CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1. Initial observations
After a somewhat hesitant and slow beginning, Audiovisual Translation (AVT) has experienced an unprecedented growth in recent years, rapidly consolidating as a discipline in its own right within Translation Studies. In its effort to achieve this consideration, most of the research carried out in this field has emphasised its specificity, i.e. what makes it different from other types of translation, and more specifically the constraints it poses to translators. In the case of dubbing, the focus has mainly been placed on the different synchronies at play. Consequently, other aspects such as the study of the language used in dubbing, of great relevance to translators, have been largely overlooked. The few studies available on the subject, such as those by Herbst (1995, 1996, 1997) in the case of German, seem to agree that there is a general lack of naturalness in the language used in dubbing, which may also apply in Spanish (Duro 2001). Yet, most of these studies rely on intuition or have not had access to the appropriate means to provide an empirical view. Now that research in this field has been provided with a range of tools to account for the audiovisual component and the different constraints it poses, and especially now that corpus-based methodology and the required technology to make it possible have been adopted within Translation Studies (Olohan 2004), it is possible to study dubbing language with empirical methods. In the case of Spanish, recent studies by Chaume (2004a) and Baños (2007) have adopted corpus-based approaches to describe the Spanish dubbing language as opposed to the Spanish language used in non-translated audiovisual texts. Yet, the key question of the naturalness of the Spanish dubbing language remains unexplored. In this sense, if it is to be tackled empirically, as has been by Pavesi (2004, 2005) in the case of Italian, it requires the use of an empirical and objective approach, comparing dubbed dialogue not only to non-translated fictional dialogue but also to the type of dialogue it imitates – naturally-occurring conversation. This is precisely the approach adopted in the present thesis.

The focus of analysis in this thesis is on discourse markers (DMs), increasingly present in current research on corpus linguistics and conversation analysis and generally regarded as key units in the achievement of naturalness in both fictional (Fox Tree and
Schrock 1999) and spontaneous dialogue (Gregori-Signes 1996). This analysis thus contributes to bridge the gap between two areas, AVT research and the study of DMs, which occupy a similar position within Translation Studies and Linguistics as relatively young and increasingly important areas of research concerned with the analysis of conversation and often investigated within corpus-based approaches and with computer-assisted tools. Yet, it should not be inferred from this that the analysis proposed in the present thesis is purely linguistic. In fact, the audiovisual component of the corpora will also be duly taken into account using Chaume’s (2004a) model for the analysis of audiovisual texts from a translational viewpoint.

1.2. Aims and objectives of the study

The broad aim of this thesis is to investigate whether there is lack of naturalness in the use of DMs in the Spanish dubbed script of the American sitcom *Friends.*

The specific objectives of the study are:

- to provide a description of the Spanish dubbing language which can account for, and distinguish, those features that stem from its condition as translation for dubbing, fictional script and imitation of spontaneous conversation, in order to facilitate a comparison between dubbed, (non-translated) fictional and spontaneous dialogue;
- to provide a definition of naturalness that can be applied to the Spanish dubbing language bearing in mind the above description;
- to construct a theoretical framework and identify a set of DMs which are appropriate for the analysis of the naturalness of Spanish dubbed dialogue;
- to find a model for the analysis of audiovisual texts which can take into consideration the specific features and constraints at play in dubbing;
- to carry out a comparative analysis of the use of DMs in the corpora chosen for this thesis using both quantitative and qualitative methods.

In its attempt to investigate the naturalness of the DMs used in the Spanish dubbing language, the study included in this thesis also endeavours to describe, in those cases (if any) in which naturalness is found to be missing, the nature of this lack of naturalness. The present study also attempts to provide an interpretation of the textual effect of this
lack of naturalness on the dubbed dialogue. Finally, although it is not within the scope of this thesis to offer empirical explanations as to the possible origin of this lack of naturalness, suggestions will be made that will point to new avenues for further research on this area.

1.3. Content and structure of the thesis

First of all, Chapter 2 seeks to provide an overview of the literature on AVT that can be of relevance for the development of the theoretical framework of this thesis, presented in Chapter 4. After defining dubbing and describing the dubbing process, a review of the most important approaches to the study of dubbing is presented, placing special emphasis on Chaume’s (2004a) model of analysis of audiovisual texts from a translational viewpoint, which will be partially adopted in the present study. Chapter 2 then narrows its focus to the Spanish language used in dubbing. After a general overview of the research carried out so far on dubbing language in general, a detailed description is provided of the Spanish dubbing language, whose main features are allocated into a fictional and a translational dimension. Finally, Chapter 2 ends by tackling the notion of naturalness in Translation Studies in general and in dubbing in particular, providing the definition of naturalness that will be applied in this thesis.

Following a similar structure, Chapter 3 surveys the most relevant literature on colloquial conversation and then narrows its focus to deal with the object of study chosen in this thesis –colloquial DMs. Firstly, it presents a series of conditions for a conversation to be regarded as colloquial. These conditions are important insofar as they will be applied to the corpora included in this thesis. Attention is then turned to DMs in general, including their status and relevance in the study of conversation, their definition and main characteristics as well as their so far limited presence in AVT research. The last part of this chapter is concerned with colloquial DMs in Spanish, describing the main types among which the DMs analysed in this thesis will be chosen.

Based on the information presented in the previous two chapters, Chapter 4 presents the theoretical framework with which the study proposed in this thesis can be conducted. Given that, for instance, only part of Chaume’s (2004a) model has been found to be useful for the present thesis, an explanation is provided of what is applied and what is left out. The same goes for the description of the Spanish dubbing language, also
presented in Chapter 2, as well as for the data on colloquial conversation, included in Chapter 3. Finally, with regard to the different types of DMs described in Chapter 3, a selection is made of the ones that will be analysed in the corpora included in this thesis.

The description of these corpora as well as of the methodology adopted in the present study is reviewed in Chapter 5, which is divided into three different sections. The first section includes a brief survey of corpus-based approaches to translation research, an account of their advantages and disadvantages and a description of the approach chosen for this study. The second one describes the parallel, comparable and reference corpora used in the present thesis. Finally, in the last section the methodology adopted for the analysis of these corpora is reviewed.

Having presented the theoretical framework, the corpora and the methodology adopted in this thesis, attention is turned in Chapter 6 to the analysis of the DMs chosen as objects of study in the three corpora. This analysis is divided into five sections, corresponding to the five different types of DMs analysed. In turn, each section features a brief description of every DM, a quantitative analysis of their occurrence in the three corpora and a qualitative analysis of their usage. The discussion included in this qualitative analysis will take into consideration the audiovisual nature of the corpora and will attempt to elucidate whether or not the selected DMs may be considered natural on the basis of the definition of naturalness proposed in the present thesis. This and other issues are also dealt with in the conclusions of every analysis, where the main findings and results obtained are summarised and discussed.

Based on the quantitative and qualitative data obtained in Chapter 6, Chapter 7 addresses some of the possible reasons for the presence of unnatural features in the use of DMs in the Spanish dubbing language. In this sense, the phenomenon of suspension of linguistic disbelief is posed as a tentative explanation for the perpetuation of some of these unnatural features. Most importantly, it points to the need to carry out empirical audience-based research to determine whether this phenomenon or other causes may explain why these unnatural features occur and especially why they seem to be accepted, or go unnoticed, both by the audience and the translators.
Finally, Chapter 8 concludes with a revision of the main findings obtained in this study, which are checked against the aims and objectives set at its outset. Taking up the discussion presented in Chapter 7, suggestions are made as to potential avenues for further research into the naturalness of dubbing language in general and the Spanish dubbing language in particular.
CHAPTER 2
FROM AVT TO THE NATURALNESS OF THE SPANISH DUBBESE

2.1. AVT: emergence and coming of age
From the first publications on AVT (Rowe 1960, Caillé 1960) and only until very recently, most books and articles on this subject have had a very similar introduction. Mayoral et al. (1988), Delabastita (1989) and Luyken et al. (1991), among many others, devote the first lines of their publications to the striking mismatch between the lack of literature on AVT and the increasing importance of this type of translation. Díaz-Cintas (2004a:50) explains it as follows:

A clear paradox exists which emphasises the surprising imbalance between the little research on audiovisual translation and its enormous impact on society. In numerical terms, the translation carried out in the audiovisual realm is the most important translational activity of our time. Firstly, because of the high number of people it reaches, mainly through television. Secondly, because of the large quantity of translated products which cross over to other cultures: documentaries, films, news, debates, concerts, television series, etc. Thirdly, because of the immediacy of its reception: television, cinema, DVD.

Several reasons may account for the paradox described by these authors. The first one is the marginalisation and invisibility of translation altogether (Venuti 1995). Also important is the fact that AVT is often concerned with films and television, i.e. popular arts that are sometimes dismissed by translation scholars as not worthy of their attention (cf. Whitman-Linsen 1992). In addition, two further obstacles for the development of AVT as a research field are the difficulty involved in gaining access to its objects of study, researchers often having to transcribe audiovisual material to obtain scripts that are rarely available (Díaz-Cintas 2004a), and the absence of a settled terminology. As pointed out by Chaume (2004a), this latter point applies even to the very denomination of the field, which has been referred to as constrained translation (Titford 1982), film translation (Snell-Hornby 1988), film and TV translation (Delabastita 1989), screen translation (Mason 1989), media translation (Eguíluz et al. 1994), Film Communication (Lecuona 1994), film dialogue translation (Li 1998), language transfer (Pollard 1998), multimedia translation (Remael 2001), versioning (Gambier 2003) and even transadaptation (Gambier 2003). Finally, Chaume (2004a) adds one last argument to the list, namely the particular time and money constraints involved in AVT, which have resulted in translators focusing on the practice of their profession rather than on academic research.
Nevertheless, the beginning of the 21st century has witnessed a dramatic change in this field, which has now come of age as a thriving research area (Díaz-Cintas 2006). As for its denomination, audiovisual translation seems to have consolidated (Orero 2004) as the most common term to refer to a type of translation that deals with texts featuring verbal and non-verbal information simultaneously transmitted by an audio and a visual channel (Mayoral 2003). A clear proof of the remarkable growth of AVT is that, as explained by Toda (2005), scholars no longer need to offer detailed accounts of the publications available in this area before moving on to the focus of their study, not only because these accounts already exist but also because of the increasing difficulty in keeping up to date with them. Franco and Orero (2005) illustrate this point with data obtained from BITRA (http://www.ua.es/dfing/tra_int/bitra.htm), an international and interactive database of publications on translation and interpreting. Created by Javier Franco and updated monthly, this database has currently over 32,000 references, 1,181 of which deal with AVT. Whereas from 1940 until 1990, AVT constituted only 1-1.5% of the total number of works included in BITRA, from the 1990s this percentage has increased to 4%. Indeed, after a period of transition in the 80s, which featured 55 entries, the 90s raised this figure up to 393 entries, 11.5% of the total publications of BITRA for that decade. The beginning of the 21st century seems to have confirmed and even increased this growth, which is faster than that of any other type of translation. In only 7 years (2000-2007), BITRA has registered 608 entries on AVT, i.e. more than all the rest of the decades (1950-2000) put together.

Along with these publications, the consolidation of AVT has also been facilitated by the numerous international conferences dealing exclusively with this type of translation as well as by its incorporation to university programmes, both at an undergraduate and postgraduate level. Thus, despite its slow start, AVT can be said to have finally acquired the “terminological, methodological and theoretical groundings to be a discipline of its own merits” (Franco and Orero 2005:90). In this sense, research on AVT is no longer restricted to the “now much exhausted topics of cultural references and dubbing versus subtitling dilemma” (ibid.:81), and can deal with different and under-researched issues such as the one analysed in this thesis.
2.2. The evolution of research in AVT

2.2.1. AVT as literary translation

After the symbolic start marked by the publication of a special edition of the journal *Babel* in 1960 under the title *Cinéma et traduction*, much of the research on AVT carried out in the following 25 years is concerned with the place of this discipline within the general framework of Translation Studies (Reiss 1971, Snell-Hornby 1988, Bassnett 1991). Until the mid 90s, before achieving its current status, AVT was regarded by many scholars as a subdivision within literary translation. In her 1991 revision of *Translation Studies* (1980), Bassnett subdivides Translation Studies into four groups: History of Translation, Translation in the Target Language Culture, Translation and Linguistics and Translation and Poetics. The latter comprises literary texts, including film translation:

The fourth category, loosely called *Translation and Poetics*, includes the whole area of literary translation, in theory and practice. Studies may be general or genre-specific, including investigation of particular problems of translating poetry, theatre texts or libretti and the affiliated problem of translation for the cinema, whether dubbing or sub-titling. (ibid.:7-8)

Snell-Hornby (1988) also includes AVT as a subtype of literary translation. Her classification has three main groups: translation of general language, translation of specific language and literary translation, which includes Bible translation, lyric poetry, modern literature and stage/film translation.

As explained by Chaume (2004a), the first objection that can be made to these views is that they only refer to the translation of films, whereas AVT deals with many other audiovisual genres that should be included in any thorough theoretical account. Secondly, and most importantly, Bassnett, Snell-Hornby and later on Zaro and Truman (1998) fail to realise that AVT cannot be classified in the same terms as other types of translation, using the field of discourse as a parameter. In this sense, Chaume (2004a) notes that in Snell-Hornby’s classification, AVT could belong to any of the three main groups depending on whether we are dealing with the translation of films (between literary and general translation), documentaries (between general and specific) or news (general). Thus, any attempt to classify audiovisual texts from the point of view of their field of discourse is bound to be incomplete. As opposed to what literary approaches presuppose, AVT does not stand in paradigmatic opposition to legal or scientific
translation, given that, as noted for example by Castro (1997), the main requirement for audiovisual translators is to be ready to deal with any field of discourse in any given situation.

Far from being a petty consideration, the distinction between literary and audiovisual translation is actually a rather important issue, lying at the root of many shortcomings found in the analysis of translated audiovisual texts. Indeed, literary approaches tend to focus almost exclusively on the linguistic code of these texts to the detriment of the other auditory codes and especially of the visual codes. This is the case of the study proposed by Moutsatsos (1997), who, although acknowledging the multidimensionality of the audiovisual text, decides to place the focus “only on the verbal or linguistic dimension” (ibid.:242) of the film under analysis, arguing that “non-verbal signs would most likely be understood by the target culture, and do not require incorporation into the dubbing and/or subtitling” (ibid.:243). Needless to say, many of the strategies adopted by the translator of the film in question may well have been triggered by the visual codes, and therefore Moutsatsos’ analysis is bound to be incomplete. By applying a strictly literary analysis to an audiovisual text, Moutsatsos ends up treating the film as a novel and the viewers as readers, thus disregarding a whole set of factors that can have an enormous influence on the translational activity.

Furthermore, as put by Hochel (1986:152), if research in literary translation can hardly be applied to AVT is not only because of the semiotic difference (sound and image), but also because “the literary translator conforms to the language of literature” whereas the film translator deals with “a different secondary modelling system (…), i.e., with the language of film”. Whitman-Linsen (1992:103) further contributes to highlight the independence of AVT from other specific types of translation such as translation for the theatre and the opera:

[AVT] does indeed share many of the characteristics of literary and poetic translations yet its strictures are even more exacting since it is not to be only read but listened to. Neither can it be likened to the translation of theatre plays since the film translator is not conceded the latitude of lines loosened from the actor’s mouth. Some similarities might also be discovered with translation of libretti for operas and operettas, which are bound by rhythm and rhyme, but there the imperatives of the visual image are also absent.

To conclude, these and other similar opinions (Cómitre Narváez 1997, Bartrina 2001, Agost 2001) indicate that literary approaches, with their consideration of AVT as a
subtype of literary translation and their focus on the field of discourse, cannot account for the complexity of AVT, which may be described as “a species of its own” (Whitman-Linsen 1992:103). The interest lies now in determining what it is that makes AVT specific and therefore different from other types of translation, since this feature might provide a valid starting point for the development of a model of analysis for dubbed texts. In this sense, before delving into dubbing, it is necessary to describe the object of study, the audiovisual text, where a great deal of the said specificity lies.

2.2.2. The specificity of AVT: the audiovisual text

Although many different text typologies have been offered for research in Translation Studies (Reiss and Vermeer 1984, Snell-Hornby 1995, Hatim and Mason 1997), the one put forward by Zabalbeascoa (1997) is especially relevant here. The reason for this is that it classifies the audiovisual text from the point of view of what makes it different to other types of texts: the simultaneous use of two different channels of communication. Drawing on Delabastita (1989), Zabalbeascoa (1997) explains that the audiovisual text is characterised by the simultaneous and combined presence of two sets of signs (verbal and non-verbal) transmitted through two channels of communication (acoustic and visual).

In this sense, neither the production of verbal signs transmitted through the acoustic channel (oral text) nor verbal and visual (written texts) nor non-verbal and audio (melodies) nor non-verbal and visual (iconic compositions) suffice to make up an audiovisual text. Both the audio and visual channel must be present simultaneously. Thus, as pointed out by Sokoli (2005), a dubbed text often features verbal (dialogue) and non-verbal (soundtrack, effects) signs transmitted through the acoustic channel and mainly non-verbal signs (images) through the visual channel. Contrarily, a subtitled film features much more verbal content through the visual channel (subtitles).

Taking this as a starting point, Sokoli (2005) adds three more elements to outline the main features that characterise the audiovisual text, which are then (1) reception through two channels (audio and visual), (2) presence of verbal and non-verbal signs, (3)
synchrony between these verbal and non-verbal signs\(^1\), (4) transmission/reproducibility by means of a screen and (5) predetermined sequence of images and sound. In Sokoli’s view, the latter feature is what sets the audiovisual text apart from the so-called multimedia texts, which are often included as objects of study of AVT (Agost et al. 1999).

It goes without saying that, even though the focus of the present thesis is placed on the Spanish language used in dubbed dialogue (acoustic and verbal), due consideration will be given to other elements involved, whether acoustic-non verbal or visual-verbal and non verbal, insofar as they have an impact from a translational viewpoint. This will be done by steering clear of literary approaches and applying the model for the analysis of translated audiovisual texts devised by Chaume (2004a) (see 2.3.3.3), who delves further into the semiotic composition of an audiovisual text described by Zabalbeascoa (1997) and Sokoli (2005). However, before offering an overview of Chaume’s model and other approaches to the analysis of a dubbed text, it is essential to explain and describe what dubbing consists of, since a better understanding of the process may provide interesting insights into the analysis of the product (the dubbed text).

2.3. Dubbing

2.3.1. Definitions and relation to subtitling

Ever since 1928, when the film *The Flyer* was dubbed into German (Ávila 1997) and especially 1929, when *Río Rita* became the first film to be dubbed into Spanish, German and French, dubbing has established itself as one of the two main types of AVT, along with subtitling. According to Lyuken (1991:73), dubbing is an imperfect art consisting of

\[
(\ldots) \text{the replacement of the original speech by a voice-track which is a faithful translation of the original speech and which attempts to reproduce the timing, phrasing and lip movements of the original.}
\]

This replacement mentioned by Lyuken makes dubbing a rare case of what-you-see-is-not-what-you-get, the dubbing audience seeing a foreign actor but hearing a voice in their own language instead, which leads Myers (1973:56) to define this type of

---

\(^1\) This is paramount with regard to translation. Thus, whereas subtitling involves synchrony between acoustic-verbal (dialogue) and visual-verbal (subtitles), dubbing requires synchrony between acoustic-verbal (dialogue) and visual–non-verbal (mouth movements).
translation as “trying to fit square pegs in round holes”. According to Whitman-Linsen’s (1992:33 et seq.), dubbing entails:
- synchronisation of the dubbed script with the screen actors’ mouth articulation and body movements, which includes a similar duration of source text (ST) and target text (TT) utterances;
- credible performance on the part of the dubbing actors;
- believable dialogues corresponding to the oral register of the target language.

Gottlieb offers a different description of dubbing within his semiotically based taxonomy of translation (2005). For this author, dubbing can be defined as the isosemiotic translation (the same semiotic balance is used in the ST and the TT) of a polysemiotic text. In other words, it retains the “semiotic composition of the original text while recreating the semantic content in another (verbal) language” (ibid.:11). It thus differs greatly from subtitling, regarded by Gottlieb as the diasemiotic translation of a polysemiotic text. Although the channels used (visual and auditory) are still the same, in subtitling “the semiotic balance is undeniably shifted from predominantly aural to predominantly visual text reception” (ibid.). Precisely for this reason, Gottlieb adds that dubbing, “by bravely trying to recreate the authentic cinematic (sound film) experience” (ibid.:21), may be regarded as a more “authentic” type of translation, at least from a semiotic point of view.

Gottlieb’s statement must be understood as a defence of a type of AVT that has traditionally been criticised as unauthentic and unnatural. Critics and filmmakers alike have often complained about films being “spoilt by dubbing” (Paolinelli 2004:177). Criticism has also come from AVT literature, where dubbing has been dismissed as a “corruptive artistic intent, perverting original purity, and debasing quality” (Whitman-Linsen 1992:12) or even as “the Germans’ revenge on the Allies” (ibid.). It is not the objective of this thesis to engage in the long-running discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of dubbing and subtitling. However, it is worth noting that the traditional disagreement elicited by this issue has given way to considerable agreement as to the fact that a) economic, social, cultural and political factors need to be considered if this question is to be addressed thoroughly and that b) research on AVT needs to move away from a debate that has already produced enough publications and all too often has reduced AVT to a false alternative between two modalities that are neither mutually
exclusive nor the only types of AVT available (Zabalbeasosa 1993, Chaume 2004a, Díaz-Cintas 2005a). For the purpose of this thesis, suffice it to include the following explanation given by Gottlieb (2005:25), which can help to understand, if only partially, the complexity of this issue while further helping to characterise dubbing as a type of AVT:

When money is not the option (sic), and broadcasters emphasize semiotic authenticity, boosting of the domestic language and smooth content mediation (in other words: viewer-friendly and localized versions of foreign productions), dubbing is the undisputed choice. As a covert form of translation, dubbing strikes a comfortable balance between presenting foreign (TV) genres and interestingly ‘exotic’ settings and at the same time ridding viewers of two subtitling evils: listening to incomprehensible dialogue and having to read while trying to enjoy the action onscreen.

2.3.2. The dubbing process

Along with the dubbing versus subtitling debate, the description of the process of both AVT modalities is now often regarded as an exhausted topic (Chaume 2004a). Once again, it is included here only insofar as it is relevant to the study of naturalness in the Spanish dubbing language. In this sense, it is paramount to remember that, as such, the dubbed version of a film has no single author (Chaume and García de Toro 2001) and that the translator’s task is but one part of the whole dubbing process (Galassi in Ulrich 1996). Taking this into account, dubbing may be described, at least in the case of Spain2, as:

The translation and adaptation of an audiovisual text and the subsequent delivery of this translation by the dubbing actors under the supervision of a dubbing director. (Chaume 2003:17; my translation)

Drawing on Templer (1995), Castro (2001) Gilabert et al. (2001) and Chaume (2004a), the dubbing process in Spain may be divided into six stages. First of all, a public or private company acquires a foreign audiovisual product or, more accurately, the rights to broadcast it in its country. A dubbing studio, which may or may not belong to the same company, is then assigned to undertake the translation, adaptation and acting of the said product. The translation of the audiovisual text is commissioned to a translator (usually freelance). Once it is done, it is sent to a dialogue writer (unless in cases in which the translator acts also as dialogue writer), who adapts it to ensure that it is synchronised with the images on the screen. The adapted dubbed text is then sent to the dubbing studio, where it is “performed” by the dubbing actors under the supervision of the

2 Although the dubbing process is similar in the different European countries (Marzà 2007), some small differences may also be found, such as in the case of Germany (Luyken et al. 1991).
dubbing director. Finally, the dubbed version is mixed by a sound engineer, who puts together the dubbing tracks and adds different effects where necessary.

The dubbing process is especially relevant for the analysis proposed in this thesis, as it can have a considerable impact on the final version of the dubbed product. The first aspect to consider is that although many professionals are involved in the translation of a film for dubbing, not all of them are necessarily in contact with one another. Thus, even though dubbing is often defined as “teamwork” (Ulrich 1996, Gilabert et al. 2001), it is more accurately the work of a “chain of professionals” (Más and Orero 2005) who happen to be undertaking different stages of the same job. The quality of dubbing may also be affected by the fact that none of the professionals involved in the dubbing process is “officially” responsible for the final dubbed version and thus no one in particular can be held accountable for possible mistakes (Chaume 2004a). Besides, it is also worth-mentioning that although translators are often the only ones with a proper command of the source language (SL), usually English, everyone else involved in the dubbing process could potentially modify the translation (Templer 1995). In the light of this, several authors (Agost 1999, Fontcubierta 2001, Chaume 2004a) have advocated for translators to take on the dialogue writers’ task, so that the former can have more control over their translation. Whitman-Linsen (1992), who also agrees that both functions should be invested in the same person, explains that the dialogue writer introduces changes not only to synchronise the dubbed text with the images, but also to adapt the dubbed text to the oral register. In this sense, Chaume (2004a) also stresses that dialogue writers often complain that the translations submitted to them sound too much like a translation and thus need to be provided with orality. The problem is that, as has been explained, dialogue writers do not usually have a proper command of the SL, thus missing an important element of the equation. In any case, it goes without saying that the analysis of the dubbed corpus included in this thesis must take into consideration its multiple authorship and especially the role played by the dialogue writer, who is bound to have an effect on the (un)naturalness of the dubbed text.

---

3 Templer (1995) notes that even the client, in a special screening of the dubbed film once it has been mixed by the sound engineer, can ask the dubbing team to change certain aspects that s/he might not like, thus being the last person who can potentially alter the dubbed text.
Finally, two other factors deriving from the dubbing process that may have an impact on the final dubbed version are the time available for the translation of the script and the remuneration obtained by the translator. In the case of Spain, although prices vary across different regions, in Madrid or Barcelona translators receive €270 for an average 90-minute film for TV and €360 if the film is to be shown on cinemas (Chaume 2004a). Considering that, as described by Chaume and García de Toro (2001), these translations have to be done in an average of three or four days, this professional situation is one more factor that can negatively affect the quality of translated texts.

It is also worth noting that, despite their essential role, translators are normally the worst paid of all the professionals involved in the dubbing process (Chaume 2004a). This clearly illustrates the generally low consideration of the dubbing translator’s task as a “simple literal transposition of one language into another” (Pommier 1988:31; my translation), somewhat akin to the above-mentioned low consideration of dubbing as an unauthentic form of AVT. However, it seems logical to believe that some credit should be given to dubbing translators if, as most authors point out, dubbing audiences in general (Gottlieb 2005) and especially in Spain (Templer 1995, Palencia Villa 2002) are happy with the quality of dubbed products. In Gottlieb’s (2005) view, this may explain why TV channels spend so much money dubbing films and programmes when they could have them subtitled for about one tenth of the price and suggests that “the notion that it is impossible to recreate a filmic illusion in foreign minds is an illusion itself” (ibid.:21). Far from being a petty consideration, this last remark by Gottlieb touches upon a key notion with regard to the study of the naturalness of the Spanish dubbing language and will be taken up later on in this thesis (see Chapter 7).

Now, having already described the dubbing process, it is time to turn to the different approaches adopted for the study of dubbed texts and especially to the model chosen for the analysis of the corpus included in this thesis.

2.3.3. Models of research in dubbing

As denounced by Díaz-Cintas (2004a:66), the growing interest in AVT has led many scholars to apply the label audiovisual with “certain flippancy” to studies that are not really concerned with this type of translation, but with a general translation problem in an audiovisual corpus. In this sense, one of the main features that characterise the
approaches included in this section is that they are thoroughly embedded in AVT. Drawing on Chaume (2004b), these approaches will be divided here into three different groups: constraint-oriented, polysystemic and cinematographic approaches.\footnote{These approaches are also applied to other types of AVT, but their description here will focus mainly on their application to dubbing.}

### 2.3.3.1. Constraint-oriented approaches

Constraint-oriented approaches to dubbing were introduced by Fodor (1976), the first author who explained and described thoroughly the different synchronies at play in dubbing. Although he does not use the term constraint, it is clearly implicit when he advocates the adaptation of the translation to the mouth movements of screen characters according to the different shots and angles. He even goes as far as to suggest different techniques to achieve a similar pronunciation for dubbing actors and adds that failure to achieve this results in dyschrony, which is Fodor’s equivalent to the notion of noise introduced by Mayoral et al. (1988). Unlike Fodor, Mayoral et al. (1988) do not only focus on synchronies, but also on other dubbing constraints such as content, music, image and spoken language. They describe dubbing as constrained translation, which was first used by Titford (1982) with regard to subtitling, and place the stress on the cohesion between text and images, thus paving the way to the study of the interaction of the different audiovisual codes at play in this type of translation. In relation to Fodor’s approach, Mayoral (2003) argues that his academicism makes it unviable from a commercial standpoint. Along the same lines, Whitman-Linsen (1992) explains that the reality of the dubbing process, including time and money constraints, makes it almost impossible to achieve Fodor’s standard. Considering that in Spain, Germany, France and Italy, lip sync is only required in cases of close-ups, extreme close-ups or detailed lip shots (Mayoral 2001), Fodor’s requirements seem not only unrealistic but also unnecessary:

Fodor’s standard of perfection is far removed from the situation professionals actually face at work, since the length of time required to carry out the dubbing process would make it financially unfeasible. Besides, in artistic terms, it is redundant, as the reality effect can also be achieved through the right interpretation on the part of the dubbing actor. (Chaume 2004b:38)

Despite being excessively demanding, Fodor’s approach to dubbing has been taken up by many AVT scholars (Kahane 1990-1991, Zabalbeascoa 1993, Agost 1999), who have
drawn on his notion of synchrony to develop models of analysis for AVT in general and dubbing in particular.\footnote{Chaume (2004b) describes these approaches as \textit{functionalist}, because, he argues, if the function of an audiovisual text is often to “entertain the viewer”, then it follows that respect for synchronisation is essential to prevent the viewer from being distracted so that this entertainment can take place. Yet, when credibility is not a priority, respect for synchronization is not always a prerequisite to entertain the viewer. The Spanish dubbed version of the popular Chinese film \textit{Kung Fu Hustle} (2004) achieves its comic purpose (and entertains the viewer) precisely by not respecting synchronisation, showing pre-revolutionary Chinese criminals using catchphrases coined by current Spanish celebrities with completely unsynchronised dialogues. In this case, the credibility of dubbing (and thus synchronisation) has clearly taken a back seat to the comic function of the translation. It is for this reason that the term \textit{functionalist} will not be applied to constraint- or synchrony-oriented views in this thesis.}

The main advantage of these approaches for the study of dubbing is that research is carried out in this case taking AVT as a starting point, which makes them considerably more suitable than those originated from literary stances. Based as they are on the different constraints posed by this type of translation, they thus acknowledge the specificity of the audiovisual text. However, this constrained-translation view also seems to pose certain problems as far as its practical application is concerned. Firstly, it seems to give rise to models of analysis that are too focused on searching for translation errors. Santamaria (2001), for example, draws on Fodor (1976) to elaborate a model that enables her to identify mistakes in the dubbed TT, i.e. those cases in which the translator fails to maintain any of the relevant synchronies. This spot-the-error approach is of no interest for this thesis, since the analysis of the Spanish dubbese proposed here is conceived as a descriptive study rather than a prescriptive one. Secondly, the fact that constraint-oriented approaches revolve around the notion of synchrony complicates matters, given the different use this term has received in the literature. Content synchrony, for instance, is described by Chaume (2004b:45) as “the semantic relation between the translation and what happens on screen”, whereas for Whitman-Linsen (1992:19) it is the “synchrony in translation, its aptness, fluidity, authenticity and accuracy”.

Finally, perhaps the main objection that may be made to constraint-oriented approaches is the use of the label \textit{constrained translation}, which has proved to be somewhat misleading with regard to research in this field (Zabalbeascoa 1996). Firstly, as explained by Toda (2005), this is probably too wide a term. Dubbing, subtitling and
other types of AVT can certainly be classified as constrained translation, but the same goes for the translation of comics, which may be constrained but certainly not audiovisual. Secondly and most importantly, the label *constrained translation* has brought about, in the case of dubbing, a great deal of attention to dubbing synchronies, as if they were the only factor determining the specificity of this type of translation. As a result of this, other key issues of dubbing such as the naturalness of dubbed dialogue, just as relevant and specific to dubbing as the different synchronies, have been largely neglected (see 2.4.4). Besides, as far as the dubbing constraints are concerned, it is important to note that the interaction of the different audiovisual codes does not always result in restrictions for the dubbing translator, but sometimes in moments of almost complete freedom from a translational viewpoint (see 2.3.3.3). In this sense, although the main contribution of constraint-oriented approaches is to have helped establish AVT as a discipline within Translation Studies by stressing its specificity, their main disadvantage is to have adopted too narrow a notion of specificity, focusing exclusively on constraints and thus fuelling the idea of AVT as a problem, rather than as a solution to a problem.

2.3.3.2. Polysystemic approaches

Drawing on Toury (1995) and the Descriptive Translation Studies, polysystemic approaches adopt a very different view to constraint-oriented approaches. The focus is now placed on the status of the audiovisual text in the target culture and on the study of the conventions of this culture in a given context. From the study of a representative corpus and taking into account the existing norms in a given target culture, the scholar’s role is now to establish regularities in the strategies adopted by the translator in order to be able to make predictions about translational behaviour. Therefore, polysystemic approaches provide AVT with a much-needed socio-cultural dimension:

Pioneering studies on dubbing and subtitling were flawed by approaches that were biased by the linguistic dimension. Socio-cultural, as well as professional factors that also have an impact on the final decision on how to translate an audiovisual product, were ignored or dealt with in a rather superficial manner. (…) By transcending the purely linguistic dimension, the postulates put forward by DTS have the advantage of placing translation researchers on a starting grid that allows them to channel their efforts into the object of study from a plural and interdisciplinary perspective. (Díaz-Cintas 2004b:24)

Apart from its exponential growth, perhaps the main characteristic of AVT research in the past years has been the overwhelming dominance of descriptive approaches. Spain is
no exception to the rule, especially with regard to dubbing. In her contribution to *La traducción audiovisual. Investigación, enseñanza y profesión* (Zabalbeascoa et al. 2005), Rosa Agost (2005) sums up the main steps to describe and analyse the translational norms currently at play in the different Spanish TV channels as featuring in a given audiovisual corpus. Hers is only one of the 22 articles in this book (out of a total of 25) that subscribe to Toury’s descriptivism. According to Chaume (2004a), this is due to the fact that the polysystemic approach is the only one that has so far proved to be systematic enough to yield the necessary tools for rigorous research in this field. Chaume’s (2004c) only complaint about these studies is that they tend to focus almost exclusively on the macrotextual level, that is, on the political or economic agendas governing general translation choices, thus leaving aside considerations on a microtextual level. However, recent studies are contributing to fill this gap. Marzà (2007) and Baños (2007), for instance, adopt a polysystemic approach to describe the Catalan and Spanish dubbing language model respectively. As in the present thesis, both authors choose a dubbed and a non-dubbed fictional audiovisual corpus for their investigation. They start off describing the audiovisual polysystem where these corpora are embedded, looking at the factors that intervene in the production of these texts, which include social, economic and even political considerations. Then, they move on to the microtextual level, where they search for patterns or regularities in the translated text. These regularities may be indicative of norms and help to finally describe the language model used in dubbing.

Although the present thesis has a great deal in common with the studies carried out by Marzà and Baños, there are also key differences that may help to explain why a polysystemic approach has not been adopted in this case. In their descriptions of the language model used for dubbing, particularly in the case of Catalan, the political and economic agendas governing the production of the texts analysed are just as important (if not more) as the regularities found on the microtextual level, given that the latter are often caused by the former. Hence the importance placed on political and socio-economic factors before the language model is described. The present thesis, however, adopts the last step of their investigation, dubbing language, as a starting point and sets out to analyse its naturalness on the basis of a comparison to the language it imitates, in this case colloquial conversation. The extra-textual factors that need to be taken into account for this study are included in the model of analysis described in 2.4.3 and do not
seem to justify the use of a polysystemic approach. More importantly, as will be explained in 2.4.4, many of the linguistic tools used by these polysystemic approaches to describe the TT, such as the notion of orality, seem to fall short of fully accounting for the (un)naturalness of the language used in dubbing.

Finally, a further feature of polysystemic approaches that sets them apart from the approach adopted in this thesis is their sometimes excessive descriptivism. Concerned as they are with descriptive rules to understand the translation of a text as opposed to normative rules to “monitor and judge the work of others” (Bell 1991:12), polysystemic approaches often have, as pointed out by Chaume (2004a), little practical application, even though this is not what Toury intended (1995). In this sense, some voices are beginning to suggest that unquestioning descriptivism may end up widening the gap between theory and practice. Scholars like Neves (2005), for example, advocate prescriptive outcomes to descriptive research in AVT, especially in relatively new fields such as Subtitling for the Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing and Audio Description, in which there is an increasing need for guidelines and codes of practice that will inevitably have a prescriptive nature. In the case of dubbing and more specifically in the study included in this thesis, the following advice by Gottlieb (1997:220) seems particularly appropriate:

DTS may go in the wrong direction if the prescriptive what should be done is replaced only by the armchair translatologist’s what is done, and why is never supplemented by what could be done.

This does not mean that the analysis of the (un)naturalness of the Spanish dubbing language included here is to be prescriptive. Rather, it means that prescription (how DMs should be translated in Spanish dubbed dialogue) is to be replaced by description (how they are translated) and, if possible, by alternatives (how they could be translated).

2.3.3.3. Cinematographic approaches: Chaume’s model
The approaches put forward by the authors included in this group are characterised by forging links with a discipline that has traditionally been ignored in AVT research –Film Studies. Scholars such as Ulrich (1996), Chaves (2000) and Bartrina (2001) have all resorted to this discipline to gain a better understanding of the dubbed text and dubbing in general. In this sense, the most relevant contribution is that of Chaume (2004a), who devises a model for the analysis of audiovisual texts from a translational viewpoint.
Like the approaches mentioned in 2.3.3.1 and 2.3.3.2, Chaume (2004a) also places the stress on the specificity of dubbing and of the dubbed text. However, this specificity does not lie in this case in the constraints at play (constraint-oriented approaches) or in the status of the audiovisual text in the target culture (polysystemic approaches). Nor does it lie in the field of discourse, as advocated by some literary approaches. Very much along the same lines as Delabastita (1989), Zabalbesacoa (1997) and Sokoli (2005), Chaume (2004a) argues that the presence of two different channels of communication is what characterises a dubbed text. These channels are considered as “the means by which the film message reaches its audience” (Delabastita 1989:196). In Chaume’s view (2004a), the audiovisual text is a semiotic construct whose meaning, transmitted through the acoustic and the visual channel, is brought about by the interaction of different audiovisual codes. Every code is made up of a number of verbal and non-verbal signs that produce the meaning of the audiovisual text and have the potential to influence its translation. The specificity of the audiovisual text lies in the fact that its meaning is provided by the meaning of every code plus the extra meaning resulting from the interaction of all the codes. Thus, the focus is therefore shifted from constraints and synchronisation to the interaction of the different audiovisual codes.

As explained by Chaume (2004c:13), “a model of analysis is justified due to the need to examine an object of study in a closer, more systematic way”. Having defined this object of study, the audiovisual text, Chaume (2004a) sets out to develop a model that can account for all the factors involved in the production of the meaning of such text. This model may be used for both dubbed and subtitled texts, but it will only be described here as applied to the former. As shown in Figure 2.1 (Chaume 2004a:16; my translation), the model is divided into external and internal factors, the latter being in turn divided into general translation problems and those which are specific to the audiovisual text:
External factors
Following the preliminary norms (Toury 1995) used by the polysystemic approaches mentioned in 2.3.3.2, the external dimension of this model includes a number of factors that can be analysed prior to translation, “simply by observing the situation in which the text is used” (Nord 1991:37). These factors determine both the approach to the translation and its final outcome. Within professional factors, Chaume includes time available to carry out the translation assignment, material available (DVD, videotape, only written script), research material available, remuneration, royalties and copyright, training and finally dubbing conventions of the relevant country/region. The factors related to the communication process comprise the identification and analysis of the following elements: the role played by the addresser/s of the communication process, the role played by the addressee, the context, the message and the channel chosen to broadcast the text (cinema, television, video etc.). As for the socio-historical factors, they are the date/time when the translation was commissioned, date/time when the dubbed translation was produced, existence of previous dubbed or subtitled versions of the same ST, comparison with other dubbed or subtitled versions (of the same genre, same authors, same time etc.), situation of the dubbed version within the system of dubbed texts as well as within the overall audiovisual polysystem, mediation (use of pivot translations) and use or not of different types of AVT within the dubbed text.
Finally, the so-called *reception factors* encompass the degree of flexibility in the fulfilment of the different synchronies, the degree of acceptance of over/under acting on the part of the dubbing actors and the extent to which a natural text is expected. As pointed out by Chaume (2004a), the analysis of these factors will cast light on issues such as translational strategies; for instance, on why a given translator opts for a domesticating or a foreignising approach.

**Internal factors: general translation problems and the audiovisual codes**

As for the *general translation problems* included in the internal dimension, Chaume draws on Hatim and Mason’s (1990, 1997) contextual factors and identifies linguistic, communicative, pragmatic and semiotic problems. They can be found in audiovisual corpora but they are common to other types of translation, that is, they are not specific AVT issues. Thus, the results and conclusions obtained from their study are similar regardless of the corpora analysed (Díaz-Cintas 2004a, Fuentes Luque 2005). It is worth noting that the linguistic problems included here by Chaume (2004a) do not cover the analysis of the language used in dubbing. This issue is “particular to the configuration of audiovisual texts” (Chaume 2004a:161; my translation) and thus falls within the specific problems of AVT and in this case dubbing.

It is precisely to these specific issues of dubbing that Chaume pays special attention and this is also the part of his model where the contribution from Film Studies comes into its own. As described by Casetti and di Chio (1991), the semantic network of an audiovisual text is constituted by a number of codes of meaning that can be transmitted through the visual or the acoustic channel. The interest for the AVT scholar lies in all those signs (verbal and non verbal) within every code that can have an influence on the translation of a given text. In this sense, special attention is given to the impact of the different codes on the linguistic code, which is the only one the translator manipulates. As shown in Figure 2.1, Chaume distinguishes ten different codes that can in some way or another have an impact on the translation of an audiovisual text for dubbing. Four of them are transmitted through the audio channel and six are transmitted through the visual channel.

---

6 It must be noted that if a broader notion of the term dubbing translator is adopted, i.e. one that includes the dialogue writer, the dubbing director and the dubbing actors, then it can be said that at least the paralinguistic code is also subject to be manipulated by the translator.
One of the codes discussed by Chaume within the former group is the **paralinguistic code**. Still an understudied area of research in Translation Studies (Poyatos 1997, Gottlieb 2005), paralinguistics comprise the non-verbal qualities of the voice, i.e. suprasegmental features such as intonation, rhythm, tone, etc. which are linked to the expression of different emotions (laughter, pain, surprise…). In dubbing, the paralinguistic code needs to be taken into account at least for two reasons. Firstly, if the dubbing translator is also in charge of the adaptation (thus taking on the role of the dialogue writer), s/he will have to make annotations of these paralinguistic signs that are essential for the dubbing director, who then uses them to orientate actors as to how to read the dialogues (Chaume 2004c). Besides, as pointed out by Chaume (2004a), the analysis of a dubbed text must also take into account the fact that translators usually evaluate the paralinguistic meaning of the ST utterances they are translating and often explicitise this meaning in the only code they can manipulate –the linguistic code.

Another set of codes transmitted through the audio channel is the **musical code and the special effects code**. As for the musical code, first of all it is important to note that both the songs and the soundtrack of an audiovisual text are usually essential carriers of meaning and are often used as punctuation signs to mark the introduction of a new story, a change of setting, mood, theme, etc. (Carmona 1996). In Chaume’s view (2004a), the translator/researcher must then pay a great deal of attention to the different signs conveyed through this code in order to understand the whole meaning of the audiovisual text. But more relevantly for the dubbing translator, songs that appear in the soundtrack usually have to be translated. According to the conventions in Spain (Chaume 2004a), songs are dubbed in cartoons and children’s films (although this is becoming less and less common) and subtitled in ordinary films and TV series (even if their dialogue has been dubbed). Especially in the case of dubbed songs, translators are expected to produce a translated song that matches “the rhythm of the music in accordance with the four poetic rhythms of classical rhetoric (i.e. rhythm of quantity or number of syllables, rhythm of intensity or accentual distribution, rhythm of tone and rhythm of timbre or rhyme)” (Chaume 2004c:18).

---

7 Proxemics (distance between the characters or between the characters and the camera) and kinesics (movements and gestures) are also studied by paralinguistics but, given that they are transmitted through the visual channel, they are described by Chaume (2004a) within the visual codes (mobility code).
As far as special effects are concerned, they are all too often overlooked in AVT studies. However, they can be very important from a translational viewpoint and they somehow act as a reminder of the great amount of factors that must be taken into account in this type of translation. In many cartoons or humour programmes, jokes and wordplays are followed by a sound that reinforces what the characters have said. There is thus a semantic relationship (or *estatuto semántico*, according to Garí [1995]) between the special effect and the verbal sign conveyed acoustically in the linguistic code. It goes without saying that such relationship complicates the dubbing translator’s life considerably. In the case of the dubbed audiovisual text analysed in the present thesis, a special effect that must be taken into account is the so-called canned laughter, very rarely tackled in AVT research (Chiaro 1992, Zabalbeascoa 1996). Scenes with canned laughter may be considered as cases of “vulnerable translation”, a term applied by Diaz-Cintas (2003:44) to subtitling, where translators are subject to criticism on the part of the audience, as the co-existence of subtitle and original soundtrack enables the comparison between the ST and the TT. Although in dubbing the TT viewers do not have access to the ST, they do expect a comic effect when they hear canned laughter (regardless of whether the ST is actually funny or not), hence the consideration of these scenes as instances of vulnerable translation.

Also within these groups of codes transmitted through the acoustic channel is the *sound arrangement code*. Chaume (2004a) explains that the diversity of the characters in a film and their location when producing utterances provide the audiovisual text with its polyphonic nature. First of all, the film sound can be described as diegetic or non-diegetic. Diegetic sound is the one coming from the story space and made by, for example, characters or objects in the film. Non-diegetic sound comes from outside the story space, i.e. mood music or an off-screen narrator, if s/he is not a character in the film. It is important to note that diegetic sound can in turn be produced on- or off-screen, depending on whether the character who is speaking is visible or not. Carmona (1996:107-109) distinguishes the following five different types of voices:

- *voice in*: that of an on-screen character (his/her mouth being visible);
- *voice through*: that of an on-screen character whose mouth is not visible;

---

8 Chaves (2000) points out that the sound engineer can sometimes be called to replace or lower the volume of a given effect.
- **voice out**: that of an off-screen character;
- **voice off**: the one used for interior monologues or for the narrator, whether diegetic (in a flashback, for example) or non-diegetic (documentaries);
- **voice over**: that which is parallel to the images and allows the audience to listen to the original voices.

The sound arrangement code has a great impact on the translation of an audiovisual text for dubbing. Whereas on-screen dialogue, and more specifically a *voice in*, may be subject to lip-synchrony requirements (which will be dealt with in the planning code), off-screen dialogue present a completely different situation. An instance of *voice out* or a *voice off*, for example, provides the translator with a great deal of freedom in an otherwise very constrained type of translation. In a way, it is as though the translator could suddenly make an aside, almost like a footnote, which is typically absent from this and other types of AVT. This illustrates how by focusing on the specificity of dubbing, i.e. the interaction of the different audiovisual codes, Chaume’s model not only addresses the different constraints, but also instances of translational freedom that merit just as much attention. The analysis included in this thesis will dwell on these instances to see if, as has been suggested (Fuentes Luque 2005), the dubbing translator takes these opportunities to make additions or compensate for previous losses.

Finally, the last code transmitted acoustically is by far the most important from the point of view of the dubbing translator —the linguistic code. It goes without saying that this code is shared with other types of translation, but what makes it specific to AVT and in this case to dubbing is its mode. Thus, most films, TV series, cartoons and other fictional texts feature scripts that are written to be spoken as if not written (Gregory and Carroll 1978). In any case, given that the analysis of the language used in dubbing is precisely the core of the present thesis, it will be tackled separately and more in depth in 2.4, and especially in 2.4.3.

As for the codes transmitted through the visual channel, the planning code and the mobility code are particularly relevant in dubbing. **The planning code** deals with the different types of shots. Although they can be classified according to many different parameters, Chaume (2004a) opts for size, given its importance in this type of translation. Thus, he distinguishes the following types of shot:
- Group shot: a group of human figures seen entirely;
- Long Shot: an entire human figure, from head to toe, is seen wholly on the screen or a relatively far away object is seen in its entirety in a spatial context;
- American shot: the human figure is seen in the frame from top of head to the hips or knees;
- Medium Shot: the human torso from top of head to waist appears in the frame;
- Close-up: conventionally, an entire human face from chin or lower neck to top of head or equivalent part of the physiognomy or object fills the frame;
- Extreme close-up: a shot wherein some feature of the physiognomy (or object) fills or virtually fills the entire frame, i.e. one part of the human being: eyes, mouth, one finger, face (then a close up).

In close-ups and extreme close-ups, the dubbing translator must maintain the so-called lip synchrony, also known as phonetic synchrony (Fodor 1976), paying special attention to bilabial consonants and open vowels:

The translator should maintain the impression of verisimilitude fitting the open vowels and bilabial consonants into those instants in which the person on the screen in close-up shot visibly opens his/her mouth or closes his/her lips in order to articulate a bilabial vowel or consonant respectively. (Chaume 2004c:20)

Chaume (2004a) also explains that this restriction does not go as far as to require that an open vowel or a bilabial consonant be translated by an identical one, but by any open vowel or bilabial consonant. For instance, in the case of consonants, an m can be replaced in the Spanish dubbed text by an m, a p, a b (bilabials), an f or a v (labiodentals). Even so, dubbing translators are faced on these occasions with a very challenging task, as the need to fulfil lip-synchrony does not exempt them from having to produce natural-sounding dialogue. Instances of close-ups and extreme close-ups thus illustrate the impact of the planning code on the linguistic code. However, it is also worth noting that even though lip-synchrony has been amply covered in AVT research (Fodor 1976, Mayoral et al. 1988, Whitman-Linsen 1992, Ávila 1997, Martí Ferriol 2006), many of these authors also point out the apparent mismatch between the attention devoted to this issue and its real impact on translation (Whitman-Linsen 1992, Bartrina 2001, Mayoral 2003). As pointed out by Chaume (forthcoming), close-ups and especially extreme close-ups and detailed lip shots are relatively scarce in films in comparison to other types of shots. In this sense, it seems that the interest in lip-
synchrony could be due to the traditional consideration of this type of synchrony as the one and only specificity of dubbing, what Bartrina (2001:435) describes as “the dubbing myth”. This is not to say that lip-synchrony does not exist, but rather that its real impact on translation, at least quantitatively, seems to be less significant than that of other types of synchrony such as isochrony (similar length of ST and TT utterances). Although it will be described under the mobility code, isochrony does not only apply in close-ups and extreme close-ups, but also in American and medium shots. However, it is not relevant in long shots, which usually allow a more flexible approach in terms of synchronisation.

As for group shots, Chaume (2004a) notes that they often feature either unintelligible or overlapped dialogue in the ST. On these constraint-free occasions, the dubbing translator usually resorts to the symbol (AD LIB) to indicate the dubbing actors and the dubbing director that they can improvise that scene, which usually features a group agreement, disagreement, congratulation, etc. Thus, just like instances of *voice out* or *voice off* in the sound arrangement code, group shots further illustrate how the interaction of the audiovisual codes (in this case the planning code and the linguistic code) does not only bring about constraints, but also much-needed leeway in dubbing.

Another visually transmitted code is the *mobility code*. Chaume (2004a) does not refer here to the mobility of the camera that is filming the scene but the mobility of people and objects on screen. According to Chaume (2004a), these movements may be divided into proxemic signs, kinetic signs and the screen characters’ mouth articulation.

Proxemic signs deal with the distance between the characters and the distance between the characters and the camera. Thus, not only do they cover close-ups and extreme close-ups, for which lip synch is required, but also long shots and group shots, in which the characters are seen in a distant position. It could be argued that the consideration of proxemics in the mobility code adds nothing new to what was explained as to the planning code, which already addresses the different types of shots and therefore the distance between the camera and the characters. However, Chaume (2004a) explains that in a group shot where no synchronies apply, one of the characters may move towards the camera, thus bringing about a situation in which isochrony and perhaps lip-synch must be considered by the translator.
With respect to kinetic signs, the dubbing translator is responsible for maintaining kinetic synchrony, i.e. the correlation between the characters movements, gestures etc. and the linguistic signs. In this sense, the translator is usually expected to avoid instances of “noise” (Mayoral et al. 1988), such as having a character nodding while uttering a negative phrase, at least in most cultural settings. Likewise, in instances in which a gesture is reinforced by a linguistic unit, topicalisation is often required to ensure that the TT features the said linguistic unit at the same time as the gesture is being seen on screen.

Finally, the screen characters’ mouth articulation is important in order to maintain isochrony, described by Whitman-Linsen (1992:20) as “temporal correspondence or disparity between visually and acoustically perceived beginning and end of utterances”. In other words, the dubbing translator must ensure the equivalent duration of ST and TT lines as they are uttered by the characters on screen. This is a further constraint posed by dubbing, and one which will often force translators to enlarge or reduce their TT versions in order to meet the duration of the ST. Chaume (2004a) explains that translators working with the language combination of the corpus under study in this thesis (English-Spanish) tend to resort to reduction rather than enlargement, given that English language is more concise than Spanish (see also Mayoral 2003). Whatever the case, it must be noted that, despite having traditionally taken a back seat to lip-synch in AVT literature, isochrony is regarded by some authors as the most important type of dubbing synchrony (Whitman-Linsen 1992, Chaume forthcoming).

At this point, having covered the three synchronies at play in dubbing, namely lip-synchrony (planning code), kinetic synchrony and isochrony (mobility code), Chaume (2004a:256; my translation) summarises in the following table their impact on the translation for dubbing:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of shot</th>
<th>Lip synchrony (planning code)</th>
<th>Kinetic synchrony (mobility code)</th>
<th>Isochrony (mobility code)</th>
<th>Symbols</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long shot</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>(ON) (DL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American shot</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(ON) (DE) (DC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium shot</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close shot</td>
<td>Yes (labials and vowels)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(ON) (DE) (DC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close up</td>
<td>Yes (labials and vowels)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(SB) (in the case of arm, finger…)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1. The impact of the different dubbing synchronies on the translation

Chaume (2004a) includes four more codes transmitted via the visual channel: the iconographic, photographic, graphic and syntactic codes. The **iconographic code** deals with the representation of icons, indices and symbols in the translation. The **photographic code** includes issues such as the use of colours, lighting and perspective. The **graphic code** deals with the written language appearing on the screen, which may adopt the form of titles, subtitles, intertitles (used to explain or link images and especially common in silent cinema) or texts (such as letters, messages, signs etc.). Finally, the **syntactic codes** include the so-called audiovisual punctuation marks, namely fade to black or fade-outs, wipe-offs, juxtapositions, etc.

In general, having described several models or rather approaches to research in dubbing, whether constraint-oriented or polysystemic, Chaume’s model seems especially systematic and comprehensive. Not only does it cover some of the fundamental polysystemic concerns, such as the *preliminary norms* (included in the external dimension), but it also provides tools to analyse the main constraints at play in dubbing, namely the different synchronies. Most importantly, it helps to bridge a long-standing gap between Translation Studies and Film Studies, drawing on the latter to place the
stress on the specificity of the audiovisual text, i.e. the fact that its overall meaning is provided by the sum of every code plus the extra meaning resulting from the interaction of all the codes. Dubbing is thus not only a matter of (achieving) synchronisation, nor is it about (overcoming) constraints in general, but about (achieving) the satisfactory interaction of the different audiovisual codes, which may sometimes bring about instances of considerable freedom for the translator. As for the possible criticisms to be made to this model, it could be argued that some of the audiovisual codes analysed by Chaume have little relevance for the dubbing translator. In this sense, Chaume (2004c:13-14) makes clear that his model is not aimed at professional translators, who probably have no need or time to apply it, but is “more suited to the analyst, the translation researcher and also for the apprentice translator or the student”. Whether the study of, for instance, the syntactic codes is indeed relevant to the analyst remains to be seen. As far as the present thesis is concerned, Chaume’s model proves a very useful tool to analyse the dubbed text under study. However, it poses a similar problem to the above-mentioned polysystemic approaches, namely that, as will be argued in 2.4.2, it falls short of providing all the linguistic tools needed for the analysis of the Spanish dubbese proposed in the following section. More specifically, it does not cover the general features of film dialogue and several dubbing features that are regarded here as paramount with a view to analysing the naturalness of the DMs used in the Spanish dubbese.

2.4. The language used in dubbing: the Spanish dubbese

2.4.1. The language used in dubbing

As mentioned in 2.3.1, traditional scholarship on dubbing has devoted most of its attention to the dubbing versus subtitling debate, the description of the dubbing process and the analysis of the different synchronies at play in this type of translation. The focus on the latter is probably due, as has been explained, to the prevalence of the notion of dubbing as constrained translation (Titford 1982) or traducción subordinada (Mayoral et al. 1986). However, the study of these constraints alone cannot account for the specificity of dubbing. As suggested by Chaume (2004a), it is necessary to turn the scholars’ attention to the interaction of the different audiovisual codes and especially to the only code translators can have a real impact on –the linguistic code.
Yet, the study of the language used in dubbing has been largely overlooked in the literature, as denounced firstly by Herbst (1995) and later on by Chaume (2003), Díaz-Cintas (2005a) and Bravo (2005). Fortunately, recent publications show unequivocal signs of a change in this trend. At the Scuola Superiore di Lingue Moderne per Interpreti e Traduttori de Forlì, in Italy, Christine Heiss, Marcello Soffritti and Cristina Valentini set out in 2003 to compile the so-called Forlixt (Forli Corpus of Screen Translation), a textual and audiovisual database for the collection and study of film translation data. Among the many avenues of research explored with the help of this tool is the study of different aspects of the Italian dubbing language (Valentini 2006), which is also scrutinised by Pavesi in her recent book on what she labels “parlato doppiato” (2006). In Spain, Chaume’s research on both Catalan (2003) and Spanish (2004a) dubbing language has yielded a number of publications (Martí Ferriol 2006, Marzà 2007, Baños 2007) that illustrate a growing interest in an area that is generally considered as crucial in dubbing.

In this sense, a particularly relevant aspect of the language used in dubbing is its naturalness or lack thereof. Gottlieb (2006) singles it out, along with the different synchronies, as one of the two conventions at play in dubbing, and points at naturalness as the main potential loss in this type of AVT. Pavesi (2005) regards it as one of the parameters that should be used to assess the quality of audiovisual products. Chaume (forthcoming) goes even further, thus agreeing with Whitman-Linsen (1992) and Mayoral (2003) that the naturalness and credibility of dubbed dialogue is to take precedence over other parameters (the achievement of synchronies, cohesion and coherence in the TT, fidelity to the ST, performance of dubbing actors, the editing process) when assessing the quality of dubbing. Needless to say, if research on dubbing has traditionally neglected the study of dubbing language, this is all the more true in the case of its (un)naturalness, probably due to the elusive nature of a concept that is dangerously prone to trigger impressionistic observations.

Before turning to the analysis of this concept applied to the use of DMs in the corpora under study, a characterisation of the Spanish dubbing language will be offered, preceded by an overview of dubbing language in general and the different labels used to refer to it in the literature.
2.4.2. General views on the language used in dubbing

Ever since Myers introduced the term *dubbese* as far back, at least by the standards of AVT, as 1973, the language used in dubbing has received many different labels. Among other, the literature includes *parlato-recitato* (Nencioni 1976), *doppiaggese* (Cipolloni 1996) and *parlato doppiato* (Pavesi 2006) in Italian; *género doblaje* (Palencia Villa 2002), *translationese audiovisual*, *registro de doblaje* (Chaume 2004a) and *discurso oral elaborado* (Baños 2007) in Spanish or even *dubbingese* in English (Taylor 1996). Yet, as Marzà (2007) explains, it is precisely the oldest one, *dubbese*, that seems to have consolidated as a common term used in different languages.

Although, as pointed out by Pérez-González (2007:8), “the essence of dubbed dialogue remains elusive when it comes to formulating a definition”, several attempts have been made not only to define dubbese but also to single out its most important features. The Catalan TV channel Televisió de Catalunya (1997:12; my translation), for example, explains in its guidelines for dubbing translators that dubbese “takes in almost all the characteristics of the colloquial [register], although in a controlled way”. Very much along the same lines, Marzà (2007:180; my translation) explains that the main norm underlying dubbese is that it “resembles spontaneous oral language though avoiding its loyal reproduction”. In order to achieve this, translators make use of several linguistic and paralinguistic resources to “colloquialise” their dubbed scripts. Marzà thus agrees with Chaume (forthcoming) when he describes dubbese as “a prefabricated, artificial, non-spontaneous oral register; in other words, one which does not exactly imitate the spontaneous oral register, but echoes many of its characteristics”. In Chaume’s view, dubbese features a *prefabricated orality* that must sound credible enough so that the “previous elaborated written language (that from the script) should sound as though it have [sic] not in fact been written” (ibid.). Adopting a slightly different stance, Pavesi (2004:1) considers that dubbing language is placed “closer to a ‘neutral’, uniform (formal) standard”, as it fails to portrait “important areas of sociolinguistic variation”. This opinion is also shared by Goris (1993), Herbst (1996) and Malinverno (1999). Pavesi (2005:2) goes on to describe dubbese, regardless of the specific characteristics of every language, as featuring several universals:

Finally, in less systematic studies and mentions in passing, dubbese has also been found to contain unmotivated style shifts (Herbst 1995, 1997) and some degree of artificiality and lack of naturalness (Whitman-Linsen 1992), which also seems to apply in the case of the Spanish dubbing language (Duro 2001, Fuentes Luque 2005, Baños 2007).

As can be seen, the characteristics of dubbese included above refer to the same phenomenon and yet are very different in nature and brought about by different factors. The first group of views, and especially those by Chaume (2004a) and Marzà (2007), place the stress on the specificity of the mode of dubbese, which is written to be spoken as if not written (Gregory and Carroll 1978). In this type of view, which is becoming increasingly common in the case of Spanish (Chaume 2003, 2004a, Bravo 2005), dubbese is set apart from the language it usually imitates (spontaneous oral language) as well as from that of other types of translation. However, characteristic as it is of dubbese, this mode may also be found in original, non-translated film dialogue, which is also often written to be spoken as if not written. As a matter of fact, under this view, many of the definitions and descriptions of (original) film dialogue found in the literature may also be applied to dubbese. Such is the case of Bogucki (2004:83), who describes film dialogue as “not real, merely purporting to be so” or Boxer (2002:18), who refers to it as “a canonical approximation of spontaneous talk in interaction”. The same holds true for the more thorough account provided by Valdeón (forthcoming), in which the word “writers” could be replaced by “dubbing translator”:

The writers carry out a meticulous job which consists not only in producing reasonably natural language, but also in striking the right balance when eliminating interference or disfluency: too much of it would render the text unpalatable and, therefore, would never be accepted by television and film producers, but too little would make the speech sound artificial and stilted. We are talking about imitating orality within certain boundaries.

Therefore, in the case of the Spanish dubbese, most of the features outlined by Chaume (2004a) in his model are brought about by the fictional nature of dubbed dialogue, and are thus likely to be found in original Spanish film dialogue. This view is also held by Baños (2007:61):

El modelo de análisis propuesto por Chaume (…) para el estudio de la oralidad prefabricada en doblaje (…), a nuestro entender, podría aplicarse por igual a las series de producción propia.
In any case, this is probably an intentional choice of the author. Chaume chooses to focus on the mode, the above-mentioned prefabricated orality, which helps him to provide the most thorough characterization of the Spanish dubbese available to date. He does not set out to differentiate dubbed and non-dubbed film dialogue, as illustrated by his constant references to “the language of audiovisual texts” as well as dubbing language.

However, for the purpose of this thesis, further elucidation is needed in the description of the Spanish dubbese. In order to compare dubbed and spontaneous dialogue, it is important to start at the very beginning, that is, at those features that are present not only in dubbed dialogue but in any kind of film dialogue, whatever the language. These general features of film dialogue have always been neglected in the study of dubbing language but are essential to understand it, especially when comparing it to spontaneous dialogue. Besides, if dubbese is to be compared to original Spanish film dialogue, it is also important to dwell on those features that set dubbese apart from the latter, i.e. those features that “derive from the fact that dubbed texts are translated texts” (Herbst 1997:303). After all, for all the similarities, “there also seems to be a somewhat tacit consensus that it is easy to recognise samples of dubbed prefabricated orality (as opposed to original fictional dialogue)” (Pérez-González 2007:8). This view is also shared by Whitman-Linsen (1992), Herbst (1997) and particularly Duro (2001) in the case of the Spanish dubbese, all of whom agree that it is, among other factors, the artificiality and lack of naturalness that make dubbed dialogue recognizable when compared to original film dialogue.

The following pages provide a thorough description of dubbese, and more specifically of the Spanish dubbese, concluding with the crucial issue of its (un)naturalness (see 2.4.4). This description will be divided into two parts that reflect the views included thus far: the fictional and translational dimensions of the Spanish dubbese.

2.4.3. Description of the Spanish dubbese

The description of the Spanish dubbese offered here is regarded as a necessary step for the subsequent study of its (un)naturalness with regard to the use of DMs. However, it is important to note that only the analysis of this (un)naturalness will be carried out with the help of the corpus-based study included in this thesis. The general description of the
characteristics of the Spanish dubbese will thus rely on the literature available on the subject. Primary emphasis is given to studies on the Spanish dubbese, but due references will also be made to other works dealing with dubbing language in general if a given characteristic is considered to be recurrent enough and has been found across (dubbing) languages.

The Spanish dubbese is regarded in the following description as film dialogue dubbed into Spanish. Its features belong to either the fictional dimension or the translational dimension, which account respectively for its condition as (a) film dialogue (b) dubbed into Spanish. As indicated in Figure 2.3, the fictional and translational dimensions are intertwined to form the Spanish dubbese (which cannot be explained by one of the dimensions alone), but they have been separated here so as to explain their different features and to analyse them in the corpora under study. As film dialogue, the Spanish dubbese has some general features of film dialogue that also apply to any type of original film dialogue, especially in Spanish. It goes without saying that these features may be considered translational, given that they would not normally be present in the dubbed dialogue had they not been in the ST. However, they are included here within the fictional dimension because they are caused by the constraints imposed by fiction and they can be found in original Spanish film dialogue such as Siete Vidas, the Spanish sitcom analysed in this thesis (see 5.2.1). Finally, as film dialogue dubbed into Spanish, the Spanish dubbese also contains some dubbing features derived from the fact that the TT is a translation or, more accurately, a dubbing translation. These features belong to the translational dimension and are thus not normally found in non-translated film dialogue. Figures 2.2 and 2.3 provide a concise and a more detailed illustration of this structure:

---

9 Having said this, the polysystemic relation of original and translated film dialogue, that is, of series like Siete Vidas and Friends is undeniable, as shown by Gómez Capuz (2001a).
The Spanish dubbese

Film dialogue dubbed into Spanish

Fictional dimension + Translational dimension

Figure 2.2. The Spanish dubbese (concise)

The Spanish dubbese

- **Fictional dimension**
  - Multimodality
  - Polyfunctionality
    - Extrodiegetic level
      - principles
      - characteristics
      - constraints
    - Diegetic level
      - Prefabricated facet
        - Functions
        - Predictability
        - Relevance
        - Linguistic features
      - Spontaneous facet
        - Linguistic features

- **Translational dimension**
  - Extrodiegetic complexity
  - Monotony of delivery and tense articulation
  - Constraint-based modifications
  - Lack of cohesion and prefabricated syntax
  - Geographical underdifferentiation
  - Colloquialisation and register adequacy
  - Permeability of the TT to the SL: the pragmatic interference
  - Occurrence of translational routines and privileged carriers of orality

Figure 2.3. The Spanish dubbese (detailed)
2.4.3.1. Fictional dimension

True to the multidisciplinary nature of AVT in general and of dubbing in particular, the first part of this description of the Spanish dubbese draws partly on authors who deal with film dialogue but not necessarily with translation. Yet, the general features of film dialogue are, as highlighted by O’Connell (2000), very relevant to dubbing translators, who are not usually scriptwriters and yet are expected to produce convincing fictional dialogue. Hence his suggestion with regard to the training for dubbing translators in the light of the conclusions drawn by Goris (1993) in his study on dubbese:

[…] the problems identified by Goris could be alleviated if Cattrysse’s advice (1996:9) on including scriptwriting skills in translator training were taken on board. (O’Connell 2000:8)

A similar view is provided by Baños (2007) with regard to the Spanish dubbese when she describes Spanish dubbing translators as second scriptwriters who are supposed to match the writing skills of the ST authors. In this sense, Cómitre Narváez (1997:89) stresses that translators must be familiar not only with the features of dubbing (or subtitling) language, but also with those of film language:

Para aproximarse al arte de traducir en el audiovisual, el traductor deberá conocer las características del lenguaje cinematográfico, tanto del doblaje como de la subtitulación, así como del medio, es decir, el cine.

Inexplicably neglected in the study of the language used in dubbing and in AVT literature as a whole, the general features of film dialogue are paramount to understand dubbese, not only because they are brought about by the “special structure and peculiarities of film dialogue”, but because they “set it aside from other genres of the language” (Pavesi 2004:6).

In this sense, perhaps the two most characteristic features of film dialogue are its multimodality (Luckmann 1990) and polyfunctionality (Pfister 2000). Film dialogue is multimodal in that “verbal signs are always combined with body-posture, gestures and facial expressions, especially in narrative film” (Remael 2003:232). This quality differentiates film language (and so dubbese) from other types of fictional dialogue such as literary dialogues. In the present thesis, the multimodality of dubbese will be accounted for using Chaume’s model for the analysis of audiovisual texts (2004a), which covers not only the interaction of linguistic and paralinguistic signs, but also the interaction between the rest of acoustic and visual signs described in 2.3.3.3.
Given that both spontaneous face-to-face dialogue and film dialogue are multimodal, it is the polyfunctionality (Pfister 2000) of film dialogue that sets it apart from naturally-occurring conversation. Baumgarten (2005:89) describes this feature as follows:

Every instance of language use in a film is simultaneously relevant for the onscreen diegetic communication and the extradiegetic communication between the film and the audience.

This two-fold level of communication has also been referred to by Vanoye (1985), and more recently by Pérez-González (2007) in the case of dubbese, as horizontal (between the on-screen characters) and vertical (between on-screen characters and viewers) communication. However, it is important to note that the extradiegetic or vertical level of communication includes further complexity. Burger (1984), for instance, suggests that what he calls the inner (primary situation) and outer (secondary situation) circles of communication are sometimes completed by a further circle made up of the studio audience. This is certainly the case of *Friends*. In addition, Betten (1977) points out that there is no direct link between the message of the screenwriter/director and the audience, since both the cameras and the process of editing must be taken into account. Thus, film dialogue or screen-to-face dialogue, as described by Bubel (2006), entails the interaction of three layers across two levels of communication, which Burger (1984) illustrates as follows:

Diegetic level

Layer 3: Characters interact

Layer 2: The production team, the actors and the audience jointly pretend that events in layer 3 take place.

Extradiegetic level

Layer 1: The audience in front of a TV and the TV station jointly realise layer 2.

Figure 2.4. Burger’s (1984) levels of communication in screen-to-face dialogue.

This division into extradigetic and diegetic levels shapes the structure of the fictional dimension of the Spanish dubbese described here. Although the study of the corpus included in this thesis will focus on the diegetic level, i.e. the interaction between the characters, it is necessary first of all to dwell on the extradiegetic level given that it explains to a great extent many of the features that may later be found in the dubbed script.
Extradiegetic level

According to Baumgarten (2005), extradiegetic communication is text-transcending, as it refers to the communication between the action on screen and the audience. As Clark (1996) indicates, this communication is governed by two principles: the principles of imagination and appreciation. With the former, viewers imagine what is happening in layer 3 thanks to the mechanisms of projection and identification (Dyer 1986, 1987). With the first mechanism, the individual viewer is supposed to project him-/herself inside the film and to take part in the action of the film. In turn, identification enables viewers to “vicariously share the experience of the characters in the film” (Baumgarten 2005:100). Crucially, the naturalness of film dialogue, or of dubbese in the case of dubbed scripts, is paramount to allow the audience to suspend disbelief resorting to these two mechanisms (Bubel 2006). As for the principle of appreciation, it is activated when viewers become aware of the second layer between them and the characters. The cinematic illusion is thus broken and the suspension of disbelief violated as the viewers are caught in the act of eavesdropping (Kozloff 2000). This idea of suspension of disbelief and the effects of its violation will be taken up at the end of this thesis with regard to the naturalness of the Spanish dubbese (see Chapter 7).

Apart from these two principles, extradiegetic communication is marked by a “strictly determined and essentially invariable reception situation” (Baumgarten 2005:90). Its main characteristics are the following:

- institutionalised settings (cinema, TV in public places or private homes);
- the temporal and spatial separation of the contexts of speech production and reception;
- the lack of reciprocity in the interaction between the participants:
  Indeed, whereas the characters in the film are the speakers, the viewers are not normally the addressees (unless, that is, they are addressed by an on-screen or off-screen character). The viewers thus play the role of a third party to the conversation, i.e. the overhearers (Bell 1984, Clark and Schaefer 1992, Clark and Carlson 1992);11
- the restriction of audience reaction to so-called “commentary texts” (for example laughter, crying, applause, exclamations and walk-outs [Hess-Lüttich 1991]);
- the unidirectional stream of information;

---

10 In the particular case of dubbing, viewers normally know that the characters on screen are foreign, but, as Chaume (2005) notes, they choose to forget this.
11 For more information on these aspects of extradiegetic communication, see Bubel’s (2006) analysis of the creation of friendship through scripted dialogue in the American sitcom Sex and the City, where she deals with the notion of overhearer design in screen-to-face discourse.
- the fixed sequence of information.

Apart from these, there are five other features of extradiegetic dialogue that are especially relevant to the present study, as they pose enormous constraints for the achievement of credible dialogue, whether or not dubbed:

- limited screen time: as film dialogue, dubbese is time-constrained (Pavesi 2005). Screen time must be economised, which means that this type of dialogue is purely functional (Bubel 2006) and must go to the point to conform to the duration of the programme: on average twenty-two minutes for a sitcom, forty-five for a drama series and about two hours for a feature film (Valdeón forthcoming).

- limited comprehension time: the audience is only allowed a fixed amount of time to decode the information presented (Baumgarten 2005). There is usually no second chance to understand the dialogue, which must thus be “immediately comprehensible and natural to the native ear” (Zhang 2004:183).

- economic impositions: as noted by Valdeón (forthcoming), films and programmes have to “conform to the expectations of their respective industries as well as the complementary ones: television channels, advertising companies, etc.”. Whenever the entertainment of the viewer is a key target, film dialogue tends to discard excessive realism both in dialogue (Rabadán 1991) and images (Chaume 2004a), as it is likely to bore viewers. This is usually the case for both dubbed and original films, although some degree of discrepancy may be found between them.

- multiple authorship: the diegetic dialogue taking place in layer 3 and addressed to layer 1 (the viewers) is often created in layer 2 by a number of authors, especially in the case of TV series, who write and rewrite the scripts over and over again, but who are not always writers. This is what Herbst (1997) describes as degree of preparation of film dialogue and is explained by Bubel (2006:83) with regard to the American TV series Sex and the City as follows:
[film dialogue] is characterised by an extremely complex authorship situation, involving original authors, producers, directors, screenwriters, storyboard editors, cutters, camera and actors. SATC’s multiple authorship – together with the show’s popularity with countless viewers worldwide and the contradictory reviews by media critics – render the show a socio-cultural nexus and as such an ideal site for investigation.

This multiple authorship is likely to have an effect on the naturalness and credibility of film dialogue. In the case of the dubbed script of Friends, its naturalness will be affected by the multiple authorship of the original script and by its own multiple authorship, already explained in 2.3.2.

- complex elaboration process: this is very much related to the idea of multiple authorship, although the focus is now placed on how carefully film dialogue is elaborated. In the case of sitcoms such as Friends, for example, spontaneity is meticulously planned over almost two months: the dialogues are planned for half a month, then they are written over ten to fifteen days and finally acted and produced over the next fifteen to twenty days (Kelly 2003a). Seeing as the dialogues are not written until they have been planned for half a month, they could be regarded as the tip of a carefully built iceberg. Once again, this is likely to have an impact on the dubbed dialogue, as is the complex elaboration process of the dubbed script described in 2.3.2.

**Diegetic level**

On this level, the participants in the communicative event are the film characters, who interact with each other using verbal and non-verbal means (Baumgarten 2005). The focus of this section will thus be placed on the actual on-screen dialogue, or more accurately, on those features of the on-screen dialogue that are normally present in dubbese and in this case in the Spanish dubbese. However, constant references, whether implied or explicit, will be made to the extradiegetic level, given that, as has been explained, it triggers to a great extent the dialogue between the on-screen characters. Hess-Lüttich (1991) refers to this phenomenon as the “hierarchy of communicative circles” and Baumgarten (2005:91) explains it as follows:

> Everything in the diegetic communication serves the superordinate communication between the film text and the audience.

As a matter of fact, the principles, characteristics and constraints described on the extradiegetic level are very much the rationale behind the above-mentioned widespread
notion of dubbese as a *prefabricated orality* (Chaume 2004a). It is, among other reasons, because the audience has to be able to follow the script as well as be entertained by it that spontaneous oral dialogue does not normally feature in dubbed dialogue. Thus, scripts often feature a mixed communicative situation (Agost 1999) in which the boundaries between speech and writing are blurred (Salvador 1989), which results in language that is more cohesive than spontaneous speech (Payrató 1990). As Chaume (2004a) argues, spontaneous oral language and elaborated written language constitute the two extremes of a *continuum* (from more to less elaboration), the audiovisual text falling somewhere in between those two extremes.

The description of diegetic or on-screen film dialogue included here echoes this tension between the two extremes of the written-oral continuum and is thus divided into two parts: the prefabricated facet and the spontaneous facet. The first one deals with the characteristics, mostly caused by extradiegetic constraints, which set film dialogue (and thus dubbese) apart from spontaneous speech, namely its different functions, two key general features and its main linguistic features. The second one is devoted to those characteristics of film dialogue, mainly linguistic, that are similar or identical to those found in spontaneous speech.

- Prefabricated facet

Although it seems undeniable that naturally-occurring dialogue can fulfil several functions, those fulfilled by film dialogue are different, very specific and pose a considerable constraint for the achievement of natural dialogue. Drawing on Chion (1990) and Kozloff (2000), the most important *functions* of film dialogue are the following:

- to provide narrative causality, that is, to advance the plot;
- to supply facts to the audience and establish relations between these facts;
- to supply the episode themes;
- to describe the characters;
- to reveal the conflicts and moods of the characters;
- to constitute the main source of humour (in some cases);
- to provide a subtext and avoid providing information that is already known;
- to resort to non-verbal codes.
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Last but not least, film dialogue is normally supposed to evoke an illusion of reality (Baumgarten 2005), but, given that this is precisely the function that motivates the similarity between film dialogue and spontaneous dialogue, it will be dealt with in the spontaneous facet of diegetic dialogue.

In addition, there are two more general features of on-screen film dialogue that account for its dissimilarity to spontaneous dialogue –its predictability and its relevance. The predictability of film language is explained by Taylor (2007:5), who points out that because film dialogue is particularly “cued and crafted”, it is also more predictable than spontaneous dialogue. This is all the more true given the existence of genrelets, i.e. “social occasions enshrined in language”, such as ‘chat up’ routines, presentations or greetings and farewells (ibid.:4). According to Taylor, genrelets tend to resort to the same cues, the same response mechanisms and also the same formulae, which can then be regarded, in Hoey’s terms (2004), as primed and also as predictable.

More importantly, film dialogue is crucially characterised by its relevance (Bubel 2006). Whereas extemporaneous speech is often not intended to go anywhere, thus having “no point or purpose other than to fill the time, like the rocking of a chair” (Pirsig in Brown and Yule 1983:4), film dialogue presents a completely different situation. Every word must earn its place in the script, which is highlighted by Baumgarten (2005:86) as the single most distinguishing feature of this type of dialogue:

> Every linguistic unit – including phenomena of dysfluency and error – is there for a reason. Every linguistic unit fulfils a function for the overall communicative goal of the dramatic dialogue.

Indeed, not only does the dialogue have to entertain the audience but also to fulfil a tight agenda set by the above-mentioned functions of diegetic dialogue as well as the constraints posed by the extradietgetic level:

> A line of dialogue is related directly to a character's emotional make-up, which is related directly to the character's motivation, which is related directly to the momentum of the narrative, which is related directly to the whole script. (Kelly 2003b)

Finally, this agenda or straightjacket constraining film dialogue is reflected in a series of linguistic features that set a number of limitations to the realism of screen dialogue (Bubel 2006). These linguistic features apply not only to film dialogue in general but
also to original Spanish film dialogue and, most importantly, they crucially contribute to shape the Spanish dubbese too as a translation of SL film dialogue:

In an overview of the issues involved in research on spoken language in film translation, a provision must finally be made for modal variation in source texts. Approximation to orality is to be expected in the translated script as a reflection of the approximation to orality in the source script. That is, other things being equal, greater realism is likely to be achieved in the translation of texts which already exhibit a high degree of naturalness in the source language. Conversely, if the source text contains very unrealistic language, the translated text will not be expected to strive for naturalness either. (Pavesi 2005:2)

It thus follows that the limitations to the realism of original film dialogue are bound to have an impact on the realism of dubbed dialogue. The data included in the following paragraph have been obtained from studies carried out by Elam (1980), Taylor (1999), Baumgarten (2005) and Bubel (2006) in the case of general film dialogue, and Chaume (2004a) and Baños (2007) in the case of original Spanish film dialogue12:

From a phonetic point of view, film dialogue is supposed to have illocutionary purity, given that the comprehensibility of the illocution is paramount for the development of the action. In the case of Spanish, for instance, film dialogue features a clear and correct pronunciation, thus excluding prosodic ambiguities or metathesis (alteration of the order of phonemes in a word), which often occur in spontaneous speech. On a morphological level, film scripts typically present a morphological correctness that is closer to written language than to spontaneous speech. Spanish film dialogues, for example, do not feature incorrect grammatical agreements, which can often be found in naturally-occurring colloquial conversation (Briz 1998). As regards its syntax, film dialogue is supposed to feature syntactic orderliness. In order to ensure followability, the syntax of film dialogue is less fragmented than that of spontaneous dialogue, which is less suited for precise communication. Each utterance is usually characterised by a clear topic of discourse and is structured aiming at maximum comprehensibility. In order to achieve this objective, film dialogue tends to avoid resorting to abrupt topic shifts and repetitions, unmotivated aside comments, conversational sequences clarifying mishearings or misunderstandings, incomplete utterances, excessive overlapping, unmotivated pauses and, in general, unintelligible and redundant talk, unless they are used as tools to describe characters. In the particular case of Spanish, the syntactic orderliness of film dialogue is reflected in the use of a canonical word order (as opposed

12 Baños’ (2007) work is particularly relevant, as it provides a qualitative comparative analysis of a small sample of precisely the same corpora used in the present thesis (Siete Vidas and Friends).
to the pragmatic order of spontaneous speech [Briz 1998]), little fragmentation, a moderate use of hesitation phenomena and exophoric references to on-screen objects. Finally, the lexical level is often recognised as the most natural of film dialogue, which, however, does contain a number of prefabricated lexical features. The most salient one is probably its informational density, brought about by the above-mentioned need for relevance. Unlike the lexical scarcity of spontaneous spoken language, film dialogue is densely packed, often wrapping character- and plot-developing information in an utterance or, in the case of sitcoms, in a joke. Another important prefabricated lexical feature of film dialogue is the presence of stock lines typical of stage dialogue and accepted by the audience “according to the terms of the cinema, not of reality” (Berliner 1999:3). They are recognised as film dialogue and would sound strange in everyday conversation. Finally, in the particular case of Spanish film dialogue, the lexical level presents an almost complete absence of dialectalisms, very common in spontaneous talk.

Thus, this section has presented the description of the straightjacket constraining film dialogue, whether or not dubbed, and consisting of its different functions, its predictability, its relevance and its linguistic features, all of them determined by extradiegetic requirements (see Figure 2.3). This straightjacket is particularly clear in the case of Friends, the audiovisual text analysed in the present thesis. In every episode there are three plots, of all which are developed over three acts, with a similar duration and a similar number of scenes. Each act in every plot is supposed to last between 2 and 3 minutes and to contain 1 or 2 scenes, which therefore have an average duration of 1-2 minutes. It is in this tight structure that the writers must include dialogue which is supposed to move the plot forward, be true to the speaker’s personality and usually comic enough to justify the existence of canned laughter, as is the case in most of the scenes in the corpus.

This straightjacket, existent before the dialogue is introduced, must be taken into consideration when describing not only film dialogue but also dubbese, as in this case the Spanish dubbing translator will have to deal with similar constraints in terms of time, functions of the dialogue, etc. More importantly, this is essential when analysing the naturalness of this type of dialogue, which is precisely the factor that will complete this description of the fictional dimension of dubbese. Indeed, a thorough description of the general features of film dialogue shaping the Spanish dubbese would not be complete
without one more feature that is probably as relevant as the said straightjacket—the need to sound credible and natural.

- Spontaneous facet
The features of film dialogue that mirror or resemble those of naturally-occurring conversation are driven by the need to fulfil the above-mentioned function of evoking an illusion of reality. In turn, this function is related to the extradiegetic need to activate the principle of imagination (Clark 1996) of the audience through projection and identification (Dyer 1986, 1987) with the characters on screen. Even in the face of the strict constraints mentioned above, film dialogue, whether or not dubbed, normally attempts to represent orality (Pavesi 2005), that is, to sound credible, dynamic, real, spontaneous and natural (Chion 1990, Berger 1990). Drawing on the same authors as in the previous section, a description is offered of the most important spontaneous (or spontaneous-like) linguistic features of film dialogue in general and Spanish film dialogue in particular that help to shape the Spanish dubbese:

From a phonetic point of view, like spontaneous dialogue, film dialogue makes use of suprasegmental traits to add meaning to the characters’ utterances. In Spanish, despite the clear and correct pronunciation mentioned above, film dialogue, whether or not dubbed, typically resorts to intonation to organise the discourse and provided it with rhythm and expressiveness. Likewise, it often features marked and emphatic pronunciation to express reinforcement or intensification. On the morphological level, in spite of the above-mentioned prefabricated nature of film dialogue, several means are sometimes used to express intensification. This is the case of Spanish scripts, which usually feature spontaneous-like augmentative and diminutive suffixes. From a syntactic point of view, like extemporaneous dialogue, film dialogue is highly interactive. As a matter of fact, in her analysis of the Italian dubbese, Pavesi (2005:5) concludes that its interactivity is not a “by-product of the translation process”, but rather “an inherent feature of film language in general”. This interactive nature is reflected in the common occurrence of second person pronouns as well as short turns and questions, due to its dialogic nature. In addition, despite the above-mentioned syntactic orderliness, scriptwriters usually strive to provide the syntax of film dialogue with spontaneous-like features. In the case of Spanish, these are the use of short and simple structures, the absence of strong syntactic links, the prevalence of yuxtaposition and coordination over
subordination, the occasional topica lisation of the information, the contextual and grammatical ellipsis, the short turns and dialogic nature, the first and second person pronouns and the common occurrence of routine formulae and DMs. Finally, on the lexical level, as has been mentioned, the informational density is one of the few features that differentiate film dialogue from spontaneous dialogue. Other than that, film dialogue makes use of different lexical resources to appear as natural, often featuring a colloquial register (if that is the register that is being imitated/represented) and including slang, taboo terms, proverbs and idioms. In addition, film dialogue in Spanish typically uses the so-called pro-forms or verba omnibus (Beinhauer 1964), known in Spanish as comodines, and presents a great degree of lexical creativity.

Finally, after describing the fictional dimension of the Spanish dubbese, including both its prefabricated and spontaneous linguistic features, it is important to give a first indication as to why DMs have been chosen as the object of study for this thesis (see also 3.2.1). The rationale behind this choice is that, although film dialogue seems to feature fewer DMs than spontaneous dialogue (Rossi 2002, Pavesi 2004), they are regarded as an essential part of naturally-occurring conversation and are thus regularly used to make dialogue appear less scripted and more spontaneous (Bubel 2006). In this sense, Valdeón (forthcoming) notes that these units add informality and a “tinge of authenticity” that is paramount to accomplish the realism sought after in film dialogues (Kobus 1998). Therefore, they constitute ideal units to study the naturalness of either spontaneous (Gregori-Signes 1996) or dubbed dialogue (Cuenca 2002).

Before moving on to the translational dimension of the Spanish dubbese, a number of definitions are offered in the next section that apply to both film dialogue in general and the fictional dimension of the Spanish dubbese in particular.

**Proposed definitions of film dialogue**

Building on the general features analysed so far, film dialogue may be defined as straightjacketed dialogue that is intended to sound natural. This definition could also be applied to dubbese or, more accurately, to the fictional dimension of dubbese. A complete definition of dubbese would thus require the consideration of the translational dimension, included in the next section. As far as the mode is concerned, the label “written-to-be-spoken-as-if-not-written” does not seem to do full justice to the
complexity of film dialogue and dubbese, especially with regard to their elaboration process. This label starts from the written phase, thus disregarding the planning phase, without which the dialogue cannot be understood. Therefore, film dialogue (and the fictional dimension of dubbese) can be described from the point of view of its mode as a type of dialogue that is planned to be written and to eventually be acted as if not written or planned.

Finally, a further description of film dialogue stems from Halliday’s views on speech and writing. As explained by Halliday (1985:81), “written language represents phenomena as products” and “spoken language represents phenomena as processes”. Whereas writing is done, finished, like an object, speech is being done, it is happening. In a film, the script has been written and is therefore an object. It has already happened. However, it is shown to the viewers as speech, as something that is happening –as a process. Most importantly, Halliday (1985) notes that when we speak, we do things. To some extent, we drive the plot of the story we are going through. In the case of film dialogue, although it may seem that the characters are also determining the plot as they speak, the plot has been determined beforehand. They are not driving the plot but rather driven by the plot. Therefore, a key aspect of film dialogue, and of dubbese, is its condition as a plot-driven object passed off as a plot-driving process.

Both film dialogue and the fictional dimension of dubbese are then defined as

Straightjacketed dialogue --- that is intended to sound natural
Dialogue that is planned to be written --- and to eventually be acted as if not written or planned
A plot-driven object --- passed off as a plot-driving process

As can be noted, all three definitions proposed here follow the same pattern. The left-hand side features the conventions, the constraints, the need to plan and write, to lay out the plots and meet certain requirements. The right-hand side includes the end result, the attempt to achieve, or fake, naturalness and spontaneity. In many ways, these definitions echo the tension between the two extremes of the written-oral continuum that Chaume (2004a) describes as prefabricated orality as applied to dubbing. However, in this thesis, this notion of prefabricated orality and the three definitions proposed above apply to film dialogue in general and only to the fictional dimension of dubbese. For a complete
description of dubbese, it is necessary to take into account the translational dimension and its different features, which are included in the next section.

2.4.3.2. Translational dimension

Having very briefly touched upon some general features of film dialogue to introduce his description of the German dubbese, Herbst (1997:294) points out that

(…) if one follows general observations, original film dialogue must be different from dubbed dialogue in a few striking ways. One indication of this is just as most people – without seeing the pictures- would be able to tell on the basis of a tape recording whether they are listening to a recording of spontaneous conversation or the sound track of a film (which can be explained in terms of the absence of performance factors) they are also able to tell quite easily whether they are listening to the sound track of an original or a dubbed film.

It thus follows that, as film dialogue dubbed into Spanish, the Spanish dubbese has several translational features or, more accurately, dubbing features, which constitute its translational dimension and which are not normally expected to be present in original film dialogue in Spanish13:

Thus, when they [films] are subsequently dubbed, the language is not only once removed from real speech, but, in a sense, twice removed (…). (Chiaro 1996:131)

The features included here concern the second “removal” referred to by Chiaro and apply mainly to the Spanish dubbese translated from English, which is by far the most common scenario in Spain and the case in the corpus under study in this thesis. However, it should be noted that these translational features of the Spanish dubbese are not always or not only triggered by the ST or the SL, as in the case of calques and anglicisms, but also by its nature as dubbing translation in general (for instance, in the case of register neutralisation) or Spanish dubbing translation in particular (omission of intervocalic d in past participles). In any case, although the aim of this description is not to establish the origin of each dubbing feature, due reference will be made to whether the features in question are regarded as universals of dubbese (“shared across national borders”, as put by Pavesi [2005:2]) or as idiosyncratically Spanish.

The eight features included within the translational dimension are the following:

13 Yet, as noted in 2.3.3.2, the polysystemic relation between translated and not translated audiovisual texts in the same language might entail some degree of influence on one another.
• Extradiegetic complexity

Most of the extradiegetic features and constraints of the Spanish dubbedse are common to film dialogue in general and have thus been included in its fictional dimension. Yet, the Spanish dubbedse is also characterised by some extradiegetic factors that are brought about by its translational nature, such as its particular multiple authorship and elaboration process. Explained in detail in 2.3.2, these two factors do not apply to original film dialogue but must be included in any thorough description of the language used in dubbing.

• Monotony of delivery and tense articulation

The first factor put forward by Herbst (1997:294) to account for the difference between film dialogue and dubbed dialogue is “the intonation and speech style of many dubbed programmes”, which, in his view, “lack the full range of accentual contrasts and pitch movements”. Leaving aside the issue about accents and geographic differentiation, which is addressed in this section as a separate feature, many authors have denounced the monotony of delivery and lack of credibility of intonation patterns and pitch contours in the language used in dubbing. In the case of Spanish, as described by Chaume (2004a), the norm is to respect the standard Spanish pronunciation in dubbed texts even if the ST regularly resorts to colloquial phonetic features. Although a clear and correct pronunciation has been described as a feature of the Spanish dubbedse that is common to original film dialogue in Spanish, Baños (2007) notes that the specificity of the Spanish dubbedse lies in its tense phonetic articulation. Whereas original Spanish film dialogue features a relaxed articulation that often results in phonetic hesitation, loss of phonemes and linking of different words, dubbing actors utter their lines with an “extremely tense articulation” (Baños 2007:215; my translation) that makes it impossible for any of the said vacillations to appear in dubbed dialogue. As a matter of fact, not even the omission of the intervocalic \(d\) in the past participle (i.e. cansao for cansado), common in both film dialogue and spontaneous conversation, seems to find its way into dubbed texts. Following from this, both Chaume (2004a) and Baños (2007) concur that the distance between naturally-occurring dialogue and dubbed dialogue in Spanish is more noticeable on the phonetic level than it is on any other level.

---

14 As well as German, Catalan dubbing language has also been found to feature a markedly non-spontaneous delivery (Dolç and Santamaria 1998). As a matter of fact, Marzà (2007) highlights that it is precisely its flat and standardised articulation and intonation that gives away the prefabricated origin of the Catalan dubbedse.
- Constraint-based modifications

As explained in 2.3.3.3, in the case of the Spanish dubbese preference is given to the fulfilment of isochrony (similar length of ST and TT utterances) over other synchronies. In order to achieve this, dubbing translators (and especially dialogue writers) are often expected to alter the length of their dubbed text. Both Chaume (2004a) and Mayoral (2003) concur that this adjustment usually entails a reduction of the ST utterance, given that English is more synthetic than Spanish, which is regarded as more hypotactic and whose words are, on average, longer than English words. In practical terms, Mayoral (ibid.) argues, and although context and co-text must also be considered, this syntactic alteration of the ST means that the Spanish dubbese typically features simple verb tenses and avoids continuous tenses (thus resorting to comeamos instead of estamos comiendo) and perfect or periphrastic tenses such as salimos, saldremos and huyamos instead of hemos salido, vamos a salir or tenemos que huir. In Mayoral’s (ibid.) view, the use of these tenses violates the syntactic norm in Spanish and would be unacceptable in a different context, but has now become accepted as a norm of the Spanish dubbese. Furthermore, sometimes the need to reduce a TT utterance results in the omission of certain units, which Chaume (2005) identifies as names, surnames, vocatives and interactive DMs.

However, the modifications required for the fulfilment of isochrony do not only entail reduction. Mayoral (2003) himself notes that spoken Spanish is generally faster than spoken English, which means that dubbing translators sometimes need to make additions to make their dubbed texts longer. Chaume (2005) points out a number of strategies used for this purpose, which can thus be said to further characterise the Spanish dubbese, such as the use of repetitions, paraphrases, synonyms, antonyms and hyperonyms. Yet, what is relevant for this thesis is the fact that sometimes it is the dialogue writer and/or the dubbing director/actors who have to make additions to the text provided by the translator so that isochrony is achieved. In the case of the dubbing director/actors, this constitutes one of the few occasions in which there is some deal of improvisation involved in the production of the dubbed text. Matamala (2004) notes this phenomenon in the Catalan dubbese, where interjections and DMs are added to make up for TT utterances that are visibly shorter than their ST counterparts. As

---

15 This is also pointed out by Vinay and Darbelnet (1995:193) in the case of English and French, as they note that the former language is “shorter” than the latter.
explained by Baños (2007), in the Spanish dubbese, DMs such as es que (analysed in 6.1.3.5) are often introduced to “adjust a certain utterance to the actor’s mouth movements” (2007:155; my translation). Although Baños does not provide quantitative evidence, she points out that these unplanned and almost spontaneous additions are what provides the dubbed text with naturalness\(^\text{16}\). Yet, it must be noted that, in general, improvisation on the part of the dubbing director/actors is rare, which differentiates the Spanish dubbese from original film dialogue in Spanish, where the ad-libbed interventions of the actors often result in morphological deviations (Baños 2007).

- Lack of cohesion and prefabricated syntax

Lack of cohesion seems to be a universal of dubbese, as noted by Goris (1993) in French, Herbst (1997) in German and Pavesi (2004) in Italian. In the case of the Spanish dubbese, Chaume (2004d) describes it as one of the main characteristics that differentiates dubbed texts from their source counterparts, hence its inclusion in the translational dimension and not in the fictional dimension. Apart from this lack of cohesion, Baños (2007) also identifies other syntactic features that can be said to characterise the Spanish dubbese. They are actually variations of some of the syntactic features described in the previous section. In other words, they are triggered by fictional constraints and thus common to original Spanish film dialogue, but they are modified in the dubbing process, which makes them more prefabricated and less spontaneous. Thus, according to Chaume (2004a) and Baños (2007), the Spanish dubbese is set apart from original Spanish scripts by having a less pragmatic word order (see 3.1), less spontaneous syntax, less redundancy as well as less deixis and ellipsis. All these syntactic features, including the lack of cohesion mentioned above, are manifested in the following specific traits of the Spanish dubbese (by opposition to original Spanish film dialogue):

- fewer (and less varied) DMs and colloquial fillers;
- fewer (and less varied) hesitation phenomena such as repetitions, false starts, reformulations etc;
- fewer typically oral opening and closing units;
- fewer first and second person pronouns;
- fewer suspended phrases.

\(^{16}\) In this sense, the analysis included in this thesis offers the possibility to verify with quantitative and qualitative means whether this is actually the case with regard to DMs in the corpus under study.
This syntactic part of the translational dimension of the Spanish dubbese is particularly relevant to the present thesis, as it is directly concerned with DMs. As a matter of fact, even some of the hesitation phenomena and typically oral opening and closing units mentioned by Baños (2007) fall within the notion of DM applied in this thesis and will thus be studied in the data analysis. However, Baños’ (2007) study can only be taken as a reference or starting point, given that, although the difference in the use of DMs in the Spanish dubbese and spontaneous or original film dialogue is said to be a matter of quantity, no quantitative data is provided. The analysis of the naturalness of DMs in the Spanish dubbese included in the present thesis will resort to both quantitative and qualitative methods to compare dubbed, original and spontaneous dialogue.

- Geographical underdifferentiation

As early as 1960, Rowe identified geographical variation as one of the main problems a dubbing translator has to face. In this sense, evidence from different dubbing languages indicates that a general standardisation is the most common strategy to deal with this problem. Goris (1993) explains how dialects and idiolects are whitewashed into a neutral uniform standard in the French dubbing language, just as they are in the Italian dubbese, which is labelled by Raffaelli (1996:25; my translation) as “an Italian for all seasons”. Besides, as argued by Herbst (1997:295) in the case of German, not only is this geographical standardisation common to all dubbing languages, but it also sets them apart from original film dialogue, hence its inclusion in the translational dimension:

Although the increased use of the standard language could generally be seen as a feature that distinguishes natural conversation from film language, comparable German productions tend to use (modified) regional and social accents so that the use of a regionally neutral pronunciation (in situations where it would not normally be expected) must be seen as a key characteristic of dubbed films.

The Spanish dubbese is no exception to this rule. As explained by Chaume (2004a), dubbing translators usually avoid any geographical trait in their scripts. It could be argued that this is indeed a general feature of Spanish film dialogue, which also tends to avoid dialectalisms (see 2.4.3.1). However, it is more accurately classified as a dubbing feature, given that, unlike dubbed scripts, original film dialogue does very often feature regional accents (the Andalusian accent of Laura in Siete Vidas is a case in point).
Colloquialisation and register adequacy

Another universal of dubbese proposed by Pavesi (2005) (see 2.4.2) is register and style neutralisation, which, even though it could seem otherwise, does not overlap with geographical underdifferentiation. Whereas the latter would be included as a user-related type of language variation in Halliday’s (1964) model, the former would classify as use-related. More accurately, the notion of register and style neutralisation brought up by many dubbing scholars mainly focuses on the tenor of the dubbed text. Thus, Whitman-Linsen (1992:118), for instance, notes how dubbed scripts are all too often “unimaginative and devitalised” by the “levelling of language”, and especially by the absence of the colloquialness that is often present in their source counterparts. Similar views may be found with regard to the French (Pettit 2004), Italian (Brincat 2000) and German (Heiss 2004) dubbese. In this sense, Herbst (1997:299) goes even further pointing out in the case of the German dubbese that it not only loses colloquialness, but also displays an increase in the level of formality on the lexical level:

Apart from grammatical features, lexis plays an important part in establishing the formal style typical of dubbed texts. Thus, some of the vocabulary that is used in dubbing is most unlikely to occur in informal conversation. (...) Thus there can be no doubt that one of the key features of the language of films dubbed into German is a tendency to aim for a stylistic level which is too formal to be appropriate to the spoken language of film dialogue (even if this differs in many ways from spontaneous conversation, as pointed out above).

Also observed in Italian and French (Malinverno 1999, Rossi 1999, Pettit 2004), this increased lexical formality of dubbese does not seem to be consistent, but rather reflected in the random occurrence of formal elements in the dubbed script (Herbst 1995). In any case, as highlighted by Heiss (2004:213), standardisation and increased formality may be regarded as universals of dubbese:

Examples of flattening out and the formalisation of authentic-sounding spoken language are to be found in almost all dubbed versions, whatever the genre.

Nevertheless, unlike in the case of geographical underdifferentiation, the Spanish dubbese does not seem to conform to this pattern. As explained in 2.4.3.1, Spanish dubbed dialogue shares with original Spanish film dialogue the use of different lexical resources to produce a colloquial text (provided that this is the register featuring in the ST), resorting frequently to slang and taboo terms as well as to colloquial proverbs and idioms. Although the occurrence of these features may be lower in the Spanish dubbese
than it is in original Spanish film dialogue (Baños 2007), it is on this lexical level that the Spanish dubbese can be said to be closest to naturally-occurring conversation:

The fake orality of dubbed texts is based on the imitation of spontaneous oral lexis. It is on this level that spontaneous oral discourse and the prefabricated discourse of audiovisual texts bear great resemblance, as, in fact, the latter takes from the former all the features that are necessary to acquire the credible tone which will enable its relationship with the viewer. (Chaume 2004a:181; my translation)

Thus, unlike the standardisation found in other dubbing languages (Pavesi 2005), the Spanish dubbese appears to be characterised by a considerable adequacy in terms of register, at least from a lexical point of view, and especially when it comes to the use of colloquial lexis. More interestingly, far from finding occasional formal elements, authors such as Valdeón (2006) point towards a recent trend of colloquialisation in the Spanish dubbese. In his study on the translation of expletives, he observes a “tendency to the vulgarization of the discourse of the original scripts” (ibid.:131) whereby Spanish dubbed scripts adapt informal lexical items “to the slang and taboo levels” (ibid.:136). This is found to be the most common procedure in the translation of expletives in his study and, he argues, is not reduced to his corpus of analysis:

The trend seems to have been initiated in the early 1990s with the Spanish versions of the British films covered here (and probably others) and has affected television series as well in recent years. (ibid.:130)

The analysis included in the present thesis will offer the possibility to verify with quantitative and qualitative methods whether this lexical discrepancy between the Spanish dubbese and other types of dubbing language applies in the case of DMs.

- Permeability of the TT to the SL: the pragmatic interference

Also regarded by Pavesi (2005) (see 2.4.2) as a universal of dubbese is the permeability of the TT to the SL. Taking into account Toury’s (1995:276) views on how “the more the make-up of a text is taken as a factor in the formulation of its translation, the more the target text can be expected to show traces of interference”, it then follows that AVT is likely to be particularly susceptible to SL interference. This is all the more true in dubbing, where, as Goris (1993) notes, the linguistic structures of ST and TT become increasingly similar as the camera focuses more on the actors’ mouths.

Given that the focus of this description is the Spanish dubbese translated from English, especial attention will be given to a specific type of calques known as anglicisms,
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defined by Gottlieb (2001:196) as “any language feature adapted or adopted from English or inspired or boosted by English models, and used in intralingual communication in a language other than English”. In the German dubbing language, Herbst (1997) explains that the interference of the ST is not manifested in the presence of lexical anglicisms (i.e. direct use of English words in German), as is the case in other types of texts, but rather in the use of anglicisms at the level of grammar and “especially at the level of pragmatics”, with units that are used “in inappropriate contexts” (ibid.:303). Pavesi (2005:12) presents a similar scenario in the case of Italian, but plays down the influence of the ST and the SL on the dubbed script, which is only affected “selectively and to a restrictive extent”. This view seems to hold true for most languages:

Findings available to date support both the existence of specific language features used in the dubbed target texts to convey orality and the limited influence of the source text on the configuration of emerging target text norms. (Pérez-González 2007:10)

Although perhaps not entirely different to the case of German and Italian, the situation regarding the Spanish dubbese merits further comment. In their corpus-based study on ST and SL interference in the Spanish dubbing language, Chaume and García de Toro (2001) distinguish four types of anglicisms: semantic, lexical, syntactic and pragmatic. Yet, it is the latter that plays the most important role. Not only is it, by far, the category featuring the highest number of anglicisms, but the lexical is practically non-existent and the examples included in the syntactic level are actually classified by Gómez Capuz (2001a) as pragmatic anglicisms. As a matter of fact, this study by Gómez Capuz is of great relevance to the present thesis. This author studies the pragmatic interference of the English language in an unusually large corpus (at least by the standards of corpus-based studies in AVT) consisting of 20 dubbed films and 8 episodes from dubbed series, 27 episodes from original Spanish series and even a corpus of spontaneous colloquial conversation, focusing part of his analysis on DMs. Drawing on Clyne (1972), Gómez Capuz (2001b) defines pragmatic interference as syntactic, phraseological and even semantic calques whose influence goes beyond the syntactic and phraseological level to enter the pragmatic level. Indeed, they determine the discursive organisation of a text or speech act and function pragmatically as routines whose value is provided by the context, especially in conversation. DMs and prefabricated discourse are subject to this type of interference. Gómez Capuz (2001a) explains that of all different types of translation, dubbing is particularly susceptible to this type of pragmatic interference,
given its dialogical nature, and sitcoms a particularly likely genre to feature it, as they are influenced by “Anglo-Saxon cultural and pragmatic models” (ibid.; my translation).

As far as the Spanish dubbese is concerned, Gómez Capuz (ibid.) concludes, in line with what has been said of other dubbing languages, that the ST influence is quantitatively limited, especially in the case of direct lexical loans (use of English words in the Spanish dubbed script), which are generally avoided by translators. However, he also notes a considerable qualitative influence “on almost all the different discourse areas that are nowadays regarded as objects of study of pragmatics” (ibid.; my translation), including DMs and routine formulae. He points out that if translators overlook these instances of pragmatic interference it is because many of them are grammatically correct in Spanish but used differently in terms of context and frequency. They thus constitute examples of what Vázquez-Ayora (1977) and Lorenzo (1987) call anglicisms of frequency:

Words and phrases which are not anglicisms per se but exclude other alternatives available in the Spanish language and sound, due to their insistence, strange and monotonous. (Lorenzo 1987:74; my translation)

With regard to the use of DMs in the Spanish dubbese, Gómez Capuz (2001a) finds virtually no SL interference. Yet, this conclusion is to be taken with some reservation. Although his study is the first one to comparatively analyse dubbed and spontaneous dialogue in Spanish, it only includes quantitative results about the dubbed corpus. As the author himself admits (ibid.), given the above-mentioned importance of frequency of use, a proper analysis of SL interference in DMs would require the use of quantitative methods in both dubbed and spontaneous texts.

In this sense, the importance of frequency in the pragmatic interference caused by DMs in the Spanish dubbese is also highlighted by Cuenca (2006), who believes this type of interference to be “increasing quantitatively and qualitatively, especially in the translation of soap operas and sit-coms” (ibid.:32). Most importantly, Cuenca (2006) adds further insight on this issue. In her view, if DMs introduce pragmatic interference is not only because they are used with a different frequency, but also in a different context. This argument is also supported by Chaume and García de Toro (2001), who conclude that the real problem caused by the occurrence of pragmatic interference in the Spanish dubbese lies in the use of units such as these DMs “in an incorrect linguistic register” (ibid.:134; my translation).
To summarise, then, the Spanish dubbese seems to be characterised by a certain degree of permeability to the SL. This pragmatic interference is manifested, among other ways, in the occurrence of SL-influenced DMs that are used in dubbed scripts with a different frequency (hence their consideration as anglicisms of frequency) and/or in a different context to the way they are used in spontaneous Spanish. In its attempt to examine the naturalness of the use of DMs in the Spanish dubbese, the analysis included in this thesis will be the first corpus-based study to compare quantitatively and qualitatively dubbed and spontaneous dialogue in Spanish.

- Occurrence of translational routines and privileged carriers of orality

Finally, Pavesi (2005) singles out two more characterising features of dubbese – translational routines and privileged carriers of orality. As for the former, Pavesi (ibid.:12) explains them as follows:

Film translation also amplifies the formulaic nature of spontaneous spoken language through the use of stock translations or translational routines (Maraschio 1982, Pavesi 1994, 2005), that is, recurrent solutions to translation problems which tend to become overextended (Toury 1995; Gellerstam 2005). Translational routines offer some of the advantages of formulas in spontaneous interactions as they save the translator’s time, allowing the translator to choose from a pre-determined set of options, as well as reduce the viewers’ comprehension effort by offering them highly repetitive and predictable language (Karamitroglou 2000).

Although these translational routines might initially resemble calques or seem a consequence of SL interference, Pavesi (1996) makes clear that they are not associated to the source or the target systems, but rather to a third norm –that of the Italian dubbese. Very much along the same lines, Cipolloni (1996) identifies self-referentiality and self-institutionalisation as two inherent features of dubbing language, a view that is also shared by Marzà (2007) in her study of the Catalan dubbese. Although this is still to be demonstrated in the case of the Spanish dubbese, Mas and Orero (2005) hint at it when they explain the importance of the different genres in dubbing. In their opinion, when a dubbing translator tackles a film of a specific genre, s/he is supposed to produce the same clichés and linguistic elements used in previous dubbed films of the same genre, as they will be expected and consciously or unconsciously recognised by the viewers.
Perhaps an example of these translational routines, rather than a further dubbing feature, is the occurrence of **privileged carriers of orality**. They are defined by Pavesi (2005) as linguistic units that are systematically chosen by dubbing translators to convey the impression of spontaneity. Once again, Pavesi applies this notion to the Italian dubbing language, and so the presence of privileged carriers of orality in the Spanish dubbese is still to be verified. Given that, as explained in 3.2.1, DMs are often used in scripts to make dialogue appear less scripted, it will be interesting to see whether they are also used by the dubbing translator as privileged carriers of orality and indeed whether they actually add orality to the TT.

### 2.4.4. Naturalness in the Spanish dubbese

#### 2.4.4.1. Towards an objective view of naturalness

As mentioned in 2.3.1, dubbing language has traditionally been accused of featuring a stilted and unnatural flavour (Whitman-Linsen 1992). Araújo (2004:161), for instance, concludes in her corpus-based study on the Portuguese dubbese that “one norm governed the translation, that of absence of naturalness”. This was manifested, according to Araújo (ibid.:166), in the creation of “grammatically correct expressions which do not sound nativelike in Portuguese”. Similarly, Herbst (1995:262) identifies the lack of naturalness of the German dubbese in expressions that do not violate the system but the norm of spoken German, and explains it as follows:

> It seems that there are certain ways of expressing certain facts in a language and although it is possible to express the same facts differently in that language, it then somehow does not sound right.

In Spain, authors such as Duro (2001) and Luque (2005) have also criticised the lack of naturalness of the Spanish dubbese, identifying it as one of its main general problems. Similarly to what has been mentioned of other languages, Palencia Villa (2002:66; *my translation*) finds this lack of naturalness in expressions that are “intelligible and correct” but “uncommon in daily life”.

However, although there seems to be general consensus as to the capital importance of the study of (un)naturalness in dubbing (see 2.4.1), the few studies available seem to be highly impressionistic and fail to provide empirical evidence on a) whether there is actually lack of naturalness in dubbing language and b) where this alleged lack of naturalness lies. As for the second point, Duro (2001) agrees with Whitman-Linsen
(1992) and Herbst (1995) that the permeability to the ST is the cause of the lack of naturalness of the Spanish dubbese. He then singles out a number of calques as examples of this unnaturalness. Therefore, this view relates the unnaturalness of dubbese to the notion of translationese, where “the source language of a translation seems reluctant to make its exit; it prefers to seek reincarnation in the target language” (Tsai 1995:242). Yet, Pavesi (2005), the only scholar so far to have analysed naturalness in dubbing empirically, plays down the importance of SL interference in this issue, as does Pérez-González (2007:10), who stresses that recent corpus-based studies point to the “limited influence of the source text on the configuration of emerging target text norms”.

Elusive as this subject may seem, it is important to consider the first point mentioned above: the search for an empirical method to analyse (un)naturalness in dubbed dialogue. The few authors who have addressed this have done so by intuitively comparing dubbese to spontaneous dialogue (or rather their idea of spontaneous dialogue). With this method, most of the features included in the fictional dimension and all the features included in the translational dimension of the Spanish dubbese may be considered as unnatural, given that they set dubbese apart from spontaneous dialogue. However, although exceptions may be found, original film dialogue often eludes this accusation of unnaturalness. Such is the case, for example, of the Spanish sitcoms analysed by Gómez Capuz (2001a). As a matter of fact, unnaturalness is often posited as the reason behind the “somewhat tacit consensus that it is easy to recognise samples of dubbed prefabricated orality (as opposed to original fictional dialogue)” (Pérez-González 2007:8), a view that had already been put forward by Whitman-Linsen (1992) and Herbst (1997). From this point of view, it would appear that it is the dubbing features, i.e. those that set dubbese apart from original film dialogue, that make it unnatural.

Yet, this is no more than just a hypothesis. If the (un)naturalness of dubbese is to be analysed by comparison to spontaneous dialogue, then an empirical analysis of both types of dialogue is in order. So far, only Pavesi (2005) has attempted this in the case of the Italian dubbese. In Spanish, Chaume (2004a) and Baños (2007) focus their interest in the description of the Spanish dubbese, not on the analysis of its naturalness, and thus they do not compare it to spontaneous dialogue in an empirical
manner. As far as it has been possible to determine, only Gómez Capuz (2001a) has attempted a corpus-based comparison of dubbed and naturally-occurring data in Spanish, but he does not resort to quantitative methods, which are essential given the above-mentioned importance of frequency in this issue (see 2.4.3.2). Thus, the present thesis attempts to start filling this gap by providing the first corpus-based analysis of the naturalness of the Spanish dubbing using both quantitative and qualitative methods. For this, it is first of all necessary to describe the notion of naturalness as applied here.

2.4.4.2. The notion of naturalness as applied in this thesis
The notion of naturalness is far from new in Translation Studies. Within the context of Bible translation, for instance, Nida and Taber (1969/1982:12) viewed translating as “reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style”. Naturalness is, for them, “the use of grammatical constructions and combinations of words which do not violate the ordinary patterns of a language” (ibid.:203). Beekman and Callow (1974) consider that the naturalness of the TT should be comparable to that of the ST, and Vázquez-Ayora (1977) warns in this respect that every language has its idiosyncratic style and manner of expression. In this sense, a similar concept is that of idiomaticity, used for example by Larson (1984), who refers to an idiomatic translation as one that aims for a TT which reads as naturally as possible. In general, it would seem that these definitions are still too wide and vague to be applied to this thesis, and subject to criticism such as that put forward by Gutt (1991:99), who points out that they do not give full consideration to the “inferential nature of communication and its strong dependence on context”. Therefore, it is still necessary to pin down a less vague idea of naturalness so as to avoid impressionistic observations.

Firstly, naturalness is used in this thesis as a synonym of idiomaticity, which is not regarded as “given to or marked by the use of idioms” (Onions 1964:952), but as the use of language that “sounds natural to native speakers of that language” (Sinclair 1995:833). In this sense, idiomaticity is often defined as “completely natural and correct in grammar and style” (Walter 2005:324). Although apparently similar to the previous one, this last definition adopts a different approach and brings about an important problem. It equates correctness with naturalness/idiomaticity, thus positing the former as
the only prerequisite to achieve the latter. Warren (2004:5), whose notion of idiomaticity will be adopted for the purpose of this thesis, considers this view to be too broad:

Failing to realise that accounting for what is possible is not “the whole story” has been a serious sin of omission among theoretical linguists, which only now is beginning to be rectified.

Warren (2004) regards idiomaticity/naturalness as what is conventional, frequent, among the many options that are possible in a given situation. Drawing on Pawley and Syder (1983), Warren (op. cit.:1) defines idiomaticity as the “nativelike selection of expression” that involves “knowing which particular combinations are conventional in a language community although other combinations are conceivable” (op. cit.:5), which may only be determined with the use of corpora. This suits what was mentioned before about the (un)naturalness of the different dubbing languages (Herbst 1995, Araújo 2004) and especially the Spanish dubbese, which was said to feature expressions which were correct but uncommon (Palencia Villa 2002). It also echoes the notion of anglicism of frequency put forward by Vázquez-Ayora (1977) and Lorenzo (1987). However, following Gutt’s views on the subject (1991), Warren’s definition seems to lack some kind of reference to the context, given that what is natural in a given situation may differ greatly from what is natural in another. Taking this into account, naturalness is described in this thesis as nativelike selection of expression in a given context. Admittedly, this definition is still indeterminate and not specific enough to be used objectively, but the addition of in a given context paves the way to a more empirical approach.

The reference to the context is indeed a reference to the register of the dialogue to be analysed in this thesis. As will be explained in the description of the corpora (see 5.2.1), the TT analysed here features, as is usually the case in sitcoms (Gómez Capuz 2001a), a colloquial register; more accurately, an imitation of colloquial conversation. Given the definition of naturalness called upon here, the naturalness of the dubbed dialogue will thus be assessed by comparing it to the register and type of discourse it imitates – spontaneous colloquial conversation. This emphasis on register, whose importance is supported by Gómez Capuz (2001a) and Chaume and García de Toro (2001) with regard to the Spanish dubbese, is precisely the reason why naturalness and not orality has been chosen as a key mainstay of this thesis. The few studies carried out so far on the prefabricated orality of dubbing language (Chaume 2004a, Matamala 2004, Marzà 2007, Baños 2007) have adopted orality as a central notion and pointed to the lack of orality as
a possible reason for the hypothetical lack of naturalness of this type of dialogue. To a certain extent, they assume that this alleged lack of naturalness is due to the excess of written features in the dubbed script. As Herbst (1995:262) puts it, “although in dubbing, spoken language is translated into spoken language, it seems (...) that often it is not really translated as spoken language”. However, it should be noted that orality may not be a recipe for naturalness after all –at least, not in dubbing. It may be in subtitling, where the written code the translator works with may be in need of certain oral features. In dubbing, however, there is no code-change, as both the ST and the TT feature speech. Thus, in the same way that what is natural in writing need not be natural in speech, what is natural in a formal conversation may not be natural in a colloquial one. The consideration of the specific register to be analysed is thus key when assessing the naturalness of dubbed dialogue, as noted by Chaume and García de Toro (2001) and Cuenca (2002, 2006), who point at the wrong choice of register as a common source of pragmatic mistranslations in the Spanish dubbese. It is for this reason that the notion of naturalness takes precedence in this study over that of orality.

Following from this, the present thesis attempts to provide the first quantitative and qualitative corpus-based analysis of the naturalness of the Spanish dubbese by comparing the use of DMs in an American sitcom dubbed into Spanish to their use in a Spanish sitcom (i.e. an intermediate step featuring original Spanish film dialogue) and in spontaneous colloquial conversation (the yardstick for naturalness). Having already described the main features of Spanish dubbed and original film dialogue, it is now time to turn to the characterisation of spontaneous colloquial conversation, placing particular stress on the role played by DMs in this type of discourse and the reason why they have been chosen here as objects of study for the analysis of the (un)naturalness of the Spanish dubbese.
CHAPTER 3
DMS IN SPONTANEOUS COLLOQUIAL CONVERSATION

3.1. From speech to colloquial conversation

As mentioned in 2.4.4.2, the choice of naturalness as opposed to orality as a key notion in this thesis is explained by the fact that there is not only one type of speech, but rather “different genres of spoken language” and that “the degree of formality and length of planning time are crucial factors” (Miller and Weinert 1998:2). This is also one of the conclusions drawn by Biber (1988, 1995) in his multidimensional analysis of variation across speech and writing, where he points out that there may be more differences between different types of speech than between speech and writing. In his study, Biber (1995:238) places special focus on the description of spontaneous face-to-face conversation, which seems to fit neatly in the oral end of the continuum:

Conversation and informational exposition are stereotypical in the sense that each maximally exploits the resources of its mode, while placing minimal emphasis on the communicative priorities that are better suited to the other mode. (…) This characterization of conversation as stereotypical speaking is not controversial: all languages and cultures have conversational interactions, and it can be considered the unmarked means of communication universally.

Yet, despite all their similarities and common features, spontaneous conversation cannot exactly be equated to colloquial conversation, which constitutes the focus of this thesis. Rather, the former can be said to include the latter as well as formal spontaneous conversation. As put by Cortés (1992:60; my translation), “associating what is colloquial with what is spontaneous is not false, but it is only one part of the truth we are looking at”. The characterization of colloquial conversation thus requires further elaboration, which may be done by analyzing its register. Although there are multiple definitions available for this term in the literature, the present thesis draws on Halliday and Hasan’s (1985:41) notion of register as

a variety according to use. In other words, the register is what you are speaking at the time, depending on what you are doing and the nature of the activity in which the language is functioning.

In this regard, Halliday (1988) notes that register can be described at any level of generality, from the very general distinction of speech and writing to highly specified ones such as “methodology sections in psychology articles” (Biber 1995:7). For the purpose of the present study, and drawing on the “German-Spanish-Italian tradition of
studies on *colloquial Spanish*” (Pons 2006:1), a good place to start is the traditional division of register into field, mode and tenor. Drawing once again on Halliday and Hasan (1985) as well as on Hatim and Mason (1990), the field is regarded here as a reference to “what is going on” (ibid.:48), that is, the kind of language use or the social function of the text. It is not the same, these authors point out, as the subject matter, although there may be a close link between the two in those cases in which the subject matter is highly predictable. As for the mode, it refers to the medium of the language activity, and thus ranges from the most basic distinction of writing and speech to more specific variations such as the written-to-be-spoken-as-if-not-written mode applied to film scripts. Finally, the tenor is concerned with the relationship between the addressee and the addressee and is also analysed on the basis of a continuum from the most formal to the most informal. According to Payrató (1992), in colloquial conversation the field is *daily* (literal translation of the Spanish *cotidiano*), the mode is *oral* and *spontaneous* and the tenor is *interactive* and *informal*. However, as Briz (1998) points out, further specification is still needed to narrow down this notion of colloquial conversation. Briz (1998) and his team Val.Es.Co, the leading research group in the study of colloquial Spanish, do so by providing a thorough and detailed characterization of colloquial conversation, in this case of general features that apply to both Spanish and English. First of all, conversation (any conversation) is described as a type of oral discourse characterised by being:

- **immediate**, i.e. unlike, for instance, pre-recorded news, it happens here and now;
- **dynamic** and **dialogic**, i.e. with a more or less prolonged occurrence of simultaneous or successive turns between speaker and hearer as opposed to monologues (non dialogic) or short rituals (non prolonged);
- **non-predetermined** in terms of turn-taking (as opposed to interviews or most debates);
- **cooperative**: there is continuous feedback and joint negotiation between the addressee and the addressee, both of whom build the conversation.

(Briz 2002)

For this conversation to be colloquial, it must have what Briz (ibid.) describes as primary colloquial features. In other words, it has to be **unplanned**, thus often featuring restarts, hesitations and reformulations; **interpersonal**, i.e. concerned with the establishment and
maintenance of human relationships as opposed to with the transference of information (transactional); and informal, which corresponds to the tenor. Finally, Briz points out that his characterization of colloquial conversation is also subject to be regarded as a continuum. This is illustrated by the presence of a series of parameters, the so-called situational or colloquialising features (Briz 1998), whose presence or absence determines how colloquial a conversation may be:

- **relation of equality** between the participants, referred to by Brown and Gillman (1960) as [- power] and [+solidarity]. This equality may be social (background, profession, etc.) or functional (depending on the situation);
- **shared knowledge**: proximity between the participants;
- **familiar setting**: determined by the relationship between the participants and the setting;
- **non-specialised theme**: everyday topics.

According to Briz (1998, 2002), these colloquialising features bring about the existence of prototypical and peripheral colloquial conversations. All of them contain the specific features of any conversation plus the primary colloquial features (unplanned, interpersonal, informal). However, prototypical colloquial conversations feature all the colloquialising features whereas peripheral ones may not have some of them.

In any case, all these features account for the linguistic and paralinguistic characteristics of colloquial conversation in general, as described, among many other authors, by Brown and Yule (1983), Biber (1988, 1995) and Miller and Weinert (1998). First of all, this type of discourse depends to a large extent on pitch, amplitude, rhythm and voice quality. If developed face-to-face, it also depends on gestures, eye-gaze, facial expressions and body postures, all of which signal information. Its syntax is fragmented and typically much less structured than that of written language. It contains incomplete sentences, more coordination and parataxis than subordination, a pragmatic word order, also known as topic-comment structure (Givón 1979), and a high occurrence of deictics. Finally, it is also characterised by its lexical scarcity and a more limited and generalised range of vocabulary than written language, which means that it is less suited for highly informational or precise communication.
Although originally applied to the English language, these characteristics are general enough to be regarded as non-language specific, and they certainly apply in the case of Spanish. In this sense, the literature devoted to the study of colloquial conversation in Spanish has traditionally focused on specific aspects such as syntax or morphology (Cortés 1986, Vigara 1992), rather than on providing a global overview of this type of discourse. Briz (1998) is one of the few authors who attempt this in his so-called pragmagrammar of Spanish colloquial conversation, which he divides into six different strategies used by the participants in the conversational exchange (syntactic, contextual, verbal, phonetic, lexical and paralinguistic). These strategies are brought about by the above-mentioned conversational, primary and colloquialising features of colloquial conversation and, in turn, result in the occurrence of certain linguistic units, such as DMs. Although a description of Briz’s model would exceed the scope of this thesis, a detailed account of the role played by DMs in colloquial conversation, especially in the case of Spanish, is in order, given that they are the units chosen as objects of study for the data analysis included in Chapter 6.

3.2. DMs

3.2.1. Status and relevance to the present study

Described by Pons (2006:28) as “a melting pot of problems and perspectives” and often subject to very different and sometimes opposing definitions and classifications, the study of DMs only seems to elicit consensus as to their capital importance in the construction of coherent conversation. However, this importance has not always been recognised. As explained by Schwenter (1996), it has taken linguists to look beyond the sentence and to adopt a pragmatic approach focusing on contextual elements such as shared background knowledge to realise the importance of these units. Before this, particles now regarded as DMs were largely dismissed in different languages as fillers, muletillas or particelle (Romero Trillo 1997). As a matter of fact, they were even stigmatised as bad habits (cf. Stenström 2006) or “verbal garbage” (cf. Schourup 1985) and attributed to the speaker’s incompetence.

Nowadays, the consideration of DMs has changed drastically. Walrod (2006), for instance, compares them to road signs or cues on a musical score which guide our interpretation of the conversation or which, as put by Fitzmaurice (2004:428), “oil the wheels of conversational exchange”. Iglesias Moreno (2001:130) highlights that they
have a “primary role” in conversation, not only because they contribute to build coherence, but also because they “fulfil multiple interactive functions fundamental to the speaker-hearer relationship, thus being essential elements in everyday interaction”. Fox (1999) describes them as one of the most salient features of spontaneous talk and points out that they illustrate the naturalistic, unplanned and unrehearsed nature of colloquial conversation. This is especially relevant for the purpose of the present thesis. Indeed, DMs are often said to add liveliness (Stenström 1990) and authenticity (Amador Moreno et al. 2006) to colloquial conversation, which makes them “essential to assess the naturalness” of this type of discourse (Gregori-Signes 1996:169; my translation). Even more importantly, DMs are also used in fictional dialogue to achieve a naturalistic conversational effect (Fox and Schrock 1999). In contrast, Walrod (2006:10) argues, conversations bereft of them will be “insipid, boring and ineffective”, which are some of the flaws commonly attributed to the language used in dubbing (see 2.4.2). It is for this reason, i.e. their crucial role regarding the naturalness of both spontaneous and fictional dialogue, that DMs have been chosen as objects of study in the present thesis. Interestingly, a recent study carried out by Zhang (2006) also chooses DMs to analyse the orality of the original script of Friends. This author concludes that the use of DMs in the English script (the ST in this thesis) does reflect what she describes as “natural language” (ibid.:68). The data analysis included in Chapter 6 will explore whether this is also the case in the Spanish dubbed script.

3.2.2. Terminology, definitions and characteristics

The realisation of the paramount role played by DMs in conversation has turned their study from non-existent into a “thriving field of enquiry” (Schwenter 1996:872) with a separate entry in Östman and Verschueren’s Handbook of Pragmatics (1995). Yet, as has already been mentioned, there is still a great deal of disagreement as to the most basic aspects of DMs. Deborah Schiffrin, one of the leading scholars in the field and author of the seminal Discourse Markers (1987), summarises the current situation as follows:

The study of what Robert Longacre (1976) aptly called “mystery particles” has proliferated over the past twenty years. Words such as well, and, like, now and y’know have been studied by scholars from virtually all branches of linguistics (...) and have kept pace with the development of new approaches for the analysis of discourse (e.g. corpus linguistics) and new paradigms in both semantics (e.g. cognitive semantics) and pragmatics (e.g. relevance theory). The range of languages in which such terms have been examined is typologically diverse, including, for example, Chinese, Danish, French, Hebrew, Indonesian, Latin and Mayan. Attention has been focused on both
synchronic patterns (...), and diachronic change (...). Given so wide a range of theoretical and analytical diversity, perhaps it should not be surprising that there has not yet emerged a consensus in some of the basic tenets of discourse marker research or theory. (Schiffrin 2006:1)

Referring to the last comment made by Schiffrin, Pons (2006:3) points out that “the most basic disagreement” among the scholars concerned with DMs involves class name. Although discourse markers seems to be the most common term, there is a wide variety of competing names, such as sentence connectives (Haliday and Hasan 1976), semantic conjuncts (Quirk et al. 1985), pragmatic markers (Fraser 1990) discourse operators (Redeker 2000) or discourse particles (Zeevat 2006)\(^\text{17}\). Needless to say, the importance here lies in the fact that these are not just different labels for one reality, but rather “different ways of thinking about the organization of what ends up being different sets of words and expressions” (Schiffrin 2006:7).

Several authors, such as Fraser (1990), have attempted to unify the study and classification of DMs. In this sense, the recent contribution by Pons (2006) seems especially useful, as he provides a very clear overview of this field, including a broad/narrow opposition that accounts for the two main views on DMs:

The broad/narrow opposition can be formulated in the following way: is it our aim to describe a broad functional word class whose only common feature is not to be included in the syntactic and/or semantic structures of a sentence/proposition? If this is the case, we will talk of discourse markers. If, on the contrary, we restrict ourselves to the study of a subset within this group, namely the one comprising the items whose main function is to bind elements together, we will talk of connectives. (ibid.:4)

According to Pons (2006), connectives are DMs whose primary (or prototypical) function is to bind two linguistic items at an infra-, extra- or sentential level. This is, for instance, the view put forward by Fraser (2006), who thus considers as DMs sentential and textual markers like then or so, but not interpersonal markers such as you know. A broader notion is provided by Schiffrin (1987:31), who defines DMs as “sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk”. Schiffrin (ibid.:41) goes on to explain that, at a more theoretical level, DMs are “members of a functional class of verbal (and non verbal) devices which provide contextual coordinates for ongoing talk”. As noted by Pons (2006), this is a much broader view of DMs, which thus become hyperonyms of connectives. In other words, every connective is a DM but not every DM is a connective.

\(^{17}\) A list of more than twenty of these terms may be found in Brinton (1996).
Under this view, DMs may be expected to have interpersonal, textual or even modal functions, heterogeneous syntactic and distributional features and influence at various levels (sentence, paragraph, sequence etc.):

*Discourse marker* is a global label for most elements without propositional meaning, thus including connectives (like *and, therefore* or *but*), modal markers (like the German *Modalpartikeln* *doch, eben* or *mal*) or interactional markers (like *say* or phatic expressions) and some elements with propositional meaning (like *as a consequence* or *as a result*). (ibid.:4)

Indeed, a thorough description of DMs needs not only a definition of these units, but also an account of their main characteristics. The ones that follow have been drawn from works by authors who subscribe to the broader notion of DMs, such as Schiffrin (1987), Schwenter (1996), Romero Trillo (1997), Lenk (1998) and Iglesias Moreno (2001):

- they are especially frequent in everyday oral interactions;
- they operate at local and global levels of discourse;
- they have either no meaning or vague, diminished meaning;
- they are syntactically detachable from a sentence;
- they are syntactically flexible and thus may occur in sentence-initial, -medial or –final position;
- they have a range of prosodic contours (i.e. tonic stress and often followed by a pause);
- functionally, they are often used to initiate the discourse in order to indicate topic shifts, hold turns of talk, mark background or foreground information and signal the relationship between propositions;
- they may have retrospective and/or prospective orientation, that is, they may focus on prior information, such as *oh*, and/or on upcoming information, such as *now* and *so* as transition markers;\(^{18}\)
- as contextual coordinates, they are essential to regulate conversation, make clear the speaker’s intentions and produce a coherent discourse.

Two other characteristics of DMs that deserve further attention are their grammaticalisation and multifunctionality. The former is regarded here as the process whereby a given unit incorporates some interactionally pragmatic meaning into its grammatical meaning (Hopper and Traugott 1993). As described by Romero Trillo

\(^{18}\) As will be shown below (see 3.1.2 and 3.2), this feature is especially relevant to the present study.
(1997:208) with regard to DMs, this process affects “words and phrases whose meanings are modified and/or expanded in conversation”. In his view, the grammaticalisation of DMs has an impact on the semantic and syntactic organization of the surrounding discourse as well as on the structure of the conversation in which it is embedded. This author mentions as an example the grammaticalisation of *well* as a pre-closing marker (discussed in 6.3), which sets it apart from the reply marker *well*, for instance. Both are, as pointed out by Hopper and Traugott (1993), homonyms in a particular synchronic system, and may thus be assigned “a particular functional slot on the context in which they appear” (Romero Trillo 1997:208). The multifunctionality of DMs is thus closely related to their grammaticalisation, and seems to divide scholars as to whether in cases such as that of *well* they should consider the existence of different DMs or the same DMs with different functions. Drawing on Schiffrin (1987), this thesis will subscribe to the latter view, always taking into account Romero Trillo’s (1997:208) caveat that for a particular function that we identify for the use of these elements, different languages may behave differently with respect to the distribution and use of the linguistic items realizing it.

Finally, authors such as de Fina (1997) point out the importance of register in the description and analysis of DMs. As explained by Martin and Portolés (1999), DMs are often register-bound, that is to say, they are associated with certain registers but not with others. In this sense, they are particularly relevant in terms of the tenor of the utterance they modify, as they reflect “the relative status of speaker and addressee, as well as their level of familiarity/intimacy and the topic and setting of their discourse” (Andersen et al. 1999:1340). This is especially apparent in classroom discourse, where, as argued by Coulthard (1977), teachers may use certain DMs because their role involves the choice of topic. It would be anomalous not only for students but also for participants in a colloquial conversation (where there is a relationship of [- power] and [+solidarity]) to use these markers and exert this degree of control. This reference to the use of DMs in classroom discourse and, in general, the role played by tenor in the use of DMs will be taken up in the analysis of the transition markers *bueno* and *bien* included in 6.2.

### 3.2.3. DMs and other areas of research: DMs in AVT

Apart from the main characteristics of DMs that have been described here, other values of these units have been found by scholars who have tackled their study from different perspectives, such as Text Linguistics, Conversation Analysis, Politeness Theory or
Relevance Theory (Pons 2006). Some of the aspects of DMs that have been researched are their historical development (Brinton 1990), their prosody (Ferrara 1997) or their acquisition (Lindqvist 2005). However, even though, as pointed out by Schiffrin (2006), DMs have been studied in a wide range of languages, their contrastive aspect has attracted little attention (Stenström 2006). As explained by Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2004), the few tendencies that have been found so far as to the translation of DMs are the lack of one-to-one correspondences and the difference in frequencies across languages.

If Translation Studies seem to be out of step with the “growth industry” (Fraser 1999) of research in DMs, this is all the more true in the particular case of AVT, with very few exceptions, such as the contributions by Chaume (2004d) and Mattson (2006). The latter examines the translation of DMs from English into Swedish in a series of subtitled films. Firstly, Mattson (2006:3) highlights the importance of these units both in spontaneous informal conversation and fictional dialogue, more specifically as regards “how a certain character appears on screen”. Then, she goes on to explain how, although DMs are often omitted in subtitling due to tight space constraints, they seem to be maintained in a series of channels whose guidelines explicitly encourage translators to use this kind of units.

More relevant to the present thesis is Chaume’s (2004d) study on the translation of DMs in dubbing. Chaume analyses the Spanish translation of DMs in the dubbed and subtitled versions of the American film *Pulp Fiction*. First of all, he highlights that DMs are essential not only in everyday conversation, but also for dubbing translators to reproduce/imitate this conversation in the dubbed script. Also, like Aijmer and Simon-Vanderbengen (2004), he notes the difficulty involved in the translation of these units, given the difference in pragmatic meanings and the lack of one-to-one correspondences between languages. The results obtained by Chaume in this study seem to indicate, similarly to Baños’ (2007) contribution (see 2.4.3.2), that DMs are often lost in AVT, and more so in subtitling than in dubbing. Resulting from this loss, Chaume detects less cohesion in the dubbed script than in the original. However, he argues, this is not a problem for the viewers, who accept this lack of cohesion as an inherent characteristic of dubbed films. Although there is a certain loss of interpersonal meaning, viewers can still retrieve the semantic meaning with the help of the information conveyed through the visual channel.
Chaume’s study is relevant here insofar as it deals with DMs and dubbing into Spanish. Yet, unlike the study included in this thesis, his aim is to compare the ST and the TT, that is, to examine what happens to ST DMs when translated in the dubbed script. The (un)naturalness of dubbed dialogue is of marginal importance to Chaume and only deserves a brief mention in passing, not backed up by a corpus, as to the artificiality of the TT DM *ya sabes*.

In this sense, it is surprising to see how little attention DMs have received both in the study of the naturalness of dubbing language and overall in AVT. On a general level, much more overlap could be expected between AVT and research on DMs considering that a) they occupy a similar position within the bigger fields of Translation Studies and Linguistics as relatively young and increasingly important areas of research, b) they both entail conversation analysis and c) they often adopt corpus-based approaches and use computer-assisted tools for this analysis. In the particular case of the naturalness of the Spanish dubbese, DMs are ideal objects of study, not least because, as pointed out by Chaume (forthcoming), Spanish dubbing translators are advised to resort to them to produce natural-sounding dialogue.

It is for this reason that DMs have been chosen as the focus of the analysis of the naturalness of the Spanish dubbese included in this thesis. In this sense, the contributions by Chaume (2004d) and Baños (2007) may be regarded as a starting point for this analysis and also as a reminder of the need to use a corpus of spontaneous Spanish if this study is to be carried out empirically. Before describing this corpus and presenting the analysis included in this thesis, it is first necessary to further dwell on DMs, in this case colloquial DMs, in order to describe the ones that will be analysed in Chapter 6.

### 3.3. DMs in colloquial conversation

This section will draw mainly on Martín and Portolés’ (1999) extensive contribution in the case of Spanish. The reason for this is that the focus of the data analysis included in Chapter 6 will be placed primarily on Spanish DMs, given that the aim of the thesis is to examine the naturalness of the DMs used in the Spanish dubbese. The classification put forward by Martín and Portolés (1999) will shape the structure of this section and will provide the DMs to be analysed later. Needless to say, a great deal of attention will also
be paid to English DMs (and to the research carried out in this field, especially under every specific type of DM) but mainly insofar as they trigger Spanish DMs in the Spanish dubbed text. In addition, a further reason for the choice of Martin and Portolés’s (1999) work is its canonical status in the literature as the only global classification of Spanish DMs:

(...) we can only count on three global descriptions: Bazzanella (1995) for Italian, Martin and Portolés (1999) for Spanish and Cuenca (forthcoming) for Catalan, all within comprehensive grammars. For other languages, global descriptions are not available, although for English and French partial descriptions are available in numerous works. (Pons 2006:3)

Martin and Portolés’ (1999) view on what they label marcas des del discurso corresponds to Schiffrin’s (1987) broad notion of DMs and so their definition of these units adds nothing new to the one provided by Schiffrin (see 3.2.2). What is interesting in this case is the list of conditions put forward by Martin and Portolés (1999) to help determine when a given particle classifies as a DM. Similar in some cases to the characteristics of DMs outlined above, these conditions are especially relevant for the purpose of this thesis (see 5.3), given that the grammaticalisation and multifunctionality of these units makes it sometimes difficult to differentiate them from their homonym counterparts that are not DM. Thus, for Martín and Portolés (1999:4059-4071), DMs

- are morphologically inflexible;
- cannot co-occur with modifiers or complements;
- cannot be coordinated with other DMs;
- cannot be used in negation (directly modified by no);
- cannot be modified by a relative clause, as DMs are not integrated in the sentence;
- have a syntactic relationship with the whole utterance they modify; for example, if this utterance is a sentence, DMs are not syntactically dependent on the main verb;
- are syntactically flexible;
- are preceded and sometimes also followed by pauses (commas in writing);

19 As described in the case of English, Spanish DMs have also received a wide range of labels that reflect different views and comprise different units -enlaces extraoracionales (Gili Gaya 1943), muletillas (Christl 1996), conectores (Martínez 1997), conectores discursivos (Montolio 1992), conectores pragmáticos (Briz 1993), conectores enunciativos (Lamiquiz 1994) and operadores discursivos (Casado 1991).
- have varying degrees of independence and can sometimes act as separate utterances or even turns in a conversation.

Drawing on their notion of DMs and on the above conditions, Martín and Portolés (1999) distinguish five different types of DMs used in written and oral discourse: information operators, connectives, reformulators, argumentative operators and conversational markers, which are in turn divided into metadiscourse markers, interactive markers, evidential markers and deontic markers.

The description included below and the data analysis in Chapter 6 focus mainly on conversational markers, but they also include some markers belonging to the other types that are described by Martín and Portolés (1999) as being more typical of oral than written discourse. According to these authors, these markers, as well as conversational markers in general, are not only very frequent in colloquial conversation, but also brought about by the inherent features of this type of discourse (see 3.1). Besides, unlike other DMs, they may be doubled for intensification, they sometimes co-occur with other conversational DMs and often constitute independent utterances.

3.3.1. Metadiscourse markers
Martín and Portolés (1999:4191; my translation) define these markers as “tools used by the participants to build the conversation” and Briz and Hidalgo (1998) regard them as signs of the effort made by the speakers to formulate and organise their discourse. They act as connectives and thus play an important retrospective and/or prospective role in conversation (Schiffrin 1987). They typically occur as DMs with other functions, more so than other types of DMs, and somewhat resemble punctuation marks (Gülich 1970). Indeed, as explained by Martín and Portolés (1999), they are marked by bigger pauses than other DMs and often constitute autonomous utterances. Among all the different metadiscourse markers used in colloquial conversation, research has mainly focused on three groups –hesitation markers and unlexicalised filled pauses, transition markers and closing and pre-closing markers.

3.3.1.1. Hesitation markers and unlexicalised filled pauses
As explained in 3.1, when engaged in spontaneous conversation, speakers often find themselves hesitating (Baumgarten 2005) or replacing and refining expressions as they
go along (Brown and Yule 1983). The impromptu nature of conversation brings about a number of features that are not included in traditional descriptions of the language and that are described by Biber et al. (1999) as *performance phenomena*, which include false starts, repeats, restarts, lengthenings, self-corrections and pauses (Biber et al. 1999, Leech and Svartvik 1994). Among all these phenomena, DMs are especially relevant in self-corrections and pauses, more specifically in the so-called hesitation and self repair markers and in unlexicalised filled pauses.

Described by Brown and Yule (1983:15) as “pre-fabricated planning ‘fillers’”, *hesitation and self repair markers* (HRMs) tend to be used unconsciously and are more or less void of semantic content (Cortés 1991). It is precisely this lack of semantic content, as well as the fact that they are often used in combination with filled and/or unfilled pauses, that has gained them a reputation as superfluous empty words (Porroche Ballesteros 1998). However, most scholars seem to agree nowadays that, even in their capacity as fillers, HRMs fulfil an essential role in colloquial conversation. In situations in which the real-time conditions of spontaneous conversation are especially pressing, HRMs such as *well* and *you know* help the speaker to hold his/her turn while planning the next intervention (Christl 1996). They are thus considered both as turnholders and planning devices (Stenström 2006). As such, they can be used by speakers who want to go on speaking (Cortés 1991) but also as stallers (Lam 2006) or delay devices (Fuller 2003), when speakers need time to stop and think while hesitating. Likewise, they fulfil a repair function in that they help speakers to adjust what they have said (Lee and Hsieh 2004) if they “struggle for words” (Coates 1996:152).

Apart from the above-mentioned *well* and *you know*, other HRMs in English are *I mean* (Fox and Schrock 2002) and *like* (Meehan 1991). In Spanish, *bueno*, *o sea* and *pues* are also very common and often posited as possible translations (Chaume 2004d, Stenström 2006), although a one-to-one correspondence can hardly be expected here. As pointed out by Briz (1998) and Martín and Portolés (1999), other Spanish HRMs are *vamos*, *es que*, *claro*, *hombre*, *eh*, *este* and *esto*. The interest of these markers in the present thesis lies in the inherent contradiction of their use in dubbed scripts: on the one hand, they provide the script with a naturalistic conversational effect (Fox and Schrock 1999); on the other, they are especially time-consuming and thus not fiction-friendly considering the extradiegetic constraint posed by the limited screen-time available (see 2.4.3.1).
As mentioned above, **unlexicalised filled pauses** (UFPs) are the second category of performance phenomena that is likely to be conveyed by DMs. In general, Dalton and Hardcastle (1977) identify two main types of pauses in spontaneous speech – those that are related to articulatory processes and those that are not. The latter may in turn be unfilled (silent) or filled, that is, voiced. Described by Croucher (2004:38) as “vocal hiccups”, these filled pauses rank as the sixth most common unit in the COBUILD Spoken Language Corpus (Rose 1998). Finally, filled pauses may in turn be lexicalised or unlexicalised. Lexicalised filled pauses are expressions used by speakers to buy time as they decide about a future word or the organisation of discourse (Leech and Svartvik 1994). In other words, they are units such as *well, you know* and *I mean*, which have just been covered here as HRMs. It is thus UFPs such as *uh* and *um* that are of relevance in this case.

Although some exceptions can be found (Heeman et al.1998), most authors grant UFPs the status of DMs (Fraser 1990, Redeker 1990, Montes 1999). They normally fulfil a stalling or filling role, indicating that the speaker is having trouble, needs more time, wants to hold the floor or is uncertain (Garg and Ward 2006). In the case of English, the open *uh* and the closed/nasal *um* are similar but do not seem exchangeable, the difference being one of frequency, as some studies (Rose 1998) point to a higher occurrence of *uh* in spontaneous speech. In Spanish, the UFP *eh* is, according to Martín and Portolés (1999), the most common DM in colloquial conversation. It functions as a turnholder, a device used by speakers to adjust their expression while keeping their turn. The second most common UFP in Spanish is *em* (Montes 1999), also transcribed as *hm* (Andersen et al. 1999), which is less recurrent than *eh* but very similar in its function. Thus, there seems to be an apparent parallelism between English and Spanish in this respect, both languages featuring nasal (*um, em*) and more frequently non-nasal UFPs (*uh, eh*).

Despite their recurrence and importance in spontaneous colloquial conversation, UFPs seem to have received considerably less attention than other DMs. The reason for this may be the fact that they do not lend themselves easily to quantitative analyses, as they are sometimes overlooked in large corpora. Thus, although they seem appropriate...
candidates for the study of naturalness in the Spanish dubbese, they present an important drawback for analytical purposes.

3.3.1.2. Transition markers

One of the essential common features of written and spoken discourse is the need to mark continuity and discontinuity, that is, the need to, for example, shift a topic or start a new part of the discourse (Bestgen 1998). However, whereas writing often allows much editing, pauses for thought and the use of resources such as punctuation, this is not possible in spoken discourse (Miller and Weinert 1998). In the case of spontaneous conversation, the on-line production and the obligation to negotiate the topic with the hearer mean that the speaker has to find other devices to show clarity in boundary signalling. Although there are other means available, such as paralinguistic devices, speakers often resort to DMs to segment their discourse (Horne et al. 1999). Among the many DMs that have been identified and studied in the literature, transition markers (TMs) are particularly useful for this purpose. They are sometimes labeled as topic changers (Aijmer 2002) or topic shift markers (Zitzen 2004), but they will be referred to here as transition markers (Nakano and Negishi 2004) because, as well as changing the topic, they also enable speakers to indicate the boundaries of the conversation, signalling the beginning of a new phase (Clark 2001). Some of the TMs that are commonly used in colloquial conversation in English are okay (Beach 1993), alright (Filipi and Wales 2003), so (Mariano 2002) and now (Schiffrin 1987). In Spanish, TMs are also known as marcadores iniciativos (Calsamiglia and Tusón 1999) or marcadores estructurales (Barbero and San Vicente 2006), and some of the recurrent examples are bueno, bien, muy bien and en fin.

According to Schiffrin (1987:230), TMs indicate “a speaker’s progression through discourse time, by displaying attention to an upcoming idea, unit, orientation and/or participation framework.” It thus seems that unlike other types of DMs, TMs offer no choice between retrospective and prospective orientation (Lenk 1998), as they only focus on upcoming information. In addition, and perhaps most importantly, from a practical point of view these markers facilitate discourse organisation for the speaker and comprehension for the hearer (Lam 2006). These two aspects will be of interest for the analysis presented in this thesis. As described at the extradiegetic level (see 2.4.3.1), the audience has limited comprehension time, that is, no second chance to understand the
dialogue. It would thus appear that clarity in boundary signalling may be an important priority for scriptwriters (and dubbing translators), who must ensure that dialogue is “immediately comprehensible and natural to the native ear” (Zhang 2004:183). Like in extemporaneous conversation, in the case of the dubbed script TMs are bound to play an important role in signalling the different boundaries between conversations and even scenes. As for Zhang’s mention of TMs being natural to the native ear, it is a different matter that, given the definition of naturalness adopted here (see 2.4.4.2), entails a quantitative and qualitative comparison of the use of TMs in dubbed and spontaneous colloquial conversation.

3.3.1.3. Closing and pre-closing markers as routine formulae

Closing and pre-closing markers are normally included within the general group of routine formulae. It is thus important to address the latter before attempting to describe the former. First of all, it should be noted that, as is the case with conversational DMs, routine formulae are also brought about by the inherent features of this type of discourse, in this case, by its structure.

According to Coulmas (1981), the claim that conversation is a structured activity is one that needs no defence and is commonly accepted by linguists and ethnographers of communication alike. Even though every conversation may be different, this structure means that there are a number of items that are common to most conversations, items that seem to build on certain schemes. As explained by Kiss (2002:2), “places in conversations where these schemes occur are openings and closings”. Laver (1981) regards these instances of greeting and parting as small-scale ritual ceremonies that are essential for the negotiation of social relationships between participants in a conversation. More importantly, he points out that, spontaneous as they may sometimes seem, openings and closings are highly conventionalised situations; in other words, the type of situations that bring about the occurrence of routine formulae (Coulmas 1979). Following from this, routine formulae may be defined as highly conventionalised prepatterned expressions (Laver 1981) whose occurrence is, in Coulmas’ view (1979:240), “closely bound to specific social situations and which are, on the basis of an evaluation of such situations, highly predictable in a communicative course of events”. As has been mentioned, routine formulae are particularly relevant in this thesis not only because of their importance regarding the relationships between the participants in a
conversation, but also because they are often DMs. In this sense, although both openings and closings are interesting units of study to analyse the naturalness of spontaneous and dubbed conversation, closings seem more suitable for the analysis presented in this thesis, as it is in farewells where DMs typically act as routine formulae (Schegloff and Sacks 1973).

In conversation, farewells summarise the effect of the encounter on the relationship between the participants and show what they may expect of one another in their next meeting (Goffman 1967). But most importantly, farewells often constitute a particularly fragile phase (Laver 1981), a face-threatening act (Cameron 2001). As described by Coppock (2005), the speaker’s attempt to end a conversation may carry the implication that the exchange or even the company of the other is not being enjoyed. Special care is thus needed when wishing to lift the turn-taking system (Kiss 2002) to end the conversation. As put by Bien and Coppock (2005), speakers do not just say *bye* and walk away, but rather resort to a conversation ending strategy included in the closing sequence and consisting of two parts, the first one to signal to the other that the conversation is ending and the second one to add a concluding salutation. These two parts making up the closing sequence are commonly known as *pre-closing* and *terminal exchange* (Schegloff and Sacks 1973) and they enable speakers to end the conversation politely, saving face (Kiss 2002).

The *pre-closing* is the initial part of the closing sequence and fulfils a two-fold role in the final stage of a conversation. On the one hand, it offers the possibility of introducing *deferred mentionables* (Williamson 1997) or *unmentioned mentionables* (Schegloff and Sacks 1973), i.e. items that have not been mentioned in the conversation but that are regarded by one of the participants as relevant enough to be brought up before the exchange ends. In this case, the pre-closing does not succeed in its attempt to open up the closing of the conversation and is thus described by Schegloff and Sacks (1973) as a *possible pre-closing*. If, on the other hand, no new topic is brought up, the pre-closing succeeds, thus leading to the terminal exchange and then to the end of the conversation. Furthermore, being as they are polite tries to end a conversation (Kiss 2002), *pre-closings* are sometimes delivered with an explanation why the conversation is to be closed, and they may also constitute pairs formed by the speaker’s offer to initiate the closing and the hearer’s acceptance or rejection. Finally, one more feature of this crucial
part of the conversation is that it can be made up of an extensive collection of units (Schegloff and Sacks 1973), ranging from whole phrases like *I gotta go* to DMs or, more accurately, *pre-closing markers* (PCMs)\(^\text{20}\) (Emery 2000) such as *well* (Schiffrin 1987), *okay* (Beach 1993), *so* (Williamson 1997) or *right* (Bien and Coppock 2005). In Spanish, some of the most common PCMs studied in the literature are *bueno* (Bauhr 1994), *bien* and *muy bien* (Martín and Portolés 1999) or *venga* (Blas Arroyo 1998).

As for the *terminal exchange*, it consists of the last two utterances in a conversation that lift the need for further exchange (Levinson 1983). These two utterances are known as the *adjacency pair* of the terminal exchange (Kiss 2002). As explained by Levinson (1983), the closure of the conversation is announced by the first part and secured by the second. In other words, “an uttered first pair part in the form of a ‘good-bye’ makes the utterance of a fitting second pair part which would end the conversation absolutely necessary at the next possible point” (Kiss 2002:11). Apart from *goodbye, see you, bye* and *bye-bye* are often used in English in colloquial terminal exchanges (Gardner 2004), whereas Spanish colloquial conversations normally resort to *hasta luego, adiós* or even *venga* (Blas Arroyo 1998).

Finally, there is a further factor that makes closing and pre-closing markers especially relevant to this thesis. As routine formulae, these markers are prefabricated linguistic units (Coulmas 1981) that are used in predictable situations in extemporaneous conversation. They are thus among the least spontaneous units used in spontaneous conversation. In the case of film dialogue, even less spontaneity may be expected, given that predictability is one of its inherent features (see 2.4.3.1). With regard to dubbed dialogue, Taylor (2007) notes that this predictability is actually increased, especially if the dialogue lacks naturalness overall. However, as explained by Coulmas (1981), it must be borne in mind that speakers in spontaneous exchanges have a large stock of routine formulae available and that they often strive for variation within the existing restrictions. Such variation provides conversation with a “natural and proficient flavour” (Coulmas 1981:9). This also applies to dubbed scripts, hence Taylor’s (2007:8) clarification that, predictable as these scripts may be, they usually allow margin for

\(^{20}\) PCMs are sometimes referred to as *pre-closing devices* (Bangerter and Clark 2003) or *pre-closing items* (Williamson 1997).
“original language use”. Therefore, the interest of the analysis included in this thesis lies in examining how these prefabricated DMs are used in a conversation that is already prefabricated and especially whether there is margin for variation that may provide the dubbed script with naturalness.

3.3.2. Interactive markers: attention-getters

In the same way that the on-line production of spontaneous speech brings about the need for hesitation markers to enable speakers to hold their turn while (re)formulating their discourse (see 3.3.1.1), the presence of an addressee accounts for a different type of device –interactive markers (McCarthy and Carter 1994, Szlezák 2007). Martín and Portolés (1999) refer to these markers as marcadores de alteridad, which point more or less directly to the hearers and which may fulfil different roles in conversation, such as attracting their attention, warning them about the relevance of an upcoming utterance, drawing the speakers closer to them by introducing complicity, etc. Among all these markers, scholars have focused especially on the so-called attention-getting devices (Romero Trillo 1997, Mackie et al. 2004) or attention-getters (Fitzmaurice 2004, Zambrano 2005, Martínez-Flor and Usó-Juan 2006). Usually found in sentence-initial position (Beinhauer 1964, Alcina and Blecua 1975), attention getters (AGs) comprise units such as look and listen in English and mira and oye in Spanish. They are used, according to Romero Trillo (1997), to draw attention to what is being said, either because the speaker feels that the hearer is not paying enough attention or because s/he feels the need to emphasise a part of the message that is especially relevant. Although some authors describe AGs as mere fillers (Vigara 1980, Hernando Cuadrado 1988), there seems to be considerable consensus regarding their status as DMs (Briz 1998, Pons 1998, Montolío and Unamuno 2001). As such, they are to be distinguished from their verbal homonyms, often imperatives, which have a “purely semantic-grammatical function”, instead of an “over-riding pragmatic meaning” (Romero Trillo 1997:213).

Apart from the ones mentioned, other AGs are you see and see (Ball 1986) in English and escucha, vamos a ver and veamos in Spanish (Romero Trillo 1997, Cuenca and Marín 2000, Montolio and Unamuno 2001). Although they may initially look fairly

---

21 Biber et al. (2002) classify AGs as a sub-category within inserts, whereas for Stapleton (2004) they are a specific type of alerters.
diverse, especially the Spanish ones, most scholars believe that the similarities between them outstrip the differences, which explains why they are usually regarded as a homogeneous group (Cuenca and Marín 2000) and often included together in very different types of research studies (Romero Trillo 1997, Montolío and Unamuno 2001, Amador Moreno et al. 2006).

First of all, they all derive from verbs belonging to the semantic field of perception, whether visual or auditory. Besides, they all present a parenthetical nature (Cuenca and Marín 2000), that is, they constitute an autonomous utterance (Martín and Portolés 1999), often followed by a pause and in sentence-initial position (Alcina and Blecua 1975). Thus, although their function is not to convey hesitation or self-repair, they do resemble HRMs in that they interrupt the conversational flow (Cuenca and Marín 2000) and may act as delay devices (Montolío and Unamuno 2001). As far as combinations with other units are concerned, these AGs may co-occur with vocatives and other AGs, which increases their pragmatic meaning, but they are not used with subjects or other complements (Cuenca and Marín 2000). Another important common feature is their appellative power (Pons 1998). It derives from their condition as imperatives, whether first or second person, and is related to the phatic function of conversation, AGs thus being “means for keeping the communication channel open” (Senft 1995:3). Finally, along with their appellative value, all these AGs have a prospective orientation, in other words, they act as alerters (Llorente 1996) or indicators of informative relevance (Blakemore 1987) that place the emphasis on upcoming information.

For the purpose of this thesis, AGs present a range of potential interests. Firstly, they seem to play a crucial role in both naturally occurring conversation (Biber et al. 1999) and film dialogue (Onkamo 2004). Secondly, as Cuenca and Marín (2000) note, they pose a great deal of difficulty from a translational viewpoint, not least because of the different ways in which these units are realised and distributed across languages. Finally, another essential characteristic of these markers highlighted by Martín and Portolés (1999:4144; *my translation*) is that they determine “the position adopted by the speaker with regard to the hearer, be it friendly or distant”. Judging by this last statement, AGs are likely to have an impact on the tenor of the dialogue, which, as pointed out above (see 3.1), may play an important role in the naturalness of the dubbed script analysed in this thesis.
3.3.3. DMs and modality

As noted by Høeg Müller and Klinge (2005), modality is one of the most intriguing and inspiring areas of study for logicians, philosophers and linguists, who have scrutinised it and interpreted it “in countless ways in countless languages” (ibid.:1). One of the reasons for this scholarly fascination lies in the fact that modality seems to cut across morphological, syntactic, semantic and pragmatic boundaries, involving “all dimensions from cognition to communication” (ibid.). Also important to account for this growing academic interest is its elusive nature:

‘Modality’ is one of the ‘golden oldies’ among the basic notions in the semantic analysis of language. But in spite of this, it also remains one of the most problematic and controversial notions: there is no consensus on how to define and characterise it, let alone on how to apply definitions in the empirical analysis of data. (Nuyts 2005:5)

Palmer (2001) addresses the difficult task of defining and describing modality by placing it on a par with tense and aspect as one of the three categories that are concerned with the event or the situation that is reported by the utterance. Whereas tense has to do with the time of the event and aspect with its ‘internal temporary constituency’ (Comrie 1976:3), modality “does not refer directly to any characteristic of the event (as tense and aspect do), but simply to the status of the proposition” (Palmer 2001:1). In general terms, modality is concerned with commitments, judgments and stances (Halliday 1994). Yet, as Nuyts (2005) highlights, a more precise definition of modality necessarily hinges on the subcategories it includes, which is yet another source of disagreement among scholars. Drawing on Palmer’s (1979, 2001) distinction between epistemic and deontic modality, modality is regarded here as dealing with the plausibility of propositions and the desirability of actions (Verstraete 2001). These meanings are conveyed by modal items which do not necessarily have to be modal verbs or to occur in written texts:

To suggest that the domain of modality be expanded beyond the closed-class modal verbs is not a new idea; several linguists have advocated this based on the frequent occurrence in written texts of a wider range of modal items (Holmes 1988) or on sociolinguistic ‘fieldwork’ (Stubbs 1986). The spoken corpus statistics underscore this earlier work and provide compelling evidence of the ubiquity of modal items in everyday communication. (McCarthy 1999:240)

In relation to the last remark made by McCarthy, it is important to highlight that spoken interaction is seen as a particularly “fruitful environment” (Recsky 2006:162) for modality, and one in which “it may be textualised by a wide range of linguistic devices” (ibid.:161), such as verbs, adverbs, adjectives and DMs (Martín and Portolés 1999). The following section deals with the two types of colloquial DMs described by Martín and

3.3.3.1. Epistemic modality: evidential markers

According to Lyons (1977), epistemic modality has to do with matters of knowledge, belief or opinion rather than with facts. He defines this type of modality as “any utterance in which the speaker explicitly qualifies his commitment to the truth of the proposition expressed by the sentence he utters” (ibid.:793). Very much along the same lines is Recsky’s (2004:53) definition, which may be regarded as even more appropriate here, as it is posited as the definition of epistemic modality in natural language: “the speaker’s qualification of the truth of what is said”. Epistemic modality may be conveyed by a wide range of units as varied as I know, I think, must and may (Palmer 1979, 2001). It also includes DMs, known as evidential markers (EMs) or evidentials (Precht 2003, Carretero 2002). According to Recsky (2006:167), they are “means by which any alleged matter or fact whose truth is investigated is established or disproved”. In English, some of these EMs are absolutely (Precht 2003), of course (Furkó 2007), definitely (McCarthy 1999), yeah, totally, really (Walrod 2006), indeed or sure (Holmes 1988). In Spanish, Martín and Portolés (1999) include the following: en efecto, efectivamente, desde luego, por supuesto, claro and sin duda.

Overall, there are two aspects of EMs that may be very relevant to the present thesis. The first one has to do with the influence of register on the use of EMs. Coates (1982) shows that these markers are more recurrent in informal speech than in formal impersonal language and Carretero (2002:34) refers more specifically to tenor, highlighting the status of the participants as “an influential factor” on the choice of EMs. As a matter of fact, most authors seem to agree that there are specific situations within conversations that are more likely than others to feature EMs. Recsky (2006) points out that narrative sections where a speaker is holding the floor usually contain a lower proportion of EMs than evaluative sections in which all participants express their views. Evaluative sections in conversations also have a higher proportion of EMs than those in written texts. This is due, according to Carretero (2002), to the lower degree of preparation of spoken interaction, which brings about numerous stretches of text with high occurrence of EMs “uttered spontaneously” (ibid.:34). Given that, as explained in
2.4.3.1, dubbed dialogue is highly planned, it will be interesting to see how it represents, if at all, these spontaneous instances of clustered EMs.

Secondly, another important aspect to be mentioned is the variation that seems to characterise the use of EMs in colloquial conversation. As put by Recsky (2006:182), the use of repeated and isolated EMs is only common in “invented examples of linguists”, whereas native speakers tend to use a wide array of EMs and to combine them with different units. Having defined naturalness as native-like selection of expression in a given context (see 2.4.4.2), this characteristic of EMs becomes all the more relevant for the purpose of this thesis.

3.3.3.2. Deontic modality: deontic markers
As mentioned in 3.3.3, deontic modality is concerned with the desirability of actions (Verstraete 2001). More specifically, it relates to issues of obligation and permission, which may come from the speakers themselves:

> Although deontic modality stems from some kind of external authority such as rules of the law, typically and frequently the authority is the actual speaker, who gives permission to, or lays an obligation on, the addressee. (Palmer 2001:10)

Following from this, Martín and Portolés (1999) explain that the role of deontic markers in colloquial conversation is to indicate whether or not the speaker accepts, or agrees with, what is inferred from the segment of discourse they refer to. In other words, these markers are often used by speakers to accept or refuse proposals, suggestions or offers made by their addressees. As noted by Martín and Portolés (1999), deontic markers are, from a syntactic point of view, as flexible as epistemic markers and have a retrospective orientation, but differ from the latter in that they are separated from the previous and following utterance by a bigger pause.

It must be noted that the term “deontic marker” does not seem to be very recurrent in the literature on DMs in English. Instead, most authors refer to agreement markers (Schegloff 1982, Guthrie 1997), agreement tokens (Filipi and Wales 2003) or markers of agreement (Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen 2003), such as okay and alright, which introduce a statement that is said in agreement with a previous one. In Spanish, apart from the most commonly studied deontic markers, bueno and bien (Martín and Portolés 1999), authors such as Lázaro Carreter (1997), Riquelme (1998) and Blas Arroyo (1998)
include in this group the markers vale and venga, which are attracting increasing scholarly attention (Gómez Capuz 2001a). Vale is very recurrent in spontaneous conversation and in dubbed films, where it is often used as a translation of okay (ibid.), whereas venga is regarded as a more modern marker that seems to be replacing vale in specific contexts (Blas Arroyo 1998). However, Martín and Portolés (1999) do not grant vale and venga the status of DMs, thus recognising only bien and bueno as deontic markers used in colloquial conversation. It is important to highlight that these authors do not provide enough arguments to substantiate this exclusion, which may be regarded as questionable, given that both markers seem to abide by the conditions established for a unit to classify as a DM (see 3.3). In this sense, a corpus-based study such as the one included in this thesis offers a good opportunity to determine whether or not vale and venga behave as DMs in dubbed and spontaneous conversation and to compare bueno and bien with their above-described uses as TMs.
CHAPTER 4
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

4.1. The study of naturalness in this thesis
As stated in 1.2, the broad aim of the present thesis is to investigate whether there is lack of naturalness in the use of DMs in the Spanish dubbed script of the American sitcom *Friends*. In order to achieve this aim, it is essential to determine what is understood by naturalness as applied to this study. This is done in section 2.4.4. Drawing on Warren (2004), naturalness is defined here as nativelike selection of expression in a given context, which, as applied to the corpora analysed in this thesis, becomes *nativelike selection of expression in spontaneous colloquial conversation*. Following from this definition, the study of the naturalness in the use of DMs in the Spanish dubbese is carried out by comparing dubbed dialogue to spontaneous colloquial conversation, taking original film dialogue in Spanish (fictional but not translated) as an intermediate step. This type of research has only been carried out by Pavesi (2004, 2005) in the case of the Italian dubbese, and thus remains unexplored in other dubbing languages, including Spanish. It is also worth noting that, even though Warren’s definition of naturalness was not initially conceived for dubbed dialogue, it seems especially appropriate for this purpose given its emphasis on what is conventional or common as opposed to what is possible or correct. On the one hand, it points to the use of corpora to determine what is recurrent and what is not, as will be done in Chapter 6. Most importantly, it seems particularly suitable for the analysis of the Spanish dubbese, which, as explained in 2.4.4.1, is often criticised for featuring expressions that are “intelligible and correct” but “uncommon in daily life” (Palencia Villa 2002:66; my translation).

In any case, given that the study of naturalness proposed here involves the comparison between dubbed and spontaneous dialogue, it is necessary to describe them both individually before they can be comparatively analysed.

4.2. The Spanish dubbese
Chapter 2 starts off addressing AVT as a whole and then narrows down its scope to provide a detailed account of the Spanish language used in dubbing. Although it is this last part (2.4.3) that is of most relevance to the study proposed in this thesis, also of
interest are the general approach to the study of AVT (2.2) and the overview of the different models of research in dubbing (2.3), with particular emphasis on Chaume’s (2004a) model, partially adopted in this thesis.

4.2.1. Research on AVT: models of research in dubbing

Although of limited direct application in this thesis, a look back at early research on AVT gives an idea of the rapid development of this field from the time in which AVT was regarded as a subcategory within literary translation, including only the translations of films, tackled exclusively from a linguistic point of view and classified on the basis of its field (2.2.1). In subsequent years, AVT seems to have gained its rightful place within Translation Studies by placing the emphasis on its specificity and especially on that of the audiovisual text. This specificity does not lie in the field of the audiovisual text, but rather in its channel or, more accurately, in the simultaneous and combined presence of two sets of signs (verbal and non-verbal) transmitted through two channels of communication (acoustic and visual) (2.2.2). The consideration of AVT as a discipline in its own right and the stress on the specificity of its channel of communication are essential to this thesis. The former lies behind the models of research for dubbing discussed in 2.3.3, and the latter constitutes the basis of Chaume’s (2004a) model for the analysis of dubbed texts, partially applied in this thesis (2.3.3.3).

Before discussing Chaume’s model, due account is taken of two other relevant approaches to the study of dubbing: constraint-oriented and polysystemic approaches. Constraint-oriented approaches (2.3.3.1) shed a great deal of light on the nature and characteristics of the main constraint faced by the dubbing translator—the different synchronies. Yet, these models regard synchrony as the main and often the only specificity of dubbing, thus overshadowing others that may be just as important. As for polysystemic or descriptive models (2.3.3.2), they constitute the preferred choice for the analysis of dubbed texts among scholars in the field. Their main contribution is their emphasis on the socio-cultural dimension of dubbing and the description of its role in society or, more accurately, in the audiovisual polysystem. Given that the two series analysed in this thesis, *Friends* and *Siete Vidas*, co-exist in the same audiovisual polysystem as a translated and an original sitcom respectively, due references will be made to these descriptive approaches insofar as the potential influence of *Friends* on *Siete Vidas* (or vice versa) may be due to their polysystemic relation. However, as
discussed in 2.3.3.2, none of these models is adopted in this thesis. This absence is justified, first of all, by the descriptive emphasis on the social and political agendas behind the dubbed text, which have not been deemed a especially relevant factor in the present study, and secondly by the lack of depth in the linguist analyses included within polysystemic models, which have so far not provided the necessary tools for an analysis like the one proposed in the present thesis.

Finally, the last group of approaches discussed in 2.3.3 are the so-called cinematographic approaches, particularly Chaume’s (2004a) model for the analysis of dubbed texts (2.3.3.3). Chaume’s model is made up of an external and an internal dimension, which is in turn divided into general translation problems and those specific to the audiovisual text and thus related to the different audiovisual codes. Given that the content of the external dimension that is relevant to this thesis is included within the extradiegetic level of the description of the Spanish dubbese proposed in 2.4.3, it is mainly the internal dimension and more specifically the division of the dubbed text into different audiovisual codes that is of relevance to this study. Indeed, the examples included in the qualitative study of the corpus of this thesis will be analysed on the basis of these codes. This will help to determine the extent to which the interaction of the audiovisual codes in a given scene constrains the dubbing translator or whether, on the contrary, it provides him/her with translational freedom. Yet, it should be noted that not all the audiovisual codes described by Chaume have been applied to this thesis. The iconographic, photographic, graphic and syntactic codes, for example, have not been found to provide useful insight into the present study. Conversely, the mobility, sound arrangement and shooting codes have proved particularly relevant, given that, as will be illustrated in Chapter 6, they have a direct impact on the presence or absence of synchrony-related constraints. Finally, with regard to the linguistic code, it has been deemed to fall short of providing the linguistic tools needed for the analyses proposed in this thesis and thus its contents are incorporated to, and further developed in, the description of the Spanish dubbese included in 2.4.3 and discussed in the next section.

4.2.2. Description of the Spanish dubbese
The description of the Spanish dubbese is a necessary step in order to compare it to spontaneous colloquial conversation. The introduction of this description, included in 2.4.1 and 2.4.2, provides evidence as to how little research has been done on the crucial
subject of the study of dubbing language in general, but it also shows that this tendency may be changing, particularly in the case of Spanish. Yet, most of these works on the Spanish dubbing language focus on its written-to-be-spoken-as-if-not-written nature. This approach poses a two-fold problem. On the one hand, most of what is said about the Spanish dubbese is actually applicable to (non-dubbed) film dialogue in general, which is also written to be spoken as if not written. Not enough emphasis is placed on those features that make, as has been noted in the literature, dubbed dialogue different from original film dialogue. In other words, more attention needs to be paid to the translational dimension of dubbese. On the other hand, also neglected are some features, many of them extra-linguistic or rather extradiagnostic, that are common to both original and dubbed film dialogue and that crucially help to explain why dubbed dialogue needs to be written to be spoken as if not written. Unlike the previous ones, these features are not translational, but fictional. In other words, more attention needs to be paid to the fictional dimension of dubbese. Following from this, the Spanish dubbese, regarded here as film dialogue dubbed into Spanish, is made up of two overlapping dimensions—the fictional and the translational dimension. The former, determined by its being film dialogue, contains those features of the Spanish dubbese that may also be found in non-translated film dialogue. The latter, determined by its being dubbed into Spanish, contains those features that are added in or brought about by the translational process.

This approach has several advantages. Firstly, it allows a thorough description of the Spanish dubbese, not only of its translational features but also of the features derived from its being film dialogue. If, as it is often reiterated, the way forward for AVT research is to be informed by other disciplines (Díaz-Cintas et al. 2006), especially Film Studies (Chaume 2004a), then it is only reasonable that the description of the Spanish dubbing language may draw on this discipline too. In addition, the distinction between a fictional and a translational dimension is very useful to differentiate the dubbed script of Friends and that of Siete Vidas. It allows the researcher to ascertain if the presence of a given unnatural feature in the dubbed script is due to its being fictional or translational and if it can be expected to occur in Friends and/or in Siete Vidas. Then, knowing the cause or the origin of this unnatural feature, it becomes easier to determine whether or not it may be avoidable and how.
4.2.2.1. Fictional dimension

Most of the contents included in the fictional dimension of the Spanish dubbese (2.4.3.1) are relevant to this thesis, not least its multimodality, which will be examined in the qualitative analysis of the corpora using Chaume’s (2004a) model, and its polyfunctionality, which will determine the division of the features included in this description into extradiegetic and diegetic features.

The extradiegetic level is divided into a series of principles, characteristics and constraints. The principles, and the mechanisms through which they are activated, account for the notion of suspension of disbelief, which will be taken up in Chapter 7. The six characteristics described at this level are also important, as they all apply to both original and dubbed film dialogue. Finally, the extradiegetic constraints are paramount to understand why a dubbed (as well as an original) script is written to be spoken as if not written, why there is a need to find a balance between written and spoken discourse and why dubbing translators have to make certain choices, sometimes unnatural, at given instances. In sum, the dubbed dialogue that is usually studied, the one between on-screen characters (diegetic dialogue), cannot be fully understood if these extradiegetic features are not taken into consideration.

As explained in 2.4.3.1, dubbed dialogue is regarded, from the point of view of its fictional dimension, as straightjacketed dialogue that is intended to sound natural, which could also be said of non-translated film dialogue. This definition shapes the description of the fictional dimension of the Spanish dubbese on the diegetic level. This description is thus divided into a prefabricated facet and a natural facet. Its prefabricated facet (the straightjacket) is made up of a series of functions, general features and linguistic features. Particularly important here are its general features, which will be constantly referred to in the corpus analysis, and the linguistic features. All of them contribute to give an idea of how constrained any script (whether or not dubbed) is due to its fictional nature. As for the natural facet, it is basically made up of a series of linguistic features aimed at making original and dubbed scripts look spontaneous. Added to the previous prefabricated facet, this natural facet completes what can be regarded as the description of the fictional dimension of the Spanish dubbese. For a full description of the Spanish dubbese it is necessary to take account of its translational dimension too.
4.2.2.2. Translational dimension

In this case, the focus is placed on those features of the Spanish dubbese that are brought about by the fact that it has been dubbed. In other words, they are, in theory, not expected to be found in original film dialogue such as that of *Siete Vidas*. As was the case in the fictional dimension of the Spanish dubbese, the majority of the contents included in this section (2.4.3.2) are in some way or another relevant to the study proposed in this thesis. The extradiegetic complexity included within the translational dimension means that the naturalness of the dubbed script is not only likely to be affected by, for example, the multiple authority of the ST, but also by the complex elaboration process of the dubbed script (see 2.3.2). The constraint-related modifications are also important insofar as the reductions or additions often carried out by dubbing translators may affect DMs, chosen as objects of study in this thesis. The same holds true for both the colloquialisation of the discourse and the permeability of the TT to the ST and the SL in general. The former is bound to have an influence on this study given the importance of register and, more specifically, of tenor, in the use of DMs (see 3.1). The latter is generally considered to be the main source of unnaturalness in dubbed scripts, particularly with SL-influenced DMs that are used with a different frequency and in different contexts to the way they are used in spontaneous Spanish. Finally, as for the use of translational routines and privileged carriers of orality, their importance lies in their recurrence in dubbed scripts as well as in the fact that many of them may be DMs. Their naturalness, or lack thereof, will thus play a very significant role in the overall naturalness of the dubbed script.

Having described the Spanish dubbese, it is now time to turn to the second element in the comparison proposed in this thesis, namely spontaneous conversation and, more accurately, colloquial DMs.

4.3. Spontaneous colloquial conversation: conversational DMs

4.3.1. Research on colloquial conversation and DMs

As mentioned in 3.1, the corpora analysed in this thesis conform to the conversational, primary and colloquialising features established by Briz (1998, 2002) as conditions for an oral exchange to qualify as colloquial conversation, whether fake (*Friends and Siete Vidas*) or real (Corpus de Referencia del Español Actual [CREA]). Once these conditions have been established, an account of the most important linguistic features of
colloquial conversation helps to complete the portrait of the type of discourse that is going to be analysed. The scene is thus set for the analysis of the actual objects of study in this thesis – DMs (section 3.2).

Section 3.2.1 shows how the realisation of the key role played by DMs in conversation has led to an exponential growth of research in this field. This initial section is important because it provides an overview of the state of the art in terms of research on DMs as well as an initial justification of why these units are relevant enough to merit an analysis like the one proposed in this thesis. Following this, a description is offered of the two main views on the nature of DMs, the narrow/wide distinction (see 3.2.2), the latter of which is adopted in this study. In addition, this section provides a definition and a description of the main characteristics of the units to be analysed. Especially relevant are their grammaticalisation, multifunctionality and register-bound nature. The first two provide useful clues for the identification and distinction of DMs (see 5.3); the latter will be taken up later in the data analysis. Finally, 3.2.3 is needed to further justify the choice of DMs as objects of study in this thesis and to highlight the need to use a corpus of spontaneous conversations if this study is to be carried out empirically.

4.3.2. DMs to be analysed in this thesis

In section 3.3, attention is shifted to the type of DMs analysed in this thesis. Several arguments are put forward to explain why Martín and Portolés' (1999) study is chosen as the main source from which this section is to draw. These authors provide a set of conditions for a unit to classify as DM (which will be essential to identify the objects of study in this thesis) and a clear taxonomy of DMs. Among all the different types, the most relevant ones are those used in colloquial conversation, namely metadiscourse, interactive, evidential and deontic markers.

4.3.2.1. Metadiscourse markers

Within metadiscourse markers (see 3.3.1), the focus is placed on markers indicating hesitation, transition and closing. The former (3.3.1.1) are in turn divided into HRMs and UFPs. As for HRMs, their relevance to this thesis lies in the fact that, whereas they are said to add naturalness to the conversation (Stenström 2006), they are difficult to use in fictional scripts, as they are time-consuming units to be used in time-constrained dialogue. The HRMs analysed in this thesis are those that have been covered by Martín
and Portolés (1999), namely *bueno, o sea, vamos* and *pues*. Also added are *es que, claro* and *hombre*, regarded by España Villasante (1996), Fuentes and Alcaide (1996) and Bravo Cladera (2005) as key HRMs in Spanish colloquial conversation. Conversely, UFPs have been left out of the present thesis (3.3.1.1). The reason for this exclusion is their elusiveness in most corpora, a case in point being CREA, the corpus of spontaneous colloquial conversation analysed in this thesis, which does not include them.

The second type of metadiscourse markers studied here is that of TMs. These markers are particularly interesting given that, as mentioned in 3.3.1.2, they play a key role signalling boundaries in the discourse and helping viewers to follow the on-screen dialogue. Most importantly, it should be noted that a sitcom script may feature up to 15-18 conversations in one episode, many of which are already underway when the (over)hearsers, i.e. the audience, start watching them. In other words, many of these exchanges do not start with a greeting. In these cases, TMs are often used at the beginning of a conversation to enable viewers to get their bearings before a new topic is introduced. The importance of this function for the viewers’ comprehension is illustrated by the fact that these transitions are sometimes also marked visually, in the case of *Friends*, with the shot of a city street or the camera panning up the side of a building where an event (or conversation) is about to occur (Kelly 2003a). It will be interesting to see if this fictional role of TMs makes them more recurrent in fictional dialogue than in spontaneous dialogue. The TMs analysed in the present thesis are (*muy*) *bien* and *bueno*, given their importance in conversation and the fact that they are often defined and described by comparison/opposition to each other, which facilitates their analysis in the corpora.

Finally, the third type of metadiscourse markers are closing and pre-closing markers, described in 3.3.1.3. Although closing markers are important in colloquial conversation, most researchers do not grant them the status of DMs. As a result, they are often excluded from most studies on the subject, as is the case in Martín and Portolés (1999), and they have been left out of this thesis too. PCMs present a different situation, as most of them are invariably regarded as DMs. The present study covers the ones that have received most attention among scholars, such as *bueno, (muy) bien* and *venga*, as well as three other (*hala, pues nada, oye*) that have been largely overlooked and yet occur
frequently in the spontaneous corpus included in this thesis. As explained in 3.3.1.3, PCMs belong to the category of routine formulae, which are typically prefabricated and predictable but which may add naturalness to a conversation by means of variation. It will be interesting to see if the use of these prefabricated and predictable markers in prefabricated and predictable dialogue can still add naturalness through variation.

4.3.2.2. Interactive markers
As far as interactive markers are concerned, the analysis included in this thesis focuses on a specific type –AGs. The reason for this choice is that a) AGs are particularly relevant in both spontaneous and dubbed conversation, b) they are distributed differently across languages, which makes their translation remarkably difficult, and c) they are believed to have a considerable impact on the relationship between the participants in the conversation. The AGs chosen for the present study are mira, verás, oye, escucha, (vamos) a ver and veamos. Despite their apparent diversity, these AGs share a great deal of common features, as detailed in 3.3.2, and have been found to be particularly frequent in the relevant literature.

4.3.2.3. Modal markers
Finally, the last two types of conversational markers described in 3.3, deontic and evidential markers, help to bridge the gap between DMs and modality. Although both types of markers are studied by Martín and Portolés (1999), deontic markers will not be covered in the present thesis. The reason for this exclusion is that, unlike the other DMs chosen for this study, they do not seem to be recognised as a proper class by many scholars. References to deontic markers are indeed scarce in the literature on DMs in English (see 3.3.3.2). Other labels such as agreement markers or agreement tokens are used, but they do not even always refer to the same type of markers. The same holds true for Spanish, where deontic markers trigger similar dissension.

A different situation is that of EMs, which convey epistemic modality. Although Martín and Portolés (1999) distinguish six different EMs (en efecto, efectivamente, desde luego, por supuesto, claro and sin duda), the present thesis only focuses on the three EMs to which these authors devote most of their attention: desde luego, por supuesto and claro. The use of these EMs in three corpora of formal, standard and colloquial spontaneous conversations is also analysed by Fuentes and Alcaide (1996) in a study that may be of
great use for the analysis presented in this thesis. In any case, the overall relevance of EMs here lies in the fact that, as mentioned in 3.3.3.1, they are often uttered by groups of speakers expressing their views spontaneously. It will be interesting to see how this spontaneity is conveyed in the highly planned dubbed script. Most importantly, these instances are likely to correspond to group scenes filmed with group shots. As explained in 2.3.3.3, not only are these shots free of constraints, but the translator usually resorts to the symbol (AD LIB) to indicate the dubbing actors and the dubbing director that they can improvise the dialogue. According to Baños (2007), the spontaneity that characterises this type of scenes is what provides the dubbed text with naturalness. However, Baños (2007) does not provide evidence to substantiate her claim. The analysis of EMs included in this thesis affords an appropriate opportunity to verify whether or not spontaneity, improvisation and lack of constraints do result in naturalness with regard to the use of DMs in the Spanish dubbese.
CHAPTER 5
CORPORA AND METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

This chapter is devoted to the description of the corpora and methodology that will be used to achieve the aims and objectives set in Chapter 1, based on the theoretical framework outlined in Chapter 4, which in turn drew on the theory on AVT and DMs presented in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3. The present chapter is divided into three different sections. First of all, a review of corpus-based approaches to translation research is presented in 5.1, which includes an account of their advantages and disadvantages as well as a description of the approach adopted in this study. Section 5.2 presents and describes the parallel, comparable and reference corpora used in the present thesis. Finally, the methodology adopted for the analysis of these corpora is reviewed in 5.3.

5.1. Corpus-based approaches

Before delving into the advantages and disadvantages of the use of corpora in translation research, it is necessary to specify what is understood by corpus in this study. Although many other definitions may be found in the literature, a widely-accepted one is that of Baker (1995:225), who defines it as “collections of texts held in machine-readable form and capable of being analysed automatically or semi-automatically in a variety of ways”. Nowadays, there seems to be broad consensus among scholars that the introduction of corpora has greatly benefited research in Translation Studies, constituting “one of the most important gate-openers to progress in the discipline” (Malmkjær 2003:119). The positive effect of this introduction is explained by Valentini (2006:68) as follows:

The last decade has witnessed a massive growth in the creation and use of corpora, which have arguably become the necessary hallmark of all scientific linguistic analysis. Electronic corpora nowadays provide the basis for empirical research in translation-based studies, with positive repercussions which have long been discussed in the literature from a theoretical, practical and pedagogic point of view (Baker, 1995; Aston, 2001; Zorzi, 2001; Zanettin, 2001; Ulrych, 2001).

As pointed out by Valentini, perhaps the main advantage of corpus-based approaches is that they provide researchers with an empirical and objective tool with which they can test their intuitions, which, as Biber et al. (1994:170) note, are usually strongly held, but also often “incorrect when they are tested empirically against the actual patterns of use in large text corpora”. Yet, it must be said that corpus-based approaches have also raised objections from different scholars. Chomsky (in McEnery and Wilson 2001:5-12), for
instance, criticises their focus on performance as opposed to competence as well as the fact that they are always incomplete, whereas language is non-finite. This last point, taken up by Sinclair (1991:13) when he argues that “the results are only as good as the corpus”, is important insofar as it touches upon the key question of representativeness, i.e. whether corpus-based results may be extrapolated to other contexts. In this sense, Mason (2001) warns against vague generalisations based on quantitative data and advocates a combination of quantitative and qualitative analyses. Quantitative analyses provide research with “weight and credibility” (Mason 2000:17); qualitative analyses, in the form of manual processing, are needed if scholars are to go “beyond the words on the page” (Mason in Olohan 2004:22). As will be explained in 5.3, the corpora included in the present thesis are analysed both quantitatively and qualitatively so that the conclusions obtained may be regarded empirical and objective. In this sense, no attempt will be made in this thesis to extrapolate these results to, for example, other corpora of dubbed dialogues.

As regards the type of corpora used, Translation Studies have so far focused mainly on parallel corpora, which may be divided, as explained by Olohan (2004), into unidirectional (STs in language A and TTs in language B) and bidirectional (STs in language A and TTs in language B, and STs in language B and TTs in language A). However, useful as these parallel corpora have proved to be, Baker (1995:233) advocates a different approach, one which allows the investigation of “how text produced in relative freedom from an individual script in another language differs from text produced under the normal conditions which pertain in translation”. In order to adopt this approach, it is necessary to use a comparable corpus, defined by Baker (ibid.:234) as:

Two separate collections of text in the same language: one corpus consists of original texts in the language in question and the other consists of translations in that language from a given source language or languages […] Both corpora should cover a similar domain, variety of language and time span, and be of comparable length.

In Baker’s view, the use of comparable corpora may yield patterns that are in some way, for instance regarding frequency, restricted to the translated text. In the case of the comparable corpus included in this thesis, made up of the TT and SV (see 5.2), the presence of these patterns in the TT may be expected to be attributable to the translational dimension of the Spanish dubbese. Finally, it should be noted that even
studies making use of both parallel and comparable corpora analysed with quantitatively and qualitatively methods can only offer, as explained by Olohan (2004:41), “limited explanation of the constraints, causes, etc.” related to the translation. Researchers will thus have to combine corpus-based studies with “other kinds of methods and studies” (ibid.). Given the above-mentioned importance of constraints in AVT in general and dubbing in particular, the present thesis combines the quantitative and qualitative analyses of the corpus under study with the partial application of Chaume’s model for the analysis of audiovisual texts, as will be explained in the section dealing with methodology (5.3).

In this sense, before moving on to the description of these corpora, some words must also be devoted to the application of corpus-based approaches to AVT. As pointed out by Diaz-Cintas (2005b:2), the use of corpora still appear “not to have made its entry into the field of AVT”, at least not to the extent to which it has been introduced and investigated in other fields of translation. Valentini (2006) concurs with this view, adding that the only exceptions are some contributions of individual scholars who adopt a case-study approach (Gambier and Gottlieb 2001). However, recent publications seem to indicate a change in this trend. Apart from the studies carried out by Marzà (2007) and Baños (2007), also Martínez Sierra (2004) and Matamala (2004), to name but two, have recently presented corpus-based doctoral research on AVT. Matamala’s (2004) corpus may be said to be, like Forlixt (see 2.4.1), truly audiovisual, as the parallel and comparable corpora that she studies are aligned with the audiovisual material included. This introduction of the audiovisual component constitutes, for scholars like Payrató (2003), one of the last frontiers to be conquered by corpus-based research.

Although the corpora included in the present thesis are also audiovisual, they have not been aligned with the dialogue. Yet, as will be explained in the next section, this thesis includes an element that has so far been missing in AVT in general (with the exception of Pavesi [2004, 2005]) and particularly in the study of the Spanish dubbing language: a reference corpus. According to Leech (2002:1), a reference corpus is designed to provide comprehensive information about a language acting as a “benchmark, or a yardstick”, in other words, “something that people can regard as a standard of comparison”. In this regard, Leech adds that reference corpora somehow represent the language as it is spoken by the community at large. Needless to say, this type of corpus aims at achieving
a great deal of representativeness, which is obtained by resorting to three factors: diversity (as wide a range as possible of the varieties of the language), balance (proportion between the varieties and their importance in the language) and size (over 20 million words and preferably around 100 million) (ibid.). One of the corpora mentioned by Leech to illustrate his description is precisely CREA, the reference corpus chosen in this thesis as the yardstick against which the naturalness of the DMs used in the dubbed dialogue is to be analysed.

5.2. Compilation of the corpora for the present thesis
As has been explained, the study of the naturalness in the use of DMs in the Spanish dubbese proposed in this thesis is based on a comparative analysis of these units in dubbed dialogue, non-translated fictional dialogue and spontaneous dialogue. Three corpora have been used for this purpose: a parallel corpus, a comparable corpus and a reference corpus.

5.2.1. Parallel and comparable corpora
Given that one of the objectives of this study is to conduct a quantitative analysis of DMs in the data, it is necessary to have large-scale corpora displayed in machine-readable form. As far as the parallel corpus is concerned, the choice of a single film, as has traditionally been the case in corpus-based AVT research (Díaz-Cintas 2004a), was thus ruled out from the beginning. Using several films was also ruled out on the grounds of consistency, given the difficulty (though by no means impossibility) involved in finding a group of films that can be said to be completely comparable and to feature dialogue with the same register. Finally, 48 episodes (complete seasons 1 and 4) of the American series *Friends*, both original (ST) and dubbed into Spanish (TT), were chosen as a parallel corpus for this thesis.

As explained by Baños (2007), the texts included in this parallel corpus belong to the dramatic genre in Agost’s (1999) classification of audiovisual texts and, more specifically, to the narrative subgenre. A further distinction often made in the field of television studies would situate *Friends* as a fictional series belonging to the genre of situation comedies or sitcoms (Creeber 2001). In many ways, *Friends* may be considered as the quintessential sitcom and certainly one of the most popular of all time (see table 5.1). Its popularity is precisely one of the reasons that motivates its inclusion in the
present thesis. *Friends* is regarded as a cultural phenomenon whose influence spans from the English language (Roberts and Tagliamonte 2005) to original sitcoms in other languages. One of these sitcoms is *Siete Vidas*, considered to be greatly inspired by *Friends* (Huerta 2005) and thus very appropriate for the comparable corpus. It is used as an intermediate step (non-translated but fictional) in the comparison between dubbed dialogue and spontaneous dialogue put forward in this thesis. The following table, adapted from the one presented by Baños (2007), includes the most relevant data about these series and illustrates their few differences and many similarities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Friends in English (ST)</th>
<th>Friends in Spanish (TT)</th>
<th>Siete Vidas (SV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genre</strong></td>
<td>According to Agost (1999) Dramatic, narrative</td>
<td>Dramatic, narrative</td>
<td>Dramatic, narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>According to television studies</strong></td>
<td>Fictional series Sitcom</td>
<td>Fictional series Sitcom</td>
<td>Fictional series Sitcom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>The life of six friends, three men and three women, who share flats in New York and meet regularly at a local coffee house to discuss family, work and relationships.</td>
<td>The life of six friends, three men and three women, who share flats in New York and meet regularly at a local coffee house to discuss family, work and relationships.</td>
<td>The life of a group of friends who share flats in Madrid and meet regularly at a local coffee house to discuss family, work and relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Themes</strong></td>
<td>Friendship, relationships, family, work.</td>
<td>Friendship, relationships, family, work.</td>
<td>Friendship, relationships, family, work, homosexuality, politics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Original run</strong></td>
<td>Ten</td>
<td>Ten</td>
<td>Ten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TV Channel</strong></td>
<td>NBC</td>
<td>Canal +</td>
<td>Telecinco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeslot</strong></td>
<td>Evening Thursday</td>
<td>Lunchtime Monday-Friday</td>
<td>Evening Sunday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ratings</strong></td>
<td>23, 610,000</td>
<td>1,047,000</td>
<td>3,093,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1. Differences and similarities between *Friends* and *Siete Vidas*
As for the parallel corpus, the choice of consecutive seasons was avoided in an attempt to provide as representative a corpus of the series as possible. It should be noted that this parallel corpus is not made up of the official scripts of the series, but of post-synchronised transcripts obtained from repeated viewings of the episodes. As was the case in Roberts and Tagliamonte’s (2005) study on the use of intensifiers in Friends, invaluable help was obtained from a number of unofficial transcripts readily available on the Internet. Yet, spot checks had to be conducted against the versions of the episodes featuring in the commercialised DVDs. Minor corrections were introduced to ensure the total accuracy of the transcripts. The same procedure was followed in the case of the Spanish transcripts. Given that every episode has an average duration of 22 minutes, the corpus, including both ST and TT transcripts, contains 35.2 hours of dialogue (17.6 hours per language), featuring 223,296 words in total, 114,336 words in English and 108,960 in Spanish.

As for the comparable corpus, it is made up of the TT used in the parallel corpus and the transcripts of the first season of the Spanish sitcom Siete Vidas (SV), made up of 26 episodes and broadcast in 1999. In this case, no unofficial transcripts were available on the Internet and thus the dialogue had to be transcribed manually. The reason why only one season was chosen for the corpus is that every episode of Siete Vidas has an average duration of 50 minutes, approximately twice as long as those from Friends. Therefore, the non-translated part of this comparable corpus (SV) consists of 21.7 hours and features 135,485 words. It can thus be said to meet the above-mentioned requirements established by Baker (1995) as to its comparability with the translated part of the comparable corpora (TT): a similar domain (as described in table 5.1), variety of language (prefabricated colloquial conversation), time span (1997-2000) and comparable length (135,485 words from SV and 108,960 from TT).

It should be noted that, even though the parallel and comparable corpora included in the present thesis are machine-readable, they have not been aligned. Indeed, their dialogic nature, the use of name tags and especially the division in episodes and even numbered scenes facilitates searches in the corpora without the need to carry out the time-consuming task of aligning them. Likewise, no computerised concordancer has been

22 These numbers correspond to words in dialogue, that is, they exclude the tags with the characters’ names, the number of the scenes, the title of the episodes, etc.
used, given that the search engine integrated within Microsoft Office provides the necessary applications for the quantitative and qualitative analysis of the corpora.

To conclude this section, it should be clear that if the naturalness of the DMs used in the dubbed dialogue is to be analysed on the basis of a comparison to their use in spontaneous dialogue, then the reference corpus featuring the latter dialogue must be comparable to the dubbed dialogue. In other words, the dubbed transcripts of *Friends* determine the nature of the reference corpora to be used, especially regarding the register of the dialogue. As pointed out by Gómez Capuz (2001a), Matamala (2004) and Baños (2007), sitcoms in general seek to portray genuine colloquial conversation (although it is in reality prefabricated) in spite of the many constraints at play. *Friends* is no exception to this rule. According to Roberts and Tagliamonte (2005), for instance, the original dialogue of this sitcom reflects the natural use of colloquial language, at least regarding the use of intensifiers. As a matter of fact, most of the conversations included in the parallel and comparable corpora analysed in this thesis meet the requirements set by Briz (1998; see 3.1) for a conversation to qualify as colloquial. Non-colloquial dialogue, which can be found in very specific scenes, has been either excluded or, in some cases, mentioned as an example of non-colloquial conversation to illustrate a particular point. Following from this, there is no doubt that the reference corpus needed for the analysis proposed in this thesis must contain spontaneous colloquial conversation in Spanish.

### 5.2.2. Reference corpus

As mentioned in 5.1, the reference corpus chosen in this thesis as the yardstick against which the naturalness of the dubbed DMs is to be analysed is the Corpus de Referencia del Español Actual (CREA). Created in 1995 by the Real Academia Española de la Lengua, CREA contains approximately 170 million words and is by far the biggest corpus available in the Spanish language (Pino 1997). It is a dynamic corpus, i.e. it is constantly being updated and enlarged, and is split into two even halves –one dealing with Spanish from Spain and the other one with Spanish from Latin America. In turn, it is also divided into a written and an oral section.

The oral CREA features 9 million words contained in 1,600 documents corresponding to 1975-2004. However, most of the contents belong to the period between 1995 and 2004, thus including the time span covered by the Spanish transcripts of *Friends* and *Siete*
Vidas analysed in this thesis. The contents of this oral CREA belong to two different genres with further subgenres. On the one hand, the bulk of the corpus is made up of recordings and transcripts from radio and TV programmes, including news, interviews, debates, documentaries, etc. On the other hand, the oral CREA also contains a section called otras grabaciones (other recordings), most of which consists of spontaneous conversations obtained from ten different oral corpora that have been adapted to the standards and conventions applied in CREA. These recordings are in turn divided into conversations of high and low formality. The latter, which correspond to sections 9205-9208 of the whole of CREA and contain 876,854 words, meet the criteria established by Briz (1998) and are thus chosen as the reference corpus of spontaneous colloquial conversation with which the dubbed transcripts of Friends are to be compared in the present thesis.

5.3. Methodology
This section sets out to present the methodology adopted for the analysis of the corpora described in 5.2. It has already been mentioned that the present thesis opts for a combination of quantitative and qualitative analysis. Yet, before delving further into them, a key methodological issue must be clarified.

As mentioned in 3.3, the focus of the present thesis is placed on Spanish DMs. It can thus be said that this thesis adopts a TT-oriented approach, differing considerably from more common approaches such as the one adopted by Chaume (2004d) in his small-scale study of DMs in dubbing. The reason for this departure lies in the idiosyncrasy of dubbing in general and the dubbed script in particular. In his study, Chaume (2004d) conducts a ST-TT search for DMs; in other words, he looks at ST DMs and then at their translations in the TT. Spanish DMs are only explored insofar as they are triggered by English DMs. Yet, this approach would not be valid for the purpose of the present study, which is to analyse the naturalness of the DMs used in the Spanish dubbed dialogue. If a ST-TT search was to be performed here, a great deal of Spanish DMs, namely those that are not triggered by ST DMs, would go unnoticed. Considering that, as advanced in 3.2.3, DMs are often added in dubbed scripts for no other reason than their naturalistic effect and with no one-to-one correspondence in the ST, it seems reasonable to start from the analysis of the TT, thus ensuring that all Spanish DMs chosen as objects of study are accounted for. This does not mean that ST DMs are excluded from this
analysis, but rather that they are analysed insofar as they trigger TT DMs, whose naturalness constitutes the focus of the present thesis.

As for the **quantitative analysis** of the corpora, the relevant data is compiled in three types of tables, the first two of which feature occurrences per 100,000 words, calculated to one decimal place. First of all, a general table presents the total occurrences of all the Spanish DMs of a given type in the three corpora analysed. Secondly, individual tables are introduced comparing the occurrence of every marker in TT and CREA. An important problem here is posed by the different size of the corpora, especially of CREA as compared to both SV and TT. This difference in size calls into question the significance of the results obtained. To overcome this difficulty, the present thesis has resorted to the log-likelihood test, a statistical tool which draws into the factor of the number of tokens and their percentage in the total corpora and then calculates whether these differences have statistic significance\(^{23}\). Given that this test can only be performed between two corpora, it is not included in the general tables with data from the three corpora but in the different individual tables. Finally, this quantitative analysis also features tables with all the ST units, whether or not DMs, triggering the TT DMs under scrutiny.

As far as the **qualitative analysis** is concerned, it is introduced by way of discussion within the individual analyses of every marker once the quantitative data has been presented. However, before describing the structure and methodology of this discussion, it is necessary to dwell on a particular phase of this qualitative analysis that is carried out even before the quantitative analysis, one that may in fact be regarded as a prerequisite for the latter to be performed —the identification of DMs in the corpora. As explained in 3.2.2, the grammaticalisation and multifunctionality of DMs often make it difficult to identify these units, as they may occur as DMs with different functions and not even as DMs. In the latter cases, the distinction between DMs and non-DMs is facilitated by the application of the general characteristics of DMs described in 3.2.2. Besides, given that the DMs analysed in this thesis are colloquial Spanish DMs, the features put forward by Martin and Portolés (1999), outlined in 3.3, also constitute an invaluable help to find out

\(^{23}\) According to this test, only results over 3.84 may be regarded as significant. For further information, see [http://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/llwizard.html](http://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/llwizard.html) (last accessed on 20 January 2007).
whether or not a given unit is a DM. Finally, as for the distinction between different functions of the same DM, it is necessary to draw on the specific characteristics of every type of DM analysed, which have been included in 3.3.1, 3.3.2 and 3.3.3.

Once a given unit has been identified as a DM of the relevant type and the above-mentioned quantitative data has been presented in general and individual tables, the qualitative analysis is carried out. This analysis consists of a discussion of the quantitative results looking at the occurrences in context and paying special attention to the visuals or, more accurately, to the interaction of the different audiovisual codes.

First of all, the focus is placed on the ST units triggering the TT DMs analysed. This is done with the help of the individual quantitative tables and is essential to determine whether or not a given TT DM may be considered as a calque. Yet, the bulk of this qualitative analysis is concerned with the use of Spanish DMs in the three Spanish corpora (TT, SV and CREA). One of the most important steps is to ascertain whether the dialogue analysed conforms to the conditions established by Briz (see 3.1) for a conversation to be colloquial. As explained in 5.2, the corpora analysed in this thesis is supposed to feature colloquial conversation, whether prefabricated (ST, TT and SV) or spontaneous (CREA). Yet, it is often the case that what looks like a colloquial conversation, or what has been classified as such in CREA, turns out to contain non-colloquial features. This may happen, for instance, when a speaker takes responsibility for the management of the interactional event (de Fina 1997). In this case, the relation of equality between the participants is violated, becoming one of [+power] and [-solidarity], and the conversation becomes less dynamic, less cooperative and, in sum, no longer colloquial. In some cases (see 6.4), the qualitative analysis performed must be as specific as to indicate who is using what DM to address whom in what situation. This detailed analysis, especially when applied to CREA, often yields interesting insight into possible cross-linguistic correspondences for some of the ST DMs identified.

Besides, the qualitative analysis proposed in this thesis also sheds light on other aspects of the use of DMs in the corpora analysed. In some cases, it may be important to investigate what units a given DM co-occurs with (see 6.1). In others, this analysis allows a further specification as to the function of a DM (see 6.5) and it can even serve to discover new functions that were not anticipated (see 6.2.3.3). On many occasions, the
qualitative analysis has to be tailored to the particular type of DM studied, depending on what is pertinent to examine, be it its prospective/retrospective orientation (see 6.2) or its role in monologue/dialogue (see 6.5). At any rate, it is often the case that this qualitative analysis clarifies the results shown in the quantitative tables.

Last but by no means least, the qualitative analysis is concerned with the audiovisual component of the corpora, which is excluded from CREA. The focus is in this case placed on the interaction between the acoustic and the visual codes as explained by Chaume (2004a) and described in 2.3.3.3. As pointed out in 4.2.1, six of the ten codes distinguished by Chaume are applied in this qualitative analysis. This sheds a great deal of light on why certain DMs are used, providing valuable information that would have been overlooked should the analysis be only quantitative or even qualitative but without the audiovisual component. It is important to note that the qualitative analysis included in this thesis only refers to dubbing constraints when they are found to be relevant to the translation of the DMs analysed. If no mention is made, it is because, although still present, they are not considered to have an influence on the use of these units. All in all, this analysis helps to ascertain the extent to which the interaction of the audiovisual codes in a given scene constrains the dubbing translator\(^\text{24}\) or whether, on the contrary, it provides him/her with translational freedom.

Finally, once both the quantitative and qualitative analyses have been performed, the next step is to try to elucidate whether or not the TT DMs chosen as objects of study may be considered natural on the basis of the definition of naturalness proposed in 2.4.4.2. This and other issues are dealt with in the conclusions of every analysis, where the main findings and results obtained are summarised and discussed.

\(^{24}\text{As explained in 2.3.2, this reference must be extended to the dialogue writer, the dubbing actors and the dubbing director, all of whom may have a direct input on the final version of the dubbed script.}\)
CHAPTER 6
ANALYSIS OF THE CORPORA

6.1. HRMs
6.1.1. Description of the HRMs to be analysed

6.1.1.1. Bueno
Due to its multifunctionality, bueno is one of the most common DMs in colloquial conversation in Spanish, where it can act as a deontic (3.3.3.2), interactive (3.3.2) or metadiscourse marker (3.3.1). Within the latter group, it can play the role of a TM or a HRM (Martín and Portolés 1999). As a HRM, it allows speakers to correct and reformulate their own discourse (Lindqvist 2005). In this sense, it is often suggested as the most common and straightforward translation for well, and, in general, as a fairly transparent DM in terms of meaning, which may help to explain why it is one of the first DMs to be used (and overused) by non-native speakers of Spanish (Lindqvist 2005).

6.1.1.2. O sea
Apart from being a marker of consequence or conclusion (Martín and Portolés 1999), o sea is an extremely recurrent HRM with an added sociological value that has led Briz (1998:212; my translation) to label the current generation of young Spanish people as the “o sea generation”. It provides time for speakers to think and hold their turn, supporting them in their hesitation (Cortés 1991) and, according to Schwenter (1996:864), marking their “ongoing thought processes” as they organise and prepare their next utterance. Schwenter (ibid.:864) also notes a number of regularities in the use of this marker – it tends to occur in medial position and with “first person singular subjects and belief verbs”. Needless to say, the different nuances attached to o sea make it difficult to find one-to-one correspondences in other languages, hence its scarce and problematic use among non-native speakers (Lindqvist 2005). Some of the English translations suggested in the literature are well, sort of and like (Stenström 2006).

6.1.1.3. Vamos
Vamos is usually regarded as a complex DM, especially because it has gradually gained new values and meanings over time (Romero Aguilera 2006). As an independent, (semi)lexicalised unit (i.e. not as a verb), vamos can function as an interjection or a conversational DM (ibid.). The interjection is the first non-literal use of vamos and the
most common one in colloquial conversation, where it serves as a stimulant (Vigara 1992) to persuade the addressee to do something (Hernández García 1997). When fulfilling its more specialised role as a HRM, it allows speakers to search for the right expression, while, at the same time, showing signs of cooperation and complicity with the hearer. According to Martín and Portolés (1999), this complicity comes from the original features of vamos as a verb, given that it is used with first person plural subjects and therefore includes both the speaker and the hearer.

6.1.1.4. Pues

Although its functions are manifold, Martín and Portolés (1999) make a clear distinction between the role of pues as a connector (indicating either cause or consequence) and its role as a sentence-initial “commentator” in colloquial conversation, where it introduces content regarded by the speaker as particularly valuable and relevant to what has been said before. However, except for some specific cases, this sentence-initial pues does not indicate hesitation. In this sense, what is relevant to this study is the use of the “commentator” pues in sentence-medial position, where it is often preceded or followed by pauses (Stenström 2006) and enables speakers to hold their turn as they struggle to formulate and reformulate their discourse (Briz 1998). As it happens with o sea, pues is one of the last DMs to be acquired by non-native speakers, probably due to the low correlation between form and meaning (Lindqvist 2005).

6.1.1.5. Es que

In essence, es que is a copulative structure with an omitted subject (Lindqvist 2005). However, its common occurrence in spoken language, especially among young people, as a lexicalised unit and always in the present, has earned it the status of DM (España Villasante 1996). As such, its pragmatic function is to introduce justification or explanation in the discourse (Porroche Ballesteros 1998). In instances of hesitation and (self-)repair, it is usually found in sentence-medial position as a strategy to buy time to think during the on-line production of spontaneous discourse (España Villasante 1996). It still fulfills the pragmatic function of justification, but it occurs in a context of hesitation along with other performance phenomena such as repeats and false starts. Unlike pues and o sea, es que seems to pose no problems for non-native speakers, who, if anything, and as it happens with bueno, tend to overuse it (Lindqvist 2005).
6.1.1.6. *Claro* and *hombre*

The role of *claro* and *hombre* as HRMs is marginal as compared to their role as evidential and interactive markers respectively (see 3.3.3.1 and 3.3.2 or Martín and Portolés 1999). However, when used in hesitation, they are useful *muletillas* or supports for the speaker. Unlike *pues*, they do not usually introduce long pauses, whether filled or unfilled, and, especially in the case of *hombre* (and probably due to its origin as a vocative), they carry a friendly connotation that makes them suitable for colloquial conversation (Martín and Portolés 1999). Finally, another feature of these two markers (which also applies to *es que*) is that they tend to co-occur with connectors indicating cause, consequence or objection such as *porque*, *y* and *pero*.

6.1.1.7. *En fin* and *verás*

First of all, it should be noted that neither *en fin* nor *verás* are regarded in the literature as HRMs. Yet, they are mentioned here because, as will be explained below, they have been found to play this role in the TT. *En fin* is regarded in the literature as a summarising marker (Martín and Portolés 1999) used in colloquial conversation to present a summary or a conclusion of what has been said. When this previous utterance is a digression from the main topic of the conversation, *en fin* is used to resume this topic (Flores Acuña 2001), hence its similarity to the resumptive DM *anyway* (Ferrara 1997). Although Flores Acuña (2001) does point out that *en fin* may be used to convey doubt, she also explains that this only occurs in very particular cases in which the speaker attempts to introduce a conclusion but fails to do so. As for *verás*, its presence as a HRM in the TT is even more striking, given its complete absence in the literature. As a matter of fact, only brief references in passing have been found about this DM (Beinhauer 1964, Briz 1998), all of which describe it as an AG, that is, a DM used by the speaker to draw attention to what is being said (Romero Trillo 1997).  

---

25 Its use as an AG in the TT is analysed and discussed in 6.4.
6.1.2. Quantitative analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HRM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>CREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bueno</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O sea</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>119.7</td>
<td>316.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vamos</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>327.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es que</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claro</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hombre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1. HRMs in the three corpora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HRM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bueno</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2. The HRM bueno in the TT and SV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HRM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>CREA</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bueno</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>75.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3. The HRM bueno in the TT and CREA

---

26 The figures included in this table account for the occurrence of these units as HRMs, not as DMs with other functions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST unit</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okay</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uh/um</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You know</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I mean</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-I-I</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of course</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeah</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinda just</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m just, it’s</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.4. ST units triggering the HRM *bueno* in the TT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HRM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O sea</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>119.7</td>
<td>164.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.5. The HRM *o sea* in the TT and SV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HRM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>CREA</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O sea</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>316.8</td>
<td>615.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.6. The HRM *o sea* in the TT and CREA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST unit</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I mean</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In that</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.7. ST units triggering the HRM *o sea* in the TT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HRM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vamos</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.8. The HRM *vamos* in the TT and SV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HRM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>CREA</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vamos</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>125.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.9. The HRM *vamos* in the TT and CREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST unit</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I mean</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.10. ST units triggering the HRM *vamos* in the TT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HRM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>35.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.11. The HRM *pues* in the TT and SV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HRM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>CREA</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>327.1</td>
<td>672.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.12. The HRM *pues* in the TT and CREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HRM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Es que</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>26.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.13. The HRM *es que* in the TT and SV
### Table 6.14. The HRM *es que* in the TT and CREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>CREA</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Es que</em></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>68.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6.15. ST units triggering the HRM *es que* in the TT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST units</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uh//um</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s that</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6.16. Most recurrent units preceding *es que* in the three corpora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HRM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>CREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pero</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porque</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Es que</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6.17. The HRMs *claro* and *hombre* in the TT and SV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HRM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Claro</em></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hombre</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6.18. The HRMs *claro* and *hombre* in the TT and CREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HRM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>CREA</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Claro</em></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>61.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hombre</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST units</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.19. ST units triggering the HRM *claro* in the TT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>CREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pero</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porque</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es que</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hombre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pero</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porque</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es que</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.20. Most recurrent units preceding the HRMs *claro* and *hombre* in the three corpora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HRM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>En fin</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>92.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verás</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>106.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.21. *En fin* and *verás* in the TT and SV as HRMs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HRM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>CREA</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>En fin</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>242.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verás</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>290.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.22. *En fin* and *verás* in the TT and CREA as HRMs
Table 6.23. ST units triggering *en fin* as a HRM in the TT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST unit</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I mean</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You know</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Um/Uh</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okay</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-I am</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A first look at the results included in table 6.1 shows a consistently lower occurrence of HRMs in the TT as compared to SV and especially to CREA. The biggest difference is found in the use of *o sea*, which is 40 times less recurrent than in SV and over 100 times than in CREA. The only exception is *bueno*, more frequent in the TT than in SV, and yet nowhere near as common as in CREA. Overall, the TT seems to feature less hesitation in terms of total numbers and also less variation (*pues* and *hombre* are absent) than the other two corpora. Finally, one last comment should be devoted to the comparison between the three corpora and their results. As explained in 5.2, the three corpora represent a gradual transition from constrained to non-constrained dialogue: from fictional and translated (TT), to fictional but not translated (SV), to non fictional and non

Table 6.24. ST units triggering *verás* as a HRM in the TT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST unit</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uh/um</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You know</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I mean</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-ever</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-I</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The-the</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Her-her</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
translated (CREA). However, the results do not reflect this gradual transition, as the gap between the TT and SV is wider than that between SV and CREA. Does this mean that there is something in the translational dimension of the Spanish dubbese used in the TT (see 2.4.3.2) that determines the use of HRMs? Is it that dubbing constraints play a fundamental role in this case? Or is it that the ST is not natural? The qualitative analysis below should help to throw some light on these questions.

6.1.3. Qualitative analysis

6.1.3.1. Bueno

Tables 6.2 and 6.3 include a comparison between the frequencies of bueno in the three corpora as well as data on the significance of this comparison. There is a considerable statistical difference between the results from the TT and CREA, but it is also worth noting that bueno is by far the most common HRM in the TT. This is the only case in which the frequency of a HRM in the TT is similar to that in SV, the log-likelihood test showing no significant difference between them.

As shown in table 6.4, in 60% of the cases, bueno is used in the TT to translate an English HRM (well, you know, I mean, like) or unlexicalised filled pauses (uh/um), also regarded as hesitation phenomena. In the rest of the cases, it translates different units used in instances of hesitation either as performance phenomena (repeats such as I-I-I) or along with performance phenomena (false starts, restarts, lengthenings, self corrections, filled and unfilled pauses, etc.) (see description of performance phenomena in 3.3.1.1). Therefore, with the exception of some of the cases triggered by O, bueno is used in the TT to translate moments of natural hesitation in the ST:

- Instances of self-repair

(Ex. 1)
Ross: Okay, I have a question, **well**, actually, it’s not so much a question as… more of a general wondering… ment.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Ross: Tengo una pregunta, **bueno**, de hecho, no, no, no es una pregunta sino un pensamiento general...

(Friends: Episode 7 – season 1)
- Instances of hesitation

(Ex. 2)
Ross: No, no, no. Technically the... sex is not... being had. But that’s... see, that’s not the point. See, um, the point is that... well, Rachel and I should be, uh, well, Rachel and I should be together.

(Ross: No, no, no. Técnicamente el sexo no se ha llevado a cabo todavía... Pero eso no es el problema...Verás, la cuestión es que, bueno, Rachel y yo deberíamos estar..., bueno, Rachel y yo deberíamos estar juntos. (Friends: Episode 7 – season 1)

Apart from the presence of some units that may be characteristic of the TT, such as verás (see 6.1.3.7), the hesitation shown in the dubbed script with bueno is very similar to what can be found in SV and CREA:

- Bueno + de hecho for self-repair, as in (Ex. 1):

(Ex. 3)
De verdad, de verdad, o sea, yo te admiro mogollón, pero mucho, o sea, no sé, o sea, bueno, de hecho, soy fan tuyo, ¿sabes?

(SV: Episode 7)

- Es que + bueno for hesitation, as in (Ex. 2):

(Ex. 4)
No, no, el, el problema no es ese, es otro. Es, es que, bueno, en efecto, yo tenía molestias musculares y esto en el lado derecho.

(CREA)

As for the use of bueno to translate Ø, it reveals further insight into the use of this HRM in Friends:

(Ex. 5)
Ross: Okay. Here goes. Um, for a while now, I've been wanting to, um....

(Ross: Vale, allá va. Um, bueno, ya hace mucho tiempo que quiero... verás...

(Friends: Episode 7 – season 1)

In this example, um, for a while could have been rendered perfectly well as em, ya hace mucho tiempo. A closer look at the scene shows, however, an important dubbing constraint at play: although the Spanish utterance is slightly longer than the English one, the speed at which Ross has delivered his hesitant utterances in this scene is considerably higher in Spanish. Unless he drops his speed of delivery considerably for this line, the Spanish dubbing actor will find himself with no text to deliver as Ross is
still moving his mouth on screen, thus violating the principle of isochrony, regarded as the most important of all synchronies (Chaume forthcoming; see 2.3.3.3). An addition must therefore be made to the TT. Bueno is in this case the chosen unit, perhaps in line with a general tendency to add DMs to provide fictional dialogue with a naturalistic effect (Fox and Schrock 1999). Bueno thus contributes to the (natural) hesitation of the TT. However, the addition of bueno to translate Ø is not always caused by dubbing constraints:

(Ex. 6)
Phoebe’s mum: So, however hard it is to give up this puppy, it would be a million times harder to give up a child.

Phoebe’s mum: Así que por muy difícil que te resulte desprenderte de este perrito, bueno, sería un millón de veces más difícil desprenderte de un hijo.

(Friends: Episode 11 – season 4)

In (Ex. 6), the use of bueno is motivated by another specificity of AVT that is all too often overlooked in favour of the ever-present constraints – the audiovisual leeway. Before Phoebe’s mum mentions the word puppy, the camera changes the shot to her back, where it remains until the utterance is finished. Further corroborating the importance of the shooting code in dubbing (see 2.3.3.3), the second part of the sentence provides a great deal of freedom in terms of translation. Thus, there is no apparent reason why bueno should be added, other than the fact that it is possible to do so. Given that Phoebe’s mum is visually nervous in the scene, the translator introduces a hesitant bueno presumably for a naturalistic effect; in other words, not because s/he has to (constraints) but because s/he can (leeway).

As shown so far, bueno is not only used in the TT to translate English HRMs (well, I mean, you know) and unlexicalised filled pauses (uh/um), but also very different performance phenomena (I-I-I-, kinda just, no I’m just it’s…) and even Ø, that is, as an addition when it is obligatory (constraints) or possible (leeway). Bueno can thus be described as a privileged carrier of orality (Pavesi 2005; see 2.4.3.2), that is, a feature that is systematically chosen, in this case in hesitations, to convey an impression of spontaneity in translation.

In theory, this should not be a problem, given the high occurrence of bueno in both fictional and spontaneous Spanish. However, the naturalness of the TT could be affected
if the systematic selection of *bueno* as a default hesitation marker means that no other Spanish HRM is used along with it. In other words, lack of variation could also result in an unnatural TT.

6.1.3.2. *O sea*

As indicated in tables 6.5 and 6.6, the HRM *o sea* shows the biggest difference between the TT and the two non-translated corpora. It occurs only 3 times, thus being 40 times less frequent than in SV and over 100 times less frequent than in CREA. The gap between the TT and SV is much wider than that between SV and CREA, where *o sea* occurs only 2.5 times more often. The three occurrences of *o sea* in the TT are the following:

(Ex. 7)
Melanie: You’re like the most generous man I ever met, **I mean**, you’re practically a woman.

Melanie: Eres el hombre más generoso que he conocido nunca, **o sea**, prácticamente eres una mujer.

(Friends: Episode 24 – season 1)

(Ex. 8)
Chandler: Yeah, but that’s like two blocks away from the beach, **I mean**, it’s a total party zoo.

Chandler: Sí, pero está a dos manzanas de la playa, **o sea**, que es un zoo con demasiada marcha.

(Friends: Episode 21 – season 1)

(Ex. 9)
Phoebe: It’s, **I mean**, it’s nothing, I’m fine. It’s my friends. They-they have a liking problem with you. **In that**, um, they don’t.

Phoebe: Está bien. No es nada serio, estoy bien. Pero, verás... son mis amigos. Tienen un problema de simpatía hacia ti, **o sea que**... no la tienen.

(Friends: Episode 13 – season 1)

All three examples illustrate how the speakers use *o sea* to pause briefly as they hold their turn (Cortes 1991). As for (Ex. 7), it shows what has already been pointed out by Chaume (2004d), namely that *o sea* may sometimes be a very appropriate translation for *I mean* in cases like this one, in which they both enable the speaker to pause and reformulate an utterance. As a matter of fact, this is a very natural use of *o sea*, also found in the following examples from SV and CREA, which feature many other HRMs and performance phenomena apart from *o sea*:
Laura: Sí, sí tú a mí tampoco me gustas, o sea, quiero decir, no es que no me gustes, vamos, mm, que, vamos, que sí que me gustas pero no en el sentido de gustar, gustar, sino que me gustas como un primo.

(SV: Episode 22)

(... pues mis padres al principio en esa casa, pues, pensaban que, pues, que podrían alquilar un la mitad más o menos, o sea, el bajo porque era una amplia casa, o sea, era grande, una casa grande, amplia y que, bueno, pues eso, que tenía mucho espacio.

(CREA)

Both SV and CREA also feature uses of o sea which do not necessarily indicate self-repair, but just hesitation on the part of the speaker:

Ex. 12
Paco: (...) yo te admiro mogollón, pero mucho, o sea, no sé, o sea, bueno, de hecho, soy fan tuyo, ¿sabes?

(SV: Episode 7)

Ex. 13
- Entonces, ¿no te vale ningún otro equipo?
- Hombre, es que, en fin, o sea, me vale, pero, pero me haces polvo.

(CREA)

These cases of hesitation and self-repair are either identical or very similar to many of the contexts in which I mean occurs in spontaneous colloquial conversation (Fox and Schrock 2002). Yet, out of the 357 occurrences of I mean in the ST (an average of 1 every 3 minutes), only 2 have been translated as o sea. Thus, judging by the results shown in table 6.7, there seems to be no systematic use of this Spanish marker. Unlike the case of bueno, which is systematically used to translate well, the occurrence of o sea is so random that it could be down to occasional contributions of the dubbing actors (see 2.4.3.2). This absence of o sea is all the more unnatural considering its frequency in CREA, where it is the second most recurrent HRM after pues, and in SV, where there is 1 o sea every 6 minutes. In contrast, the TT features 1 o sea every 6 hours.

6.1.3.3. Vamos

Tables 6.8 and 6.9 show with significant results not only how rare and random the HRM vamos is in the TT but also, as in the case of o sea, the fact that there is no proportional correlation between the three corpora. Whereas vamos is over 10 times more common in
SV than in the TT, it is only 4 times more recurrent in CREA than in SV. The following examples show the two occurrences of *vamos* as a HRM in the TT:

(Ex.14)
Paula: Listen, as someone who’s seen more than her fair share of bad beef, I’ll tell you: that is not such a terrible thing, *I mean*, they’re your friends.

Paula: Oye, hablando como alguien que ha visto más carne de tercera que nadie en el mundo, opino que tampoco es tan terrible, *vamos*, son tus amigos.  
(Friends: Episode 3 – season 1)

(Ex.15)
Rachel: Please, they’ve been going out a week. They haven’t even slept together yet, *I mean*, that’s not serious.

Rachel: Oh, por favor, ya hace una semana que salen y ni si quiera se han acostado, *vamos*, eso no es serio.  
(Friends: Episode 16 – season 1)

Both examples point to the suitability of *vamos* for the translation of an English HRM like *I mean* when it has a stalling effect allowing speakers to pause briefly before resuming their utterance. The examples extracted from SV and CREA suggest that the utterance following *vamos* may or may not be a reformulation:

- hesitation without reformulation:
  (Ex. 16)
Paco: Pero, *vamos*, en mi planeta soy clavadito a Brad Pitt.  
(SV: Episode 15)

  (Ex. 17)
Yo quería hacer un, *vamos*, que cuando en la conferencia, que insistes mucho en el punto de que las mujeres cuando se casaban dependían totalmente de su familia.  
(CREA)

- hesitation with self-repair or reformulation:
  (Ex. 18)
Laura: Eh, eh, eh, no, no, ta, tranquilo, tranquilo, no te pongas nervioso. Si, si tú a mí tampoco me gustas. O sea qu, quiero deci r, no es que no me gustes, vaya, mm, que, *vamos*, que sí que me gustas pero no en el sentido de gustar, gustar, sino que me gustas como un primo.  
(SV: Episode 22)

  (Ex. 19)
(CREA)
The fact that \textit{vamos} occurs only twice in the dubbed script as a HRM does not mean that it is never used as an independent, (semi)lexicalised unit (see 6.1.1.3). In fact, the TT features up to 169 occurrences of the original and most traditional lexicalised value of \textit{vamos} –the interjection or stimulant (Vigara 1992). 90\% of these occurrences are translations of \textit{come on}. Thus, the TT shows a clear preference for the traditional lexicalised \textit{vamos} as an interjection (98\%) to the detriment of the more modern and specialised HRM \textit{vamos} (2\%). The analysis of this distribution in SV and CREA shows results that are, once again, similar to one another but different from the ones in the TT: fewer occurrences of \textit{vamos} as an interjection (70\% in SV, 66\% in CREA) and more of \textit{vamos} as a HRM (30\% in SV, 34\% in CREA).

\textbf{6.1.3.4. Pues}

The first conclusion that can be drawn from tables 6.11 and 6.12 is that \textit{pues} is, together with \textit{hombre}, the only HRM that is completely absent from the TT. This is not to say, however, that \textit{pues} does not feature in the dubbed script as a different type of DM. In fact, \textit{pues} has a frequency of 170 in the TT, mostly as a conversational marker in a sentence-initial position:

(Ex. 20)
Monica: Remember back in freshman year? \textbf{Well}, Billy Drestin and I had sex on your bed.

\begin{flushright}  
\end{flushright}

(Friends: Episode 17 – season 1)

(Ex. 21)
Ronni: Yeah, uh, Joey said I could use your shower, since, uh, Chandler’s in ours.

\begin{flushright}  
[b]Ronni: \textbf{Pues} sí, Joey me ha dicho que puedo utilizar tu ducha porque Chandler está en la nuestra.  
\end{flushright}

(Friends: Episode 13 – season 1)

In (Ex. 20), \textit{pues} is a commentator (Martín and Portolés 1999), as it introduces content that Monica regards as relevant to what has been said before or, in this case, to the question she has just posed. Even though \textit{well} is followed by a very brief pause, it is by no means an indicator of hesitation here, and certainly no hesitation (not even a pause) is shown in the translation either. The second example presents a different situation. The ST does contain two unlexicalised filled pauses (\textit{uh}) indicating hesitation, which have been ironed out in the translation –the first \textit{uh} has been translated as sentence-initial
commentator *pues*, thus showing relevance and cohesion but not hesitation, and the second *uh* has simply disappeared.

It is in SV and CREA where sentence-medial HRM *pues* can be found:

(Ex. 22)
Fernando: (...) ¿Qué más pasó después?
Sole: Pues después... después... *pues*..., *pues*..., bueno, sí, recuerdo una vez que Paco se comió veinte croquetas y... de una tacada. Bien, bien, bueno, tuvimos que llevarlo al hospital.

(SV: Episode 15)

(Ex. 23)
Entonces tenía este, esta perra, pero como ella hacía guardias y no la podía cuidar, y estos perros, *pues*, necesitan, *pues*... eso, una persona que esté con ellos, porque son perros de vivir en piso y muy cariñosos y que necesitan, *pues*, de un amo, ¿no?

(CREA)

Although the first *pues* in (Ex. 22) may be regarded as a sentence-initial commentator highlighting the relevance of the upcoming utterance, the next two are clearly HRMs, that is, turnholders providing time for the speaker to think. As such, they are used along with other indicators of hesitation like repeats and unfilled pauses. The same holds true for (Ex. 23), where the speaker uses *pues* on three occasions while also resorting to false starts and unfilled pauses. In this sense, the particularly high occurrence of mid-sentential hesitant *pues* with performance phenomena, especially unfilled pauses (Stenström 2006), could shed some light on another interesting aspect shown by tables 6.11 and 6.12— the considerable gap between SV and CREA, where *pues* is 15 times more recurrent that in SV. Unlike in the case of *o sea* and *vamos*, in this case the results in TT are similar to those in SV, and both very different to CREA. In other words, *pues* behaves very differently in fiction than it does in naturally-occurring dialogue. This may thus be explained by specific fictional constraints or, in the case of the TT, by the features included in the fictional dimension of the Spanish dubbese (2.4.3.1). Indeed, given the limited screen time available for fictional dialogue, whether or not dubbed, it is only normal that instances of hesitation with *pues* and unfilled pauses, being as they are particularly time-consuming performance phenomena, may become less recurrent. In any case, it is also important to note that this cannot account for the complete absence of the HRM *pues* in the dubbed script, as it can perfectly well be used to translate, for example, mid-sentential *well* indicating hesitation.
6.1.3.5. Es que

In line with what has been found so far, es que shows a much lower frequency in the TT than in the other two corpora (see tables 6.13 and 6.14), even though, it must be said, it is the second most common HRM in the dubbed script. The pattern is also repeated in terms of the similarity between SV and CREA. As for the ST units triggering es que (see table 6.15), they are all indicators of hesitation: whether HRMs (well), unlexicalised filled pauses (uh, um) or units that are not DMs but that are used in these specific cases as performance phenomena. Here are some of the examples:

(Ex. 24)
Joshua: Nothing, I, uh, it’s just that I know that they’re still out there.
Joshua: Nada, yo... es que... sé que aún están ahí fuera.
(Friends: Episode 18 – season 4)

(Ex. 25)
Ross: Uh, okay, it’s uh, Emily and I, we decided to uh, to get married.
Ross: Hm... bueno, veréis, es que... Emily y yo hemos decidido casarnos.
(Friends: Episode 19 – season 4)

(Ex. 26)
Fun Bobby: Hey, sorry I'm late. But my, uh, grandfather, he- died about two hours ago. But I-I-I couldn't get a flight out 'til tomorrow, so here I am!
Bobby el divertido: Hola cariño, siento llegar tarde. Pero es que, uh, mi abuelo, ha muerto hace un par de horas y no-no-no puedo coger un avión hasta mañana, así que, aquí estoy!
(Friends: Episode 10 – season 1)

In all three examples, es que is triggered by the same ST unit –the unlexicalised filled pause uh. Es que enables the speaker to pause briefly as he hesitates and, unlike previous HRMs, to provide a justification for his being nervous (Ex. 24), his having gathered his friends (Ex. 25) and his delay (Ex. 26). This pragmatic function of justification or explanation means that the scope of es que is more limited than that of other HRMs, which is not to say, however, that it cannot be used on many occasions. In fact, a close look at the ST reveals many cases in which it could have been used, certainly more than the 10 occurrences registered in the TT:

(Ex. 27)
Monica: Well... of course I thought of you! But... but...
Rachel: But, but?
Monica: But, you see, it’s just... this night has to go just perfect, you know?

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

127
Monica: Al principio pensé en ti, pero... pero...
Rachel: ¿Pero, pero?
Monica: Pero, verás, en esa cena todo tiene que salir perfecto, ¿sabes?

(Friends: Episode 15 – season 1)

(suggested translation)
Monica: Al principio pensé en ti, pero es que...
Rachel: ¿Es que qué?
Monica: Pues es que en esa cena todo tiene que salir perfecto, ¿sabes?

This example adds more insight into the issue of es que as a HRM. Judging by the results obtained from CREA and SV, and in line with what has been pointed out in the relevant literature (see 6.1.1), es que normally occurs after a series of units. Pero seems to be the most common one, as it allows the speaker to explain or justify why s/he has not done something, in this case, why Monica has not offered Rachel a job. The translation of but, but as (pero) es que and even that of but, but? as ¿es que qué? would therefore convey both the hesitation and the (attempted) justification present in the ST.

It is not the purpose of this study to provide a full characterisation of the HRM es que. However, as shown in table 6.16., a brief account of the units that tend to precede it in the three corpora sheds some more light on the (un)naturalness of the dubbed script. Indeed, it would appear that the unnatural use of es que in the dubbed script does not only have to do with its low frequency, but also with its lack of variation regarding its co-occurrence with other units that are very common in SV and CREA.

6.1.3.6. Claro and hombre

The qualitative analysis of the last two HRMs described in 6.1.1, claro and hombre (see tables 6.17, 6.18 and 6.19), suggests that these markers may offer a possible translation solution for instances of quick filled pauses used by speakers to stop briefly before resuming their message. These pauses are indeed much shorter than the unfilled and filled pauses that usually co-occur with pues, which makes these two markers much less time-consuming and thus more fiction-friendly than pues and especially useful for the translation of the ST. Claro emerges as a possible natural translation for you know (Ex.28), not only because you know is often used as a quick filled pause, but also because, just like claro, it places emphasis on shared knowledge (Schiffrin 1987):

(Ex. 28)
Ross: Apparently, they’re attracted to the dryer sheets, and, you know, they’re going in fine, but they’re coming out all... fluffy.

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Ross: Por lo visto, se sienten atraídas por la secadora y, claro, entran bien, pero salen un poco... despeinadas.

(Friends: Episode 5 – season 1)

As for hombre, it is absent from the TT and very rare in SV, but its occurrence in CREA (Ex.29) suggests that it is also a very common HRM, not least because the friendly connotation attached to this marker (Martín and Portolés 1999) could provide the TT with much-needed familiarity:

(Ex. 29)
Lo que sí puedo decir es que es, pero, en las casas pero, hombre, lo-lo-lo que, lo que no puedo decir, lo que no, lo que sí puedo decir es que en Lo en Logroño, una ciudad latina, la gente es más, más, exterioriza más su sociabilidad.

(CREA)

Finally, with regard to the issue of co-occurrence, mentioned in 6.1.1 and illustrated with table 6.16 in the case of es que, SV and CREA seem to paint once again a more varied landscape than the TT (see table 6.20), which features only one (y claro) of the eight combinations found in the non-translated corpora.

**6.1.3.7. *En fin* and *verás***

As explained in 6.1.1.7, neither verás nor en fin are described in the literature as HRMs, which is why they have not been included in table 6.1. This is in line with the results obtained in SV and CREA, where these markers are either extremely rare (en fin) or non-existent (verás) as HRMs (see tables 6.21 and 6.22). Yet, they feature as the second and third most recurrent HRMs in the TT. In the case of en fin, it is used in the TT to translate different hesitation phenomena, namely HRMs such as I mean or you know and unlexicalised filled pauses such as um and uh (see table 6.23).

As a matter of fact, en fin is used in the dubbed script as the second most common translation of the HRM I mean, the first one being the omission. Both strategies are present in the following example:

(Ex. 30)
Ross: I mean, why not? I mean, I mean, why not?

Ross: ¿Por qué no? En fin, ¿por qué no?

(Friends: Episode 19 – season 4)
As for verás, its occurrence as a HRM in the TT is even more unexpected and difficult to explain. As pointed out in 6.4, verás may be regarded as a formal AG, that is, a marker used by the speaker to draw attention to what is being said in exchanges in which the participants do not know each other (or at least are not close) and are separated by a considerable age difference. Needless to say, this is a completely different role to the one it plays here, where it translates common English HRMs such as well, you know or I mean (it is the third most common translation of this marker), unlexicalised filled pauses (uh/um) or even hesitation phenomena such as repeats (see table 6.24).

Given that verás is a formal AG, its use in hesitation may be regarded as unnatural. In (Ex.31), for example, the ST features Paul stuttering in a tense situation (an intimate confession) as he uses performance phenomena. Instead, the TT provides him with a much more confident attitude. Um and uh are omitted and the repeat (ever-ev-ever) is turned into verás, with which Paul no longer hesitates but formally draws the attention of the addressee to what he is about to say:

(Ex.31)
Paul: Well, ever-ev-ever since she left me, um, I haven’t been able to, uh, perform sexually.
Paul: Bueno, verás, desde que ella me abandonó, yo no he conseguido volver a funcionar sexualmente.

(Friends: Episode 1 – season 1)

Most importantly, verás is often added to the TT, like bueno, as a (unnatural) privileged carrier of orality to convey hesitation in instances of audiovisual leeway:

(Ex.32)
Chandler: It’s—it’s about Kathy. Um, I like her. I like her a lot, actually.

(Friends: Episode 7 – season 4)

In this example, a one-to-one translation of um as bueno would have fitted perfectly in the actor’s lips. Yet, the leeway that typically characterises isochrony (see 2.4.3.2) allows the addition of a two-syllable word such as verás without losing synchrony. Once again, this instance suggests that the translator is adding a HRM not as an imposition of dubbing constraints but as a personal choice, risking a certain loss of synchrony, presumably to add a naturalistic effect. The problem is that, unlike in the case of bueno, verás only makes the TT more unnatural.
6.1.4. Conclusions

HRMs are invariably more recurrent in CREA than in the fictional corpora. This may be explained by the fact that hesitation is a time-consuming phenomenon that has to be minimised due to the different requirements of a script, in this case to the extradiegetic constraint posed by the limited screen-time available (see 2.4.3.1). A case in point is *pues*, which is often used with relatively long unfilled pauses and which is notably more recurrent in CREA than in any of the fictional corpora.

With some exceptions (*pues*), SV seems to mirror CREA to a large extent. This resemblance is in fact quite consistent in terms of percentages for most of the markers analysed, which gives a good idea of how close non-translated fictional dialogue is to spontaneous dialogue. In other words, it helps to ascertain what influence the fictional constraints have on the creation of (non-translated) prefabricated orality.

The TT shows very different results to SV and especially to CREA. There is in general less hesitation, less variation in the use hesitation markers and a number of unnatural features, namely the recurrent use of *en fin* and *verás* as HRMs.

The lack of variation is illustrated by the choice of *bueno* as a privileged carrier of orality. This marker is the preferred option (and often the only one) not only when an addition is required (dubbing constraints) but also when it is allowed (audiovisual leeway). Although *bueno* is very recurrent in spontaneous conversation, the translator makes an excessive use of it (sometimes along with other unnatural features), thus contributing to the lack of naturalness of the TT.

The lack of variation is shown both in the fact that few markers are used and in how these markers are used. Whereas SV and CREA feature a wide range of units that often co-occur with certain markers (*es que, claro*), TT shows a much more limited range of combinations.

The use of markers in the TT is characterised by a considerable lack of specialization. The TT favours traditional uses of markers (*bueno, vamos*) as opposed to more modern and specialised uses (*claro, vamos, hombre*) that are very common in SV and CREA.
The absence of certain HRMs (vamos, claro, hombre) prevents the TT from having a much-needed touch of familiarity in the dialogues (see 6.2). Besides, the fact that claro and hombre are often used in spontaneous conversation to fill brief pauses means that they are especially fiction-friendly, unlike pues, which would have made them very useful for the translation of the ST.

The absence of variation in the TT contributes to the creation of a language that is less natural and idiomatic than that found in SV and CREA, and that could be said to resemble the language used by a (proficient) non-native speaker. As a matter of fact, the results obtained in this study clearly mirror those obtained by Lindqvist (2005), who, looking at the use of DMs among native and non-native speakers, concludes that the latter use bueno (often excessively) and es que, but not other very common ones such as pues and o sea.

Another key factor to explain the lack of naturalness of the TT is the occurrence of en fin and verás as HRMs. The use of these markers to convey hesitation is regarded as extremely rare (en fin) or non-existent (verás) in the literature, which is confirmed by the results obtained in SV and CREA. Yet, they are the second and third most recurrent HRMs in the TT. En fin is usually a summarising marker which presents a conclusion or summary of a previous utterance and only very occasionally expresses hesitation. In the TT, it is the most common unit used to translate the ST HRM I mean (in 47 cases). As for the use of verás to express hesitation in the TT, it may be regarded as even more unnatural, given that this marker only features in the literature, and indeed in SV and CREA, as a formal AG. When used in the dubbed script, it provides the TT speaker with a confident tone that has nothing to do with the hesitation conveyed by the ST. Furthermore, on some occasions, verás is used either because something needs to be added (constraints) or because something can be added (leeway), thus corroborating its role as a privileged carrier of orality, which, in this case, carries lack of naturalness.

The results obtained in this study show that the gap between the TT (translated, fictional) and SV (non-translated, fictional) is wider than that between the latter and CREA (non-translated, non-fictional). In other words, the translational dimension of the language used in the TT seems to have more influence on the (lack of) naturalness of the dialogues than the fictional dimension. At least two arguments could be put forward to
explain this: the fact that the ST may not be natural and the restriction imposed by dubbing constraints.

As for the first argument, the ST seems, at least regarding hesitation, much more natural than the TT. Although not the focus of this analysis, the results show that the ST features a considerably higher number of common HRMs and unlexicalised filled pauses than the TT. The most recurrent ST HRM, *I mean*, undergoes two main treatments in translation—elimination (60% of the cases) or translation with unnatural features (21% of the cases).

A number of HRMs that are recurrent in SV and CREA could be used as translations for English HRMs. Occasional occurrences of *o sea* and *vamos* to translate *I mean* in the TT corroborate this, also showing that there is no systematic treatment for these recurrent ST units.

As for the second potential reason to explain the influence of the translational dimension on the naturalness of the TT, namely dubbing constraints, this study shows that, although important to a greater or lesser extent, they cannot be considered as crucial and certainly cannot account for this lack of naturalness. In fact, some instances of natural translations in the TT indicate that it is perfectly possible for the TT to convey hesitation naturally in spite of the said constraints.

The present study seems to corroborate what was already pointed out in 2.3.3.3, namely that the specificity of dubbing has to do not only with its constraints, but also with instances of leeway for the translator. This leeway has been found to be just as revealing as the constraints (if not more so) about the translation and the translator’s behaviour. Firstly, it strengthens the idea that dubbing constraints cannot account for the lack of naturalness of the TT (see examples 6 and 32). Finally, it is often in these moments of leeway that the translator adds the HRMs *bueno, en fin* and *verás*, presumably for naturalistic purposes, which indicates that the translator’s intention may be to produce as natural-sounding a script as possible.

Judging by the results obtained in this study, it is suggested that this objective has not been achieved, and that neither the ST nor dubbing constraints nor the fictional nature of the TT can fully account for this.
6.2. TMs
6.2.1. Description of the TMs to be analysed
6.2.1.1. Bueno and (muy) bien

As common TMs used in spontaneous conversation in Spanish, (muy) bien and bueno are usually defined and described by comparison/opposition to each other. According to Martín and Portolés (1999), they are both framing, metadiscourse devices used to indicate a change in topic as well as progression or the beginning of a new stage in the conversation. Most of the general characteristics of TMs outlined in 3.3.1.2 apply to these two markers.

However, a closer look reveals several differences between them. First of all, bien is less lexicalised than bueno, as it can be modified into muy bien (Martín and Portolés 1999). Besides, bien lacks the expressive value of bueno and is, according to Martín and Portolés (1999), more neutral, less friendly and often used by speakers who not only take part in a conversation, but actually run it, such as interviewers, teachers, doctors, etc. The use of this TM is therefore determined by (a) the social role of the speaker and (b) his/her attitude. In Chaume’s (2004d) view, it is normally used by authoritative speakers who want to appear as cold and detached.

Following this last point, it is important to remember that DMs in general vary not only within the speech vs. writing opposition but also within speech itself. Due to their multifunctionality (see 3.2.2), different DMs are used in different social occasions such as political discussions (Wilson 1993), therapeutic sessions (Gerhardt and Stinton 1994), medical interviews (Heritage and Sorjonen 1994) and colloquial conversation. In order to determine what effect the use of transitional (muy) bien might have in the TT, it is essential to mention what contexts and situations this marker is commonly used in. According to de Fina (1997), bien is especially recurrent in what is often referred to as classroom discourse (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975, Van Lier 1988, Cazden 1988). This discourse is characterised by specific time boundaries, social expectations, institutional needs, goal orientations and especially by a “fundamental asymmetry between participants determined by the institutional responsibility of the teacher” (de Fina 1997:339). Teachers use bien to signal an upcoming change in their discourse and very often the introduction of a new phase or activity in the class. According to de Fina (ibid.), the use of bien highlights the centrality of the teacher’s role and cannot be found
in students’ talk. As a matter of fact, after a brief period of time in which the teacher and the students engage in personal, informal conversation in her data, thus blurring the social boundaries, the teacher quickly resorts to bien to regain her authoritative position. In this sense, de Fina points out that “it is the type of relationships established between participants that seems to crucially determine the kind of functions that (muy) bien can have in spoken Spanish” (ibid.:352).

In sum, (muy) bien does not occur in colloquial settings (Fuentes Rodríguez 1993), but in more formal and stereotyped exchanges such as interviews, therapeutic sessions or classroom discourse, that is to say, in situations where one of the participants is responsible for the management of the conversation (de Fina 1997). As for bueno, it is constantly used to signal transition in colloquial conversation (Gregori-Signes 1996) and, as pointed out by Martín and Portolés (1999), its use by a doctor or a teacher may well be due to an intention of attenuating or softening up an utterance.

6.2.1.2. De acuerdo and está bien

As it happened in the case of en fin and verás used as HRMs (see 6.1.1.7), neither de acuerdo nor está bien are TMs (which is why they have not been included in table 6.25 but in table 6.33), but they are used as such in the TT. In the relevant literature, both markers are regarded as markers of agreement. Camacho Adarve (2005) classifies de acuerdo as a “marcador interactivo de acuerdo” (interactive marker of agreement) and Llorente Maldonado de Guevara (1980) and Gómez Capuz (2001a) regard está bien as a natural translation for alright when signalling agreement. Apart from having a very different pragmatic function to TMs, these markers also differ from TMs in the key issue of their orientation (see 3.2.2). As markers of agreement, de acuerdo and está bien focus on prior information, that is, they point backward in the text (Schiffrin 1987). In the TT, however, they are used as TMs and are thus expected to point forward in the text to upcoming information.
6.2.2. Quantitative analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>CREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bueno</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Muy) bien</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>173.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>146.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>75.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.25. Occurrences of the TMs *bueno* and *(muy) bien* in the three corpora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bueno</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>14.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.26. The TM *bueno* in the TT and SV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>CREA</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bueno</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.27. The TM *bueno* in the TT and CREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST unit</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>So</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okay</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alright</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okay so</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alright well</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You know what</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>97</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.28. ST units triggering the TM *bueno* in the TT

---

28 The figures included in this table account for the occurrence of these units as TMs, not as DMs with other functions, given that they can also occur in colloquial conversation as markers of agreement, for example.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Muy) bien</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>102.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.29. The TM (muy) bien in the TT and SV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>CREA</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Muy) bien</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>325.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.30. The TM (muy) bien in the TT and CREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST unit</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Okay</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alright</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.31.: ST units triggering the TM bien in the TT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST unit</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alright</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alrighty</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.32.: ST units triggering the TM muy bien in the TT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>CREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De acuerdo</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Está bien</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.33. Occurrences of de acuerdo and está bien as TMs in the three corpora
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST unit</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alright</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okay</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.34. ST units triggering *de acuerdo* as a TM in the TT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST unit</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alright</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okay</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uh</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.35. ST units triggering *está bien* as a TM in the TT

The quantitative results included in table 6.25 show, first of all, an overall lower occurrence of TMs in CREA than in SV and especially than in the TT. This may be explained by the fictional nature of the latter two corpora. As explained in 2.4.3.1, many of the 15-18 conversations featuring in an episode do not start with a greeting or an introduction, but with a marker (visual, verbal or both) indicating transition between scenes. It thus follows that TMs are likely to occur more often here than in spontaneous conversation. Another aspect that stands out is the high occurrence of (*muy*) *bien* in the TT. Whereas both SV and CREA clearly opt for *bueno*, the dubbed script of *Friends* features an almost even distribution of (*muy*) *bien* and *bueno*. This mismatch between translated and non-translated corpora could be due to some factor included in the translational dimension of the language used in the TT (see 2.4.3.2), such as the ST units triggering (*muy*) *bien* or dubbing constraints. In order to clarify this point and ascertain what effect the (over)use of this marker may have on the TT, a qualitative analysis must be carried out.

6.2.3. Qualitative analysis

6.2.3.1. Bueno

The quantitative and qualitative analysis of the corpora shows what seems to be a natural use of the TM *bueno* in the TT. Firstly, it is used to translate ST TMs that are common
in colloquial conversation in English, especially so, okay, well and alright (see table 6.28). Secondly, from a quantitative point of view, it shows no significant difference with CREA (see table 6.27). Finally, it seems to have the same pragmatic function it has in spontaneous colloquial conversation, i.e. to change the topic and move on to a new stage in the conversation. This means that it not only appears in the middle of a conversation (Ex. 33 and 34), but also at the beginning, introducing the first topic (Ex. 35 and 36)29:

(Ex. 33)
Rachel: I loved the moment when you first saw the giant dog shadow all over the park.
Phoebe: Yeah, but did they have to shoot him down? I mean, that was just mean.
Monica: Okay, right about now the turkey should be crispy on the outside, juicy on the inside. Why are we standing here?

Rachel: Me ha impresionado ver la sombra de ese perro gigante sobre el parque.
Phoebe: Sí, pero, ¿era necesario dispararle? Ha sido muy cruel.
Monica: Bueno, el pavo ya debería estar doradito por fuera y jugoso por dentro. ¿Qué hacemos aquí?

(Friends: Episode 9 – season 1)

(Ex. 34)
Pero una vez que estás, o sea, que estáis juntos y en casa, pues siete no parecen tantos... Bueno, en fin, dejémonos de rollos y os cuento un poco, ¿no?

(CREA)

(Ex. 35)
Chandler: So...
Janice: Just us.

Chandler: Bueno...
Janice: Al fin solos.

(Friends: Episode 14 – season 1)

(Ex. 36)
Hola. Aquí, Pepe. ¿Qué tal?
¡Hola! Bueno, ¿qué nos has traído?

(CREA)

On other occasions, as has already been mentioned, bueno is used both in SV and the TT as a device to help viewers get their bearings as they are introduced to a conversation that is already underway. In the case of (Ex. 37), for example, the transition is, in keeping with the polysemiotic nature of a sitcom, three-fold: the TM bueno (acoustic and verbal), the preceding shot that shows the side of the building in which the

29 When introducing a farewell, that is, at the end of a conversation, bueno is regarded as a PCM, analysed in 6.3.
conversation will be taking place (visual, non verbal) and a short snippet of transitional music (acoustic, non verbal):

(Ex. 37)

[New scene: Ross, Rachel, Chandler and Phoebe are talking while sharing a bowl of popcorn]
Chandler: Well, I ended up telling her everything.
Rachel: Oh, how’d she take it?
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Chandler: Bueno, al final se lo he dicho todo.
Rachel: ¿Y cómo se lo ha tomado?

(Friends: Episode 16 – season 1)

Cases such as (Ex. 37) abound in SV and the TT, as they serve fictional purposes, but not in CREA, in which conversations are longer and addressed to hearers but not audiences. However, this fictional use of bueno is not problematic in terms of naturalness, as bueno is the most recurrent TM in colloquial Spanish conversation.

Finally, as far as dubbing constraints are concerned, the only synchrony that has a real impact on the translation is isochrony \(^{30}\). As explained in 2.3.3.3, isochrony is concerned with the similar length of ST and TT utterances, but it allows a margin of one or two syllables. This means that bueno can be used to translate all the most common ST TMs (so, okay, well, alright, right...) and explains why on four occasions this Spanish marker has been added without being triggered by any ST unit (Ø). A case in point is (Ex. 38), where bueno is added to enable TT Joey to make clear that he is going to finish his monologue (as opposed to ST Joey, who does not resort to any TM):

(Ex. 38)
Joey: Oh-oh! And then Ross’s new girlfriend, Bonnie, shows up and Rachel convinced her to shave her head. And then Ross and Rachel kiss, and now Ross has to choose between Rachel and the bald girl and...I don’t know what happened there either. Y’know what? Hold on, let me go get Chandler.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Joey: ¡Ah! Y luego apareció la nueva novia de Ross, Bonnie, y Rachel la convenció de que se afeitara la cabeza. Y después Ros y Rachel se besaron, y ahora Ross tiene que elegir entre Rachel y la chica calva y... Bueno, pues tampoco sé lo que ha pasado. ¿Sabéis qué? Esperad, voy a ver lo que ha pasado.

(Friends: Episode 1 – season 4)

---

\(^{30}\) Lip-synchrony does not apply, given that none of the TMs analysed here coincides with a close-up (see explanation of the correlation between shots and synchronies in 2.3.3.3).
6.2.3.2. (Muy) bien

As explained in Section 6.2.1.1, (muy) bien is usually regarded as a formal TM, one that does not tend to occur in colloquial conversation but in interviews, therapeutic sessions or classroom discourse. This explains its low occurrence in both SV and CREA (see tables 6.29 and 6.30), but not its common use in the TT, where it translates different English TMs (see tables 6.31 and 6.32).

It must be noted that in English, okay, alright and alrighty, which constitute more than 70% of the ST units triggering (muy) bien, are commonly used in colloquial conversation as response markers but also as TMs (Levinson 1983; Leech and Weisser 2003). In Spanish, however, although colloquial conversation often features (muy) bien as a response marker, it does not feature it as a TM. A possible explanation for its use in the dubbed script as a TM may thus be that it is a calque from these ST TMs: the translator may simply have replaced them for (muy) bien without considering the multifunctionality of DMs (see 3.2.2), i.e. the fact that the same DM may have different functions and different frequencies of use in different registers.

As shown in (Ex.39), Ross is not agreeing with anything or anybody. Muy bien is not a response marker here, but a TM used to mark the transition to a new phase in the interaction between the participants in the conversation. The main problem posed by the use of muy bien with regard to the naturalness of the dubbed script is the alteration of some of the key features of the colloquial register as described by Briz (1998) (see 3.1). In a clearly informal situation, Ross suddenly addresses his close friends as if he was a stranger conducting an interview, thus creating a relation of social and functional inequality (+ power, - solidarity) that is in sharp contrast with the colloquial nature of the ST (alright, boys):

(Ex. 39)
Ross: Alright, boys, let's eat.
Chandler: Oh, did you get that from the ‘I Love Rachel’ pizzeria?

Ross: Muy bien, chicos, a cenar.
Chandler: Oh, ¿es de la pizzeria ‘Yo quiero a Rachel’?

(Friends: Episode 18 – season 1)

In this sense, it is important to highlight that this sharp contrast does not only occur between the ST and the TT, but also between what the dubbing viewers can hear and what they can
Dubbing constraints cannot explain or justify the use of (muy) bien as a TM in the TT. Once again, given that only isochrony applies, the ST units triggering these Spanish markers (okay, so, well, alright...) could have been translated (and have been, in many cases) as bueno, for example. As a matter of fact, it would appear that the translator chooses (muy) bien even in situations in which the interaction of the audiovisual codes provides ample leeway for translation. A case in point is (Ex. 41). Stuck in the vestibule of a bank with an attractive woman, Chandler is thinking about what his next move could be. We can hear his thoughts, but he never actually says anything. Following Chaume’s model (2004a), this is a clear example of a diegetic voice off in the sound placement code, which allows total freedom in terms of translation (see 2.3.3.3). Not even isochrony needs to be respected, as long as Chandler’s thoughts are heard before the scene ends. Even so, the dubbing translator still opts for the formal TM muy bien:

(Ex.41)
Chandler: Alright, okay, what next?
Chandler: Muy bien, ¿y ahora qué?

(Friends: Episode 7 – season 1)

6.2.3.3. De acuerdo and está bien
As pointed out in 6.2.1.2, neither de acuerdo nor está bien are described in the literature as TMs. This is in line with the results obtained in SV and CREA (see table 6.33), where these markers do not feature as TMs. Yet, they do play this role in the TT, where they translate the ST units included in tables 6.34 and 6.35.

The qualitative analysis carried out here sheds some light on the effect of the use of these markers on the dubbed script. In (Ex.42), for instance, the double use of está bien by the nurse in the TT suggests that she is agreeing with something that has been said or
asked before. However, this could not be further from her original intention, as she is using a TM (alright in the ST) to put an end to the chaos caused by the presence of all five friends of Ross’ in the operating theatre as his ex-wife is about to give birth:

(Ex. 42)
Nurse: Alright, alright, there’s a few too many people in this room, and there’s about to be one more, so anybody who’s not an ex-husband or a lesbian life partner... out you go!

Enfermera: Está bien, está bien. Ya hay demasiada gente en esta habitación y ahora va a nacer uno más, así que todo el que no sea un ex-marido o una pareja sentimental lesbiana... ¡piérdanse!

(Friends: Episode 23 – season 1)

As in the case of (muy) bien, the use of de acuerdo and está bien in the TT may be regarded as a calque of alright and okay, both of which can act as markers of agreement and TMs in colloquial conversation in English. This seems to be a more plausible explanation than the influence of dubbing constraints, which, once again, do not seem to justify the use of these markers. Indeed, cases like (Ex. 43), taken from the same scene shown in (Ex. 41) and featuring Chandler’s thoughts, show that the translator decides to use de acuerdo and está bien as TMs even when there is complete freedom to use any other unit:

(Ex.43)
Chandler: Alright, alright, alright. It’s been fourteen and a half minutes and you still have not said one word. Oh, God, do something. Just make contact, smile!

Chandler: De acuerdo, está bien, está bien. Han pasado catorce minutos y medio y aún no le has dicho ni una sola palabra. Haz algo... contacta con ella... ¡sonríe!

(Friends: Episode 7 – season 1)

6.2.4. Conclusions

First of all, there is a higher occurrence of TMs in the TT and SV than in spontaneous conversation (CREA). This can be explained by the fact that both sitcoms seem to use TMs as fictional tools to orientate viewers on the many occasions in which they are faced with conversations that are already underway.

Both the qualitative and quantitative analysis carried out in this study suggest that bueno poses no problems in terms of naturalness in the TT. Its use in the dubbed script matches what is described in the relevant literature and what is shown in CREA.
(Muy) bien presents a different situation and its use in the TT may be regarded as unnatural. Typically found in real-life formal conversations, (muy) bien is used in the TT almost as often as bueno, whereas it is virtually absent from both SV and CREA. This use of (muy) bien may have a detrimental effect on the naturalness of the dubbed script, as it contradicts some of the key features of colloquial register (Briz 1998; see 3.1). It creates a considerable distance between the characters on the screen, who suddenly seem to address each other (or themselves, as in the case of Chandler in [Ex. 41]) in a cold and detached way, as if they were strangers instead of close friends. This is in sharp contrast not only with the ST but also with what the TT viewers can see on the screen.

A more problematic issue in terms of naturalness is the use of de acuerdo and está bien as TMs in the dubbed script. In spontaneous exchanges, they are markers of agreement and point backward in the conversation; that is, they refer to something that has already been said. In the TT they are used as TMs and point to something that is going to be said, thus becoming confusing and, in general, unnatural.

As for the role played by dubbing constraints in the use of TMs in the TT, the qualitative analysis carried out in this study suggests that, although these constraints do exist, they allow the use of natural TMs. Even when the interaction of the different audiovisual codes brings about a certain leeway for the translator, s/he still opts for TMs that are not common in spontaneous colloquial conversation.

A possible explanation for the use of (muy) bien, de acuerdo and está bien as TMs in the dubbed script may be that they are calques of okay, alright and right, which, unlike the Spanish DMs, can function both as markers of agreement and TMs in colloquial conversation in English. However, this explanation does not account for the occurrence of (muy) bien, de acuerdo and está bien to translate units such as so or uh, which cannot be described as markers of agreement.

6.3. PCMs
6.3.1. Description of the PCMs to be analysed
6.3.1.1. Bueno and (muy) bien
Used in the pre-closing stage, bueno indicates the end of the previous topic and announces the closing of the exchange (Bauhr 1994). According to Gregori-Signes
(1996), not only does it enable speakers to signal that they want to abandon the conversation but also to do so in a cooperative way, as if they were asking for permission, thus assuaging the potential inconvenience caused by the interruption. As for (muy) bien, it may also be used as a PCM but, following what was described in 6.2.1.1, it is a much more unusual marker than bueno (Martín and Portolés 1999). Most importantly, when it does occur, it can typically be found in formal, stereotyped environments such as interviews and polls in which the participants have different social roles and which cannot normally be regarded as featuring colloquial conversation (Briz 1998).

6.3.1.2. Venga

Like bueno, venga is a frequent multifunctional DM in colloquial conversation, where it has traditionally been used as an interactive marker (Martín and Portolés 1999) or even as a deontic marker (López Quero 2007; see 3.3.3.2). In recent years, venga has acquired new uses that are different from these traditional ones and very important in the closing sequence of the conversation (Blas Arroyo 1998), as it can act both as a PCM and as a closing marker in the terminal exchange (Bernal Llinersand 2007). As a PCM, it constitutes a pre-closing, not a possible pre-closing; in other words, it normally excludes the possibility of a new topic being introduced (Blas Arroyo 1998). So as to prevent this imposition from sounding aggressive in this “fragile” stage of the conversation (Laver 1981), the PCM venga carries strong friendly and familiar connotations that create proximity between participants (Blas Arroyo 1998). It thus constitutes a politeness strategy (López Quero 2007) and is especially useful and recurrent in colloquial conversation, where it tends to precede hasta luego more often than adiós, as the former is regarded as more familiar and less cold than the latter (Blas Arroyo 1998).

Further illustrating the idea that routine formulae are determined by the characteristics of the speaker (Laver 1981), Blas Arroyo (1998) explains that these new uses of venga as a PCM and a closing marker in the terminal exchange have been introduced by a specific social group. He describes this group as being formed by young males and females up to 40 years old when the article was published, more specifically medium-to-upper class professionals living mainly in urban environments. According to Blas Arroyo (ibid.), this group has a particularly influential presence in the media, which may have contributed to the nowadays widespread use of venga as a PCM and a closing marker.
The case in point mentioned by this author is precisely that of a number of Spanish sitcoms whose characters belong to this social profile and where these uses of *venga* have been found to be especially recurrent.

It will thus be interesting to see if the PCM *venga* is used in the TT and SV, given that both series feature colloquial conversation (and pre-closing instances of this conversation) and especially characters that match every part of the profile outlined by Blas Arroyo about the stereotypical users of this marker.

6.3.1.3. *Hala/e, pues nada/eso, oye*

This section includes PCMs that have received little or no attention in the literature but which, nonetheless, feature in the spontaneous corpora used by many of the authors working in this field. *Hala/e*, for example, is often used as an interjection with different values, but it may also be used as a PCM in colloquial conversation (Barbero and San Vicente 2006), where it introduces the terminal exchange very much along the same lines as *venga*. As for *pues nada*, it presents a different case. Hardly any reference has been found in the literature, other than by Pons Bordería (1998), who describes it as having the characteristics of a DM, and Boyero (2005), who refers to it as a sentence-initial DM. Yet, *pues nada* can be found acting as a PCM in the corpora used by many of these authors studying DMs and even PCMs, such as Blas Arroyo (1998) or Contreras Fernández (2005), whose corpus of recorded spontaneous conversations features up to ten occurrences of *pues nada* as a PCM that seem to go unnoticed. Likewise, the corpus used by López Quero (2007) in his study on *venga* shows another possible PCM that is not mentioned by the author—*oye*. Usually an AG (as described in 6.4.1.2), *oye* seems to fulfil a different role on this occasion. It is still used to attract the hearer’s attention to what is being said, but this interactive role seems to take a back seat to the metaconversational function. Indeed, *oye* is used here to help in the construction of the conversation, in this case opening up the closing or introducing the terminal exchange:

\[
\text{Oye, me tengo que acostar ya.} \\
\text{Venga, ya nos vemos.}
\]

(López Quero 2007:9)

6.3.1.4. Other DMs used as PCMs in the TT: *en fin* and *de acuerdo*

Although *en fin* is described in the literature as a summarising marker (Martín and Portolès 1999) and *de acuerdo* as a marker of agreement (Camacho Adarve 2005), they
both occur as PCMs in the TT, where they have also been found to act as HRMs and TMs respectively. *En fin*, as explained in 6.1.1.7, presents in colloquial conversation a summary or a conclusion of what has been said. It is also used to resume the main topic of a conversation after a digression (Flores Acuña 2001), very much like the resumptive DM *anyway* (Ferrara 1997). Following from this, if *en fin* is found to change the topic of a conversation from a digression to the end of the conversation, then it can be said to act as a PCM. Yet, it may still be regarded as a resumptive marker and only marginally as a PCM. As for *de acuerdo*, it is usually described as an interactive marker of agreement (Camacho Adarve 2005) (see 6.2.1.2), and not even marginally as a PCM.

### 6.3.2. Quantitative analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>CREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bueno</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venga</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bueno, venga</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pues nada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bueno, pues nada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bueno, pues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pues eso</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hala</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hale</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oye(, que)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Muy) bien</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>77.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.36. PCMs found in the three corpora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bueno</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.37. The PCM *bueno* in the TT and SV

---

31 Given the importance of variation with regard to the natural use of PCMs in colloquial conversation (see 3.3.1.3 and 4.3.2.1), this table includes not only the above-described PCMs but also combinations between them. The figures included in this table account for the occurrence of these units as PCMs, not as DMs with other functions.
**Table 6.38. The PCM *bueno* in the TT and CREA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>CREA</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bueno</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>25.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6.39. ST units triggering *bueno* as a PCM in the TT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST unit</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Okay</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alright</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okay so</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6.40. The PCM (*muy*) *bien* in the TT and CREA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>CREA</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Muy) bien</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>26.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6.41. The PCM (*muy*) *bien* in the TT and SV**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Muy) bien</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6.42. ST units triggering (*muy*) *bien* as a PCM in the TT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST unit</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alright</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alrighty</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6.43. *En fin* in the TT and CREA as a PCM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>CREA</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>En fin</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>58.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCM</td>
<td>TT</td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>LL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En fin</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>19.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.44. *En fin* in the TT and SV as a PCM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST unit</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alright</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okay</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anyway</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hey</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.45. ST units triggering *en fin* as a PCM in the TT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>CREA</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De acuerdo</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.46. *De acuerdo* in the TT and CREA as a PCM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De acuerdo</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.47. *De acuerdo* in the TT and SV as a PCM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST unit</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Okay</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alright</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.48. ST units triggering *de acuerdo* as a PCM in the TT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>CREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Okay</td>
<td>Bueno</td>
<td>Bueno</td>
<td>Bueno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All right</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>Venga</td>
<td>Venga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>Bueno, venga</td>
<td>Bueno, venga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>Pues nada</td>
<td>Pues nada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alrighty</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>Bueno, pues</td>
<td>Bueno, pues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>Bueno, pues nada</td>
<td>Bueno, pues nada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anyway</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>Oye, que</td>
<td>Oye, que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All right, so</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>Hala</td>
<td>Hala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>Hale</td>
<td>Hale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hey</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>Pues eso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En fin</td>
<td>En fin</td>
<td>En fin</td>
<td>En fin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Muy) bien</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De acuerdo</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 10 | 4  | 10 | 11 |

Table 6.49. Number of different PCMs used in the four corpora

A first look at table 6.36 shows, as its most striking feature, the absence in the TT of 9 markers that are, to different extents, present in SV and CREA. Thus, there are more (and more varied) PCMs in SV and CREA than in the TT. Whether this is due to the ST having fewer (and less varied) PCMs than SV and CREA can only be ascertained by carrying out a qualitative analysis. In this case, this analysis is divided into two parts – one devoted to the two PCMs found in the TT (as well as to en fin and de acuerdo, also used as such in the TT) and another one devoted to those that are absent from the dubbed script.

6.3.3. Qualitative analysis

6.3.3.1. Bueno and (muy) bien

As shown in table 6.36, bueno is undoubtedly the most common PCM in the three corpora. It is more than twice as common in CREA as in the TT (see table 6.38), which could be due to the fact that there are more than twice as many PCMs in CREA as in the dubbed script. As for the comparison between the TT and SV (see table 6.37), there is no significant difference in their use of this marker.
As shown in table 6.39, 

*bueno* is used in the TT to translate 5 common English PCMs, namely *okay*, *well*, *alright*, *right* and *so* (see 3.3.1.3), as well as an AG (*listen*) and Ø. In the case of *listen*, although it is typically an AG, it seems to be acting almost as a PCM here (Ex.44), the speaker attracting the hearers’ attention to the fact that he is leaving both the conversation and the room. The choice of the common PCM *bueno* in Spanish seems justified:

(Ex. 44)
Roger: **Listen**, guys, it was great seeing you again.
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Roger: **Bueno**, chicos, me alegro de haberos visto.

(Friends: Episode 13 – season 1)

In all cases but one, *bueno* has been used in the TT to translate relatively short ST units. It thus poses no problems in terms of isochrony, which, as has been mentioned in this study (see 6.1.3.1 or 6.2.3.1), is the only synchrony that may have an influence on the translation. The exception is the only addition of *bueno* (Ø):

(Ex. 45)
Emily: Oh, it’s time to go.
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Emily: Oh... **bueno**, ya es hora de irse.

(Friends: Episode 18 – season 4)

This example illustrates how, apart from the margin provided in terms of lip-synch (there are very few close-ups in the 48 episodes analysed and so labials and bilabials hardly ever have to be matched), the translator may even have some margin with regard to isochrony. Emily is seen sideways (her lips visible) in a medium shot as she utters her five-syllable line. In Spanish, so that the translated eight-syllable line can fit in her lips, the dubbing actress starts her line earlier and finishes slightly later than in the ST. Although the mismatch is virtually unnoticeable, the translator/dubbing actress has clearly gone to some effort in order to add this marker, presumably because they considered that a PCM was needed to open up this closing. Just as with HRMs, *bueno* seems the preferred choice when an addition is made, which places it once again as a privileged carrier of orality, in this case a natural one.

As for (*muy*) *bien*, it must be noted that, as explained in 6.3.1.1, it is regarded as a formal PCM, one that does not tend to occur in colloquial conversation but in interviews or
surveys. This may explain its absence from both SV and CREA (see tables 6.40 and 6.41), but not its use in the TT, where it translates the English PCMs *alright* and *alrighty* (table 6.42).

In English, *alright/y* is a common occurrence in colloquial conversation as a response marker but also as a transitional marker (Leech and Weisser 2003) and as a PCM (Levinson 1983). In Spanish, however, although colloquial conversation often features *(muy) bien* as a response marker, it does not feature it as a transitional marker or a PCM (Martín and Portolés 1999). A possible explanation for its use in the TT as a PCM may thus be that it is a calque from *alright/y*, the translator having directly replaced *alright/y* for *(muy) bien* without considering the multifunctionality of DMs (see 3.2.2). As shown in (Ex. 46), Monica is not agreeing with anything or anybody when she says *muy bien*. It is not a response marker, but a PCM used to open up the end of the conversation, which acquires a more formal tone than in the ST. This contrast is even sharper in (Ex. 47), where the ST features Ross addressing his friends colloquially with *alrighty* whereas the TT has him addressing them as if he was a stranger conducting an interview:

(Ex. 46)
Monica: *Alright*, I’m gonna go change. I’ve got a date.

Monica: *Muy bien*, voy a cambiarme. Tengo una cita.

(Friends: Episode 3 – season 1)

(Ex. 47)
Ross: André should be there in like 45 minutes. *Alrighty*, bye bye.


(Friends: Episode 22 – season 1)

6.3.3.2. *En fin* and *de acuerdo*

Given that neither *en fin* nor *de acuerdo* are actually PCMs, despite being used as such in the TT, they have not been included in table 6.36. As for *en fin*, it is the second most recurrent PCM in the TT but it is almost absent from both SV and CREA (see tables 6.43, 6.44 and 6.45).

As explained in 6.3.1.4, *en fin* (and also *anyway*) is first and foremost a summarising and resumptive marker, even though when it changes the topic from a digression to the end of the conversation it may acquire the role of a PCM. As a matter of fact, it is sometimes
difficult to decide whether *anyway/en fin* are used as resumptive markers or as PCMs. (Ex. 46) is a case in point. Joey uses *anyway/en fin* to resume the main topic of his intervention (congratulating the newly married couple) after a digression (“New York City, where everybody…”). Given that he decides to finish his speech then, *anyway* becomes a PCM that initiates the end of his utterance before he stands up and leaves:

(Ex. 48)

Joey: Hey, best man number two, Joey Tribbiani. Now, I’m not good with the jokes like Chandler here. Boy... but ah, I just want to say congratulations to the happy couple. I first met Ross in this coffee house back home... Home... New York City... Where everybody knows my name. Well, *anyway*, I love you guys, but not as much as I love America. Could we please go home now?

In any case, it seems that this use of *en fin* as a PCM, although possible, is very marginal, as suggested by its low occurrence in SV and CREA and its absence from the literature. If it had been used in the TT as a PCM only to translate *anyway*, its occurrence would have been similar to that of the non-translated corpora. However, it has also been used, as shown in table 6.45, to translate other common English PCMs such as *well, so, alright, okay* and *right*. In this sense, if the translator was looking for an alternative to *bueno* to introduce much-needed variation in the use of PCMs, *en fin* does not seem to be the most appropriate choice, given that it is only occasionally used with this function. Any of the PCMs discussed in 6.3.3.3 would have been a more natural choice.

As for *de acuerdo*, it is nowhere near as recurrent as *en fin* in the TT, but it still yields interesting findings when the results from the three corpora are compared. The use of this marker resembles that of *(muy) bien*, as it occurs in the TT and not in SV and CREA (see tables 6.46 and 6.47). Yet, it presents a more problematic case than *(muy) bien* in terms of naturalness. Unlike *(muy) bien*, or indeed *okay andAlright, de acuerdo* can only act as a response marker (Martín and Portolés 1999). It cannot be used as a PCM, which is how it is used in the TT, as shown in (Ex.49). Ross is indeed not agreeing with his friends here, but rather initiating the end of his conversation with them.
Ross: Okay, I’m off to talk to my unborn child.

Ross: De acuerdo, chicos, me voy a hablar con mi hijo no nato.

(Friends: Episode 9 – season 1)

It should be noted that Ross is sitting down and only seen sideways by the audience when he utters his line. The translator thus had a considerable deal of freedom to choose any PCM to translate okay, as proved by the five syllables added in the TT. Once again, the use of de acuerdo may be considered as a calque (as it does translate okay when used as a response marker), sounds unnatural and cannot be put down to dubbing constraints. As in the case of en fin, it would have been possible, and probably more natural, to opt for any of the PCMs discussed in the next section.

6.3.3.3. The PCMs found in SV and CREA but not in the TT

As described in table 6.36, most of the PCMs (over 80%) found in SV and CREA are absent from the TT. None of them is anywhere near as recurrent as bueno, but together they help to constitute a much more varied landscape for the closing sequences than the one offered by the TT. Out of the four PCMs used in the TT, two (de acuerdo and [muy] bien) are not used in SV and CREA and one (en fin) is a rare occurrence. Besides, it is also important to note that the 9 PCMs absent from the TT could have been used in the dubbed script, as they would have posed no problems in terms of isochrony. Most of them have two or three syllables, like those in the ST and, in the case of some that are longer (bueno pues nada, bueno venga), they provide useful translation solutions for longer ST PCMs such as okay so and alright then.

The analysis of venga (including the combination bueno, venga) confirms what was anticipated by Blas Arroyo (1998) and López Quero (2007), i.e. that this DM has acquired a new value as a PCM (Ex.50) and even as a closing marker in the terminal exchange. A case in point is (Ex. 51), where it is introduced by the PCM bueno, pues nada:

(Ex.50)
Laura: Venga, que ya aquí hemos hecho bastante, vámonos.
Paco: Pero si es que quedan pasteles.
Laura: A que no te cuento el sueño.
Paco: Vamos.
Fernando: A-adiós.

(SV: Episode 23)
(Ex. 51)
Paco: **Bueno, pues nada**, que, que nos vamos a tomar unas cañas, ¿eh?
David: **Venga**, tío.
Carlota: **Venga**.

(SV: Episode 23)

*(Bueno)* *venga* is more common in SV than in CREA, which ties in with Blas Arroyo’s (1998) view that this marker is stereotypically used in Spanish sitcoms. In any case, and especially taking into account the description of *venga* and the social profile of its users, it would constitute a very useful addition to the TT.

The same holds true for *(bueno)* *pues nada*, which is remarkably recurrent in both SV and CREA, the former opting for the longer version with *bueno* and the latter for the shorter without it. As a matter of fact, this is the second most common PCM in CREA. Probably a short version for *pues (no tengo) nada (más que añadir)*, its presence in these and other corpora (as pointed out in 6.3.1.3) suggests that it merits more attention than it has so far received in the literature. Unlike *venga*, it can only function as a PCM, and not in the terminal exchange:

(Ex.52)
*Bueno, pues nada*, Alejandro. Te voy a dejar.

(CREA)

As for the next two PCMs included in table 6.36, *bueno pues* and *pues eso*, they could be regarded as very similar or even a variation of *(bueno)* *pues nada*, the former omitting *nada* and the latter replacing it by *eso* (perhaps short for *pues eso es lo que hay*). In any case, they both highlight the crucial role played by *pues* in this initial part of the closing sequence.

A different case is that of *hala/e*. Unlike the previous PCMs, whose presence in these and other corpora is not reflected in the literature, *hala/e* is regarded as a common PCM in some studies on colloquial conversation (Barbero and San Vicente 2006) and yet its occurrence in SV and CREA is hardly noticeable.

Finally, *oye (, que)* presents a similar situation to that of *en fin*. Originally an AG, *oye* becomes, with or without the addition of *que* and mainly in SV, a useful resort to open
up the closing of the conversation. This may be regarded as a marginal value of *oye*, as it is still used to call the hearer’s attention to what is being said, but there is little doubt that it occurs in a pre-closing environment (Filipi and Wales 2003) and that it initiates the end of the conversation:

(Ex. 53)

M: **Oye, que**, que me alegro de que todo os vaya tan bien. Dale a Carlota un beso de mi parte.
P: Venga, y tú a Cristina.
M: Chao
Paco: Chao

(SV: Episode 11)

6.3.3.4. The role played by the ST in the (un)natural use of PCMs in the TT

As mentioned in 6.3.2, one of the key ideas that can be obtained from the results in table 6.36 is the fact that there are more (and more varied) PCMs in SV and CREA than in the TT. The question that remained unanswered then was whether this is due to the ST having fewer (and less varied) PCMs than SV and CREA. Although the ST units triggering the PCMs used in the TT have been included in tables 6.39, 6.42, 6.45 and 6.48, those tables also include ST units that are not or do not act as PCMs (*Ø, you know*) and do not include ST PCMs that have not been translated in the TT (*alright so*). Table 6.49 attempts to provide a clearer picture of this key issue of variation. Thus, the focus is not placed in this case on how ST PCMs are translated or on the number of occurrences of the different PCMs, but on the number of different PCMs used in the four corpora. As shown in this table, the lack of variation in the use of PCMs in the TT cannot be put down to the ST, which resorts to 10 different PCMs, the same as SV and one less than CREA. In contrast, the TT uses only four, one of which is regarded as formal (*[muy] bien*), another one of which is not a PCM (*de acuerdo*) and another of which can only occasionally have this function (*en fin*).

6.3.3.5. The role played by SV in the analysis of the (un)natural use of PCMs in the TT

The inclusion of SV in this thesis has been justified because of its relevance as a non-translated fictional corpus (see 5.2.1). SV is an intermediate step between the TT and CREA, a corpus that is only constrained by fictional factors and that can therefore, when compared to the TT, give an idea of the influence that the fictional dimension of the Spanish dubbese (see 2.4.3.2) has on the naturalness of the TT. In the case of PCMs, the
use of SV becomes even more necessary and useful. As routine formulae, PCMs are highly conventionalised and only occur in a very specific part of the conversation. They are indeed prefabricated and to some extent predictable even in naturally-occurring dialogue, which makes the TT and CREA more comparable than on any other occasion and the search for PCMs in CREA easier than the search for any other type of DM. As can be expected, in the case of SV the comparability with the TT is even greater. Farewell scenes abound in SV just like they do in the TT. Conversations, which are shortened to 1-2 minutes in every scene for fictional purposes, often end up on a character leaving a room and thus putting an end to his/her contribution. The similarity of these prefabricated situations in the prefabricated scripts of SV and the TT is so remarkable that it is often possible to find SV utterances that could almost be translated versions of the ST:

(Ex. 54)
Roger: Listen, X, it was great seeing you again.
-----------------------------------------------
Roger: Bueno, X, me alegro de haberos visto.  

(Friends: Episode 13 – season 1)
Carlota: Pues nada, X, que ha sido un placer.

(SV: Episode 11)

Although in (Ex. 54) the TT presents a natural use of the PCM bueno to translate listen, SV provides a less standard and more innovative or “novel” (Coulmas 1981) version with the PCM pues nada, very recurrent in spontaneous conversation, the addition of the colloquial que and the use of ha sido un placer instead of me alegro de veros. In other words, if SV often features, due to the similarity between Siete Vidas and Friends, natural solutions for unnatural instances of the TT, this is, in the case of PCMs, truer than ever.

6.3.4. Conclusions

As routine formulae, PCMs are bound to specific situations, more specifically the beginning of closing sequences. In this fragile phase, they fulfil a two-fold role: offer the possibility of bringing up unmentioned topics and initiate the terminal exchange to end the conversation politely. On some occasions, the choice of a particular PCM is highly determined by factors such as the age, sex and social status of the participants and has a considerable influence on the closeness or distance between them in a conversation. Besides, given that, as routine formulae, PCMs are highly conventionalised and
predictable, the naturalness of their use lies to a great extent on the variation with which they are used.

The results obtained in the present study reveal that, whereas SV and CREA feature ten and eleven PCMs respectively, the TT resorts to four, only one of which *(bueno)* does not seem problematic from the point of view of its naturalness.

As in the case of HRMs (see 6.1.3.1), *(bueno)* is used in the TT as a privileged carrier of orality. This is illustrated by its high occurrence as well as by the fact that it is added when there is leeway in terms of constraints and apparently no need to do so. In any case, it should be noted that, unlike in the case of HRMs, this is a natural use of *(bueno)* and one that mirrors that of SV.

*(Muy) bien* poses more problems as far as naturalness is concerned. In the literature it is regarded as a formal marker often used in interviews or surveys. Absent from both SV and CREA, it does not seem suitable for the colloquial dialogues featuring in *Friends*. Taking up what was mentioned above about the important role played by the characteristics of the speaker/hearer on the use of PCMs, *(muy) bien* can be said to add a certain distance between the participants (who address each other as interviewer and interviewee instead of as close friends) that was not present in the ST. Furthermore, the analysis of the ST units triggering *(muy) bien* suggests that it may be a calque of *alright*, the translator not having considered that although both *alright* and *(muy) bien* are colloquial response markers in English and Spanish, only the former can act as a colloquial PCM.

*De acuerdo* may also be considered as a calque of *okay* and *alright* although, in this case, its use in pre-closing environments is even more questionable than that of *(muy) bien*. Like *okay* and *alright*, it can be a colloquial response marker, but not a PCM (whether formal or informal), thus constituting an unnatural feature in the TT.

As for *en fin*, the second most common PCM in the TT, it seems overused. Usually a resumptive and summarising marker, it can only occasionally act as a PCM if it changes the topic from a digression to the end of the conversation. In this sense, it is very similar to *anyway*. However, unlike *anyway*, which occurs only twice in pre-closing
environments in the ST, *en fin* is chosen as a means to introduce variation in the use of PCMs in the TT, when other PCMs would have been more natural.

Some of these “more natural” PCMs are those found in SV and CREA but absent from the TT. *Venga* is a case in point. Its characteristics as a PCM, including the profile of its users and the contexts in which it is used (stereotypically in sitcoms, as corroborated here by SV), seem to match those of the TT, thus suggesting that it would have been a valuable addition to the dubbed script. Furthermore, combinations with *bueno* and *pues* seem to be particularly common as PCMs in Spanish. Among these, *(bueno) pues nada* is the most recurrent one, despite its absence from theoretical studies. In this sense, it is important to note that many more PCMs were found in the corpora than in the literature. This suggests that corpus-based research on AVT can contribute to the study of colloquial conversation and highlights a real need to analyse new PCMs, including AGs acting as PCMs such as *oye*.

As for the cause of the lack of variation in the use of TT PCMs, it cannot be put down to the influence of the ST, dubbing constraints or the fictional nature of the dialogue. The qualitative analysis shows that the ST features as much variation in the use of PCMs as SV and considerably more than the TT. Dubbing constraints consist, once again, mainly in isochrony, as the absence of close-ups exempts the translator from having to match labials and bilabials. As illustrated by the addition of the privileged carrier of orality *bueno*, there may even be instances of leeway with regard to isochrony. In any case, given that most PCMs in both languages have between two and four syllables, there is plenty of scope for variation if there is the will to do so. As for SV, which shares a great deal of features with the TT, it shows that variation in the use of PCMs is perfectly possible in prefabricated orality. As a matter of fact, given the similarities of farewells in any conversation and especially that of farewells in sitcoms, SV may sometimes act as a natural translation for the ST, thus constituting a very useful parallel text for the translator, particularly in the case of routine formulae such as PCMs.

To conclude, there seems to be consensus as to the fact that closings are generally predictable and conventionalised in naturally-occurring conversation. As explained by Coulmas (1981), variation is a means to provide this part of the conversation with
“natural flavour” and prevent it from sounding monotonous. This risk is even greater in the case of original and (especially) translated sitcoms, which are prefabricated by nature and constrained by a number of fictional conventions that make them to a great extent predictable (Taylor 2007). Variation is thus of the essence. Yet, whereas both the ST and SV resort to varied and unpredictable PCMs in predictable situations, the TT seems to opt for monotonous, predictable (bueno) and sometimes unnatural (de acuerdo, [muy] bien) PCMs in predictable situations.

6.4. AGs

6.4.1. Description of the AGs to be analysed

Despite their apparent diversity, the six AGs included in this analysis have many features in common, as explained in 3.3.2. For the purpose of the present study, and following the studies carried out by Romero Trillo (1997), Cuenca and Marín (2000), Montolío and Unamuno (2001) and Amador Moreno et al. (2006), they have been grouped in three pairs. The first two pairs, verás/mira and oye/escucha, make explicit reference to the addressee (second person singular) and follow a given pattern: passive/active visual verbs (see/look) – passive/active auditory verbs (hear/listen). The last pair, (vamos) a ver/veamos, includes both the addressee and the addressee (first person plural).

6.4.1.1. Mira and verás

Generally regarded as the most recurrent AG in Spanish colloquial conversation (Romero Trillo 1997), mira derives from the second person singular of the imperative of the verb mirar. As is often the case with AGs, it is rarely used in the plural form and it tends to co-occur with other markers, such as oye, but also with conjunctions such as porque, pues, pero and y (Cuenca and Marín 2000). In these cases, its lexical meaning is even more disguised, whereas its pragmatic function of introducing an utterance that is regarded as relevant for the hearer is enhanced (Martín and Portolés 1999). As for its appellative value, not only does mira point directly to the addressee, but it also, as put forward by Martín and Portolés (1999), draws him/her closer to the speaker, thus adding a familiar connotation to the utterance it precedes. As far as its translation into English is concerned, look seems to be the most common one (Amador et al. 2006). Whether

32 Martín and Portolés (1999) also note that depending on the context and especially on the intonation, mira may also be used by the speaker on certain occasions to convey his/her anger.
regarded as an interpersonal pragmatic marker (Brandt 2006) or as an attention-getting device (Mackie et al. 2004), *look* is used to stress something “which might otherwise get overlooked amongst other more important matters” (Ball 1986:140). In other words, it seems to play the same role as *mira* and it is also one of the most recurrent AGs in colloquial conversation (Romero Trillo 1997).

As for *verás*, it is also sentence-initial and is used by the speaker to introduce an explanation, an argumentation, a request or a story (Briz 1998). However, what is especially striking about this AG is how little it has been covered in the literature. Apart from Briz (1998), passing references to *verás* can be found in Beinhauer (1964) and Fuentes Rodríguez (1990), as well as in some dictionaries (Seco 1999), but none of them provides results obtained from real corpora. Only Pérez Vázquez and San Vicente (2004, 2007), who describe it as a marker of politeness, show corpus-based evidence of *verás* – a sample of fictional dialogue extracted from a Spanish novel. In contrast, *verás* has proved very recurrent in the TT, hence its inclusion in this study.

6.4.1.2. *Oye* and *escucha*

As an AG, *oye* shares many of its features with *mira* (not least its meaning and the rare use of the plural form), and is thus probably best defined by opposition to this marker. As noted by Martín and Portolés (1999), *oye* presents a lesser degree of grammaticalisation than *mira* (see 3.2.2), thus preserving more of its original meaning of auditory perception. These authors also point out that *oye* often behaves like an interjection, which means that it is especially versatile from a syntactic point of view and able to introduce more discourse units than *mira* as well as a wider variety of expressive meanings. In terms of proximity, the use of *oye* also establishes rapport between the participants, enhancing the so-called “phatic communion” (Laver 1975) between them, but it is in this case the speaker who gets closer to the hearer and not the other way round (Martín and Portolés 1999). Finally, it is also worth mentioning that *oye* can be found co-occurring with *mira*, *pero* and *entonces* (Cuenca and Marín 2000) and that it can be doubled if the speaker wishes to convey anger or protest (Martín and Portolés 1999). As for its English counterparts, different AGs such as *look* (Chaume 2004d) and *hey* (Félix-Brasdefer 2005) have been put forward as possible translations. Yet, it seems as though *listen* is the most habitual one (Amador et al. 2006), not least because its
distribution seems to match that of oye, thus being less frequent than look in English and mira in Spanish (Romero Trillo 1997).

*Escucha* presents a similar degree of grammaticalisation to oye, but differs from it in terms of frequency (Pons 1998): it is mainly mentioned in theoretical descriptions (Beinhauer 1964, Hernando Cuadrado 1988), whereas corpus-based studies indicate that its use is considerably less frequent than that of oye and mira (Cuenca and Marín 2000). The reason for this is that, according to Romero Trillo (1997), escucha may come across as too direct, aggressive and, in general, face threatening to be used too often in conversation. However, it still merits inclusion in this study, given that its low occurrence does not exclude it from realising its pragmatic function as AG. As in the case of oye, listen seems to be the most obvious translation (Romero Trillo 1997), but, depending on the context, other AGs such as look might also serve the purpose (Chaume 2004d).

6.4.1.3. *(Vamos) a ver and veamos*

According to Montolío and Unamuno (2001:195), vamos a ver and a ver (the latter deriving from the former) have undergone a process of grammaticalisation “consisting in a recategorisation from a verbal category (the verb of visual perception ver, to see) to that of a particle”. This recategorisation entails several changes at different levels, including the morphological (no inflectional capacity), the syntactical (absence of complement or subject), the semantic (weakening of lexical meaning) and the suprasegmental (autonomous intonation unit) levels (ibid.). Like other AGs, *(vamos) a ver* has an appellative function, but in this case it points both to the speaker and the hearer (Cuenca and Marín 2000). It also shares with the above-mentioned AGs a clear prospective sense, as it draws the hearer’s attention to the information to come. However, *(vamos) a ver* has a wider scope than mira, verás, oye and escucha, as it can be used to reorganise or reorientate the oral discourse (Montolío and Unamuno 2001). In this case, although it still fulfils the role of an AG, it also acts as a delay device to stop the conversational flow and provide the speaker with time to think about the next utterance (Cuenca and Marín 2000). As far as frequency is concerned, a ver seems to be more common than vamos a ver, which is regarded as a more formal marker (Montolío and Unamuno 2001), and both seem to be less frequent in colloquial conversations than mira (Briz 1995).
As regards veamos, its relatively high occurrence in the TT strongly contrasts, as in the case of verás, with its absence in the relevant literature. In theory, it should share many of its characteristics with (vamos) a ver, deriving as it does from the first person plural of the imperative of ver. However, no accurate description can be provided, as the only reference that has been found (Pérez Vázquez and San Vicente 2004) only mentions veamos in passing as a grammaticalised form that is similar to (vamos) a ver and that introduces a pause and an explanation. As for its translation into English, its literal equivalent, let’s see, is regarded as a common AG and is in fact often translated into Spanish as (vamos) a ver (Taboada 2006).

6.4.2. Quantitative analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AG</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>CREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mira</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>247.9</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirad</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verás</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veréis</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oye</td>
<td>421.2</td>
<td>417.7</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oíd</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escuchá</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escuchád</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Vamos) a ver</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veamos</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>657.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>811.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>199.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.50. AGs in the three corpora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AG</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>CREA</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mira</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>7.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.51. The AG mira in the TT and CREA

---

33 The present analysis is only concerned with the use of these units as AGs. Other occurrences of these units, mainly as imperatives, have not been studied.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AG</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>CREA</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verás</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>178.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.52. The AG *verás* in the TT and CREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST unit</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Look</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look, look</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okay, look</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alright, look</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You know</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You know what?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okay, you know what?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hey</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alright</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I just</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, um</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hell</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.53. ST units triggering *mira* in the TT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>(You) see</th>
<th>You know</th>
<th>Okay</th>
<th>Listen</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Ø</th>
<th>Hey</th>
<th>I mean</th>
<th>You know what</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.54. ST units triggering *verás* in the TT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AG</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>CREA</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oye</td>
<td>421.2</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>765.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.55. The AG *oye* in the TT and CREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AG</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>CREA</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Escucha</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>61.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.56. The AG *escucha* in the TT and CREA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST unit</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hey</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okay</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uh</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You know what?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alright</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeah</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.57. ST units triggering *oye* in the TT

---

34 Given the high occurrence of *oye* in the TT (459 times), the qualitative analysis, including the study of the ST, has been performed in this case in a sample of 16 episodes (8 hours) of the whole corpus, the first and last two episodes of every season.
Table 6.58. ST units triggering *escucha* in the TT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST unit</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listen</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You know</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hey listen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alright</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okay alright</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anyway</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.59. The AG *(vamos) a ver* in the TT and CREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AG</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>CREA</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(Vamos) a ver</em></td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>49.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.60. The AG *veamos* in the TT and CREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AG</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>CREA</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veamos</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.61. ST units triggering *(vamos) a ver*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST unit</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Okay</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alright</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let’s see</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you need</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.62. ST units triggering *veamos*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST unit</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Let’s see</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okay</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alright</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For instance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The added results in table 6.50 show that, with some exceptions (*mira* and *[vamos] aver*), AGs are 3-4 times more frequent in the TT and SV than in CREA. These data are in sharp contrast with the results obtained in the study on HRMs (see table 6.1), which are 3-4 times less recurrent in the TT than in SV and 3-4 times less recurrent in SV than in CREA. As discussed in 6.1.4, the lower occurrence of HRMs in both fictional corpora could be due to the fact these markers are not very fiction-friendly, as they tend to be combined with other markers and unlexicalised filled pauses, thus being too time-consuming. In this sense, the high occurrence of AGs in the present study may be explained similarly. It has been argued that DMs are often used in fictional dialogue to add a certain naturalistic conversational effect (Fox and Schrock 1999). Since HRMs are usually too time-consuming to be fiction-friendly, it makes more sense to resort to AGs to add this naturalistic flavour, given that they do not tend to be combined with other HRMs or unlexicalised filled pauses and are therefore less time-consuming and more fiction-friendly.

However, no definitive conclusions can be drawn before individual qualitative analyses of these pairs of AGs are carried out, as there seem to be considerable differences in the results obtained for every marker.
6.4.3. Qualitative analysis
6.4.3.1. **Mira and verás**

Whereas table 6.51 shows that the use of *mira* as an AG in the TT mirrors to a great extent that of CREA, at least from a quantitative point of view, *verás* presents a radically different picture (see table 6.52). Tying in with what was described in 6.4.1.1, i.e. that this marker is meant to be an AG but that it is usually absent from colloquial corpora, CREA features an insignificant occurrence of *verás*. It is only when the search is performed in the whole of the speech section of CREA, including colloquial and non-colloquial recordings, that *verás* becomes slightly more frequent (15 occurrences per 100,000 words). As a matter of fact, and as shown in the following examples, 75% of its occurrences can be found in the same context: interviews in which the participants do not know each other (Ex.55), interviews in which the participants may know each other but are not close friends and resort to non-colloquial formulae (*un cordial saludo* in [Ex.56]) and interviews in which there is a considerable age difference between the participants, the older person using *verás* while being addressed by the younger person with the formal pronoun *usted* (Ex.57):

(Ex. 55)
Buenas noches.
Hola, ¿qué tal?
Hola.
**Verás**, me llamo Beatriz.
Yo me llamo Luis.
Tengo veintitrés años.
Y yo tengo veinticuatro.

(CREA)

(Ex. 56)
Mavita, ¿tus apellidos?
Kety, ¿te los tengo que decir forzosamente por antena?
No forzosamente, no. **Verás**, los tienen, es que los tienen en control. No te preocupes, los recogeremos de control entonces. Gracias por llamar, Mavita.
Vale. Gracias a ti.
Gracias, Mavita. **Un cordial saludo**.

(CREA)

(Ex. 57)
¿Va contando los días que faltan para el gran acontecimiento, señor Abad? 
No, no. No, porque, **verás**, los medios nos lo recuerdan cada día, porque siempre hay la, la casilla que te dice “faltan doscientos tantos días para los Juegos”.

(CREA)
Thus, it can be said that the spontaneous occurrence of verás does not correspond to the parameters characterising colloquial conversation (see 3.1), as it tends to be used by (±)old speakers who are addressing (±)younger (±)strangers in (±)formal situations.\footnote{Further research is needed to ascertain whether verás may be regarded, as pointed out by Pérez Vázquez and San Vicente (2004, 2007), as a marker of politeness.}

Given that, as described in 5.2.1, all the dialogues from Friends and Siete Vidas analysed in this thesis do abide by the above-mentioned colloquial parameters, the use of the AG verás in the TT (40 times more recurrent than in CREA) may be considered as unnatural. (Ex. 58) illustrates this point, as verás is used by a young man to his girlfriend in an intimate situation (in bed) along with other colloquial units (man, oh, man > tía):

(Ex. 58)
Ethan: **You know**, you read about it, you see it in the movies. Even when you practise it at home, **man oh man**, it is nothing like that.

Ethan: **Verás**, había leído sobre esto, lo había visto en películas. Incluso lo había practicado sólo en casa, pero, te lo juro, **tía**, esto no tiene nada que ver.

(Friends: Episode 22 – season 1)

Another use that may be regarded as unnatural is that of veréis, the plural form of verás:

(Ex. 59)
Phoebe: **You know**… you let your guard down, you start to really care about someone, and I just I-…
Monica: **Look**, I- I could go on pretending…
Joey: **Okay**!

Phoebe: **Veréis**, no se debe bajar la guardia, cuando alguien te empieza a importar mucho una no…
Monica: **Mirad**, yo podría seguir fingiendo…
Joey: ¡Pues hazlo!

(Friends: Episode 3 – season 1)

As described in 6.4.1.1, the plural forms mirad and veréis are rarely used in conversation. As a matter of fact, Gómez Torrego (1997) regards them as pedantic when used in colloquial exchanges. In order to avoid this, both SV and CREA, which feature no occurrences of these markers, usually resort to either the singular form (Ex.60, Ex. 61) or the infinitive (Ex.62) to address more than one person:

(Ex. 60)
Laura: **Mira**, ni lo soñéis. Si David ve la cinta y me rechaza, prefiero que me encuentre en mi nuevo hogar.

(SV: Episode 26)
(Ex. 61)
Mira, guapas, os acordáis de todo, vamos.

(CREA)

(Ex. 62)

(SV: Episode 4)

As for the relatively high occurrence of verás in SV (53.9 – see table 6.50), it may also be considered unnatural and could perhaps indicate a certain influence of the dubbed script on that of the Spanish sitcom. Needless to say, this should be further investigated, but the fact that Siete Vidas is very much inspired by Friends (Huerta 2005) makes this suggestion all the more plausible. In any case, it must be noted that, when it comes to choosing between the two AGs constituting this pair, both SV and CREA clearly favour mira, whereas the TT opts for verás (table 6.50).

In an attempt to throw more light on the overuse of verás in the TT, tables 6.53 and 6.54 add one more element to this equation, namely the ST units triggering mira/verás in the TT. Table 6.53 shows that more than 70% of the occurrences of mira in the TT are triggered by common English AGs or derived forms (look, alright look, you know, you know what, listen, hey). The same holds true for table 6.54, where (you) see, you know, listen, hey or you know what trigger over 70% of TT verás. Thus, the ST does not seem to account for the use of a non-colloquial AG such as verás in the TT.

As for dubbing constraints, they can hardly be put down as a reason either. None of the occurrences of verás in the TT corresponds to a close-up, which means that only isochrony applies. With no need to match bilabial consonants, mira (or indeed oye) could have been used instead of verás. This does not mean, however, that the TT does not pose constraints for the translator, as shown in the following example:

(Ex. 63)
Joanna: I’m sure with your qualifications you won’t need to sleep with some guy to get that job; although I might need some convincing.

---------------------------------------------
Joanna: Con tus conocimientos no tendrás que acostarte con ningún tío para conseguirlo; aunque, verás, Rachel, tendrás que convencerme a mí.

(Friends: Episode 9 – season 4)
Although the ST and the TT have in this case a similar number of syllables, the TT is delivered considerably faster from the beginning. If this speed is to be maintained, a standard translation of *although I might need some convincing* as *aunque tendrás que convencerme* *(a mí)* would be too short, thus flouting isochrony. So as not to have the actress moving her lips while no sound is heard in the TT, an addition has to be made. The translator opts for *verás* to fill this gap, but it could have been filled by a more natural unit. Therefore, as in the case of the HRMs *bueno* (see 6.1.3.1), the AG *verás* seems to be used here as a privileged carrier of orality (Pavesi 2005), i.e. a preferred option when an addition is required (constraints), but also, as illustrated by (Ex. 58) above, when an addition is possible. In that scene, Ethan turns his back to the camera as he utters the first part of his line, which includes the AG *you know*. The translator has thus a great deal of leeway to decide what to do with this AG, which is finally translated as *verás*.

**6.4.3.2. Oye and escucha**

Following the pattern established so far, *oye* is much more frequent in the fictional corpora, whose results are practically identical (see table 6.50), than in CREA (see table 6.55). Although this may be regarded as unnatural, it is important to remember that, unlike *verás*, *oye* is often described as one of the most common AGs in Spanish (see 6.4.1.2). As pointed out above, its overuse in the dubbed script may be explained by its fiction-friendly nature, which turns this marker and AGs in general into privileged carriers of orality, especially as compared to more time-consuming markers such as HRMs.

The case of *escucha* is different. Both the literature (Romero Trillo 1997, Pons 1998) and CREA concur on its low frequency, whereas the TT resorts to it relatively often (it is 12 times more recurrent than in CREA). However, no definitive conclusions can be drawn from the results about *escucha* or *oye* before having a look at the ST units triggering them (see tables 6.57 and 6.58). *Oye* is undoubtedly the most recurrent AG in both SV and the TT, where it is chosen as the preferred marker to translate the English AG *hey*. Despite its excessive frequency in the dubbed script, *oye* is used in a very similar way to how it occurs in spontaneous speech (Ex. 64), and may therefore be considered as a natural marker in the TT. In fact, the TT even features the idiomatic
repetition of oye mentioned in 6.4.1.2 to convey the anger or complaints of the speaker (Ex.65):

(Ex.64)
Ross: Hey, why don’t I just join you both here?

----------------------------------------------------------------------
Ross: Oye, ¿por qué no nos encontramos los tres allí?

(Friends: Episode 5 – season 1)
Paco: Oye, ¿por qué no nos quedamos?

(SV: Episode 9)
Oye, ¿por qué no nos enseñas tu selva?

(CREA)

(Ex.65)
Rachel: And hey-hey-hey, those little spelling tips will come in handy when you’re at home on Saturday nights playing Scrabble with Monica!

----------------------------------------------------------------------
Rachel: Oye, oye, oye, esos consejos de ortografía te serán muy útiles cuando te quedes en casa los sábados jugando al Scrabble con Mónica.

(Friends: Episode 1 – season 4)
Paco: Oye, oye, oye, yo te lo he devuelto todo. Si estabas dormido, no es culpa mía. Habértelo despertado antes, no te jode.

(SV: Episode 7)
Oye, oye, oye, no se puede, no, no os podéis meter con la gente que está aquí conmigo porque son mis invitados y mis amigos

(CREA)

As shown in table 6.57, not only does oye translate hey, but also other English AGs (listen [Ex. 66], look [Ex.67]), as well as many other very different units, not least vocatives (Ex.68). In this sense, oye seems to constitute a privileged carrier of orality in the TT, the translator sometimes resorting to it for no apparent reason other than to add naturalness to the script. (Ex.69) clearly illustrates this point. In this scene, Susan and Ross are lifting Phoebe to see if she can escape from the room they are locked in through the air ventilation pipe. When Susan asks Phoebe whether she can see something (what do you see?), she is being totally covered by Ross, thus providing complete freedom in terms of translation. The translator opts for the standard ¿qué ves?, but decides to add oye at the beginning of the utterance:

(Ex.66)
Ross: Hi. Listen, uh, this cat belongs to a little girl.

----------------------------------------------------------------------
Ross: Hola. Oye, uh, esa gata pertenece a una niña pequeña.

(Friends: Episode 2 – season 4)
Monica: **Look**, you and I went to different high schools...  

(Mónica: **Oye**, tú y yo fuimos a institutos muy distintos...  

(Friends: Episode 2 – season 4)

Monica: **Rachel**, what’re you gonna say to him?  

(Monica: **Oye**, ¿qué le vas a decir?  

(Friends: Episode 24 – season 1)

Susan: What do you see?  

(Susan: **Oye**, ¿qué ves?  

(Friends: Episode 23 – season 1)

As far as **escucha** is concerned, it is mainly used to translate the English AG **listen**, as shown in table 6.58 and in the following example:

(Ex.70)  
Barry: **Listen**, I really wanted to thank you.  

(Barry: **Escucha**, quería darte las gracias.  

(Friends: Episode 2 – season 1)

**Escucha** is over 12 times more recurrent in the TT than in SV and CREA (see table 6.50), which seems to confirm what was explained in 6.4.1.2, namely that it does exist as an AG in colloquial conversation but that it is nowhere near as common as other AGs such as **mira** and **oye**. In this sense, it may be regarded as an anglicism of frequency (see 2.4.3.2), defined by Lorenzo (1987:74; my translation) as follows:

Words and phrases which are not anglicisms per se but exclude other alternatives available in the Spanish language and sound, due to their insistence, strange and monotonous.

Finally, both **escucha** and **oye** pose a further problem for the naturalness of the TT –the use of the plural forms **oid** and **escuchad**. Given the nature of a sitcom like **Friends**, in which the main characters are often seen together in the same scene, situations in which one of them addresses two or more people are very likely to happen. As in the case of **mirad** and **veréis**, the plural forms **oid** and **escuchad** are regarded as rare and pedantic in Spanish, and so both SV and CREA resort to the singular forms, in this case **oye** (Ex. 71 and 72). However, the TT consistently opts for the plural forms, which is all the more unnatural considering that the setting is clearly colloquial and that the participants are
close friends who are addressing each other on colloquial terms. In (Ex.73), Joey addresses his friends in an informal way (*gotta do, creeps me out*) with an informal vocative in the singular form (*man*). The TT partially conveys this tone with a colloquial phrase (*me corta el rollo*), but it also includes the rare and pedantic *oid*. Thus, the lack of naturalness does not only consist here of the use of *oid*, but also of the inconsistency in terms of register:

(Ex.71)
Laura: **Oye**, os voy a decir una cosa, que se os meta bien en la cabeza.

(SV: Episode 18)

(Ex. 72)
Sí, tú le dices que es anónimo (...). Las conversaciones...no se pueden enterar. Luego lo dices, luego: **“Oye, os he grabado, ¿os importa?”**.

(CREA)

(Ex.73)
Joey: **Man**, we gotta do something about that guy. This morning, I caught him looking into our apartment. It creeps me out! I feel like I can’t do stuff!

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Joey: **Oíd**, tenemos que hacer algo al respecto. Esta mañana le he sorprendido mirando nuestro piso, ¡me corta el rollo! ¡No puedo hacer ciertas cosas!

(Friends: Episode 20 – season 4)

### 6.4.3.3. (*Vamos*) *a ver and veamos*

Table 6.59 shows a low occurrence of (*vamos*) *a ver* in the TT as compared to CREA. But even more striking is the absence of *veamos* in SV and CREA, as shown by tables 6.50 and 6.60. This is the only case in which the TT resorts to an AG that does not occur at all in either SV or CREA. As a matter of fact, the occurrence of *veamos* in the dubbed script is not occasional, but it constitutes the preferred option over (*vamos*) *a ver*. Tables 6.61 and 6.62, which list the ST units that bring about the occurrence of (*vamos*) *a ver* and *veamos*, provide some insight into how these markers are used in the TT. The three most recurrent units triggering (*vamos*) *a ver* and *veamos* are the same: *okay, alright* and *let’s see*. A qualitative analysis shows that these markers fulfil, like (*vamos*) *a ver* and *veamos*, the role of AGs, featuring a prospective meaning (Ex.74) and providing speakers with time to stop, think and reorganise their discourse (Ex.75):

(Ex.74)
Joey: **Okay**, for next time, what do you say?
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Joey: **A ver**, la próxima vez ¿qué le dirás?

(Friends: Episode 13 – season 4)
Table 6.62 indicates, however, an obvious difference between (vamos) a ver and veamos – the latter is triggered 9 times by let’s see, an English AG that happens to be its literal translation. Given that veamos has not been found in SV or CREA, this may suggest that it is a calque of let’s see. However, before such a thing can be stated, it is worth having a look at how veamos is used, if at all, in the non-colloquial section of CREA, which may help determine what effect it has when used in the dubbed script.

This search shows, first of all, some occurrences of veamos used by TV presenters addressing their audience (4.5 occurrences per 100,000 words). Yet, none of these cases feature veamos as an AG, but as an imperative. It is only when this search is performed in the written section of CREA that veamos occurs as an AG. Within this section, it seems to be quite common in fiction books (frequency of 14.9), where it is almost evenly distributed between theoretical essays (frequency of 7) and dialogues (frequency of 7.9). In the theoretical essays, authors use veamos to engage their readers and focus their attention on forthcoming explanations or rhetorical questions, be it on philosophy (Ex.76) or even sitcoms (Ex.77). As for the dialogues, they cannot be said to abide by the parameters characterizing colloquial conversation (see 3.1). Instead, and similarly to what happened in the case of verás (see 6.4.3.1), veamos seems to be used in these cases by (±)old speakers who are addressing (±)younger (±)addressees in (±)formal situations. This is shown in (Ex.78), where a priest addresses a young man as hijo mío and especially in (Ex.79), where it is the author who describes the speaker’s tone as fatherly (paternal) after he has uttered two words: the transitional marker bien (described as formal in 6.2.3.2) and veamos:

(Ex.76)
Veamos, ¿qué es lo que conceptualmente dice este film acerca de la problemática kantiana?

(CREA)
Veamos: ¿qué es lo que más poderosamente llama la atención en una telecomedia americana? ¿Cuál es el factor común a todos estos engendros aparentemente divertidos? La casa y la cocina. 

(CREA)

Refiere un cuento del siglo XVIII que un joven iba a casarse. Al confesarse, viendo el sacerdote que no tenía mucha práctica en hacerlo, quiso ayudarle.

-Veamos, hijo mío: ¿has mentido?

(CREA)

- Bien, veamos -le había dicho en su tono paternal de siempre-. Ante todo. ¿Tiene confianza en mí? ¿Cree que estoy aquí por su bien?

(CREA)

In the light of all this, the use of veamos to translate, for example, let’s see (an AG that is normally used in English colloquial conversation) may be regarded as unnatural. Used in colloquial exchanges in the TT, it adds a certain distance between the speakers, a distance that was not present in the ST and that is far from the functional and social equality that characterises colloquial conversation (see 3.1).

Furthermore, it is important to note that, from the point of view of dubbing constraints, every single occurrence of veamos is perfectly avoidable. In the absence of close-ups in any of the 19 occurrences of this marker, isochrony is the only synchrony to be taken into account. Both vamos a ver and especially a ver can be uttered in the same time as veamos and can thus replace it, as proved by the fact that they are actually used to translate the same ST units. The following example shows how little influence constraints have on the use of veamos:

(Ex.80)
Chandler: Okay, so it’s just because it was my table I have to buy a new one?

Chandler: Veamos, ¿sólo porque era mi mesa tengo que comprar una nueva?

(Friends: Episode 12 – season 1)

The initial shot in this scene shows a fallen table and Chandler’s feet as he starts talking to Joey. This is all the audience can see as Chandler utters the first part of his sentence. The translator could have chosen any other AG, or anything else for that matter, to
translate *okay*. Why, then, *veamos*? If it is, as has been suggested so far, a calque of *let’s see*, why is it being used here to translate *okay*?

A closer look at the use of *veamos* in the dubbed script may shed some light on this. Indeed, it is mainly in the first episodes that *veamos* is used to translate *let’s see*. Thereafter, and especially in the second season, *veamos* occurs as translation of other AGs. It thus seems that, first of all, *veamos* is used by the translator as a calque of *let’s see* in a specific pragmatic situation: the speaker draws the hearer’s attention to upcoming information and perhaps rearranges his/her discourse. In other words, *veamos* is used by the translator as an AG. Then, when this situation occurs again (and it does, given the characteristic repetitiveness of sitcoms), the translator resorts to *veamos* even if the AG used in the ST is not *let’s see*, as in (Ex.80). The use of *veamos* in the TT may thus be regarded as a pragmatic calque that does not necessarily need to be triggered by *let’s see*.

6.4.4. Conclusions

Brought about by the interactive nature of colloquial conversation, AGs are essential in both spontaneous and fictional dialogue, whether translated or not. They enable the speaker to draw the hearer’s attention to what is being said and determine the proximity (or distance) between the participants in the conversation.

Unlike HRMs, AGs are 3-4 times more recurrent in both fictional corpora than in CREA. The reason for this may be that they are less time-consuming and so more fiction-friendly than HRMs, and are thus chosen as privileged carriers of orality (Pavesi 2005) to add a naturalistic effect to the script. This is especially clear in instances where AGs are added to the TT for no other reason (neither the ST nor dubbing constraints) than the possibility to do so.

However, not all the AGs used in the TT may be considered as natural in the colloquial context in which they are used. Whereas the occurrence of *mira* in the TT mirrors that of CREA and what is described in the relevant literature, *verás* presents a very different situation. It can hardly be found either in the literature or in the colloquial section of CREA. It only occurs in the non-colloquial section of CREA, where it is used as an AG by (±)old speakers who are addressing (±)younger (±)strangers in (±)formal situations.
As an AG in the dubbed script, verás is used in a completely different register, in a colloquial setting, thus adding distance and formality to the relationship between the participants. On some of these occasions, verás is used either because something needs to be added (constraints) or because something can be added (leeway), thus corroborating its role as privileged carrier of orality which, in this case, does not make the TT more natural.

As for oye, it is also overused in the TT. However, it poses fewer problems in terms of naturalness than verás, not only because it is very common in spontaneous conversation but also because its different uses in the dubbed script are similar to those found in CREA, even the most idiomatic ones. As for escucha, it seems to be more common in the TT than what CREA and the relevant literature indicate. Given that it is mainly used as a (literal) translation of listen, it may be regarded as an anglicism of frequency.

One of the most unnatural features of the TT is the use of plural AGs when the speaker addresses two or more people. In these situations, which are very recurrent in sitcoms, both SV and CREA (as well as the relevant literature) opt for a different option: either the infinitive or more frequently the singular form of the AG. The use of plural AGs in colloquial situations such as those portrayed in the TT is regarded as formal and pedantic, not least because it creates a considerable inconsistency of register when they co-occur with colloquial units.

As for the pair (vamos) a ver/veamos, whereas the former poses no major problems, other than being slightly underused, veamos does. It does not feature in the relevant literature or in the speech section of CREA but it can be found in the written section of CREA, both in dialogues and theoretical explanations. Similarly to verás, it adds formality to the TT and creates a certain distance between the speaker and the addressee/s. As it happens with the other unnatural AGs found in the TT, it is not motivated by dubbing constraints, as suggested by the fact that it can always be replaced by a different marker and that it is used in instances of total translational freedom. It may be regarded as a calque of let’s see but it is sometimes used to translate other English AGs. In this sense, it is described here as a pragmatic calque of let’s see that is triggered not only by let’s see but also by pragmatic situations in which let’s see could have been used but was not.
To conclude, whereas in spontaneous colloquial conversation AGs are a recurrent device to attract the hearer’s attention and create proximity between the participants, in the TT they are even more recurrent, especially chosen for their fiction-friendly nature as privileged carriers of orality to provide a naturalistic effect, and yet most of the times (verás, veamos, mirad, veréis, oíd, escuchad) they are unnatural, as they add distance and formality to the dubbed conversations.

6.5. EMs

6.5.1. Description of the EMs to be analysed

Apart from the general characteristics outlined in 3.3.3.1 and 4.3.2.3, the EMs described here share two other important features. The first one has to do with the intensity with which they show the speaker’s commitment to the truth of the utterance they modify. Indeed, EMs and modal particles in general are often classified with scales and continua (Westney 1986, Halliday and Matthiessen 2004) to assess the certainty or commitment expressed by the speaker, which may be high/median/low (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004) or strong/intermediate/weak (Westney 1986). According to Fuentes and Alcaide (1996), the three EMs analysed here are positioned at the far end of the scale and thus qualify as high or strong in terms of commitment.

Secondly, all three EMs may be used both in dialogue and monologue within a conversation (Fuentes and Alcaide 1996). In dialogue, their most traditional role, they are used as reactions to a previous intervention by another participant in the conversation. They function as response markers or response tokens (McCarthy 1999) which allow the speaker to intensify his/her agreement or disagreement with the addressee. When fulfilling this role, desde luego, por supuesto and claro can be combined (unlike other Spanish EMs such as en efecto) with que + clause, que + sí and que + no (desde luego que iré, por supuesto que sí, claro que no). When used in monologue, a more specialised role, they are included within the speaker’s intervention (even if this is still part of a conversation) and do not focus on prior information but on an upcoming utterance. In this role, EMs are not used as response markers to react to what the addressee has said, but as a means to introduce an utterance that is regarded by the speaker as evident (Fuentes and Alcaide 1996, Martín and Portolés 1999).
The following section offers a more detailed individual account of these markers with a special focus on the differences between them, which seem to lie mainly in their frequency in conversation and in the different values they acquire when used in monologue.

6.5.1.1. Desde luego

Used in dialogue (i.e. as a response marker, focusing on prior information), desde luego behaves very similarly to por supuesto and claro, as it is used by speakers to show their commitment (or lack of commitment, if it is followed by que no) to the truth of what the addressee has just said. However, it differs from the other two EMs in terms of frequency. As described by Fuentes and Alcaide (1996), who carry out a study on the spontaneous occurrence of these three EMs in three corpora featuring formal, standard and informal conversations, desde luego is the only one that is more common in formal conversations than in informal ones.

As for its use in monologue (focusing on upcoming information), desde luego introduces an utterance that is regarded as evident. However, according to Martín and Portolés (1999), it does so, unlike por supuesto and claro, strictly from the point of view of the speaker and often in contrast with other points of view. Its meaning may thus be paraphrased as “at least for me, this is out of the question” (Fuentes and Alcaide 1996:188; my translation), and it may be used by speakers to justify their views or their decisions when other views or decisions are expected to be different:

Un periódico local como el Correo de Andalucía, pues sí, trata mejor los problemas locales que otro como el ABC, ¿no?... (…) Ahora, yo creo que, desde luego, el Correo es el que mejor refleja, hoy en día, de los tres…

(ibid.)

Fuentes and Alcaide (ibid.) point out the high frequency of occurrence of desde luego with this function in colloquial conversation, where it acts almost as a filler. Furthermore, desde luego can also be used in monologue with a concessive value (Martín and Portolés 1999), that is, modifying an upcoming utterance that, in turn, anticipates a potential objection. It usually follows a fixed pattern: desde luego (...), pero...:

Yo era muy chica, desde luego, pero sé qué era lo principal de una casa.

(Fuentes and Alcaide 1996:189)
Finally, as for the distribution of *desde luego* in naturally-occurring conversation, Fuentes and Alcaide (ibid.) indicate that, apart from being, as has been said, more common in formal than in informal conversations, this EM is also more recurrent in monologue than it is in dialogue.

6.5.1.2. Por supuesto

As far as its use in dialogue (as a response marker) is concerned, Fuentes and Alcaide (1996) note that utterances modified by *por supuesto* are seen as more evident than those modified by *desde luego* and *claro*. In any case, the main difference between *por supuesto* and *desde luego* is that *por supuesto* seems to be much more common in standard and informal conversation than it is in formal exchanges (ibid.).

In monologue, *por supuesto* is also used to reinforce an upcoming utterance, but not, as in the case of *desde luego*, from the speaker’s standpoint (Martín and Portolés 1999). Instead, the utterance introduced by *por supuesto* is meant to be clear for everyone, i.e. a matter of common knowledge. It may even be a logical conclusion from what has already been said, thus presenting no contrast between the speaker’s and other people’s views (Martín and Portolés 1999). Like *desde luego*, *por supuesto* may be used in monologue with a concessive value, also anticipating a potential objection with *pero* (*por supuesto[...], pero...*).

Finally, and as was described regarding *desde luego*, *por supuesto* seems to be more common in monologue than in dialogue (Fuentes and Alcaide 1996).

6.5.1.3. Claro

If there is one aspect that characterises *claro* by opposition to *desde luego* and *por supuesto* is its frequency (Fuentes and Alcaide 1996): it is, by far, the most common of the three EMs, and especially recurrent in non-formal settings.

As a response marker in colloquial dialogue, *claro* comes from the phrase *está claro*, although, according to Martín and Portolés (1999), it has already acquired the status of DM. These authors also point out that *claro* often becomes the preferred choice over the more standard *sí* when the speaker needs to show his/her commitment to the truth of
what the addressee has said and that it is often followed by *que + clause, sí or no* as well as preceded by *pues (pues claro, pues claro que + clause, pues claro que sí/no)* (Fuentes and Alcaide 1996, Martín and Portolés 1999).

When used in monologue, *claro* is syntactically versatile and can fulfil different functions (Fuentes and Alcaide 1996). Firstly, and similarly to *desde luego* and *por supuesto*, it may be used to stress the truth of an upcoming utterance, which is thus seen as a logical consequence of something that has been said before. *Claro* presents this utterance as evident from the point of view of the speaker but also from that of the hearer (Martín and Portolés 1999). Secondly, *claro* may also be used in monologue with a concessive value, very much like *desde luego* and *por supuesto*, that is, preceding a potential objection that is introduced by *pero* (Martín and Portolés 1999).

### 6.5.2. Quantitative analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>CREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desde luego</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Por supuesto</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claro</td>
<td>132.1</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>290.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.63. The three EMs in the three corpora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>CREA</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desde luego</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.64. The EM *desde luego* in the TT and CREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desde luego</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>CREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monologue</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.65. Uses of the EM *desde luego* in the three corpora

---

36 The figures included in this table account for the occurrence of these units as EMs, not as DMs with other functions. Thus, the uses of *claro* as a HRM are not covered here, as they have already been tackled in 6.1.3.6.
## Table 6.66. Uses of *desde luego* in the TT, SV and formal CREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST unit</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yeah</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totally</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It (really) was</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Really</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In fact</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That’s so sweet</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I can</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m very in</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m a senior</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s so pretty</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You bet</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You got it</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You did</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.67. ST units triggering the EM *desde luego* in the TT

## Table 6.68. The EM *por supuesto* in the TT and CREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>CREA</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Por supuesto</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.68. The EM *por supuesto* in the TT and CREA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Por supuesto</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>CREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monologue</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.69. Uses of the EM *por supuesto* in the three corpora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST unit</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of course</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeah</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Really</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totally</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certainly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You got it</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You can</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.70. ST units triggering the EM *por supuesto* in the TT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EM</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>CREA</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claro</td>
<td>132.1</td>
<td>290.1</td>
<td>107.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.71. The EM *claro* in the TT and CREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claro</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>CREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>126.6</td>
<td>166.1</td>
<td>211.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monologue</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.72. Uses of the EM *claro* in the three corpora
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST unit</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sure</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeah</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of course</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okay</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You know (where I work)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.73. ST units triggering the EM *claro* in the TT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>CREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claro que sí</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claro que no</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pues claro</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claro, claro</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hombre, claro</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>59.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.74. Combinations of *claro* in dialogue (i.e. as response marker) in the three corpora

A first look at table 6.63 shows that, apart from the low occurrence of *por supuesto* in SV, the most significant discrepancies between the data, especially between the TT and CREA, is the underuse of *claro* in the former. Yet, previous sections within this data analysis have shown that no valid conclusions can be drawn before a qualitative analysis is carried out. In the case of these EMs, it is essential, for example, to look at their distribution in dialogue and monologue, as it is to compare the different ST units triggering them.

---

37 Given the high occurrence of *claro* in the TT (192 times), the qualitative analysis, including the study of the ST, has been performed in this case in a sample of 16 episodes (8 hours) of the whole corpus, the first and last two episodes of every season.
6.5.3. Qualitative analysis

6.5.3.1. Desde luego

Although the log-likelihood test shows no significant difference in the frequency of occurrence of *desde luego* in the TT and CREA (see table 6.64), table 6.65 suggests that this EM is being used in a very different way. *Desde luego* occurs in the dubbed script mainly in dialogue, that is, as a response marker, whereas SV and CREA resort to it almost exclusively for monologue, which ties in with what is described in the relevant literature (see 6.5.1.1).

In order to ascertain the effect that the overuse of *desde luego* as a response marker may have on the TT, it is important to take up what was described by Fuentes and Alcaide (1996) in this regard, namely that the use of *desde luego* in dialogue corresponds mainly to formal conversations. Table 6.66 shows the occurrence of *desde luego* in the formal speech section of CREA. It seems clear that *desde luego* is remarkably more common in formal conversations than it is in colloquial exchanges, not only in general terms, but also (and especially) in dialogue, where it is 68 times more recurrent than in colloquial conversation. In contrast, the TT resorts to *desde luego* in colloquial settings, which becomes all the more unnatural when co-occurring with colloquial units such as *tía*:

(Ex.81)

Monica: All right, I’m gonna go to work. Does anybody have a problem with that?
Joey: **Yeah**, lady, I do! I got a problem with that!

Mónica: Bueno, me voy a trabajar. ¿Eso le supone algún problema a alguien?
Joey: **Desde luego**, tía, ¡a mí! ¡A mí me supone un problema!

(Friends: Episode 10 – season 4)

Further insight on the effect of this excessive use of *desde luego* as a response marker in the TT may be gained by looking at the ST units triggering this marker as compared to those triggering *por supuesto* and *claro* (see tables 6.67, 6.70 and 6.73). Whereas *por supuesto* and *claro* are used in the TT to translate 12 and 9 ST units respectively, most of which are EMs in English (75% in the case of *por supuesto*, 70% for *claro*), *desde luego* presents a different situation. It translates a higher number of ST units (17), fewer of which (29%) are English EMs. This could indicate that *desde luego* is being used as a privileged carrier of orality, just like the HRM *bueno* or the AG *verás*, almost as a default choice to translate ST units that are, may act as, or just resemble EMs in the ST.
However, it is still too early to draw such a conclusion, especially until specific examples have been analysed.

In this sense, a particularly fertile context for this analysis are, as pointed out in 3.3.3.1, evaluative settings in which all participants express their views, often spontaneously (Carretero 2002, Recsky 2006). These instances are likely to correspond to group scenes filmed with group shots in the TT, which, as explained in 2.3.3.3, have two particularities. On the one hand, they are free of constraints and, on the other, the translator usually resorts to the symbol (AD LIB) to indicate the dubbing actors and the dubbing director that they can improvise the dialogue, thus giving them a great margin for spontaneity.

Overall, the TT features 5 occurrences of *desde luego* in group agreements. In (Ex. 82), Ross, Phoebe, Rachel and Chandler reply to Monica’s question about a documentary with EMs. The camera is, however, on Joey, who cannot answer as he has not seen the documentary in question. Since none of the four speakers is visible, the translator could have chosen any EMs other than *desde luego*, and certainly a more colloquial one. As for (Ex.83), it features a similar degree of translational freedom, as only Chandler and Ross are seen by the audience when all characters show their agreement with Chandler. Once again, the use of a more colloquial EM such as *claro* would have been possible. More interestingly, there is in this case an unexpected change of speaker, as the character uttering the EM changes from the ST (Rachel) to the TT (Phoebe). This is not in itself a sign of lack of naturalness (although the use of *desde luego* in this context is), but possibly a sign of the intervention of the dubbing actors. It is safe to assume that the translator would not normally change the speaker in a dialogue, and that this is more likely to happen if the scene is improvised by dubbing actors on the spot. (Ex.84) and (Ex.85) are even clearer in this regard. (Ex.84) shows Phoebe and Rachel, Monica and then Phoebe gradually agreeing with what Ross has said. In the TT, which features no visual constraints, all speakers are changed, as it is first Monica, then Phoebe and finally Rachel who agree with Ross. Finally, in (Ex.85), the ST features all characters congratulating and thanking Chandler for the speech he has given. In the TT, the target audience can actually hear everyone thanking Chandler, including Chandler himself. Once again, this seems a result of the improvised intervention of the dubbing actors, who have decided on the spot to use the EM *desde luego* in a setting in which there are no
constraints (the character’s mouths are covered by the glasses they are raising as they make a toast) to translate ST units that are not EMs (*that’s so sweet, thank you*). Thus, *desde luego* seems to be added in these scenes as a privileged carrier of orality (although, as has been explained, it adds formality) for no apparent reason (no constraints) not only by the translator but also spontaneously by the dubbing actors:

(Ex.82)
Monica: Oh! Did anybody see that-that documentary on the Korean War?
All: Oh, yeah. **Yeah.**

(Mónica: ¡Oye! ¿Habéis visto ese documental sobre la guerra de Korea?
Todos: Uy, sí, sí. **Desde luego.**)

(Friends: Episode 3 – season 4)

(Ex.83)
Monica: You could do that!
Chandler: You think?
All: Yeah, yeah, yeah.
Rachel: **Absolutely.**

(Monica: ¡Tienes posibilidades!
Chandler: ¿Seguro?
Todos: (nodding)
Phoebe: Sí, sí, **desde luego.**)

(Friends: Episode 6 – season 1)

(Ex.84)
Ross: I’m telling you, it’s totally unconstitutional.
Phoebe and Rachel: Yeah.
Monica: **I totally agree.**
Phoebe: It is.

(Ross: Os aseguro que eso es anticonstitucional.
Monica: Estoy de acuerdo.
Phoebe: **Desde luego.**
Rachel: Lo es.)

(Friends: Episode 3 – season 4)

(Ex.85)
Chandler: So I guess what I’m trying to say is that I’m very thankful that all of your Thanksgivings sucked.
All: That’s so sweet.
Rachel: Thank you.

(Chandler: Lo que estoy intentando decir es que me alegra mucho de que vuestro Día de Acción de Gracias haya sido una mierda.
Todos **(including Chandler):** Sí, sí.
Phoebe and Ross: **Desde luego, desde luego.**)

(Friends: Episode 9 – season 1)
In the light of these examples, the question arises of why the dubbing actors do not choose, in a more or less spontaneous setting, what is often chosen in spontaneous colloquial conversation as opposed to the unnatural *desde luego*. These examples also call into question Baños’ (2007) view that it is the unplanned and almost spontaneous additions on the part of the dubbing actors that provide the dubbed text with naturalness (see 4.2.2.2).

6.5.3.2. *Por supuesto*

Although, as it happened in the case of *desde luego*, table 6.68 shows no significant difference in the occurrence of *por supuesto* in the TT and CREA, table 6.69 suggests that this EM is being used differently. Whereas the TT favours its use in dialogue, CREA opts for its use in monologue. Yet, the case of *por supuesto* is different to that of *desde luego*, especially with regard to its naturalness in the dubbed script. First of all, the contrast between its use in dialogue and monologue in spontaneous conversation is not so sharp, as almost 30% of the occurrences of *por supuesto* in CREA are found in dialogue. Secondly, it must not be forgotten that *por supuesto* is actually used mainly in standard and colloquial conversation (Fuentes and Alcaide 1996); thus, even if it is clearly overused in the TT, at least it cannot be said to add formality as in the case of *desde luego*. Therefore, the use of *por supuesto* in the TT may be regarded as natural, especially in group scenes, which usually feature several EMs in the ST and where a second EM is often needed in the TT to reinforce the more recurrent *claro*. The combination of *claro* and *por supuesto* proves a useful resource in this situation:

(Ex. 86)
Ross: Uh, if you guys don’t mind, I’d like to take a moment, just me and him.
All: Oh, sure. Sure, absolutely.

(Ex. 87)
- ¿Y vosotros creéis que eso... porqué... se lo puede callar la gente, sa-sabiéndolo? Una cosa tan importante importante...
- Joder, pues sí, pero... que se lo pueda callar... ¿Cosas de éstas gordas, gordas?
- Claro, *por supuesto*, si son las las cosas más simples de... que son secretos de Estado.
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6.5.3.3. Claro

*Claro* shows by far the biggest difference in the quantitative results, with a very significant contrast between the TT and CREA (table 6.71). As revealed by table 6.72, this difference is not only found in its use in dialogue but also (and mainly) in monologue, where it is 14 times more common in CREA than in the dubbed script. This seems to confirm the pattern established so far, whereby the TT favours the traditional use of all three EMs as response markers in dialogue, featuring a much lower occurrence of the more specialised use of these EMs in monologue.

In any case, the results show that the TT chooses *claro* as a privileged carrier of orality over *por supuesto* and *desde luego*, which, judging by what is described in the literature and what is shown in CREA, seems a natural choice. As a matter of fact, on many occasions *claro* features in the dubbed script, tying in with the description by Martín and Portolés (1999) about spontaneous colloquial conversation (see 6.5.1.3), as the preferred choice over the more standard *sí* to show the speaker’s agreement:

(Ex.88)
Ross: **Yes**, we have to tell her!

*----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------*

Ross: ¡**Claro** que tenemos que decírselo! 

(Friends: Episode 2 – season 4)

(Ex.89)
Monica: **Yeah**, y’know, but something like salmon, which would be so much more elegant than the chicken.

*----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------*

Monica: **Claro**, pero un poco de salmón quedaría mucho más elegante que el pollo.

(Friends: Episode 23 – season 4)

However, the use of *claro* in dialogue (i.e. as a response marker) in the TT does pose a problem with regard to another characterising feature of colloquial EMs described in 6.5.1, namely the variation in its use and the combination with different units in native(-like) conversation. As explained in 6.5.1.3, *claro* is often followed in spontaneous colloquial conversation by *que + clause*, *sí* or *no* as well as preceded by *pues* (*pues claro, pues claro que + clause, pues claro que si/no*) (Fuentes and Alcaide 1996, Martín and Portolés 1999). Given that *desde luego* occurs mainly in formal exchanges, these different combinations of *claro* become all the more important to achieve in the TT the variation that characterises a natural use of EMs.
Table 6.74 includes the combinations of claro in the three corpora under study. Although the TT does feature common occurrences of claro que sí and claro que no, it only resorts occasionally to other combinations that are frequent in spontaneous colloquial conversation, such as pues claro and claro, claro. More importantly, it contains no occurrences of pues claro que sí, pues claro que no and hombre, claro. Both pues claro que sí and pues claro que no constitute very useful solutions for the few cases in which dubbing constraints affect the translation of EMs. Once again, given that lip-synch does not apply (no close-ups coincide with EMs), the translator is mainly concerned with isochrony. As a two-syllable EM, claro is often used in the TT to translate of course, yeah, sure, right, okay and even absolutely in some cases (see table 6.73). However, it is too short for the translation of longer, combined EMs such as really in it really was (Ex. 90) and other longer utterances acting as or translated as EMs (Ex. 91). Here, pues claro que sí/no could be a very useful resource to avoid using desde luego, especially in intimate situations such as the one portrayed in (Ex. 91), where the use of this formal marker becomes all the more unnatural:

(Ex. 90)
Monica: It was a really beautiful service.
Mrs. Geller: It really was.

Mónica: Ha sido un funeral muy hermoso.
Sra. Geller: Sí, desde luego que sí.

(Ex. 91)
(Monica and Ethan in bed)
Monica: You’re not a senior?
Ethan: Oh, I am a senior... in High School.

Monica: ¿No estás estudiando?
Ethan: Oh, desde luego que sí... pero en el instituto.

(Friends: Episode 8 – season 1)

(Friends: Episode 22 – season 1)

6.5.4. Conclusions

As indicators of epistemic modality, EMs play a key role in colloquial conversation, showing the speaker’s commitment to the truth of the utterance they modify. They are found to be particularly recurrent in texts with low degree of planning, such as naturally-occurring colloquial conversation, and, within this, especially in evaluative group exchanges. Finally, the natural use of EMs in colloquial conversation is
characteristically varied, native speakers often resorting to a wide array of EMs or at least to the combination of the same EMs with different units.

The EMs analysed in this study show strong commitment on the part of the speaker to the truth of what is being said and may occur in dialogue or monologue when used in conversation. In dialogue, the most traditional value, they act as response markers, thus focusing on prior information. In monologue, with more specialised values, they are found within the speaker’s intervention, focusing on upcoming information and introducing an utterance that is regarded by the speaker as evident.

The present study highlights the importance of carrying out a qualitative analysis to further investigate the quantitative data obtained. In this case, whereas the quantitative analysis indicates a great deal of similarity between the TT and CREA, the qualitative analysis reveals a sharp contrast in the use of EMs in dialogue and monologue, the dubbed script consistently opting for the former and CREA for the latter.

As far as naturalness is concerned, the main problem arising from this preference is found in the use of desde luego as a response marker (i.e. in dialogue). Described as formal in the literature, it is virtually absent from SV and the colloquial section of CREA, but considerably more common in the formal section of CREA. In the TT it is often used to translate a wide range of units that are not necessarily EMs in English, as a privileged carrier of orality (although second to claro), adding formality to the colloquial dialogues.

As happens in real life, and unlike most dubbed scenes, group scenes are particularly spontaneous, the translator’s script taking a back seat to the ad-libbed contribution of the dubbing actors. In spite of this spontaneity, dubbing actors still opt on a number of occasions for desde luego as a response marker, whose use, unnatural in colloquial conversation, cannot be put down to the influence of the ST, the constraints of fictional dialogue or dubbing constraints, given that these scenes provide complete freedom from a translational viewpoint.

With regard to por supuesto, quantitative results are, once again, misleading, the qualitative analysis showing a preference of the TT for por supuesto in dialogue, in
contrast with the results from CREA. However, this is not as problematic as in the case of desde luego because the contrast between the two corpora is not so sharp and especially because both the literature and CREA suggest that por supuesto may be used (moderately) in colloquial conversation as a response marker. Therefore, the occurrence of por supuesto in dialogue in the TT may be regarded as somewhat excessive, but appropriate when used to reinforce the more common EM claro.

As for claro, although not as recurrent as in CREA, it is clearly the preferred choice in the TT over desde luego and por supuesto. Judging by what is described in the literature and the results obtained in CREA, this constitutes a natural choice. As a matter of fact, the use of claro in the TT as a response marker even mirrors the common colloquial practice of replacing the more traditional affirmative answer sí.

However, the use of claro as a response marker in the TT does pose a problem with regard to variation. Unlike SV and CREA, the dubbed script does not make use of the wide array of possible combinations offered by this EM. Regarded as a key feature of natural colloquial conversation, this variation would enable the translator to avoid using the formal desde luego and to overcome the only dubbing constraint that has been found to apply: isochrony.

To conclude, it is important to note that EMs often provide the dubbing translator (and the dubbing actors) with a very suitable opportunity to mirror the naturalness and spontaneity with which they are used in real colloquial conversation, as they tend to occur in scenes with little or no influence from the ST, absolute freedom in terms of dubbing constraints and a very spontaneous setting. Yet, the dubbed script seems to miss this opportunity all too often, mainly due to the lack of variation in claro and the use of desde luego as a response marker.
CHAPTER 7
THE SUSPENSION OF LINGUISTIC DISBELIEF

During the quantitative and qualitative analysis carried out in Chapter 6, a number of unnatural DMs have been found in the TT. They belong to different groups and fulfil different functions (the EM *desde luego*, the AG *verás*, the PCMs *bien* and *muy bien*…), but they all have a common feature other than their lack of naturalness in the TT, namely the fact that no cause has been found for their use in the dubbed script. Neither the influence of the ST nor dubbing or fictional constraints can be put down as reasons why these unnatural DMs are used in the TT. The following lines attempt to provide an explanation in relation to this issue.

According to Chaume (forthcoming), there are a number of conventions that dubbing viewers may expect to find, to different extents, in any dubbed film: synchronization, credible and realistic dialogues, coherence between what is heard and what is seen, etc. In his view, the extent to which these conventions are respected determines the quality of the dubbing. Most importantly, Chaume believes that there is a “tacit agreement” between the viewers and the translator whereby the viewers know that they are watching a dubbed film but agree to overlook this as well as to tolerate certain flexibility in the above conventions (i.e. an imperfect synchronisation) as long as certain limits are not surpassed. If the conventions are broken and these limits are surpassed, then the threshold of permissiveness is crossed and the viewers are taken away from the film (see principle of appreciation in 2.4.3.1). Although Chaume is referring here to “an ideal viewer” and does not specify which threshold applies to each convention, which is something that must be found out through an empirical study within a reception theory framework, he hypothesises that the naturalness of the dialogues is an especially sensitive convention in terms of the leniency of the audience, who will be more tolerant with a slightly imperfect synchronization than with slightly artificial dialogues.

Although very useful as a starting point for the present discussion, Chaume’s reflection is questioned by some of the findings obtained in this thesis. Indeed, the lack of naturalness found in the dubbed scripts of *Friends* has not deterred the Spanish audience from making this series one of the most popular sitcoms in the history of Spanish television (see table 5.1). Likewise, although numerous studies have criticised (Gómez...
Capuz 1993, Duro 2001, Luque 2005, Valdeón forthcoming) the lack of naturalness of the Spanish dubbing language, the Spanish audience seems to be happy with these dubbed products (Gottlieb 2005). This conclusion is also reached by Palencia Villa (2002), whose research on the reception of dubbing in Spain indicates that the whole dubbing experience is seen as so natural and authentic that dubbing voices are assumed as real. Does this mean that the tolerance with regard to the naturalness of dubbed dialogues is greater than was anticipated by Chaume (forthcoming)?

In order to provide more insight into this question and, eventually, to cast at least some light on the origin of the unnatural features found in the TT, it is necessary to delve further into how dubbing is accepted in the first place by the audience; in other words, how the audience manages to suspend disbelief when watching a dubbed film. Palencia Villa (2002) uses two concepts that are essential to understand this phenomenon: the wish to enjoy the diegetic experience and the genre effect. As for the first one, Palencia Villa explains that the conventions at play in dubbing (synchrony, credibility of the dialogues, coherence between what is heard and what is seen, etc.) are often subordinated to the wish on the part of the audience to enjoy the diegetic experience of “entering” a film. Most importantly, Palencia Villa adds that these dubbing conventions accepted in tacit agreement are actually accepted as part and parcel of watching a film. In other words, in the same way that ST viewers do not question why a voice coming from a distant character walking off into the horizon is heard as though s/he was sitting beside them, the TT viewers do not question why this character speaks Spanish in what seems to be an English-speaking environment. The obstacles posed by the dubbing conventions thus become one more cinematic convention that is surpassed thanks to the wish to enjoy the cinematic experience. Furthermore, this is facilitated by the second element mentioned by Palencia Villa, the genre-effect, i.e. the effect caused by the repeated viewing of different products/texts belonging to the same genre, in this case different dramatic audiovisual texts (see 5.2.1). In this way, by watching dubbed films or sitcoms, the TT viewers learn the dubbing conventions, get used to them and avoid questioning them in order to enjoy the viewing.

The wish to enjoy the diegetic experience and the genre effect thus explain how the dubbing audience manages to suspend disbelief and crucially point towards an answer for the question of why unnatural features appear in the TT. Indeed, it could be argued
that, ready as they are to suspend disbelief with regard to cinematic and dubbing conventions, the TT viewers are also likely to end up suspending disbelief with regard to the lack of naturalness of the TT. In the same way that they do not question the clear sound of a distant voice (cinematic convention) or the fact that Rachel speaks Spanish in New York (dubbing convention), they may also not question that the Spanish used by Rachel is not necessarily the Spanish they would use in that situation. In other words, they *suspend linguistic disbelief*, thus accepting the use of *verás, desde luego, muy bien*, etc. as one more cinematic convention to be overlooked in order to enjoy the cinematic experience. Indeed, as put by Chion (1993), when hearing the supposedly realistic sound of a dubbed film, viewers are not in a position to compare it to the real sound that would be heard in a similar real-life situation. Instead, they compare it to their memory of that sound, which is in turn influenced by the viewing of other dubbed films that may contain unnatural dialogue. The *suspension of linguistic disbelief* can thus be defined as the process that allows the dubbing audience to turn a deaf ear to the possible unnaturalness of the dubbed script while enjoying the cinematic experience.

The key point here for the question tackled in this discussion is that, as TT viewers, dubbing translators are also very likely to end up suspending linguistic disbelief, which may explain why there is still lack of naturalness in the Spanish dubbing language. If the translator of *Friends* was comparing his/her dubbed text to real speech, to real colloquial conversation, s/he would probably not use *muy bien* to introduce a farewell, given that it is hardly ever used among friends. However, if s/he is suspending linguistic disbelief, s/he is not comparing his/her dubbed script to real dialogue, but to other dubbed films or sitcoms that may contain *muy bien* in this situation. Similarly, the dubbing actors who use the unnatural *desde luego* when asked to express group agreement would probably resort to a more colloquial EM (such as *claro*) if they were comparing this to a real-life situation. However, in their dubbing studios they are not in a position to compare it to a real-life situation (Chion 1993) but to other similar situations in dubbed films or sitcoms in which *desde luego* may have been used. The *suspension of linguistic disbelief* is thus not so much responsible for the introduction of unnatural features in dubbing language (a question that needs to be researched), but for their perpetuation. Following from this, it would appear that, due to the nature of this phenomenon, the more recurrent unnatural features are in dubbing, the more likely they are to be overlooked by the viewers, who get used to them, and perhaps by translators too. In this sense, the fact that *Friends* has
been broadcast daily for the past ten years on Spanish TV (see table 5.1) is very likely to have played an important role in the consolidation of the above-mentioned unnatural DMs as a common occurrence in the Spanish dubbing language.

To conclude, it has been said that, since their childhood (Whitman-Linsen 1992), viewers learn not to question cinematic conventions such as when they are able to hear conversations whose participants are still not shown on the screen. It is by watching this type of scene and accepting the conditions established by cinematic conventions that viewers develop their relationship with cinema, thus learning how to enjoy the cinematic experience. In the case of dubbing, this relationship is more demanding, as it has a further set of conditions: the dubbing conventions. However, this does not seem to be a problem, given that TT viewers readily accept them as if they were a new group of cinematic codes, that is, as if they were part and parcel of watching a film. The problem is that, by suspending linguistic disbelief, the dubbing audience may also be accepting a condition, the lack of naturalness of dubbed dialogues, that does not necessarily have to be part of the filmic experience and that, most importantly, may change or even impoverish this experience (for instance, by turning colloquial dialogue into formal dialogue, thus creating a considerable distance between TT characters). The analysis included in this thesis suggests that this lack of naturalness may be overcome, as it is not caused by dubbing constraints. It also indicates that a more thorough comparison with spontaneous conversation on the part of dubbing translators, should they have the time and/or inclination to do so, may be a good way to avoid the suspension of linguistic disbelief, which seems to perpetuate this problem.

In any case, it should be noted that, unlike the analysis presented in Chapter 6, the discussion included here is to be regarded as a hypothesis, which, although still to be tested with empirical evidence, paves the way to some of the new avenues of research discussed in Chapter 8 after the conclusions of the present study.
CHAPTER 8
CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER IMPLICATIONS

8.1. Summary of the aims, objectives and methods of the study

The broad aim of this thesis has been to investigate whether there is lack of naturalness in the use of DMs in the Spanish dubbed script of the American sitcom *Friends*. In order to do this, it has been necessary to provide a thorough characterisation of the Spanish dubbese as well as a definition of naturalness that could be applied to the present study.

Although a considerable amount of work has focused on dubbing from the point of view of the constraints it poses for translators, few studies have looked at the language used in dubbing and even fewer at its naturalness, regarded by many scholars as a crucial issue in this type of translation (Pavesi 2005, Gottlieb 2006) or even as the most important factor to assess the quality of dubbing (Chaume forthcoming). In the case of Spanish, some efforts have recently been made to provide a description of the Spanish dubbese (Chaume 2004a, Baños 2007), but none of them has delved into its fictional and translational dimensions, as the one offered in this thesis. Likewise, no corpus-based studies have undertaken the analysis of the naturalness of the Spanish dubbese by comparing dubbed dialogue with spontaneous dialogue, as has Pavesi (2005) in Italian. This thesis may be regarded as a tentative first step to investigate the naturalness of the Spanish dubbese, in this case focusing on the use of DMs.

In order to investigate the above issues, a range of sources were drawn on (AVT, studies on colloquial conversation, research on DMs) in an attempt to develop a framework which could accommodate the objectives set out at the outset of this study. Three corpora were used to achieve these objectives: a corpus of dubbed conversation, a corpus of non-translated fictional conversation and a corpus of spontaneous colloquial conversation. Research on AVT provided a model of analysis that was applied to the dubbed script studied in this thesis. Studies on colloquial conversation helped to set the parameters used to ensure the comparability of the corpora. Finally, research on DMs provided essential insight into the objects of study to be analysed quantitatively and qualitatively in the three corpora.
8.2. Main findings of the study

A number of general and specific findings emerged from the study. From a general viewpoint, there is an overall higher number of DMs in spontaneous dialogue (CREA) than in fictional dialogue (SV and the TT). This carries interesting implications, such as the fact that there is considerably less hesitation in SV and the TT than in CREA. The only exceptions to this rule are AGs and TMs, both of which are more recurrent in the fictional corpora. This may be explained by extradiegetic factors, such as the limited screen time available, and highlights the importance of bearing in mind the fictional dimension of the Spanish dubbese when investigating its naturalness. Overall, it seems that, regarding DMs and especially from a qualitative point of view, SV mirrors CREA or at least makes a much more similar use of them than the TT. Both CREA and SV show more variation in the use of DMs, featuring more different markers and more combinations of the same markers with other units. In this sense, the dubbed script uses them in a more repetitive and monotonous manner. In addition, CREA and SV tend to opt for innovative uses of markers (EMs) or for common markers that have been neglected in the literature (PCMs). Resulting from this, the gap between dubbed fictional dialogue and non-translated fictional dialogue is wider than that between the latter and spontaneous dialogue, which points to the need to consider the translational dimension of the Spanish dubbese when investigating its naturalness.

More specifically regarding the dubbed script, although it must be said that some of the markers analysed in this thesis are used naturally (either qualitatively, such as the PCM *bueno* and the EM *claro*, or both quantitatively and qualitatively, such as the AG *mira* and the EM *por supuesto*), there are also unnatural DMs for all the types analysed. This lack of naturalness is manifested in several manners. Firstly, the TT makes an excessive use of some markers, such as the HRM *bueno* and the PCM *en fin*. Also unnatural is the absence from the dubbed script of DMs that have been found to be particularly recurrent in SV and CREA, such as the HRM *o sea*. In this sense, SV reveals itself as a useful parallel text to provide translation alternatives for the TT: on the one hand, it is very similar to the dubbed script and is subject to fictional constraints; on the other, its use of DMs is similar enough to that of CREA as to be regarded natural. Furthermore, the lack of naturalness in the TT is also manifested in the use of DMs with the wrong function, as in the case of the response marker *de acuerdo* used as a PCM, the AG *verás* as an HRM or the response marker *está bien* as a TM. Finally, also unnatural is the occurrence in the
TT of markers that are typically formal (the TM *muy bien*, the AG *verás* and the EM *desde luego*) and even pedantic (plural AGs). These markers co-occur in the dubbed script with colloquial terms, thus creating a considerable contrast which accentuates the lack of naturalness of the TT. In general, the use of these markers adds distance between the on-screen characters, who, despite being close young friends interacting in a colloquial setting, address each other as if they were (±)old speakers who are addressing (±)younger (±)strangers in (±)formal situations (AG *verás*). In addition, given that the dialogue is addressed both to the characters (hearers) and the viewers (overhearers), the distance between the on-screen characters introduced by the use of these markers may also apply to the viewers. In other words, the viewers are also being addressed in a relation of social and functional inequality (+ power, - solidarity), even though the setting is clearly colloquial, which could make it difficult for them to project themselves inside the fiction and “vicariously share the experience of the characters” (Baumgarten 2005:100). As put by Brown and Yule (1983:21-22), “it is quite hard to feel friendly towards someone who addresses you as if you were an audience at a public meeting”.

The qualitative analysis of the corpora suggests that some these unnatural markers are actually used as privileged carriers of orality, used by the dubbing translator either when something needs to be added (as required by audiovisual constraints) or when something can be added (as allowed by the leeway brought about by the interaction of the audiovisual codes). This seems to corroborate Chaume’s (2004a) view that the specificity of the audiovisual text lies in the interaction of the different audiovisual codes, which produces not only constraints but also a great deal of freedom for translators. As for these instances of translational freedom, they may be considered as important as the constraints, and perhaps even more revealing. They seem to confirm the general view that DMs are use to add naturalness to both spontaneous conversation and fictional dialogue. Yet, the orality provided by many of these markers is more formal than what is supposed to feature in the dubbed script and, according to the definition of naturalness adopted in the present study, it may be regarded as unnatural. It would thus seem that the dubbing translator/director/actors strive for naturalness adding oral DMs when there is a chance to do so, but many of the markers used only make the dubbed script more unnatural.
As far as dubbing constraints are concerned, they pose a significant restriction for the dubbing translator but they do not seem to account for the use of unnatural markers in the dubbed script. The absence of close-ups in the scenes analysed exempts the translator from having to match labials and bilabials, which means that isochrony is the only type of synchrony that needs to be taken into consideration in this case. Yet, as described in the literature and illustrated in every qualitative analysis, isochrony allows considerable scope for variation regarding the use of DMs if there is the will to do so.

Having ruled out dubbing constraints as a possible reason to account for the lack of naturalness of some of the markers used in the dubbed script (the EM *desde luego*, the AG *verás*, etc.), attention is now turned to the ST and the SL. In some cases, the unnatural markers found in the dubbed script may be considered as calques from the SL (the TM *de acuerdo*, the PCM *muy bien*) or even anglicisms of frequency (the AG *escucha*). Yet, even though the ST has not been compared to spontaneous dialogue as the TT has, the analysis included in this thesis in the light of the information obtained in the relevant literature suggests that the use of DMs in the ST is considerably natural; in other words, it cannot be put down as a reason for the lack of naturalness found in the dubbed script.

To sum up the findings obtained in the present study, the dubbing translator/director/actors seem to strive for naturalness, which is reflected in the addition of DMs when there is a chance to do so. Even though this naturalness is sometimes achieved, more often than not it is not, as these markers add formality to the dubbed script, creating a distance between the on-screen characters (and even between the characters and the audience) that was not present in the ST, and making the already predictable script more predictable and monotonous, even when there is spontaneity and absolute freedom from a translational viewpoint.

Since neither the ST nor the SL nor fictional or dubbing constraints seem to account for the lack of naturalness found in TT DMs, a tentative explanation may lie in the suspension of linguistic disbelief, which leads, at least, to two different conclusions. On the one hand, given the particular nature of this phenomenon, the more recurrent unnatural features are in dubbed films, the more likely they are to be overlooked by the viewers, who get used to them, and perhaps by the translators too. On the other hand,
and on a more positive note, if, as it seems, these unnatural features are not caused by AVT issues, then it could be argued that they are most certainly avoidable. Whatever the case, the notion of the suspension of linguistic disbelief is to be regarded as a hypothesis that is still to be tested empirically, which points to the need for further research to pursue the examination of the naturalness of the Spanish dubbese.

8.3. Indications for further research

There are various ways in which the analysis of the naturalness of the DMs used in the Spanish dubbese could be taken further, most of them prompted by the limitations of the present study.

An obvious development would be to enlarge the corpora, especially the TT, adding episodes from a different sitcom or even adding comparable films. This would provide insight into whether the unnatural features found in the use of DMs in the dubbed script analysed in this thesis are due to the particular approach adopted by the translator of Friends. Likewise, a more balanced analysis would be obtained by adding a reference corpus of spontaneous colloquial conversation in English, such as the BNC, which could help to ascertain whether the lack of naturalness found in the TT may find its origin in the prefabricated nature of the ST.

As far as the objects of study are concerned, another way forward concerns the analysis of other types of DMs, such as interactive markers and deontic markers, and even the analysis of other similar units such as interjections and vocatives, which play an essential role in colloquial conversation and have already aroused interest among dubbing scholars (Matamala 2004). In this sense, the overall study of the naturalness of the Spanish dubbese (or that of any dubbing language, for that matter) would benefit greatly from expanding its objects of study. A possible way forward for this would be to adopt as parameters the six strategies identified by Briz (1998) as typical of colloquial conversation, which would provide a thorough description of the Spanish dubbese as well as an accurate idea of its naturalness by comparison to the way these strategies are realised in spontaneous conversation.

Finally, yet another development would consist in testing the hypothesis of the suspension of linguistic disbelief as a potential cause of the lack of naturalness found in
the use of DMs in the dubbed script. This could be done by conducting interviews with focus groups of viewers after they have watched a given dubbed programme or film. The hypothesis would be validated if the viewers enjoy the experience, find it natural at the time of viewing and yet agree that certain elements are unnatural when presented with the fact after viewing.

This and other similar studies, especially those carried out within a reception theory framework, are essential to get to the root of the naturalness of the language used in dubbing, which is regarded by many scholars as the main priority and, as has been illustrated in the present thesis, also the main potential loss in dubbing.
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