A relevance-theoretic account of the use of the discourse marker *well* in translation from Chinese into English

Wu Guangjun
Beijing International Studies University

Discourse markers are a special category of words or expressions which have been shown to pose challenges during the translation process. This article adopts a relevance-theoretic perspective and, based on the two English translations of the Chinese play *Leiyu* (*Thunderstorm*), explores the use of the discourse marker *well* in translation from Chinese into English. The findings show that the discourse marker *well* in translation from Chinese into English is added in two scenarios: to intensify weaker forms of a similar Chinese discourse marker or as an addition when omitted in Chinese. Moreover, interlingual pragmatic enrichment will ensue and the English translations, in comparison with their Chinese originals, become more determinate. Based on this study, we can conclude that discourse markers are important pragmatic elements in translation from Chinese into English. Likewise, contrastive pragmatics is shown to be of potential in the process of translation.

Keywords: relevance theory, discourse marker, *well*, Chinese-English translation

Introduction

Inherent in human interaction is the need to signal one's communicative intention in social interaction (Alo 2010: 55). Discourse markers such as *well*, *you know*, *I mean*, *but* are one of the ways of meeting such communicative needs. Since the 1980s, discourse markers have evolved into an important domain in linguistic research. Unlike more easily definable linguistic features such as verbs, nouns, etc., which have a more well-defined semantic content, discourse markers cannot easily be put into neat categories (Mattsson 2009: 264).

Translation and Interpreting Studies 12:1 (2017), **162–179**. DOI 10.1075/tis.12.1.08gua
ISSN 1932-2798 / E-ISSN 1876-2700

Discourse markers are words and expressions that are usually semantically bleached (Fuller 2003). That is to say, these words, unlike verbs and nouns, are void of lexical meaning. However, this does not mean that these words do not play a role in communication; each has a web of context-dependent pragmatic functions signaling how the utterance preceding or following the discourse marker should be interpreted, both structurally and communicatively (Mattsson 2009: 273). Blakemore (1992: 151) states that, in spite of the pragmaticalization and the associated weakening of referential meaning, discourse markers influence the proposition of a connected utterance or the discourse by indicating the way in which the utterance or discourse should be interpreted – i.e., discourse markers are "instructions for processing propositional representations."

The key difference between words with lexical meaning, on the one hand, and discourse markers, on the other, is that the latter are greatly contextualized; the function of discourse markers can only be deduced in context (Erman and Kotsinas 1993: 76). Hölker (1991: 78–79; qtd. in Jucker 1993: 436) suggests four basic features of discourse markers: (1) they do not affect the truth conditions of an utterance; (2) they do not add anything to the propositional content of an utterance; (3) they are related to the speech situation and not to the situation talked about; and (4) they have an emotive, expressive function rather than a referential, denotative, or cognitive function. Rühlemann (2007), in contrast, proposes five features of discourse markers: (1) they indicate how discourse relates to other discourse; (2) they do meta-lingual work; (3) they are discourse-deictic and indicate how the utterance containing them is a response to preceding discourse; (4) they create discourse coherence; and (5) they are oriented to the hearer's needs. From these descriptions, it is clear that discourse markers are a special category of words which are void of lexical meaning, but play an important role in discourse processing.[1]

1. The concept of discourse markers has been extensively studied, resulting in a number of terms such as pragmatic marker (e.g., Brinton 1996), discourse marker (e.g., Schiffrin 1987; Jucker and Ziv 1998), discourse particle (Hansen 1998; Aijmer 2002), and pragmatic particle (Östman 1995). Of these, discourse marker is probably the most frequently used term and is therefore also found as a broad covering term (Lewis 2006; Jucker and Ziv 1998). Consequently, discourse marker will be the term adopted in this article.

Studies on the translation of discourse markers and the discourse marker *well*

Translation of discourse markers

Studies have shown that non-native speakers very often do not use these discourse markers in the same way that native speakers do, and the underuse or misuse of discourse markers can lead to semantic or pragmatic misunderstandings (Li 2004; Fung and Carter 2007; Lam 2010; Wierzbicka 2003). In the same vein, in translation, discourse markers are recognized as being difficult to translate. The main reason for this difficulty is their multifunctionality and the fact that they "have no satisfying correspondences in other languages" (Aijmer 2008: 95). Chaume (2004) describes that a one-to-one correspondence generally does not exist between two languages, particularly in the case of discourse markers, and most of the time their correlates in the target language do not the same pragmatic meaning.

Most studies have shown that discourse markers are frequently omitted in translation, but several show other translation strategies. For instance, Bazzanella and Morra (2000) examine translations of *well* in the Italian translation of the literary text *Brothers and Sisters* by Ivy Compton Burnett. While their findings indicate that the discourse marker *well* is omitted in translation in nearly forty percent of the cases, a variety of other strategies are used in the Italian translations. Bazzanella and Morra (2009) emphasize the importance to vary translation according to the context, in order to preserve the functionality of the item in question. Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2003) analyze English fiction texts and their Swedish and Dutch translations in the English-Swedish Parallel Corpus (ESPC) and the Oslo Multilingual Corpus (OMC). The researchers note that the omission rates of translations of *well* in the Swedish and Dutch target texts are 21 percent and 7 percent respectively, but as in the case of Bazzanella and Morra (2000), they also find alternate renditions of the discourse marker *well* into Swedish and Dutch. Based on the English-Norwegian Parallel Corpus (ENPC) and the Oslo Multilingual Corpus (OMC), Johansson (2006) demonstrates that neither Norwegian nor German had definite counterparts of *well*, with translators instead opting for other renditions. Chaume (2004) examines the translation of the discourse markers *now*, *oh*, *you know*, *(you) see*, *look* and *I mean* from English into Spanish for in the movie *Pulp Fiction*. Beyond a mere documentation of different strategies, Chaume (2004) suggests how the omission of these markers in translation affects the balance between interpersonal meaning and semantic meaning. Mattsson (2009) also investigates discourse markers in the case of ten American films and their subtitles in Swedish. The results suggest that while all of these markers can be rendered into Swedish, in most cases they were in instead omitted in the subtitles. Wang (2012) similarly analyzes the discourse marker *well* in the Chinese version of *Harry Potter and the*

Sorcerer's Stone and identifies three translation strategies: translating *well* into interjection, phrase and non-translation.[2]

In addition, Alo (2010) identifies the pragmatic functions and constraints faced in the translation of discourse markers from Yoruba into English and found that translators' choices were constrained by cultural and pragmatic differences between source language and target language. Ma (2003) likewise highlights two points when translating discourse markers: (1) translators must recognize the discourse markers in the source text and understand their intentions and functions in organizing the text; and (2) translators have to pay attention to the differences between source and target discourse markers in order to appropriately represent the pragmatic functions of source text's discourse markers in the target text.

To address the translation of discourse markers, Gutt (2000) proposes a relevance-based approach. Gutt (2000) studies the English translation of the discourse marker *so* from German and indicates that the German *so* and the English *so* are false friends. While the German *so* is essentially anaphoric, the most common use of *so* in English is consequential. Gutt (2000: 154) notes that it could be an oversight if it is treated simply as a lexical mistake, and it could also be indicative of the difficulty non-relevance-based approaches to translation have with handling linguistic items whose primary function is to specify relevance-related relationships. However, relevance theory allows an explicit account of the seemingly elusive meaning of pragmatic connectives.

In summary, the above studies illustrate the challenges posed by discourse markers in translation. Given the multiple functions often held by discourse markers a number of approaches are adopted to render these in the target language. In most of the aforementioned cases, however, the studies are concerned with translations from English into other languages, with a relative dearth of scholarship having been conducted on the translation of discourse markers from other languages into English. Consequently, studies on the topic are needed, particularly in the case of translation from Chinese into English, since the use of discourse markers in Chinese is much less frequent than that in English. In other words, Chinese tends not to use discourse markers while they are a must in English, as Chinese is paratactic and English is hypotactic (Lian 1993: 48). For example:

---

2. Discourse markers have also been examined in interpreting studies. Hale (2004) for instance, examines the interpreters' renditions of *well*, *you see*, and *now*. Hale's findings show that interpreters omitted these markers in courtroom settings almost systematically. Two main reasons were suggested for their omission: a disregard of these features, being judged as superfluous and disposable; and an inherent translation difficulty found in the lack of semantic equivalents that would carry the same illocutionary force (Hale 2004: 86).

1. 她不老实，我不能信任她。
   Literal translation: She is not honest, I can't trust her.
   English translation: *Because* she is not honest, I can't trust her.
2. 他不来，我不去。
   Literal translation: He won't come here, I'll not go there.
   English translation: *If* he won't come here, I'll not go there.

The consequence of this cross-linguistic difference is that discourse markers often must be added in translation from Chinese into English. It should also be noted that the addition of discourse markers may affect or enrich the pragmatic intent of the original. Secondly, most studies on the translation of discourse markers focus on the translation methods. Studies on the pragmatic consequences of the omission, shift, or addition of discourse markers in translation are needed. With the discourse marker *well* in view, this study attempts to explore these two areas.

The discourse marker *well*

In English, *well* is the most frequent of the discourse markers (Brinton 1996: 36) and is also probably the most studied (Schourup 2001: 1025). In this sense, the study of *well* will be quite revealing to the use of the whole category of discourse markers. Since *well* is the most frequent as well as the most typical of discourse markers, and it is well-known for being difficult to translate (Johansson 2006; Aijmer 2008), it will be selected as the focal discourse marker in this study.

As a discourse marker, *well* is a multifunctional entity. Among the many functions, scholars seem to agree that there is one core function, from which the interrelated functions originate. Jucker (1993: 446) defines the core function of *well* as:

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

According to Svartvik (1980: 177), the core function of *well* is to signal a modification or partial change in the discourse: "*Well* signals a modification or partial change in the discourse, i.e., it introduces a part of the discourse that has something in common with what went before but also differs from it to some degree." However, deciphering and separating the many functions of *well* is not a simple task (Mattsson 2009: 79). In terms of its specific pragmatic functions, Jucker (1993) distinguishes four main uses of the discourse marker *well*. First, well is a marker of insufficiency, indicating some problems on the content level of the current or the preceding utterance. Second, *well* can function as a face-threat mitigator,

indicating some problems on the interpersonal level. Third, *well* may function as a frame, indicating a topic change or introducing direct reported speech. Lastly, well can function as a delay device. Jucker's classification of the use of *well* is perhaps the most comprehensive to date, and therefore will be adopted as the framework for the analysis of the use of the discourse marker *well* in translation from Chinese into English.

At present, there are two accounts of the use of discourse markers: the *Coherence* account (Schiffrin 1987; Fraser 1990) and the *Relevance* account (Blakemore 1992, 2002; Wilson and Sperber 1993). Hussein (2006: 19) summarized the difference between these two accounts in the following terms:

> Coherence proponents argue that discourse markers are linguistic elements that contribute to the coherence of discourse by encoding cohesive relationships between discourse units. Relevance theorists argue that discourse markers encode cognitive (procedural) information which controls the relevance relations between discourse units by constraining the choice of contextual information under which an utterance is relevant.

In addition, Wilson and Sperber (1993) and Blakemore (2002) argued that the coherence-based analysis of discourse markers is incomplete and unreliable. For example:

1. He is a prime minister but/? However not a president.
2. a. I am on holiday next week.
   b. So/? Therefore, you will not attend the meeting.

Wilson and Sperber (1993) and Blakemore (2002) claimed that the coherence-based account cannot explain situations such as (1) and (2) where *however* cannot replace *but* and *therefore* cannot replace *so* even though each pair of these discourse markers encode the same coherence relation. That is to say, the well-formedness of discourse is not determined solely by linguistic or semantic relationships between units in discourse, but also by consistency with the principle of relevance. Therefore, the relevance account of discourse markers is more convincing than the coherence account (Hussein 2006). In terms of translation, Gutt (2000: 233) asserted that the focus of relevance-theory-based translation is on the comparison of interpretations, not on the reproduction of words, linguistic constructions, or textual features. In this study, the relevance account will be adopted since we will focus on the pragmatic consequences of adding discourse markers when translating from Chinese into English.

Relevance theory and translation

Gutt (2000) states that translation is best handled as a matter of communication for two main reasons. First, if we can develop an account of translation competence that can accommodate a wide range of factors without describing and classifying them with respect to their various domains, then there is no a priori reason for a multidisciplinary approach. Second, the reason why communication-theoretic approaches had been felt inadequate is related to the 'code model' of communication rather than the communication approach itself (Gutt 2000: 22). Translation – in the primary sense – is an act of communication (Gutt 2000: 211). As relevance theory, outlined in Sperber and Wilson (1986/1995), is a theory of communication based on cognitive principles (Andersen 1998: 150), it follows that relevance theory is applicable to translation which is looked at as part of communication.

The Principle of Relevance states that "every act of ostensive communication communicates a presumption of its own optimal relevance" (Sperber and Wilson 1986/1995: 158). Described in a slightly different way, every utterance comes with a guarantee of optimal relevance (Iten 1998: 9). This principle also applies to translation, and as a result, this principle entails that translation shall come with a guarantee of optimal relevance.

More precisely, translation is an act of interpretive use across language boundaries (Gutt 2000: 211). Wilson and Sperber define interpretive resemblance as follows:

> two propositional forms P and Q (and by extension, two thoughts or utterances with P and Q as their propositional forms) interpretively resemble one another in a context C to the extent that they share their analytic and contextual implications in the context C. (Wilson and Sperber 1988: 138)

Applied to the context of translation, translated texts must resemble the original texts in terms of both analytic implications and contextual implications. Analytic implications are implications obtained by a process of deduction in which only analytic rules have applied and where an analytic rule is formally distinct in that it takes only as single assumption as input (Gutt 2000: 37). Contextual implications are inferences that follow not from the propositional content of an utterance alone, nor from the contextual assumptions alone, but only from the inferential combination of the two sets of propositions (Gutt 2000: 29). In short, from a relevance-theoretic perspective, a translation can only be successful if the translation resembles the original texts closely enough in relevant respects. That is to say, the translation will share the propositional content as well as the contextual assumptions with the original text.

A case study: The translation of the Chinese drama *Leiyu* (*Thunderstorm*) in English

According to Brinton (1996: 33–35), discourse markers are often found in spoken language. As this study aims at written translation, a written text that includes the discourse marker *well* must be examined to illustrate the linguistic differences between the treatment of *well* in English and Chinese that may affect the translation of texts to and from the languages. The translation under consideration in this article is *Leiyu* (*Thunderstorm*), one of the best plays in modern China. Striking differences between its two English translations in terms of the use of the discourse marker *well* make this text well suited for this type of analysis.

Written by the famous Chinese playwright Cao Yu, *Leiyu* made its debut in 1934 and won immediate acclaim. Later, it evolved into one of the everlasting classics among Chinese drama. *Leiyu* was first translated into English by Yao Hsinnung (a Chinese playwright as well as a play translator) as *Thunder and Rain* and serially published in *T'ien Hsia Monthly* from 1936 to 1937. Later, together with the British translator Archie Barnes, Wang Zuoliang, late professor of English literature and translator at Beijing Foreign Studies University translated it into English again as *Thunderstorm* which was published by Foreign Languages Press in 1958. The main story is as follows. CHOU is a typical representative of the patriarchal family master in old China. His first wife, a housemaid named MA, bears him two sons: PING and TA-HAI. Later, CHOU marries a young woman, the main female character, FAN, who is only several years older than her step-son: PING. Before long, FAN enters into a clandestine affair with PING, who then shifts his attention to a young maid, FENG who is MA's daughter. The love between PING and FENG offends FAN and she decides to revenge and uncover the relationship. After learning that she is love with her brother, FENG is unable to face the shame and rushes out of the house and is electrocuted by a bare live wire in the yard in a thunderstorm night. Seeing the absurdity, PING finally shoots himself to death, leaving FAN insane in a crazy world. In what follows, the two translations are compared in terms of the use of the discourse marker *well*.

Well as a marker of insufficiency in translation from Chinese into English

The main function of the insufficiency marker is to signal that what one speaker is about to say does not altogether logically follow from what the previous speaker has said (Mattsson 2009: 90). That is to say, *well* is often used when an answer is not optimally coherent with the preceding question because the respondent cannot supply the requested information (Schiffrin 1987). In the following example, we will examine the addition of *well* as a marker of insufficiency in translation from Chinese

into English (ST standing for source text, TT1 for translated text 1 by Wang Zuoliang and Archie Barnes, TT2 for translated text 2 by Yao Hsin-nung).

Example one

ST: 繁：　四凤给老爷检的衣裳，四凤不会拿么？
贵：　我也是这么说啊，您不是不舒服么？可是老爷吩咐，要太太自己拿。
(Cao 2001: 148, 150)
[FAN: Si Feng takes care of the master's clothes. Can't she pick it?
LU: I also said so. Aren't you feeling unwell? But he ordered that you pick it yourself, madam.]

TT1: FAN: Sifeng looks after his clothes. Can't she get it for him?
LU: ***Well, that's what I said to the master,*** seeing that you're no feeling very well, but he insists that you get it, madam.
(Cao 2001: 149, 151, emphasis added)

TT2: CHOU FAN-YI. Shih-fêng takes care of the master's clothes. Can't she take it out for him?
LU KWEI. ***I also said that.*** Besides, you are indisposed. But the master said that he didn't want Shih-fêng to do it, but wanted you to take it out.
(Cao 2009: 556, emphasis added)

This dialogue consists of a question and an answer. LU KWEI (LU), the servant, told CHOU FAN-YI (FAN), the mistress, that the master wanted her to get his clothes and the mistress was confused about the request, so she asked with a rhetorical question. In the Chinese source text, there is no discourse marker since Chinese tends to omit this kind of marker. In TT2, LU's reply is translated into the form of a direct answer. In TT1, however, LU's reply is not translated into a direct answer, but one preceded by the additional discourse marker *well*, suggesting that LU's answer is not a complete one and calls for reevaluation.

In truth-conditional terms, there is no difference between TT1 and TT2 in this part. However, they differ in pragmatic terms. In TT1, interlingual pragmatic enrichment (interlingual enrichment) proposed by Sequeiros (2002: 1078) accompanies the addition of the discourse marker *well*. Interlingual enrichment is:

> An utterance is a case of interlingual enrichment if its semantic representation is the intended enrichment of the semantic representation of an utterance from another language. (Sequeiros 2002: 1078)

Enrichment is a pragmatic process whose function is to develop the text into a determinate representation. In this sense, TT1 becomes more determinate in the translation process since its interpretation is channeled by *well* to a specific route. According to relevance theory, human communication is ostensive-inferential communication (Sperber and Wilson 2001) and ostension alone is insufficient. What is more important is to recognize the intention behind the ostention.

Someone who fails to recognize the intention may fail to notice relevant information (Sperber and Wilson 2001: 50). The problem is that languages differ in degrees of ostension as well as the strategies to make meaning explicit. If translated literally, what is explicit and determinate in one language may become vague and incomplete in another language. As a result, interlingual enrichment occurs frequently in translation in order to fully convey the speaker's intention. In this example, the source text is linguistically complete in Chinese. In TT2, the English translation is literal, focusing on the logical form of the utterance. As a result, the speaker's intention is left untranslated. In addition, the coherence of the discourse is disrupted, for the answer in the form of an affirmative statement does not match the previous speaker's rhetorical question. Therefore, TT2 is pragmatically vague and incomplete, and an equivalent communicative effect will not be achieved. In TT1, with the pragmatic enrichment of the discourse marker *well*, the subtext as well as the route for the interpretation of the ensuing discourse is provided, adapting to the oral conventions of the English target culture. This is particularly important for drama translation, for "insensitivity to the subtext is presumably a major reason why many 'correct' drama translations seem so devoid of tension, and of life" (Tornqvist 1991: 12). The reason is that, unlike other genres of literary translation, drama translation requires performability, playability and speakability, which in turn prerequisites a high demand on an appropriate context to apprehend the discourse and derive the speaker's intention.

Well as a face-threat mitigator in translation from Chinese into English

According to Brown and Levinson (1978), in social interactions, face-threatening acts which damage the face of the addressee or the speaker are at times inevitable. Criticism, disapproval, a request that is possibly to be refused, or bringing up a topic that is sensitive to the hearer can be considered face-threatening acts. When such situations arise, mitigation strategies are often used to save the hearer's face. The use of discourse markers is one of these mitigation strategies.

Example two

ST: 繁: 鲁奶奶，我也知道四凤是个明白的孩子，不过有了这种不幸的情形，我的意思，是非常容易叫人发生误会的。

鲁: （叹气）今天我到这儿来是万没想到的事，回头我就预备把她带走，现在就请您准了她的长假。

[FAN: Grandma LU, I also know that Si Feng is a sensible girl. However, such an unfortunate situation happened. I mean, it is easy to cause misunderstanding.

LU (with a sigh) I never expected myself to be here today. Soon I will take her away with me, so I ask you to grant her along leave now.]

TT1: FAN: Yes, Mrs LU, I agree that Sifeng's sensible girl; But now that this unfortunate situation has arisen, ***well, I'm afraid it rather lends itself to misunderstanding.***

MA (with a sigh): I never expected to find myself here today. I'm thinking of taking her with me when I go back, so if you'd be kind enough to let her leave you at once – (Cao 2001: 179, emphasis added)

TT2: CHOU FAN-YI. Mrs Lu, I also know that Shih-fêng is a sensible child. But since there is such an unfortunate situation, ***I think it is very easy for people to get a wrong impression.***

LU (sighs) It's absolutely beyond my expectations that I should come here today. I am ready to take her away with me later. May I ask you now, Madam, to grant her a permanent leave?

(Cao 2009: 569, emphasis added)

The fact that the step-son of FAN fell in love with the daughter of MA who is FAN's servant shocked the mistress. In consequence, the mistress summoned the servant to discuss about the case. The true intention that the mistress wanted to convey to the servant was that her daughter knew better to than marry the mistress's son. To mitigate the possible face-threat and make it more acceptable, the mistress used the discourse marker "我的意思"(literally meaning " I mean" in English) in the Chinese source text. According to Schiffrin, the core function of *I mean* to signal that some sort of modification of a part of the preceding discourse is to come in the subsequent discourse:

> *I mean* marks a speaker's upcoming modification of the meaning of his/her own prior talk. The predicate 'mean', however, has several different senses, and thus the modifications marked by I mean include both expansions of ideas and explanations of intention. (Schiffrin 1987: 296)

Therefore, in this case, the Chinese discourse marker "我的意思" can be rendered into English as *I mean*. In TT1,instead of translating the Chinese discourse marker "我的意思" literally as *I mean*, the translators adapted it as *well* in English. According to Watts (1986), *well* is "a device available to the speaker for the minimization of a possible face-threat on a failure (whether real or assumed) to abide by the axiom of relevance" (Watts 1986: 58). So, both *well* and *I mean* can be used as mitigators. However, in terms of degree, we can say that *well* is a more powerful mitigator than *I mean*, as *well* is the minimization of the upcoming face-threat, but *I mean* is only the modification. In this sense, we can state that interlingual pragmatic enrichment also occurs in the translation of this utterance from Chinese into English, for the degree of mitigation is elevated.

Nevertheless, in TT2, the discourse marker is neglected and translated as *I think* which can't play the role as a mitigator. In addition, due to the lack of the

discourse marker, greater efforts on the part of the hearer are needed to derive the optimal relevance of this utterance. Communication efficiency, in turn, will be impaired.

Well as a frame in translation from Chinese into English

In English, in order to start or change a turn or a topic in communication, the speaker more often than not will first resort to a discourse marker to manage the turns and topics. Nevertheless, Chinese tends to omit these kinds of discourse markers. As a result, discourse markers signaling turn shift or topic changes need to be added in translation from Chinese into English.

Example three: Starting a turn

ST: 繁：我知道，你先去吧。鲁贵下。
繁：（向鲁妈）我先把家里的情形说一说。我家里的女人很少的。
鲁：是的。 (Cao 2001: 172)
[FAN: I know. You may go first.
(*Lu Gui goes out*.)
FAN: (*to Lu Ma*): I firstly tell you something about my family. There are few women in the house.
MA: Yes.]

TT1: FAN: All right. You needn't wait.
(*Lu Gui goes out*.)
FAN (*to Lu Ma*): ***Well, I'd better tell you something about the family first.*** You see, there are hardly any women in the house.
MA: I suppose not. (Cao 2001: 173, emphasis added)

TT2: CHOU FAN-YI. I know. You may go now. (*Exit* LU KWEI. *To* LU). ***Let me explain to you the situation in my house.*** First, there are only a few women in our family.
LU. Yes, Madam. (Cao 2009: 567, emphasis added)

After finishing the talk with LU, FAN shifted to her talk with MA. In the Chinese source text, there is no discourse marker to signal the new talk turn. In TT1, the discourse marker *well* is added to mark the start of a new turn, which complies with the convention in English. In TT2, no such marker is found. One of the consequences of the absence of the discourse marker *well* in TT2 is that the turn of the talk is too abrupt to be connective, which leads to unnaturalness in the English translation. According to Relevance Theory, translation should be expressed in such a manner that it yields the intended interpretation without putting the audience to unnecessary processing effort (Gutt 2000: 107). To achieve the ease in expression, translators are supposed to take the context into account. In Relevance

Theory, context refers to part of the communicators' assumptions about the world or cognitive environment (Gutt 2000: 27), rather than the social and physical world in which the utterance occurs. House (2006) argued for a theory of translation as re-contextualization which is defined as taking a text out of its original frame and context and placing it within a new set of relationships and culturally conditioned expectations (House 2006: 356). That is to say, translators shall also reframe the context and guarantee the accessibility of the contextual assumptions in their translations. In this regard, the addition of *well* in TT1 is not only appropriate but also necessary, for *well* serves as a bridge between the former part and the latter part of the discourse.

Example four: Changing a topic

ST: 蘩：请你问你的体面父亲，这是他十五年前喝醉了的时候告诉我的。（指桌上相片）你就是这年轻姑娘生的小孩。她因为你父亲又不要她，就自己投河死了。

萍：你，你，你简直– 好，好，（强笑）我都承认。你预备怎么样？你要跟我说什么？ (Cao 2001: 140)

[FAN: Please ask your respectable father. He told me about it fifteen years ago when he was drunk. (Pointing to the photograph on the table.) You are the daughter of this young girl. She drowned herself because your father deserted her.

PING: You, You, You just- All right, all right. *(Forces a smile*) I acknowledge everything. What do you intend to do? What do you want to tell me about?]

TT1: FAN: Go and ask your "respectable" father yourself. He told me all about it one night fifteen years ago, when he was drunk. (Pointing to the photograph on the bureau.) That girl was your mother. Your father turned her out, so she drowned herself.

PING: You're-you're-you're just-oh, all right, all right- (he smiles wryly) I'll take your word for it. ***Well, what are you going to do?*** What is it you want with me? (Cao 2001: 141, emphasis added)

TT2: CHOU FAN-YI. Please go and ask your honorable father. It was told to me by himself fifteen years ago when he was drunk. (*Points at the photograph on the clothe-press*) You were the infant son of this young girl. She drowned herself in a canal because your father forsook her.

CHOU P'ING. You – you – you are simply – All right, all right.*(Forces a smile*) I acknowledge everything. ***What do you intend to do?*** What do you want to speak to me about? (Cao 2009: 552–553, emphasis added)

FAN told PING that he was a bastard, but PING was unconvinced. Nonetheless, in view of the pictures, PING could not but acknowledge everything. As there was nothing more to talk about on the previous topic, PING changed the topic to what

to do next. In TT1, the discourse marker *well* is inserted to signal the shift of the topic. However, In TT2, such marker is absent. One of the pragmatic consequences of the omission of *well* in TT2 is that the connectivity of the discourse is broken and the intention in the original that the speaker is in despair is not conveyed. As Blakemore argued, we should not see comprehension as a byproduct of discourse acceptability (= coherence), but rather as the key to our intuitions about coherence (Blakemore 2004: 237). That is to say, discourse markers play key roles in establishing relevance in translation from Chinese into English.

Well as a delay device in translation from Chinese into English

When a speaker makes hesitations, *well* can be employed as a delay device to avoid prolonged pauses and signal that the speaker is not ready to offer the relevant information.

Example five

ST： 冲： （高兴地）哦，妈-（迟疑着）不，我不说了。
繁： （笑了）为什么？
冲： 我，我怕您生气。说了以后，你还是一样地喜欢我吗？ (Cao 2001: 76)
[CHONG (Joyfully): Oh, Mom-(hesitantly) No, I won't talk.
FAN (Smiles): Why?
CHONG: I-I'm afraid you will be angry. Will you still love me the same after I've told you?]

TT1： CHONG (elated): Oh, Mother-(He hesitates.)
No, I don't think I will tell you.
FAN: (breaking into a smile): Why not?
CHONG: ***Well***, I- I'm afraid you'll be angry. Will you still love me just the same after I've told you? (Cao 2001: 77, emphasis added)

TT2: CHOU CH'UNG. (Joyfully) Yes, Mother-(Again pauses, hesitantly) No, no, no, I won't speak.
CHOU FAN-YI. (Laughs) But why?
CHOU CH'UNG. ***I- I*** am afraid that you will be angry with me.
(Pauses) After my telling you, would you still love me as usual?
(Cao 2009: 394–395, emphasis added)

In old feudal China, the fact that CHONG, the second son of the master, fell in love with FENG, the daughter of the servant at the CHOU's, is ridiculous. As a result, when CHONG attempts to share this secret with his mother, FAN, he is afraid of infuriating his mother with his loving a maid. Consequently, he answers his mother's question with delay. In TT1, the discourse marker *well* is added in

English, which signals CHONG's hesitation. In TT2, however, there is no such discourse marker to manifest the original intent. Resemblance in the clues discourse markers provide can be important for translation (Gutt 2000: 151). Without the signals of discourse markers, comprehension and interpretation, according to relevance theory, will require additional effort which would impair the acceptability of the discourse.

On the whole, in terms of the use of the discourse marker *well*, it is evident that, TT1 is more communicative as a dramatic text because it takes full consideration of the pragmatic dimension, while TT2 only sticks to the semantic content.

Conclusion

As seen in the previous examples, the discourse marker *well* in translation from Chinese into English is added in two scenarios. On the one hand, *well* is added when Chinese omits or is short of this kind of discourse marker. This usually occurs when *well* operates as a frame, as a marker of insufficiency or as a delay device. On the other hand, *well* is used as intensification when Chinese has weak forms of similar discourse markers. Moreover, interlingual pragmatic enrichment occurs as the result of the addition or intensification of discourse markers. In another sense, it can be proposed that these translations from Chinese into English become more determinate, for the addition or intensification of the discourse markers will constrain the hearer or the reader to arrive at the optimal relevance.

The present study demonstrates that discourse markers are important pragmatic elements in translation from Chinese into English. They are necessary pragmatic devices for building relevance between apparently disconnected discourse units. In this sense, contrastive pragmatics is helpful to consider during the translation process.

References

Aijmer, Karin. 2002. *English Discourse Particles. Evidence from a Corpus*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/scl.10

Aijmer, Karin. 2008. "Translating discourse particles: A case of complex translation." In *Incorporating Corpora: The Linguist and the Translator*, edited by Gunilla Anderman and Margaret Rogers, 95–116. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Aijmer, Karin and Marie Simon-Vandenbergen. 2003. "The discourse particle *well* and its equivalents in Swedish and Dutch." *Linguistics* 41: 1123–1161. doi: 10.1515/ling.2003.036

Alo, M. 2010. "A pragmatic appraisal of the translation of Yoruba discourse markers into English." *African Journal of History and Culture* 2: 55–63.

Andersen, Gisle. 1998. "The pragmatic marker *like* from a relevance-theoretic perspective." In *Discourse Markers: Descriptions and Theory*, edited by Andreas Jucker and Yael Ziv, 147–170. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/pbns.57.09and

Bazzanella, Carla and Lucia Morra. 2000. "Discourse markers and the indeterminacy of translation. In *Argomenti per una linguistica della traduzione*, edited by Iørn Korzen and Carla Marello, 149–157. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.

Blakemore, Diane. 1992. *Understanding Utterances*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Blakemore, Diane. 2002. *Relevance and Linguistic Meaning. The Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511486456

Blakemore, Diane. 2004. "Discourse markers." In *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, edited by Laurence R. Horn and Gregory Ward, 221–240. Oxford: Blackwell.

Brinton, Laurel. 1996. *Pragmatic markers in English. Grammaticalization and discourse function*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter. doi:10.1515/9783110907582

Brown, Penelope and Stephen Levinson. 1978. "Universals in language usage: politeness phenomena." In *Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction*, edited by Ester Goody, 56–289. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cao, Yu. 2001. *Leiyu (Thunderstorm)*, translated by Wang Zuoliang and Barnes. Beijing: Foreign Languages Press.

Cao, Yu. 2009. *Thunder and rain*, translated by Yao Hsin-nung, T'ien Hsia Monthly. Beijing: National Library of China Press.

Chaume, Frederic. 2004. "Discourse markers in audiovisual translating." *Meta* 49 (4): 843–855. doi:10.7202/009785ar

Erman, Britt and Ulla-Britt Kotsinas. 1993. "The case of ba´ and you know." *Studier i modern språkvetenskap* 10: 76–93.

Fraser, Bruce. 1990. "An approach to discourse markers." *Journal of Pragmatics* 14: 383–395. doi:10.1016/0378-2166(90)90096-V

Fuller, Janet. 2003. "Discourse marker use across contexts: A comparison of native and non-native speaker performance." *Multilingua* 22: 185–208. doi:10.1515/mult.2003.010

Fung, Loretta and Ronald Carter. 2007. "Discourse markers and spoken English: Native and learner use in pedagogical settings." *Applied Linguistics* 28: 410–439. doi:10.1093/applin/amm030

Gutt, Ernst-August. 2000. *Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Hale, Sandra. 2004. *The Discourse of Court Interpreting*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hansen, Mosegaard. 1998. *The Function of Discourse Particles. A Study with Special Reference to Spoken Standard French*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/pbns.53

Hölker, Klaus. 1991. FranzÖsisich: Partikelforschung. *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik* 5: 77–88.

Hussein, Miri. 2006. "Two accounts of discourse markers in English." (accessed 26/8/2014). http://semanticsarchive.net/Archive/TljODdhM/DMs%20in%20English.pdf.

House, Juliane. 2006. "Text and context in translation." *Journal of Pragmatics* 38: 338–358. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2005.06.021

Iten, Corinne. 1998. "The meaning of although: A relevance theoretic account." *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 10: 1–29.

Johansson, Stig. 2006. "How well can *well* be translated? On the English discourse particle *well* and its correspondences in Norwegian and German." In *Pragmatic markers in contrast*, edited by Karin Aijmer and A.-Marie Simon-Vandenbergen, 115–137. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Jucker, Andreas. 1993. "The discourse marker '*well*': A relevance-theoretical account." *Journal of Pragmatics* 19: 435–452. doi: 10.1016/0378-2166(93)90004-9

Jucker, Andreas and Yael Ziv (eds). 1998. *Discourse Markers. Description and Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/pbns.57

Lam, Phoenix. 2010. "Discourse particles in corpus data and textbooks: The case of *well*." *Applied Linguistics* 31: 260–281. doi: 10.1093/applin/amp026

Lewis, Diana. 2006. "Discourse markers in English: a discourse-pragmatic view." In *Approaches to Discourse Particles*, edited by Kerstin Fischer, 43–59. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Li, Qiaolan. 2004. "A study on the pragmatic fossilization of discourse markers among English learners." *Journal of PLA University of Foreign Languages* 3: 53–57.

Lian, Shuneng. 1993. *Contrastive studies of English and Chinese*. Beijing: Higher Education Press.

Ma, Xiao. 2003. "Translation of discourse markers between English and Chinese: A pragmatic perspective." *Chinese Translators Journal* 5: 36–39.

Mattsson, Jenny. 2009. The subtitling of discourse particles: A corpus-based study of *well, you know, I mean* and *like*, and their Swedish translations in ten American films. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Gothenburg.

Östman, Jan-Ola. 1995. Pragmatic particles twenty years after. In Organization in Discourse. Proceedings from the Turku Conference, edited by Brita Wårvik, Sanna-Kaisa Tanskanen and Risto Hiltunen, 95–108. Turku: University of Turku.

Rühlemann, Christoph. 2007. *Conversation in Context. A Corpus-driven Approach*. London: Continuum.

Schourup, Lawrence. 2001. "Rethinking *well*." *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 1025–1060. doi: 10.1016/S0378-2166(00)00053-9

Sequeiros, Xose. 2002. "Interlingual pragmatic enrichment in translation." *Journal of Pragmatics* 34: 1069–1089. doi: 10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00026-7

Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511611841

Sperber, Dan and Deidre Wilson. 1986/1995. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sperber, Dan and Deidre Wilson. 2001. *Relevance: Communication and cognition*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Svartvik, Jan. 1980. "*Well* in conversation." In *Studies in English linguistics for Randolph Quirk*, edited by Sidney Greenbaum, et al., 167–177. London: Longman.

Tornqvist, Egil. 1991. *Transposing drama*. London: Macmillan Education Ltd. doi: 10.1007/978-1-349-21185-2

Wang, Chao. 2012. Translation Studies of Discourse Marker *well* in *Harry Potter and the Sorcerer's Stone*. M.A. Thesis, Chongqing University.

Watts, Richard. 1986. "Relevance in conversational moves: A reappraisal of 'well.'" *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 19: 37–59.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 2003. *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. doi: 10.1515/9783110220964

Wilson, Deirdre and Dan Sperber. 1993. "Linguistics form and relevance." *Lingua* 90: 1–25. doi: 10.1016/0024-3841(93)90058-5

Wilson, Deirdre and Dan Sperber. 1988. "Representation and relevance." In *Mental Representations: The Interface between Language and Reality*, edited by Ruth M. Kempson, 133–53. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Author's address

Wu Guangjun
School of English Language, Literature and Culture
Beijing International Studies University
No.1 Dingfuzhuangnanli, Chaoyang District
Beijing 100024
China
ajun345@hotmail.com

Biographical notes

Wu Guangjun is Professor of Translation Studies and Dean of the School of English Language, Literature and Culture, Beijing International Studies University. He is a member of Chinese Translators' Association and Chinese Association for English and Chinese Comparison. His articles on translation theory, criticism and teaching have appeared in venues such as *Meta*, *Perspectives*, *Babel*, *Translation Quarterly*, *Chinese Translators' Journal*, and *Journal of Foreign Languages*. His fields of interest include translation theory, translation criticism, literary translation and translation teaching, especially from Chinese into English.