Audiovisual translation of discursive markers in texts with academic terms

Mainura Murzamadiyeva – Arailym Shormakova – Ainagul Mukhamejanova – Amangeldi Saipov – Venera Yessengaliyeva

Abstract
This research aimed to identify effective ways to translate discursive markers from English when subtitling and dubbing feature films. Facilities translation of subtitles and dubbing were studied on the example of "well, you know, like and I mean," which, according to many linguists, are the most frequently spoken markers of the English language. During the study, it was found that discursive markers "well, you know, like and I mean" perform formal discursive and pragmatic functions in the dialogues of artistic films. From a formally discursive point of view, well, you know, like, and I mean help the addresser in formulating and correcting an utterance (functions of searching for an expression and corrections) and contribute to the coherence and organization of discourse (functions of the communicative step, thematic organization, explanations, entering an example and quoting). From a pragmatic point of view, discursive markers express the subjective attitude of the addresser to the content of his statement (functions of emphasis and uncertainty) and help the addresser to establish contact (functions of mitigation and a call for solidarity) or, conversely, keep a distance with the addressee (functions of evasion and etiquette). We noticed that in both types of audiovisual translation, there is the tendency to reduce discursive markers well, you know, like and I mean. However, the studied discursive markers are omitted more often than dubbing when subtitling. Firstly, we connected it with the hard spatiotemporal limitations of subtitling, which force the translator to reduce language units that do not carry plot-forming and character-forming load. Second, we noted a change in the form of speech during subtitling from oral to written. In this regard, the translator is forced to omit colloquial discursive markers well, you know, like and I mean, which are not peculiar to a written form of speech. In turn, dubbing does not apply the space-time constraints described above, so the translator has more opportunities to convey discursive markers well, you know, like and I mean. Translation of discursive markers often seems even desirable, as it allows you to achieve synchrony of the sound of the original and translated replicas and "put" the dubbing text on the lips of actors. Secondly, during dubbing, there is no change in the form of speech from oral to written, in connection with which the discursive markers well, you know, like and I mean, characteristic of colloquial speech, not only can but often must be translated, as this contributes to realism and natural sounding of the dubbed dialogue. We have established that when subtitling and dubbing artistic films, the reduction of discursive markers sometimes leads to functional loss. However, in dubbing, with the omission of discursive markers well, you know, like and I mean functional losses are observed much less often than in subtitles. We conclude that a smaller proportion of functional loss in dubbing is because when omitting discursive markers in translation, most of their formal discursive and pragmatic functions can be transferred by voice actors using phonation-paralinguistic means (intonation-prosodic means).
Key words: audiovisual, translation, discursive, markers, texts, academic terms

Introduction
This study focuses on interlingual transmission discursive markers from English in audiovisual translation, namely when subtitling and dubbing feature films. For a deeper understanding of the problems we are considering, the central concept of "discursive marker" should be highlighted. In the first chapter, we will define the investigated functional category, discuss several terms competing for its designation, and offer our reasons for using the term "discursive marker." In the chapter, we will also provide an overview of the history of the study of discursive markers and highlight their key features and functions. The concept of "discursive marker" has been long enough in the field of view of linguists. Over the half-century history of its study, thousands of articles and monographs on the topic and the area of problems have been investigated in connection with discursive markers. If in early works discursive markers were studied exclusively in the aspect of textual coherence, researchers today are interested in their formal-discursive and pragmatic functions in different genres (Brizuela, Andersen, Stallings, 1999), (Kogut, 2016), situations, interlingual contact, and translation (Sankoff et al., 1997; Mattson, 2009). The study of markers is carried out not only in synchronous (Schweinberger, 2014; Viktorova, 2016) but also in the diachronic cross-section (Brinton, 1996) and in a typological perspective. However, no definition has yet been formulated of discursive markers that would be widely recognized in the linguistic community. As many researchers have noted, defining discursive markers as class is highly problematic because this category includes units with a variety of structural, semantic, and stylistic properties (well, so to speak, I mean, there is no doubt, etc.). Some researchers also note that observation of the use of discursive markers suggests that the only possible feature that unites them is functional. We agree with this assertion and also believe that the basis for the definition of the class, the functional commonality of its members, must be assumed. Hence, B. Fraser defines discursive markers (researcher uses the term "pragmatic markers") as a functional class lexical expressions that, being part of a discourse segment, do not are part of its propositional content but indicate ("mark") to the pragmatic attitude of the addresser (Fraser, 1990: 386). A.A. Kibrik gives the following definition of discursive markers: discursive markers are "non-significant words or phrases, regulating the discursive process between the speaker and the addressee. Like B. Fraser, the researcher notes that markers "do not carry nineteen propositional information," and their functions "are in the sphere organization and regulation of the discursive flow" (Kibrik, Podlesskaya, 2009). I.P. Massalina also defines discursive markers as "special a class of words whose fundamentally important property is a direct connection with the functioning of discourse" (Massalina, 2009: 212). We agree with the above definitions in the way they represent the functional specificity of discursive markers and note that markers do not contribute to the informative content of the utterance, i.e., in what is reported in a statement. To see this, it suffices to remove the discursive marker from the sentence - this will not affect the proposition of the utterance. However, they are endowed with a certain functional value, which is to organize the discourse, i.e., promote its coherence and integrity, and regulate interpersonal and "status-role" (Andreeva, 2005: 84) relations of interlocutors. So, the main property of discursive markers, which we put in the basis for the definition of the concept under study, is their auxiliary role in the organization and regulation of discourse. Discourse is understood as coherent text in conjunction with the dynamic communicative situation of its generations (Arutyunova, 1990; Mishiev, 2015).
In addition to functional generality in defining discursive markers, it is important to point out essential (morphological and syntactic) properties from our point of view. First, we note that discursive markers do not constitute a separate lexico-grammatical class of language units: the class of markers includes words of different parts of speech (and, well, probably, um), as well as phrases (in a way, more or less) and

suggestions (there is no doubt that…). Therefore, following E.Yu. Viktorova, we call discursive markers a transcategorical group of units (Viktorova, 2016: 21). Secondly, it is essential for us that discursive markers do not are included not only in the proposition of the utterance but also in the syntactic the structure of the corresponding sentence, i.e., they are not part of the leading members of the proposal and their groups" (Mishieva, 2015: 64), and can also be removed from the proposal without compromising its structural integrity. In other words, discursive markers are characterized by syntactic "non-inclusion" (Aijmer, 2002: 2). So, taking as a basis the functional and grammatical properties units under study, we give the following definition of the concept of "discursive marker." Discursive markers are a transcategorical class of linguistic units that play a supporting role in organizing and regulating discourse, are not included in the proposition of the corresponding utterance, and are not included in the sentence's syntactic structure.

Firstly, we attempted to present the concept and term "discursive marker," identify critical features and functions of discursive markers, and give a brief overview of the history of the study of this concept in foreign and domestic linguistics. We have established that discursive markers are structurally heterogeneous language units (words, phrases, and sentences), which are united by a functional commonality - an auxiliary role in the organization of discourse, i.e., communication to him of coherence and integrity, as well as in the regulation of communicative contact between interlocutors. It was noted that having the indicated functional meaning, discursive markers are not part of the proposition of the utterance and "are not part of main members of the proposal and their groups. Based on functional and grammatical properties units under study, we formulated the following definition of the concept "discursive marker." Discursive markers are a transcategorical class of language units that play a supporting role in the organization and regulation of discourse, are not included in the proposition of the corresponding statements, and are not included in the sentence's syntactic structure. We noticed that along with the term "discursive marker" for designation of the functional category under study, a set is used in other terms. The choice of the term "discursive marker" was justified by the general functional orientation of our research and topics that, unlike competing designations, this term directly indicates the connection of the studied units with the functioning of the discourse.

We also covered the history of the study of discursive markers by foreign and domestic linguists. It was revealed that the study of auxiliary units of discourse began abroad a little earlier, namely in the 1970s, and was carried out in three directions: proper linguistic, linguocognitive and sociolinguistic. AT Within the appropriate linguistic approach framework, markers are understood as building units functioning at the text level (discourse is understood as a coherent text) and responsible for its linear organization and structuring. Within the framework of the linguocognitive approach, markers are considered units of the cognitive level, allowing you to look into the process of constructing and shaping thoughts by the addresser and their subsequent interpretation by the addressee. Within the sociolinguistic approach, markers are interesting as units of social interaction to avoid threats to the positive or negative public face of both interlocutors and enable polite communication. Further, we noted that a special study of discursive markers as a functional class began in Russian linguistics in the 1990s. However, units traditionally referred to as markers were studied earlier within the framework of the usual categories of grammar (particles, conjunctions, modal and introductory words). The national tradition is characterized by attention to the semantics of discursive markers and methods of their context-semantic description. Because many theoretical questions concerning markers as a class have been sufficiently developed in recent years, domestic linguists turn to particular aspects of the functioning discursive markers in different languages and

types of texts. Based on our review of the scientific literature, we compiled a list of signs of discursive markers, the significance of which is recognized by foreign and domestic linguists.

In the latter part of this paper, we focus on the problem of the interlingual transmission of discursive markers. Considering that our research has a functional focus, we will start with a brief overview of the functional approach to translation in general. Next, we will look at the functional approach to the translation of discursive markers. We will highlight the concept of "functional equivalence" and present basic principles and stages of translation of discursive markers from the positions of functionalism.

Within this approach, the translation process was interpreted as a reformulation of the text into one language using another language. The emphasis was on the original text. It was argued that the translator should strive to create such translation text that will reproduce as closely as possible formal features and content of the original text (Munday, 2001: 27). However, over time, according to J. Munday, it became apparent that the traditional, static approach does not apply to the analysis of an accurate, dynamic picture of the translation process (Munday, 2001: 27). In reality, translation is not just a linguistic relationship between two texts but a complex act of communication that involves speakers of different languages and cultures (Schweitzer, 1988: 75; Minyar-Beloruchev, 1996: 25, 29; Moonday, 2001: 87; Garbovsky, 2004: 11; Schaffner, 2010: 157). At the same time, bilingual Translation-mediated communication differs from monolingual communication only because it doubles the number of participants (Minyar Beloruchev, 1996: 29). Otherwise, it is like communicating in one language, and, like monolingual communication, it has one goal or another (Minchenkov, 2004: fifteen). This understanding of translation as a communicative action that pursuing a specific purpose within the framework of a complex communicative context and interaction of cultures was fundamental for functional direction in translation theory. The founders of the functional approach are German researchers G. Fermeer and K. Rice. According to the idea they developed called skopos (Greek. "goal"), researchers proceed from the fact that translation is a practical activity, and its success, like the success of any other activity, is determined by whether it achieves its goal (Vermeer, 1989: 221). Researchers emphasize that it cannot be said that all acts of translation follow one goal (for example, to be faithful to the original text) (Reiss, 1977; Reiss, Vermeer, 1984: 234). The purpose of the translation should be determined individually for each act of translation. In many cases, this goal will indeed be achieving maximum closeness to the original and communicating all the information it contains. Still, in some cases, the purpose will be to share only parts of information or even misinformation with the recipient.

As K. Nord clarifies, skopos, i.e., the purpose of the translation, which speaks G. Fermeer, is determined by two factors. The first factor is the communicative intention of the customer of the translation or another person, according to who initiated the translation (Nord, 2010: 122). The second factor is the sociocultural context for which the translation's text is intended (Nord, 2010: 123). G. Fermeer notes that, depending on the goal set by the customer, the same source text can be translated in different ways. At the same time, it does not matter to what extent the text of the translation is close to the original, provided that it fulfills its purpose in the context of the language and culture of the translation. Thus, the equivalence between the source text (IT) and the target text (PT) turns out to be secondary in comparison with the requirement of adequacy (Reiss, Vermeer, 1984: 139). Recall that, according to A.D. Schweitzer, equivalence is oriented on the result of the translation and consists in such a ratio of IT and PT, within which the translation text corresponds to some (formal and meaningful) parameters of the original (Schweitzer, 1988: 99). In its turn, adequacy is focused on translation as a process. In accordance with the purpose of the text's translation, requirements, and conditions, it consists of a particular act of interlingual

communication (Schweitzer, 1988: 93, 95, 99). Thus, if the relationship equivalence is established between IT and PT, then the relationship of adequacy 65 is rather established between the PT and the secondary context in which it functions. In the theory of skopos, it is the adequacy that comes to the fore in translation, which is determined by how the text of the translation corresponds to the communicative intention of the customer and the socio-cultural context in which it is intended to function. Like the authors of the skopos theory, G. Fermeer and K. Rice, a Finnish researcher J. Holz-Manttyari understands translation as a functionally oriented and socioculturally conditioned communicative process. Starting from the theory of communicative action, she develops the theory of translation actions (Holz-Manttari, 1984). J. Holz-Manttyari argues that the need for translation arises whenever linguistic and cultural barriers hinder cooperation between people. To overcome these barriers, translation action. The translation action includes several operators, including which the initiator (the one who needs the translation), the customer (the one who contacts the translator), IT creator, the PT creator (translator), the PT user, and the ultimate beneficiary of the PT (Holz-Manttari, 1984: 109–111). Each operator pursues its goal. The ultimate goal of the translation action is to "ensure functional communication through linguistic and cultural barriers" (Schaffner, 2010: 157).

According to A.D. Schweitzer, by revealing the functional dominant source text, the translator gets an idea of the communicative installation of its creator about the effect that the sender of the text wants to produce on the recipient. The translator's task is to produce an identical effect on the new recipient using the target language. At the same time, what means are needed to achieve the desired effect is influenced by the secondary communicative situation, and it is the new socio-cultural context and the specific communicative purpose of translation (Schweitzer, 1988: 79, 99). Thus, according to A.D. Schweitzer, the purpose of the translation is to "transfer the communicative effect of the primary text" (Schweitzer, 1988: 75), which can be modified under the influence of differences "between two languages, two cultures, and two communicative situations" (Schweitzer, 1988: 75). Such a translation follows the functional dominant 68 source text, corresponds to the socio-cultural communicative context, and will be an adequate replacement for the original. After reviewing the functional theories of translation, we come to the following conclusion. Fundamental to the functional approach to translation is the thesis about the communicative nature of translation activities. Translation is understood as bilingual communication within a complex communicative context and interaction of cultures. The purpose of this communication is determined in each case by the translator himself or the customer. In general, within the framework of the functional approach, the foreground is the adequacy of the translation text, firstly, to the communicative setting sender of the original text (functional dominant of the original text) or communicative attitude of the customer and, secondly, socio-cultural and communicative conditions of a particular act of translation. At the same time, the degree of formal equivalence between the source text and target text is secondary.

Results

Quantitative analysis of the means of translation of the discursive marker 'like' made it possible to identify a noticeable trend toward its reduction in subtitles and dubbing. In subtitles, the formal-discursive marker like is omitted in 52% of cases, and pragmatic - in 72.4% of cases; in this case, most often, the reduction exposed to like, which performs a formal-discursive search function expressions (80%) and pragmatic easing (100%) and emphases (77.8%). With regard to dubbing, formal-discursive markers are omitted in 44% of cases and pragmatic - in 62% of cases. In Russian dubbing and subtitles, the reduction is most often subjected to like in the formally discursive expression search function (70%) and the pragmatic function emphases (66.7%).

Further analysis showed that the omission of the discursive marker like in subtitles and dubbing sometimes leads to functional losses. Subtitled functional losses occur mainly in the reduction pragmatic markers, namely the emphases marker (the share of losses is 57%) and uncertainty (50%). In contrast, when formally discursive markers are omitted, the share of losses is insignificant (33.3% in the case of the marker explanation). In dubbing, a functional loss is rare and observed only when the pragmatic marker of uncertainty is omitted (16.7%) (Table 15). We also found that there often are functional equivalents in subtitles, and dubbing for discursive Like markers. Yes, in subtitles, it is possible to find equivalents for approximately half of the formally discursive (48%) and 18% of the pragmatic markers. In turn, in dubbed by functional equivalents, more than half formal-discursive (56%) and 26% of pragmatic markers are translated. To pass pragmatic functions like in subtitles and dubbing, compensation is used at the lexical or syntactic level. Using this technique, 9.5% of pragmatic markers are translated into subtitles and 12% in dubbing. Cases of translating like by adding not were revealed neither in subtitles nor in dubbing.

Thus, the discourse marker like, like other markers, is more often reduced in subtitles than in dubbing. Functional loss at like reductions also occurs more often in subtitles; a significant share of functional losses are due to the decrease in pragmatic markers 172 emphases and uncertainty. In dubbing, functional losses when the discursive marker is omitted are minimal and fall on the marker like, which performs the pragmatic function of uncertainty. In subtitles and dubbing, the discursive marker is often translated as functional equivalents; most often, functional equivalents can be chosen for the marker like, which performs formal-discursive features in subtitles. The compensation technique is also used for passing pragmatic like functions as in subtitles and dubbing. According to our observations, append is not used for transferring functions discourse marker like neither in subtitles nor in dubbing.

Another example of analyses
A quantitative analysis of the means of translation I mean allowed us to establish that the discursive marker is often reduced in subtitles and dubbing. In subtitles, I mean, which performs formal discursive functions, is omitted in 39% of cases, and I mean, which serves 185 pragmatic functions - in 70% of cases. Among the formal discursive markers in subtitles, the communicative step marker is most often omitted (66.7%). As for pragmatic markers, a large proportion of the reduction was observed both in the case of the emphases marker (71.4%) and the case of the marker easing (66.7%). In dubbing, formal-discursive markers are omitted in 30.4% of cases and pragmatic - in 50% of cases. As in subtitles, most often, the formal-discursive marker of the communicative step is omitted (66.7%) and pragmatic markers of emphases (50%) and mitigation (50%). Further analysis showed that in the subtitles, the reduction of the marker, I mean, performing the pragmatic functions of emphases and mitigation, often leads to functional losses: proportion of losses when the marker is lowered Emphasis is 70%, and Ease Marker is 75%. The share of losses at the omission of formal discursive markers is insignificant (about 22%); functional losses are due to correction markers and clarifications. A small amount of functional loss was observed in dubbing when formal discursive markers were omitted (14.3%). When reducing pragmatic markers to dubbing, functional losses were not detected.

When transferring the functions of the discursive marker I mean in subtitles and dubbing; in addition to the omission technique, translation is used by functional equivalent. Functional equivalents are especially common matches for formal-discursive markers: in 61% of cases in subtitles and 69.6% of cases in dubbing. To pass pragmatic marker functions, compensation is also used at the lexical or syntactic level: in 12% of cases in subtitles and 24% of cases in dubbing. The technique of adding is used to pass the I mean marker in neither subtitles nor dubbing. Thus, like the other markers considered earlier, the discursive marker I mean, in general, is

reduced more often in subtitles than in dubbing. Functional loss during marker reduction is also more commonly seen in subtitles; the main share of functional losses is accounted for in the reduction of pragmatic markers of emphasis and mitigation. In dubbing, in your turn, the functional loss when I omitted, I mean is minimized and falls on the formal-discursive marker of explanation. Both in subtitles and in dubbing for the discursive marker I mean often a functional equivalent is selected; often functional equivalents translate formal-discursive markers in subtitles. For passing pragmatic functions I mean as in 187 subtitles, and in dubbing, a compensation technique is used. In our observations, it is not used to transfer the functions of the marker I mean in subtitles, nor in dubbing.

Discussion
The second part was devoted to the problem of interlingual transmission discursive markers. We introduced a functional approach to translation in general and to the translation of discursive markers in particular, shed light on the concept of "functional equivalence," and outlined the key principles and stages of translation of discursive markers. First, we noted that discussing interlingual transmission discursive markers is conducted within the functional approach to translation. Fundamental to this approach is the thesis of the communicative nature of translation and its orientation towards achieving a specific goal in the context of a secondary communicative situation. Target translation, in general terms, is formulated as the achievement of communicative original text settings. However, it is noted that the latter may change under the influence of the secondary goal of the customer of the translation and the socio-cultural context of the secondary communicative situation. We noticed that, to implement a communicative attitude of the author of the source text and produce an identical effect, the translator must convey not only the propositional content of the text but also its discursive-pragmatic components, in particular discursive markers. Finding a translation match for a discursive marker source text should not go at the level of languages but at the level of communicative contexts. In other words, the marker translation represents is not a search for a permanent match in the target language (natural equivalent), and the choice of a variant correspondence adequate to the desired communicative setting and secondary communicative context (directed equivalent). To produce the same effect, the matched match must have the identity function during secondary communicative context, i.e. be the functional equivalent to the original token. We have established that the translation of a discursive marker takes two stages. In the first stage, the translator determines the function of the discursive marker in the original text. In this, he is helped by analyzing the linguistic and extralinguistic context of the use of the marker. In the second stage, the translator selects a translation match, which performs a similar function in the target language. Found the functional equivalent must be combined with the linguistic environment, be adequate to the extralinguistic context and satisfy the requirement of natural-sounding (first of all, to be appropriate in this form and style of speech). On the other hand, formal equivalence is not required in cross-language transmission discursive markers.
Today, audiovisual texts (fiction and documentary films, series, computer games, etc.) are actively distributed worldwide, and for this, of course, they are translated. In scientific literature, it is often noted that the translation of audiovisual texts or audiovisual translation is one of the most challenging types of translation, and its complexity is usually associated with the semiotic complexity of audiovisual texts (Kozulyaev, 2013, 2015, 2019; Diaz Cintas, Remael, 2014; Koryachkina, 2017). So, K. Rice notes that when translating audio-media texts, the translator, first of all, has to take into account the conditions of the non-linguistic, i.e. technical, medium through which the text is transmitted to the addressee (Rice, 1978: 224). In addition, notes K. Rice, in translating the verbal component of audio-media text, the translator must

consider non-verbal means of expression used in the original (Rice, 1978: 224). According to K. Rice, non-verbal expressive means, along with verbal, participate in creating a holistic form of audio-media works and in some cases, carry even more semantic load. In this regard, they are often decisive when choosing translation tools. For example, when translating a libretto, the translator repelled precisely from the melody and rhythm of music, not from the original's verbal component (Rice, 1978: 224). We believe that the translation requirements discussed above for audio-media texts are also applicable to the translation of audiovisual texts. Therefore, relying on K. Rice, we present the specifics of the audiovisual translation (WUA) as follows.

First, when translating an audiovisual text, it is necessary to consider features of the technical environment of the original - in our case, multichannel feature film. It is important to remember that a movie is a unity of audio and video, and a high-quality translation should not break this unity and make it difficult to perceive the artistic movie the viewer (read more about how multichannel affects subtitling and dubbing, which will be discussed). Secondly, the translator must consider the polysemiotic nature of the audiovisual text, or rather non-verbal means of expression used in the film (gestures, facial expressions, costume, musical accompaniment, etc.). The non-verbal component not only influences the choice of means of translation (as K. Rice says) but is also explicated by the translator if it is essential to convey a holistic author's intention, but with a high probability of not being perceived by the viewer implicitly (for example, from a video sequence) (Chiaro, 2009: 143). Separately, we note that the polysemiotic nature of the art film does not always complicate the translator's work and in some cases, helps him. Thus, incompleteness and some translation errors are often leveled out due to "intersemiotic redundancy" (Gottlieb, 2001: 21) of a movie: the viewer makes up for the information lost by the translator from the original audio track or video sequence. Finally, let's turn to the third feature of audiovisual translation. In this case, we will again refer to K. Rice. T When translating audio media text, the researcher notices that it is essential to understand what purpose the original pursues in the context of the source language and culture and accept all translation decisions by this goal (Rice, 1978: 224). We find similar reasoning in F. Schema. According to him, any audiovisual text (and mainly feature film) is inherently "expressive" (Chaume, 2004: 844), i.e., created to evoke an emotional response from the audience. The goal of audiovisual translation is that a feature film, having gotten into a new linguistic and cultural environment, "produced such the same effect it produces in the context of the source language and culture" (Chaume, 2004: 844). Simply put, if a replica in the original dialogue of an artistic movie causes laughter, this remark, translated into another language, should also make the audience laugh. In this case, installation on the identical "stage effect" (Rice, 1978: 225) may involve significant deviations from the form and content of the original (verbal) text, i.e. his adaptation in accordance with the desired "expressive" purpose. So, when translating a feature film, the translator must be based on the effect that the original text has on its audience and strive to create a text that, in the context of language and culture of the translation, will have the same effect on the audience. In other words, the translator must strive for the previously discussed functional equivalence between the original text and the text translation. Thus, we conclude that the complexity of translation audiovisual texts and, in particular, feature films, are associated with their multichannel, polysemiotic and expressive nature. Specificity audiovisual translation lies in the need, firstly, to observe the unity and synchronism of the audio and video series, and secondly, to accept into account the non-verbal component of the audiovisual text and, thirdly, to comply with the requirement of functional equivalence between the original text and translation text.

Conclusion

The discursive-pragmatic meaning of like is understood as an indication of approximate correspondence between what the addressee says and what he means. The marker performs the following formal discursive functions: expression search function, explanation, example input, and citations. Among the pragmatic functions, emphasis functions stand out, uncertainty and relaxation. Finally, the marker I mean has the following discursive-pragmatic value - an indication of a subsequent modification of the previous piece of discourse. It was determined that in our body, the marker performs a number of formal discursive functions: the correction function, communication step, and explanation. The marker also has pragmatic emphasizing and softening functions.

We also noted that in dubbing, the omission of discursive markers well, you know, like, and I mean rarely result in functional loss. Apparently, this is explained by the fact that when the markers are reduced, most of them formal-discursive and pragmatic functions can be transferred to voice actors using phonation paralinguistic means (intonation-prosodic means). In subtitles, the reduction of discursive markers often leads to functional loss. So, omission well, you know, like and I mean, performing formal-discursive functions of correction and explanation, sometimes affects the coherence of subtitles. Omitting markers, performing the pragmatic functions of emphases, uncertainty, mitigation, and call for solidarity often leads to a change in tone statements or distorted representation of the relationship of characters in translation dialogue. However, a subtitle translator can often avoid functional loss when discursive markers are omitted due to graphic paralinguistic means (punctuation marks, font variation, etc.). Further, suppose the marker function cannot be passed in subtitles using a graphic and dubbing using phonation paralinguistics. In that case, the discursive marker is not recommended to be omitted, and it is better to match it in the target language. Wherein potential translation match must be functional equivalent of a marker in the context of this statement and should look natural in the speech of the character. So, guided by the principles of functional equivalence and sound naturalness, a subtitle or dubbing translator can pick up 200 of the following functional equivalents for well, you know, like, and I markers mean: for markers that perform correction and explanation functions - in a sense, that is, like, in short, like; for emphases markers - true, in general, simply; for markers of uncertainty - like, it seems to me, probably; for softening markers - probably, it seems; for call tokens solidarity - you know / you know, understand / understand, see / see and etc. Finally, we have established that in order to transfer the functions of discursive markers in subtitles and dubbing besides functional equivalents, the technique of compensation is used on the lexical or syntactic level. In dubbing, there are also cases of adding. However, for subtitling, the use of this technique is not typical due to a limited number of characters in the subtitle.

Bibliographic references

Aijmer, K. (2013). Understanding Pragmatic Markers: A Variational Pragmatic Approach. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 192 p.

Fraser, B. (2005). Towards a Theory of Discourse Markers. Approaches to Discourse Particles. Amsterdam: Elsevier Press, 189-204.

Fraser, B. (1988). Types of English Discourse Markers. Acta Linguistica Hungarica, 38(1-4), 19-33.

Fraser, B. (1999). What are Discourse Markers? Journal of Pragmatics, 31, 931-952.

Heiss, Ch., Bollettieri, B., & Rosa, M. (1996). Traduzione multimediale per il cinema, la televisione, la scena. Bologna: Clueb. 508 p.

Hellerman, J., & Vergun, A. (2007). Language which is not Taught: The Discourse Marker Use of Beginning Adult Learners of English. Journal of Pragmatics, 39, 157-179.

Holmes, J. (1988). Sort of in New Zealand Women's and Men's Speech [Электронный ресурс]. Studia Linguistica, 42(2). https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1467- 9582.1988.tb00788.x.

Holz-Mänttäri, J. (1984). Translatorisches Handeln: Theorie und Methode. – Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia. 193 p.

Lakoff, R. (1973). Questionable Answers and Answerable Questions. Issues in Linguistics: Papers in honor of Henry and Renée Kahane. eds. B. Kachru et al. Urbana, Chicago: Illinois University Press, 453-467.

Langacker, R. (1976). Mystery' Particles and Affixes. Papers from the 12th Regional Meeting. Chicago Linguistic Society. April 23-25, 1976. Chicago: Chicago Univ. Press, 468-475.

Mattsson, J. (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: PhD. University of Gothenburg. 293 p. https://gupea.ub.gu.se/bitstream/2077/21007/1/gupea_2077_21007_1.pdf.

Mei, W. (2012). A Corpus-Based Comparative Study of Pragmatic Markers: I Mean and You Know in Native and Non-native Conversation: dissertation – University of Liverpool. 270 p. – http://core.kmi.open.ac.uk/download/pdf/16516619.pdf.

Müller, C. (2004). Forms and Uses of the Palm Up Open Hand: A Case of a Gesture Family? The Semantics and Pragmatics of Everyday Gestures. eds. C. Müller, R. Posner. Berlin: Weidler, 233-256.

Munday, J. (2001). Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications. – London, New York: Routledge, 222 p.

Nida, E. (1964). Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 331 p.

Nida, E., Taber, Ch. (1969). The Theory and Practice of Translation. Leiden: E.J. Brill. 220 p.

Nord, Ch. (2010). Functionalist Approaches. Handbook of Translation Studies. Amsterdam (NL): John Benjamins, 1, 120-128.

Östman, J.-O. (1982). The Symbolic Relationship between Pragmatic Particles and Impromptu Speech. Impromptu speech: A symposium. ed. N.E. Enkvist. – Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 147-177.

Östman, J.-O. (1981). You Know: A Discourse-Functional Approach. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 91 p.

Pavlović, N. (2003). The Pragmatic Theory of Politeness in TV Subtitling. Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabiensia, XLVII (47), 385-400.

Reiss, K. (1971). Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Übersetzungskritik. München: Hueber, 124 p.

Reiss, K. (1977/1989). Text Types, Translation Types and Translation Assessment. Transl. by A. Chesterman. Readings in Translation Theory. A. Chesterman. Helsinki: Oy Finn Ab, 105-115.

Schäffner, C. (2010). Theory of Translatorial Action. Handbook of Translation Studies. eds. Y. Gambier, L. van Doorslaer. Amsterdam (NL): John Benjamins, 2, 157-162.

Schiffrin, D. (1994). Approaches to Discourse. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 20-43.

Schweinberger, M. (2014). The Discourse Marker like: A Corpus-based Analysis of Selected Varieties of English: Dissertation. Hamburg. 547 p.

Tveit, J.-E. (2009). Dubbing versus Subtitling: Old Battleground Revisited. Audiovisual Translation: Language Transfer on Screen. eds. J. Diaz Cintas, G. Anderman. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 85-96.

Vermeer, H.J. (1989/2000). Scopos and Commission in Translation Action. The Translation Studies Reader. ed. L. Venuti. London, NY: Routledge, 221-232.

Watts, R. (2003). Politeness. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Murzamadiyeva Mainura
The International University of Tourism and Hospitality
14 "B" Rabigi Sultan Begim Street, 161200
Turkestan,
Kazakhstan
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8887-5773

Shormakova Arailym
The A.Baitursynov Institute
of Linguistics Kurmangazy 29
050010/A26G7T4, Almaty
Kazakhstan
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9551-3818

assoc. prof. Mukhamejanova Ainagul, PhD.
Kazakh National Academy of Choreography Uly Dala
Avenue 9
Nur-Sultan 020000
Kazakhstan
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1820-9748

prof. dr. Saipov Amangeldi
Professional education / Head of the Scientific Center
"Archaeology and Anthropological Research"
M.Auezov South Kazakhstan University
Kazakhstan
7281191@mail.ru

Yessengaliyeva Venera
West-Kazakhstan agrarian-technical university named after Zhangir Khan
Uralsk 51, 090009
West-Kazakhstan
Kazahstan