus seems to be taken into account to a certain extent when DPs are translated, but not greatly so. The functions of the DPs (textual vs. interpersonal) possibly influence the translation or non-translation of a DP more.

- Comparing the four TTs Cinema, DVD, public service TV, and commercial TV, it is clear that the distribution of translations of DPs is quite even among the TTs. Because the Cinema subtitles combined include more words than the other three TTs, but fewer DP translations than the other TTs (except the commercial TV channels, which include even fewer translations), it is clear that, even though time and space constraints naturally influence the subtitling of DPs, they are not the only reasons for a non-translation of DPs in the corpus. The study has confirmed that sociocultural norms, an overall orthodoxy concerning (spoken) language use, and working conditions for subtitlers are all aspects of subtitling that influence a final subtitling product as much as or more than technical constraints do. In addition, the use of a variety of translation types differs between the TTs, with the most striking difference being between the numbers of the public service TV channel SVT (which has more types than any of the other TTs) and the commercial TV channels TV3+TV4: the former includes considerably more types than the latter. Working conditions seem to influence the low number of DP translations and translation types included in the commercial TV channels' subtitles. When comparing the subtitling performed at the public service TV channels and the commercial TV channels, especially, a correlation is found between the working conditions at these two types of TV channels, and the quantity and variety of the DP translations.

- The study has shown that *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, and *like* are all multifunctional and context-dependent: they can signal both textual functions (i.e. DPs functioning structurally, making language more cohesive, such as *well* used medially with a frame-marking function signalling the transition taking place in the statement and/or in the physical environment of the speaker, cf., for instance, example (53)), and interpersonal functions (i.e. DP functions signalling the relation between speakers by expressing attitudes, judgements, etc., such as *well* used initially in answers to yes/no questions to show the insufficiency in the answer, cf., for instance, example (55)). The DPs signal these functions depending on which context they are in. The DP functions are not static but form a functional continuum. One occurrence of a DP may signal textual and interpersonal functions at the same time, but after systematic analysis of the context of a DP (including intonation and collocations etc. of the DP, as well as a larger social context of the dialogue), and after taking into account the cross-theoretical approach used in the study, most occurrences of the four DPs in the corpus have proven to have one function more salient than others in a given context. All DPs in the corpus show a textual frame-marking (**FRAME**), and an interpersonal mitigating function (**MIT**), as well as two additional functions: one textual and one interpersonal. The additional textual function of *well* and *you know* is a clarifying function (**CLAR**), while *I mean* has a repair function (**REP**), and

like an approximation function (**APPROX**). The additional interpersonal function of *well* is an insufficiency-marking function (**INS**), while *you know* has a solidarity-marking function (**SOL**), *I mean* an elaboration function (**ELAB**), and *like* a rapport-building function (**RAPP**).

- The distribution of the pragmatic functions of the DPs in the films shows that the textual **FRAME** function and the interpersonal function **INS/SOL/ELAB/RAPP** are the most common functions of the four DPs in the STs (the **FRAME** function has slightly more occurrences), while the interpersonal **MIT** is the third most common function, and the textual **CLAR/REP/APPROX** is the least common DP function in the STs. In the subtitles, the **FRAME** function is still the most frequently translated function, and the **INS/SOL/ELAB/RAPP** function the second most frequently translated function, while the order is changed for the **CLAR/REP/APPROX** function and the **MIT** function. The **MIT** function is the least frequently translated function in the TTs.

- The textual functions of the DPs are translated more often than the interpersonal ones, even though the majority of the ST DPs have a more salient interpersonal than textual function in the corpus. A possible reason for the textual function to be translated more frequently than the interpersonal function is the explicitation strategy often used by the subtitlers.

- When DPs are translated, a variety of Swedish linguistic means are used. The most frequently employed category of translations found is the DP/modal particle (*du vet*; *ju*; etc.), with half of the total number of translations. Following the DP/modal particle category are the translation categories conjunction (*och*; *men*; etc.), punctuation mark ("[…]"; –; etc.), and adverb (*drygt*; *riktigt*; etc.). Other categories, such as adjectives, pronouns and longer phrases, are also used, but not as extensively. No individual translation type is used to translate all four DPs.

- The variety of Swedish translation solutions employed, and the fact that no individual translation type is used to translate all four DPs, is a verification of both the multifunctionality and versatility of each of the four DPs, and the fact that the translations reflect the most salient functions of the DPs in the ST, as well as the overall multifunctionality of the DPs. Most functions are translated, but some functions of some DPs are entirely neglected, or translated only occasionally in the subtitles. When DPs are translated, the translations provide valuable information of the pragmatic functions shared by English and Swedish.

- The DPs show some differences concerning translation versatility, i.e. some DPs have a larger variety of translation types than others (indicated by how many individually different translation types are used for each DP compared with the number of translation tokens). In the corpus of the present study, *like* shows most translation versatility, followed by *you know*. *Well* is the third most versatile DP while *I mean* is the least versatile DP when it comes to translation types. These differences in translation versatility point to a tendency of *like* and *you know* to have more functional points of contact with Swedish than *well* and, especially, *I*

mean have. The disparities may also indicate that *like* and *you know* generally are more multifunctional than *well* and *I mean*.

- Not all DPs can or should be translated in subtitling, due to time and space constraints as well as to the overload of information that would be caused by such an attempt. The present study has shown, however, that an increase of DP translations (some DP functions are possibly more important to translate than others) in subtitling would be welcome. DPs are often of importance for speaker characterisations (this is especially true of the interpersonal functions of DPs) in feature films, and more often included for a reason, and less arbitrarily, in film dialogue than in authentic dialogue. DP translations may facilitate the overall comprehension of a film, its dialogue and characters, for any viewer of subtitled films.

In sum, the present study has shown that DPs are translatable, even in the constrained form of translation that is subtitling, and that the translations themselves can teach us a great deal about pragmatic functions shared by languages. However, the vast majority of the DPs in the films, and in particular certain functions of the DPs, are not translated. This non-translation is sometimes unfortunate as DP functions can be of great importance for the understanding and appreciation of film dialogue.

10.2 Some second thoughts

I will now briefly discuss the present study from a slightly different, evaluative perspective, with a focus on methodological issues. An important part of any empirical study is its source of empirical material. The multimodal film corpus compiled for the study has been a central part of it, and has greatly influenced the conclusions drawn. Consequently, this section will focus mainly on assessing the corpus used for the study. In addition, the method of analysis will be discussed.

Compiling the corpus took a great deal of time and effort, as I transcribed the complete soundtrack of ten films and up to four subtitle versions of each film by myself. The corpus has proven to be very useful and the time it took collecting it was indeed worth while in the end. One advantage of the corpus is its multimodality: having access to what speakers say, as well as to how they say it (intonation, body language, etc.), and in what context they say it, is an invaluable source for analysing DPs or any other linguistic feature. Analysing DPs in authentic conversation is a complicated task, made somewhat easier in film dialogue seeing that the language in a film is more structured than authentic language may be, and that the characters in a film usually are less complex than real people, thus making an analysis of their language easier than an analysis of real people's language.

The size of the corpus proved to be sufficient. Ten films, each with up to four different subtitle versions, resulted in a large but workable corpus. Including four TTs (the subtitles of the cinema, DVD, public service TV, and commercial TV) in the study was necessary in order to obtain a large enough sample of translations of the DPs, and to make quantitative and qualitative comparisons between the TTs.

One shortcoming of the selection criteria of the ten films may be the genre division. As there are only ten films in the corpus, dividing them into five genres does not provide each genre with enough substance to draw any definite conclusions about a certain genre. More films are needed in each genre before this can be done. However, viewing the DPs and their translations in connection to film genres was never the main aim of this study, but more a way of possibly finding patterns regarding DPs and their translations in connection with film genres, and drawing some preliminary conclusions that can be further tested in future studies.

A more general limitation of the corpus is its physical appearance. Due to time restrictions, it was impossible to computerise the corpus and make it automatically searchable. No part of the corpus is tagged, and part of the searches had to be made manually. Nevertheless, searches were made easier after the DPs and their translations were extracted from the transcribed STs and TTs and connected to the File Maker Pro Database, and film clips were added, facilitating the analysis further. In conclusion, the appearance of the corpus today is not perfect but it is still a workable corpus.

As far as the method of analysis of the present study is concerned, it has proven to be efficient given the circumstances. Because language per se is a fuzzy area of study, and DPs functionally are one of the vaguest parts of language, results of the present study relating to pragmatic functions are not to be seen as definite, but as a contribution to the study of the elusiveness of language in general and DPs in particular. Due to the fuzziness of DPs, applying a cross-theoretical approach to their functions has, however, been an efficient mode of taking in as many facets of each DP as possible. Moreover, using a number of parameters such as intonation, collocations, and position of each DP, the analyses performed in the study have been further facilitated. Despite the vagueness of DP functions, there is apparent logic behind their use, and they are far from redundant in spoken language. This fact can be illustrated most effectively through exploring the translations of the DPs. In the present study, the analysis of the translations is facilitated by studying various translation strategies used, as well as by exploring the pragmatic and grammatical Swedish realisations of the English DPs.

10.3 Wider implications

While working on an investigation such as this, many ideas arise that for obvious reasons cannot be included in the study. Some of these will be briefly discussed below.

First of all, the corpus compiled for the present study can be used for a number of further studies, relating to the American English STs, the Swedish subtitle TTs, and/or to further contrastive analyses of the material.

One part of the present study that could be expanded is the Swedish translations of the DPs. Ideally, more space could have been provided in the present study for a more thorough overview of the translations and their functions, especially as support for non-Swedish readers. However, neither space nor time permitted a more detailed account of the individual translations in this study. Additional studies could focus more on various Swedish, and/or other languages' DP translations per se.

As the multimodal corpus has proven to be an ideal starting point for studies on pragmatic functions, a natural continuation of the present study would be a further analysis of pragmatic functions in English and Swedish. Areas discussed in the present study, such as politeness, relevance, turn-taking, etc., can be expanded. Other aspects of pragmatics not examined to a great extent in the present study, i.e. humour, irony, laughter, etc., would also be interesting to study from a cross-linguistic perspective in a multimodal corpus.

Another study, which can be performed on the corpus used for the present study and/or additional contrastive corpora including subtitling or other forms of translation, is a closer examination of the Swedish modal particle *ju* and its elusive multifunctionality (cf. 5.5). *Ju* is used to a large extent in the subtitles in the corpus of the present study as a translation of DPs and other words and expressions in the STs, but it is also included in the subtitles when there is no clear expression in the ST requiring *ju* as a translation. One reason for this may be that *ju*, in addition to being a more or less well corresponding translation of some words and expressions in the ST, can reflect the function of speakers' intonation and body language in the films, and thus be a good translation choice for certain non-verbal features in communication. A study of *ju* in subtitles can possibly teach us a great deal about the function of *ju*, as well as of more intricate pragmatic functions, and functions of intonation, body language, etc. in the films.

DPs and their translations can be further studied in other spoken corpora. One aspect of their use that has not been discussed in the present study is how they are translated when they appear in combination (e.g. *well, you know, like, it just happened*). Exploring which functions are translated under these circumstances would be a valuable contribution to the study of DPs. The corpus of the present study only includes a handful of DPs in combination, but a corpus of authentic language would possibly include more.

The correlation found in the present study between the position of a DP in the pragmaticalisation process, and the stigma attached to the same DP, needs to be studied further in the present corpus and/or in other spoken corpora of English or Swedish. It seems from the present study that DPs that are still in the pragmaticalisation process are more stigmatised than DPs that have already gone through this process. *Like* is an example of the former, and *well* of the latter. *Like* is still to a large extent perceived to be a conjunction or a preposition, and consequently the DP use of *like* is often viewed as bad language or as an entirely redundant feature of language. *Well*, on the other hand, has already gone through a pragmaticalisation process and has been used as a DP for a longer time than *like*, hence the lower level of stigma for this DP.

At the beginning of the present study, it was my wish to perform a reception study of film viewers at some point during the work of the thesis. Unfortunately, there was no time for this, as such a study is greatly time-consuming. A reception study related to the present study would consider the reaction of viewers of subtitled films, and how they perceive the DPs in the film soundtracks, as well as the translation or non-translation of the DPs. An elaborate test would have to be developed, taking into consideration various aspects of DP functions, and translations, as well as how to assess the points made by the viewers.

One aspect worth noting of the corpus used for the present study is the fact that all the subtitling in this corpus is produced before the year 2006, when the public service TV channel

279

SVT reformed its subtitling production and let external companies (i.e. companies also subtitling for the commercial channels) take over the translation of most of the material broadcast on SVT1 and SVT2. The differences found in the present study between the public service and commercial channels concerning the translation of DPs may have decreased or disappeared, as the working conditions at the public service and commercial TV channels are possibly more comparable today (2009). A study similar to the present one, comparing the subtitling of DPs produced after 2006 would thus be interesting. Further studies on subtitlers' working conditions in relation to the end product of the subtitling process, as well as the process itself, e.g. by means of Think-Aloud-Protocols, would also be useful.

In a wider perspective, it would be valuable to contrastively investigate certain socio-cultural norms, traditions, etc., related to subtitling. This can be done from a diachronic perspective and/or from a cultural perspective. A diachronic study could for instance observe whether the same Swedish words and expressions are used to translate DPs (or other ST features) in subtitling today that were used 30 years ago. The result would indicate whether or not the language in Swedish subtitling keeps pace with language change or whether the language used 30 years ago is still preferred in subtitling. A similar study could be performed on the subtitling of DPs (or other ST features) in different countries to compare the norms and traditions in various countries' subtitling.

In closing, numerous further studies could be carried out in addition to the ones discussed above. I hope the present study may prove an incentive to future studies the same way other studies of pragmatics and translation studies inspired me to look into the translation of discourse particles in subtitling.

References

Film corpus

Addicted to Love (1997, Warner Bros)

      Subtitles: DVD, SVT1, TV3

American Pie (1999, Zide-Perry Productions)

      Subtitles: Cinema, DVD, SVT1, TV3

Fargo (1996, Working Title Films)

      Subtitles: Cinema, DVD, TV4, SVT1

Legally Blonde (2001, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Inc.)

      Subtitles: Cinema, DVD, SVT1, TV4

Nurse Betty (2000, Gramercy Pictures)

      Subtitles: Cinema, DVD, SVT1, TV3

Primary Colors (1998, Mutual Film Company LLC)

      Subtitles: Cinema, DVD, TV3, SVT1

Pulp Fiction (1994, Band Apart Productions)

      Subtitles: Cinema, DVD, TV4, SVT1

Se7en (1995, New Line Cinema Corp.)

      Subtitles: Cinema, DVD, SVT1, TV4

Wag the Dog (1997, Tribeca Productions)

      Subtitles: Cinema, DVD, SVT1, TV4

While You Were Sleeping (1995, Hollywood Pictures)

      Subtitles: Cinema, DVD, TV3, SVT2

References

Aijmer, K. 1985. Vad man ej klart kan säga - om vaghetsmarkörer. In: S. Allén et al. (eds.). *Svenskans beskrivning*. Göteborg: Göteborgs universitet. 107-117.

Aijmer, K. 1996a. *Conversational routines in English: convention and creativity*. London: Longman.

Aijmer, K. 1996b. Swedish modal particles in a contrastive perspective. *Language Sciences*. 18 (1-2), 393-427.

Aijmer, K. 2002. *English discourse particles. Evidence from a corpus*.

Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Aijmer, K. & Simon-Vandenbergen, A.-M. 2003. The discourse particle *well* and its equivalents in Swedish and Dutch. *Linguistics*. 41(6), 1123-1161.

Aijmer, K. 2005. Evaluation and pragmatic markers. In: E. Tognini-Bonelli (ed.). *Strategies in academic discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Aijmer, K. & Simon-Vandenbergen, A.-M. (eds.). 2006. *Pragmatic markers in contrast*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Aijmer, K. 2007. The meanings and functions of the Swedish discourse marker *alltså* – evidence from translation corpora. *Catalan journal of linguistics*. Special issue Contrastive perspectives on discourse markers (6). 31-59.

Aijmer, K. 2008. Translating discourse particles: a case of complex translation. In: G. Anderman & M. Rogers (eds.). *Incorporating corpora: the linguist and the translator*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 95-116.

Andersen, G. 1997. They gave us these yeah, and they like wanna see like how we talk and all that. The use of *like* and other pragmatic markers in London teenage speech. In: U.-B. Kotsinas et al. (eds.). *Ungdomsspråk i Norden. Föredrag från ett forskarsymposium*. Stockholm: Stockholms universitet. 82-95.

Andersen, G. 1998. The pragmatic marker *like* from a relevance-theoretic perspective. In: A.H. Jucker & Y. Ziv (eds). *Discourse markers: descriptions and theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 147-170.

Andersen, G.1999. *Pragmatic markers and sociolinguistic variation: a corpus-based study*. Doctoral thesis, University of Bergen.

Andersen, G. 2001. *Pragmatic markers and sociolingistic variation: a relevance-theoretic approach to the language of adolescents*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Andersson, L.-G. 2000. *Vi säger så*. Falun: Norstedts ordbok.

Andersson, L.-G. 2004. *Fult språk: svordomar, dialekter och annat ont.* Stockholm: Carlsson.

Atkinson, J. & Heritage, J (eds.). 1984. *Structures of social action. Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baker, M. 1992. *In other words: a coursebook in translation*. London & New York: Routledge.

Baker, M. 1995. Corpora in Translation Studies: an overview and suggestions for future research. *Target*. 7 (2), 223-244.

Baker, M. 2005. *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies*. London & New York: Routledge.

Bates, E. 1976. *Language and context: the acquisition of pragmatics*. New York: Academic
  Press.

Bazzanella, C. 1995. I segnali discorsivi. In: R. Lorenzo et al. (eds.). *Grande grammatica
  italiana di consultazione, vol III*. Bologna: Il Mulino. 225-257.

Bazzanella, C. & Morra, L. 2000. Discourse markers and the indeterminacy of translation. In:
  I. Korzen & C. Marello (eds.). *Argomenti per una linguistica della traduzione. On
  linguistic aspects of translation*. Torino: Edizioni dell'Orso. 149–157.

Biber, D. 1988. *Variation across speech and writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University
  Press.

Blakemore, D. 1987. *Semantic constraints on relevance*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Blakemore, D. 1992. *Understanding utterances: an introduction to pragmatics*. Oxford &
  Cambridge: Blackwell.

Blakemore, D. 2001. Discourse and relevance theory. In: D. Schiffrin et al. (eds.). *The
  handbook of discourse analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell. 100-118.

Blum-Kulka, S. 1986. Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation. In: J. House & S.
  Blum-Kulka (eds.). *Interlingual and intercultural communication*. Tübingen: Günther
  Narr Verlag. 17-35.

Blyth, C. et al. 1990. I'm like, "Say What?!": A new quotative in American Oral Narrative.
  American Speech. 65 (3), 215-227.

Bolinger, D. 1989. *Intonation and its use: melody in grammar and discourse*. London
  Melbourne Auckland: Edward Arnold.

Brinton, L.J. 1996. *Pragmatic markers in English: grammaticalization and discourse
  functions*. Berlin New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. 1987. *Politeness. Some universals in language use*. Cambridge:
  Cambridge University Press.

Brown, G. & Yule, G. 1983. *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Buchstaller, I. 2001. An alternative view of *like*: its grammaticalisation in
  conversational American English and beyond. *Edinburgh Working Papers in Applied
  Linguistics 11*, 21-41.

Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary. 2005. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University
  Press.

Carlson, L. 1984. *'Well' in dialogue games: a discourse analysis of the interjection
  'well' in idealized conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Catford, J.C. 1965. *A linguistic theory of translation*. London: Oxford University Press.

Chaume, F. 2004a. Discourse markers in audiovisual translating. *Meta*. 49 (4), 843-855.

Chaume, F. 2004b. Synchronization in dubbing: a translational approach. In: P. Oreo (ed.). *Topics in audiovisual translation*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 35-52.

Chesterman, A. 1997. *Memes of translation: the spread of ideas in translation theory*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Chesterman, A. 1989. *Readings in Translation Theory*. Helsinki: Loimaan Kirjapaino.

Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary. 1995. 2ⁿᵈ ed. London: HarperCollins.

Croucher, S. 2004. Like, You know, What I'm saying: A study of discourse marker frequency in extemporaneous and impromptu speaking. *National Forensic Journal*. 22 (2-3), 38-47.

Crystal, D. & Davy, D. 1975. *Advanced conversational English*. London: Longman.

Crystal, D. 2004. *The stories of English*. London: Allen Lane.

Cuenca, M.-J. 2008. Pragmatic markers in contrast: the case of *well. Journal of Pragmatics*. (40) 8, 1373-1391.

Dailey-O'Cain, J. 2000. The sociolinguistic distribution of and attitudes toward focuser *like* and quotative *like. Journal of sociolinguistics*. 1 (4), 60-80.

de Linde, Z. & Kay, N. 1999. *The semiotics of subtitling*. Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.

Díaz Cintas, J. 2003. Audiovisual translation in the third millennium. In: G. Anderman & M. Rogers (eds.) *Translation Today: trends and perspectives*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 192-204.

Díaz Cintas, J. & Anderman, G. (eds.). 2009a. *Audiovisual translation. Language transfer on screen*. Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Díaz Cintas, J. (ed.). 2009b. *New trends in audiovisual translation*. Bristol Buffalo Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

Dollerup, C. 1974. On Subtitles in TV programmes. *Babel*. 4 (20), 197-202.

Edmondson, W. 1981. *Spoken discourse: a model for analysis*. London: Longman.

Egoyan, A. & Balfour, I. 2004. *Subtitles: on the foreignness of film*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Eriksson, M. 1995. A case of grammaticalization in modern Swedish: the use of *ba* in adolescent speech. *Language Sciences*. 17 (1), 19-48.

Erman, B. 1986. Some pragmatic expressions in English conversation. In: G. Tottie & I. Bäcklund (eds.). *English in speech and writing: a symposium*. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell. 131-147.

Erman, B. 1987. *Pragmatic expressions in English: a study of* you know*, you see *and* I mean *in face-to-face conversation.* Stockholm: English Department, Stockholm University.

Erman, B. & Kotsinas, U.-B. 1993. Pragmaticalization: the case of *ba'* and *you know*. In: J. Falk et al. (eds.). *Stockholm studies in modern philology*. Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell International. 79-93.

Erman, B. 2001. Pragmatic markers revisited with a focus on *you know* in adult and adolescent talk. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 33 (9), 1337-1359.

Even-Zohar, I. 1978/2000. The position of translated literature within the literary polysystem. In: L. Venuti (ed.). *The translation studies reader*. London: Routledge.192-197.

Fawcett, P. 2003. The manipulation of language and culture in film translation. In: P. Calzada (ed.). *Apropos of ideology: translation studies in ideology - ideologies in translation studies*. Manchester & Northampton: St. Jerome. 145-163.

Færch, C. & Kasper, G. 1983. *Strategies in interlanguage communication*. London: Longman.

Ferrara, K. & Bell, B. 1995. Sociolinguistic variation and discourse function of constructed dialogue introducers: the case of be+like. *American Speech*. 70, 265-289.

Fischer, K. (ed.). 2006. *Approaches to discourse particles*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Fox Tree, J.E. & Schrock, J.C. 2002. Basic meanings of *you know* and *I mean*. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 34 (6), 727-747.

Fraser, B.1987. Pragmatic formatives. In: J. Verschueren and M. Bertuccelli-Papi (eds.). *The pragmatic perspective*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 179–194.

Fraser, B. 1988. Types of English discourse markers. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 38.1–4, 19–33.

Fraser, B. 1990. An approach to discourse markers. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 14 (3), 383-395.

Fraser, B.1996. Pragmatic markers. *Pragmatics*. 6 (2),167–190.

Fuller, J.M. 2003. The influence of speaker roles on discourse marker use. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 34 (1), 23-45.

Gambier, Y. 1994. Audio-visual communication: typological detour. In: C. Dollerup & A. Lindegaard (eds.). *Teaching Translation and Interpreting*. 275-283.

Gambier, Y. (ed.). 1996. *Les transferts linguistiques dans les médias audiovisuels*. Villeneuve d'Ascq: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion.

Gambier, Y. (guest ed.). 2003. *The translator*. Special issue. Screen translation. 9 (2).

Gambier, Y. 2008. Recent developments and challenges in audiovisual translation research. In: D. Chiaro et al. (eds.). *Between text and image: updating research in screen translation*. 11-33.

Gentzler, E. 1993. *Contemporary translation theories*. London & New York: Routledge.

Goffman, E. 1967. *Interaction ritual: essays on face-to-face behaviour*. New York: Pantheon.

Gottlieb, H. 1993. Subtitling: people translating people. *Teaching Translation and Interpreting*. 5 (2), 263-274.

Gottlieb, H. 1994. *Tekstning - synkron billedmedieoversættelse* [Subtitling – synchronous media translation]. Danske Afhandlinger om Oversættelse (DAO) 5. Copenhagen: Center for Oversættelse, Københavns universitet.

Gottlieb, H. 1997. *Subtitles, translation & idioms*. Copenhagen: Centre for translation studies, University of Copenhagen.

Gottlieb, H. 2001. *Screen translation: six studies in subtitling, dubbing and voice-over*. Copenhagen: Centre for translation studies, University of Copenhagen.

Gottlieb, H. 2004. Subtitling and international Anglification. In: C. Dollerup (ed.). *Worlds of words: a tribute to Arne Zettersten. Nordic journal of English studies*. (special issue) 3 (1). 219-230.

Grice, H.P. 1975. Logic and conversation. In: P. Cole & J. Morgan (eds.). *Syntax and Semantics* (3), Academic Press, 41-58.

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

Halliday, M.A.K. & Matthiessen, M.I.M. 1994. *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Oxford University Press.

Hasund, I.K. 2003. *The discourse marker* like *in English and* liksom *in Norwegian teenage language: a corpus-based, cross-linguistic study*. Doctoral thesis. Bergen: University of Bergen and Agder University College.

Hasselgren. A. 2002. Fluency and the small words of speaking. In: C. Estobar & A. Hasselgren (eds.). *Assessing secondary school students' oral interaction*. Barcelona: Apac.

Hatim, B. & Mason, I. 1990. *Discourse and the translator*. Singapore: Longman Singapore Publishers.

Hatim, B. & Mason, I. 1997. *The translator as communicator*. London: Routledge.

Hatim, B. & Mason, I. 2000. Politeness in screen translating. In: L. Venuti. (ed.). *The translation studies reader*. London: Routledge. 430-445.

Heiss, C. et al. 2008. Forlixt 1- The Forlì corpus of screen translation: exploring macrostructures. In: D. Chiaro et al. (eds.). *Between text and image: updating research in screen translation*. 37-50.

Hoelkher, K. 1991. Franzoesisch: Partikleforschung. In: Holtus et al. (eds.). *Lexicon der*

romantischen Linguistik. Tübingen: Niemeyer. 77-88.

Holmes, J. 1986. Functions of *you know* in women's and men's speech. *Language in Society*. 15, 1-21.

Holmes, J. & Stubbe, M. 1995. *You know*, *eh* and other "exasperating expressions": an analysis of social and stylistic variation in the use of pragmatic devices in a sample of New Zealand English. *Language and Communication*. 15 (1), 63-88.

Ingo, R. 2007. *Konsten att översätta*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Ivarsson, J. 1992. *Subtitling for the media: a handbook of an art*. Stockholm: Transedit.

Ivarsson, J. & Carroll, M. 1998. *Subtitling*. Simrishamn: TransEdit HB.

Johansson, S. 2006. How well can *well* be translated? On the English discourse particle *well* and its correspondences in Norwegian and German. In: K. Aijmer & A.-M. Simon-Vandenbergen (eds.). *Pragmatic markers in contrast*. Amsterdam: Elsevier. 115-137.

Jones, G.M. & Schieffelin, B.B. 2009. Enquoting voices, accomplishing talk: uses of *be+like* in instant messaging. *Language and Communication*. 29 (1), 77-113.

Josephson, O. 2005. *Ju - ifrågasätta självklarheter. Om svenskan, engelskan och alla andra språk*. Stockholm: Norstedts akademiska förlag.

Jucker, A. 1993. The discourse marker *well*: a relevance-theoretical account. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 19 (5), 435-52.

Jucker, A. & Ziv, Y. 1998. *Discourse markers: descriptions and theory*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Jucker, A. & Smith, S. 1998. And people just you know like "Wow": discourse markers as negotiating strategies. In A. Jucker & Y. Ziv (eds.). *Discourse markers: descriptions and theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 171-201.

Jucker, A. 2002. Discourse markers in Early Modern English. In: R. Watts & P. Trudgill (eds.).*Alternative histories of English*. London: Routledge. 210-230.

Kaeser, O. 2001. *Pragmatic markers and their importance in the teaching of English to German(-Swiss) learners*. Licentiate dissertation, University of Zürich.

Karamitroglou, F. 2000. *Towards a methodology for the investigation of norms in audiovisual translation: the choice between subtitling and revoicing in Greece*. Amsterdam & Atlanta: Rodopi.

Klaudy, K. 1993. On explicitation hypothesis. In K. Klaudy & J. Kohn (eds.) *Transferre necesse est…Current issues of translation theory*. Szombathely: Daniel Berszenyi College. 69-77.

Koller, W. 1979. Equivalence in translation theory. In: A. Chesterman (ed.). *Readings in*

translation theory. Helsinki: Loimaan Kirjapaino. 99-104.

Kotsinas, U.-B. 2002. *Ungdomsspråk*. Uppsala. Hallgren och Fallgren Studieförlag.

Kotsinas, U.-B. 2003. *En bok om slang, typ*. Stockholm: Norstedts ordbok.

Kovačič, I. 1993. Relevance as a factor in subtitling reductions. In: C. Dollerup & A. Lindegaard (eds.). *Teaching translation and interpreting 2: insights, aims, visions; papers from the second language international conference, Elsinore, Denmark 4-6 June 1993*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 246-251.

Lakoff, R. 1973. Questionable answers and answerable questions. In: B. Kachru et al. (eds.). *Issues in linguistics: papers in honor of Henry and Renée Kahane*. Urbana and Chicago: Univ. of Illinois Press. 453-467.

Landy, E. 1971. *The underground dictionary*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Lehti-Eklund, H. 1997. *alltså* som diskurspartikel. In: D. Haapamäki (ed.). *Svenskan i Finland 4*. Åbo. 75-83.

Leech, G. 1980. *Explorations in semantics and pragmatics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Leech, G. & Thomas, J. 1989. Language, meaning and context: pragmatics. In: N. Collinge (ed.). *An encyclopaedia of language*. London & New York: Routledge. 139-172.

Lenk, U. 1998a. Discourse markers and global coherence in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 30 (2), 245-257.

Lenk, U. 1998b. *Marking discourse coherence: functions of discourse markers in spoken English*. Tübingen: Günther Narr Verlag.

Leppihalme, R. 1994. *Culture bumps: on the translation of allusions*. Helsinki: University Press.

Levinson, S. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levý, I. 1967/2000. Translation as a decision process. In: L. Venuti (ed.). *The translation studies reader*. London & New York: Routledge. 148-159.

Lindström, J. 2008. *Tur och ordning. Introduktion till samtalsgrammatik*. Stockholm: Norstedts.

Linell, P. 1994. *Transkription av tal och samtal: teori och praktik*. (Arbetsrapporter från Tema Kommunikation 1994:9). Linköping: Linköpings universitet.

Lomheim, S. 2000. *Skrifta på skjermen*. Kristiansand: Nordic Academic Press.

Longacre, R. 1976. Discourse. In: R. M. Brend & K. L. Pike (eds.). *Tagmemics, vol. 1: Aspects of the field, 1-44. Trends in Linguistics, 1*. The Hague: Mouton.

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

Luke, K. 1990. *Utterance particles in Cantonese conversation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Giebven.

Macaulay, R. 2002. You know, it depends. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 34 (6), 749-767.

Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners. 2002. Oxford: Macmillan Education.

Marleau, L. 1982. Les sous-titres: Un mal nécessaire. *Meta*. (27) 3, 271-285.

Mattsson, J. 2006. The subtitling of American swearwords. A look at possible norms governing film translation in Sweden. In: B. Englund Dimotrova & H. Landqvist (eds.). *Svenska som källspråk och målspråk. Aspekter på översättningsvetenskap*. Gothenburg: Översättningsstudier vid Göteborgs universitet 9. 124-140.

Munday, J. 2001. *Introducing Translation Studies*. London & New York: Routledge.

Minchinton, J. 1993. Sub-Titling. Unpublished manuscript. Hertfordshire, England: J. Minchinton.

Newmark, P. 1981. *Approaches to translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

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

Nilsson, J. 2005. *Adverb i interaktion*. Gothenburg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.

Nornes, A. 1999. For an abusive subtitling. *Film quarterly*. 52 (3), 17-34.

Norrby, C. 1996. *Samtalsanalys. Så gör vi när vi pratar med varandra*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Norrby, C. & Wirdenäs K. 2002. En diskursmarkör i vardande? Lite om *lite*. *Språk & Stil* 11. 211–234.

Ohlander, S. 1983. Förslag typ löntagarfonder: om ett nytt språkbruk i dagens svenska. *Språkvård*. (1), 21-30.

Östman, J.-O. 1981. *You know: a discourse functional approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Östman, J.-O. & Verschueren, J. (eds.). 2005. *Handbook of pragmatics; 2003-2005 installment*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ottesjö, C. 2006. *Att fortsätta och att återgå. Studier i koherensskapande praktiker i vardagliga flerpersonssamtal*. Gothenburg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.

Owen, M. 1981. Conversational units and the use of 'well...' In: P. Werth (ed.). *Conversation and discourse*. London: Croom Helm. 99-116.

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. 2000. 6th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pavlović, N. 2003. The pragmatic theory of politeness in TV subtitling. *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabiensia*. XLVII (47), 385-400.

Pedersen, J. 2007. *Scandinavian subtitles. A comparative study of subtitling norms in Sweden*

and Denmark with a focus on extralinguistic cultural references. Doctoral thesis, Stockholm University.

Pelsmaekers, K. 2002. Subtitling irony: Blackadder in Dutch. *The Translator*. 8, 241-266.

Perego, E. 2009. The codification of nonverbal information in subtitled texts. In: J. Díaz Cintas (ed.). *New trends in audiovisual translation*. Bristol, Buffalo & Toronto: Multilingual Matters. 58-69.

Person, R.F. 1999. *Structure and meaning in conversation and literature*. Lanham: University Press of America.

Quaglio, P. 2008. Television dialogue and natural conversation: linguistic similarities and functional differences. In: A. Ädel & R. Reppen (eds.). *Corpora and discourse. The challenges of different settings*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 189-210.

Quirk, R. et al. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.

Redeker, G. 1991. Linguistic markers of discourse structure. *Linguistics*. 29 (6), 1139-1172.

Reiss, K. & Vermeer, H.J. 1984. *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Romaine, S. & Lange, D. 1991. The use of *like* as a marker of reported speech and thought: a case of grammaticalization in progress. *American Speech*. 66 (3), 227-279.

Saari, M. 1986. Jag menar. In: M. Saari et al. (eds.) *Xenia Huldeniana. Meddelanden från institutionen för nordiska språk och nordisk litteratur vid Helsingfors universitet* B:10. Helsinki: Helsinki University. 329-337

Sahlin, I. 2001. *Tal och undertexter i textade svenska tv-program - probleminventering och förslag till analysmodell*. Gothenburg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.

Schiffrin, D. 1987. *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schiffrin, D. et al. (eds.). 2001. *The Handbook of discourse analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schiffrin, D. 2001. Discourse markers, language, meaning, and context. In: Schiffrin, D. et al. (eds.). *The Handbook of discourse analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell. 54-75.

Schourup, L. 1985. *Common discourse particles in English conversation: Like, well, y'know*. New York: Garland.

Schourup, L. 2001. Rethinking *well*. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 33 (7), 1025-1060.

Schröter, T. 2005. *Shun the pun, rescue the rhyme? The dubbing and subtitling of language-play in film*. Doctoral thesis. Karlstad: Karlstad University Studies.

Sihna, A. 2004. The use and abuse of subtitles. In: A. Egoyan & I. Balfour (eds.). *Subtitles: on the foreignness of film*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press Ltd. 172-190.

Skuggevik, E. 2009. Teaching screen translation: the role of pragmatics in subtitling. In J. Díaz Cintas & G. Anderman (eds.). *Audiovisual translation. Language transfer on screen*. Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 197-213.

Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. 1986. *Relevance: communication and cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Stenström, A.-B. 1989. Discourse signals: towards a model of analysis. In: H. Weydt (ed.), *Sprechen mit Partikeln*. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter. 561-574.

Stenström, A.-B. 1994. *An introduction to spoken interaction*. Longman: New York.

Subtitling International. 1990. *Översättarmaterial* [translation material]. Sweden: Svensk Text AB.

Svartvik, J. 1980. *Well* in conversation. In: S. Greenbaum et al. (eds.). *Studies in English linguistics for Randolph Quirk*. London: Longman.167-177.

Svensson, G. 2009. Diskurspartiklar hos ungdomar i mångspråkiga miljöer i Malmö. Lund: Språk- och litteraturcentrum, Lunds universitet.

SVT. 2003. *Internt arbetsmaterial för SVT översättning och programtextning* [in-house material for SVT translation and programme subtitling].

Teleman, U., Hellberg, S., Andersson, E. 1999. *Svenska akademiens grammatik*. Stockholm: Svenska Akademien.

Titford, C. 1982. Subtitling - constrained translation. *Lebende Sprache*. 3 (17), 113-117.

Toury, G. 1995. *Descriptive translation studies – and beyond*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Underhill, R. 1988. *Like* is, like, focus. *American Speech*. 63 (3), 234-246.

van Dijk, T. 1979. Pragmatic connectives. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 3 (5), 447-456.

Venuti, L. (ed.). 2000. *The translation studies reader*. London: Routledge.

Watts, R. 1986. Relevance in conversational moves: a reappraisal of *well*. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*. 19, 37-59.

Watts, R. 2003. *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wray, A. 2008. *Formulaic language: pushing the boundaries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zabalbeascoa, P. 1997. Dubbing and the nonverbal dimension of translation. In: F. Poyatos (ed.). *Nonverbal Communication and Translation*. 327-342.

Zufferey, S. & Popescu-Belis. 2004. Towards automatic identification of discourse markers in dialogs: the case of *like*. In: *Proceedings of the 5th SIGDIAL Workshop on Discourse and Dialogue*. Cambridge, Mass. 63-71.

Electronic sources

Amazon
  http://www.amazon.co.uk/preview (accessed June, 2006)

Commission of the European Communities. 2007. High Level Group on Multilingualism.
  Final report. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European
  Communities.http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/lang/doc/multireport_en.pdf
  (accessed September 2007)

The Guardian
  http://www.guardian.cu.uk (accessed June, 2006)

Internet Movie Database.
  http://www.imdb.com (accessed April, 2006)

Internet Movie Script Database
  http://www.imsdb.com (accessed May, 2006)

Kulturdepartementet [Ministry of Culture]. Slutbetänkande av Kommittén för svenska språket
  SOU 2002:27. 2002. Mål i mun. Förslag till handlingsprogram för svenska språket.
  http://www.sprakradet.se/servlet/GetDoc?meta id=2094 (accessed April 2005).

Simply Scripts
   http://www. simplyscripts.com (accessed May, 2006)

The Department of Audiovisual Media under the National Library of Sweden
  http://www.slba.se (accessed April, 2006, as The Swedish National Archive of
  Recorded Sound and Moving Images (SLBA))

Urban Dictionary
  http://www.urbandictionary.com (accessed March, 2007)