

Translation of conversations in the subtitles of *Sherlock*

Salla Raasakka  
Pro Gradu Thesis  
English Philology  
Faculty of Humanities  
University of Oulu  
Spring 2015

## Table of contents

1 Introduction.....	1
2 Material.....	3
2.1 Episode.....	3
2.2 Delineating the conversations.....	4
2.3 Description of the scenes.....	5
3 Audiovisual translation.....	10
3.1 Subtitling.....	10
3.2 Omissions.....	13
4 Translation strategies.....	15
4.1 Different approaches.....	15
4.2 Strategies for translating conversations.....	17
4.2.1 Pragmatic strategies.....	19
4.2.2 Pragmatic strategies and subtitling.....	22
5 Illocutionary acts.....	25
6 Analysis of the translated conversations.....	28
6.1 Aspects that affect the conversations on a general level.....	29
6.1.1 Omitted turns.....	29
6.1.2 Coherence.....	31
6.2 Conversation structure.....	35
6.2.1 Conversation initiation.....	36
6.2.2 Transition between phases.....	40
6.2.3 Ending phase.....	45
6.3 Argumentation phase.....	47
6.3.1 Argumentation.....	48
6.3.2 Dialogic elements.....	51
6.4 Interpersonal aspects.....	55
7 Discussion.....	60
8 Concluding remarks.....	66
References.....	67

## 1 Introduction

Since most of imported television programmes are translated by subtitling in Finland (Vertanen, 2008, p. 149), subtitles constitute a significant part of our everyday lives. This is why I find subtitles and subtitling an area worthy of research. I have been interested in subtitles ever since I have known enough English to notice the discrepancies between what I heard and what I read. This led me to study omissions in subtitles for the topic in my Candidate's thesis and seminar paper. For this thesis the scope of the study has expanded, although the material remains the same.

Subtitles have been studied from several different viewpoints over the years, but research often seems to address specific translation problems, such as humour or word play, rather than larger elements of the source text. Other popular angles from which subtitles have been approached appear to be their use in language teaching and audience's perception or eye movement monitoring. My thesis will hopefully add a new perspective. I will study two translations of the first episode of the television series *Sherlock*, more specifically of seven conversations within the episode. Besides the moving image on the screen, the dialogue in the episode is the other means by which the story is told. So, as important parts of the overall dialogue these conversations function as a way of advancing the plot and solving the crime, displaying Sherlock Holmes's deduction skills and building the relationship between Sherlock and John. These conversations could be said to be among the central ones in the episode, because in them Sherlock contributes to the solving of the crime by offering his insights into the mystery surrounding the murders. I will examine how the structure of the conversations changes when they are translated into subtitles and how these changes are created in terms of translation strategies used. How is the target text conversation different from the original conversation?

First I will introduce the material used for this study, which consists of seven conversations from the episode. I will briefly talk about the episode, as well as describe the individual scenes in which the conversations occur to give them context. Then I will give an account of audiovisual translation, specifically subtitling, since that is the form of translation that is the subject of this study. Especially the constraints affecting subtitling will be discussed, because they are relevant in understanding the circumstances in which the conversations are translated. The constraints contribute to the changes in conversation structure. Because I will look at the translation strategies

used in the translation of the conversation, I will first explain what translation strategies are, present some classifications and also explicate the strategies chosen for this study. Another tool used in analysing the translations will be the concept of illocutionary point, which is why I offer a brief explanation of the term as well as some illocutionary acts theory as context. In the analysis I will provide examples from the conversations and illustrate the different aspects that relate to the translation of the constitution of the conversations. This includes the different phases that compose the conversation and the transitions between them as well as the structure of argumentation. I will also address some other aspects related to these conversations that are affected by translation. These points, as well as others, will be addressed further in the discussion section.

## 2 Material

This section presents the research material for this study. First the episode is introduced briefly, and then the conversations are outlined. Finally, the scenes where the conversations occur will be described so as to give a context to the examples in the analysis.

### 2.1 Episode

The material for this paper is from the first episode of BBC's television series *Sherlock* (*Uusi Sherlock* in Finnish). *Sherlock* consists of three series, three 90-minute episodes each. Based on Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's books, it is a British crime and mystery drama about Sherlock Holmes and Dr John Watson in contemporary London. The series was created by Steven Moffat and Mark Gatiss. My source of material is the first 90-minute episode of the first series, "A Study in Pink", especially its subtitles. The episode is written by Steven Moffat and directed by Paul McGuinan and was first broadcast 25 July 2010. (BBC One/Sherlock, 2014.)

In the episode "A Study in Pink" Sherlock Holmes (Benedict Cumberbatch) and John Watson (Martin Freeman) meet for the first time. John is looking for a place to live and Sherlock for a flatmate. As Sherlock is showing the apartment to John, he is called in by Detective Inspector Lestrade (Rupert Graves) to consult in a police investigation. There has been a series of mysterious suicides in London. Sherlock takes John with him to the crime scene and by using his deduction skills is able to find out that it is in fact a case of serial killings. Sherlock and John proceed to try and solve that case together. The episode "A Study in Pink" follows for the most part what Segal (2010) refers to as the classical model of detective fiction. According to Segal, the plot in this model centres on the emergence and systematic investigation of a mystery, which is often a murder. The identity of the murderer is usually kept a secret until the end, which is why the focus of attention is on the detective and the investigative methods. Although Segal's (2010) essay is concerned with literary detective stories, the points he makes about the plot and closure seem to be applicable here, as well.

The actual material used in this paper is the transcript of the spoken lines and subtitles, both for television and DVD, of seven scenes. The scenes are the seven scenes from the episode in which Sherlock presents his deductions to other people. The transcription of the spoken lines and the text on the screen was done by me without an original script available.

## **2.2 Delineating the conversations**

The segments of dialogue which are used as research material in this study have been extracted from scenes that often contain longer stretches of dialogue. These segments will be referred to as conversations. For this study, *conversation* means an exchange of turns by two or several speakers concerning a subject that is distinguishable from possible subjects preceding and following it. For instance, in the case of the material for this study, the subject of each conversation is the argumentation sequence, which is the core of the conversation. Everything relating to that argumentation sequence is considered part of the conversation, be it the turn or turns that lead to it or any subsequent turns connected to it.

The centre or the core of each of these conversations is the part in which Sherlock explains how he knows what he knows and his logic for reaching the conclusions he asserts, i.e. Sherlock's argumentation. What is included in the conversation in addition to the argumentation is the preceding segment of dialogue which leads to it, as well as what is said after the argumentation that still pertains to it. As a result, the conversations used for material are comprised of three parts: the part preceding the argumentation, the part consisting of the argumentation and the part following the argumentation. From now on they will be referred to as the initiation phase, the argumentation phase and the ending phase, respectively. The initiation phase marks the beginning in the conversation, consisting of turns which advance the conversations so that it leads to the argumentation phase. The argumentation phase is where Sherlock explains and justifies his deductions. The ending phase consists of turns immediately following the argumentation that are connected to it, at least more so than to the succeeding turns which start a new subject and thus a new conversation.

In some cases defining the borders for the conversations is easy, such as in the case of the John2 conversation, where the conversation is framed by the edges of the scene. That is to say the conversation starts at the beginning of the scene and ends at the end of the scene, with nothing else uttered for the duration of the scene except for the conversation in question. Similarly, in Victim, the end of the conversation is clear, as the scene ends immediately afterwards, save for an utterance by a member of the crime scene investigation. This last utterance is not connected to the previous dialogue, as evident from the fact that it is not directed to any of the people participating in the preceding exchange, but to someone else. In addition, Sherlock exits the scene immediately after his last turn. In other cases the starting and ending point of the conversation is determined by change in the subject of the conversation. In Shooter this change is clear and obvious, when Sherlock brings up the subject of the shooter after a short exchange with Lestrade about his blanket. In some cases the line between two subjects is not as clear, such as, for example, in the case of Cabbie. Here the conversation is understood to end where the subject of the exchange changes from Cabbie and his crimes to the identity of his “sponsor”. The focus of Sherlock's argumentation is indeed Cabbie. Therefore, the move towards Cabbie's sponsor is considered a subject change, although the dialogue continues without obvious pauses.

### **2.3 Description of the scenes**

The conversations are built around Sherlock's observations and reasoning. They are essential for the solving of the crime and, hence, the plot of the episode, since this is a detective story where the crime is the subject matter. However, the sequences themselves can be thought of as important not only as a plot advancing tool but also because this is a series about Sherlock Holmes, who is known for his deductive skills. This twofold significance of these conversations makes them excellent material when one wants to study the translation of dialogue. With regards to the aforementioned deductions: the type of inferential reasoning Sherlock Holmes uses is, in fact, *abduction* instead of *deduction* (see Eco & Sebeok, 1983). The difference between deduction and abduction, as it is explained by Truzzi (1983), is illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1. Deduction and abduction (Truzzi, 1983, p. 69.)

<b>Deduction</b>	<b>Abduction</b>
<i>Case</i> All serious knife wounds result in bleeding. <i>Result</i> This was a serious knife wound. <i>Rule</i> There was bleeding.	<i>Rule</i> All serious knife wounds result in bleeding. <i>Result</i> There was bleeding. <i>Case</i> This was a serious knife wound.

In this study the term used for Sherlock's process of reasoning will from this point forward be abduction. Next, brief descriptions of the scenes in which the conversations occur will be given.

### ***John1 & John2***

The first two conversations are connected, and can be seen to form two parts of the same argumentation sequence. In the first scene Sherlock makes claims, or assertions, about John, and only in the second scene, which in the episode takes place the following day, does he justify and offer arguments for the claims. These scenes constitute what Segal (2010) refers to as the establishing of the detective's reasoning powers to show that he is capable of solving the inevitable crime or mystery. This scene is not connected to the crime but precedes it. In the first scene (John1), John and Sherlock meet for the first time, their mutual acquaintance Stamford bringing them together to discuss the possibility of them sharing an apartment. Sherlock informs John that he has an apartment in mind and invites John to meet him there the following day. This is when the conversation occurs, and Sherlock abduces facts about John. The second scene (John2) takes place in a taxi on its way to a crime scene after Sherlock and John have been to look at the apartment as by the agreement in the first scene, and Sherlock having been invited to consult in a serial suicide case. In this conversation Sherlock explains how he knew everything he said about John in the previous conversation. The conclusions of the argumentation in both conversations are the same facts about John.

### ***Victim***

The third conversation takes place at the crime scene. The victim is a woman, Jennifer Wilson, wearing a pink coat, and she has scratched "Rache" on the floor. Sherlock spends a few moments observing the victim and invites John to take a look as well. In the initiation phase of the conversation John gives his analysis of the victim before Sherlock explains his observation in the argumentation phase. Towards the end of the conversation Sherlock is moving down the stairs,



about to leave the building. After his last utterance he leaves the scene, ending the conversation. In the argumentation part of the conversation Sherlock abduces facts about the victim, and eventually realises that it is not a case of a string of suicides but rather a string of murders.

### *Suitcase*

In the fourth conversation, Sherlock explains how he found the suitcase that was not at the crime scene, and why he thinks the murderer has the victim's phone. Sherlock and John are back at the apartment on Baker Street, and Sherlock, without an explanation, has John send a text message to someone, which during the conversation is revealed to be the killer who has the victim's phone. After sending the message John notices Sherlock taking out a pink suitcase, prompting the beginning of the conversation. The conversation ends when Sherlock explains how the killer has the phone and then closes the suitcase, standing up and starting to put on his coat. John asks a question that relates to the previous exchange, which is why it and Sherlock's answer to it are included in the delineated conversation. After Sherlock says there is no time to talk to the police, the subject of the discussion changes and it moves toward Sherlock wanting to take John with him to possibly apprehend the criminal.

### *Phone*

The fifth conversation takes place at the apartment again, this time with DI Lestrade and some other members of the Scotland Yard on site conducting a drugs bust, apparently to discourage Sherlock from withholding information. Lestrade suggests they work together, and reveals that Rachel (which is what the message scratched on the floor was supposed to say at the crime scene) is Jennifer Wilson's deceased daughter. Lestrade, Sherlock and John start speculating why Wilson started to write the name before her death. Sherlock is convinced she was trying to tell them something. Mrs Hudson comes in to tell Sherlock that his taxi has arrived. This is when Sherlock starts the argumentation phase. He abduces that the victim is leading them to the killer and explains how he knows this. Towards the end of the conversation, while explaining about the email account, Sherlock starts to locate the victim's phone. After Lestrade's and John's comments about the validity of Sherlock's claim that the killer has the phone, the focus of the dialogue moves to actions to be taken by the police once they learn the phone's location.

### *Cabbie*

The sixth conversation is where Sherlock abduces facts about the killer. It is not the kind of scene Segal (2010) says usually takes place at the end of a detective story (at least in the classical model he describes [pp. 163–167]), where the detective reveals to everyone the identity of the murderer and how the murder was indeed committed. In this respect “A Study in Pink” differs from the description. In the episode (shortly after the Phone conversation) the murderer, Cabbie, comes for Sherlock and confesses to the killings and even reveals the method himself. He threatened his victims with a gun and made them play a game of choosing between two pills, one harmless and the other poisonous. Cabbie wants Sherlock to play the same game, so Sherlock abduces facts about the killer in order to play. He abduces that the ultimate reason for why the man kills is his children. As in some of the previous scenes, here, too, the conversation ends when the subject changes. After Cabbie comments on Sherlock's abductions, the conversation starts to move towards Cabbie's sponsor, who Cabbie reveals is the mastermind behind the murders. The end of the conversation is marked after Cabbie explains how the sponsor is related to his children, which was the ending conclusion in Sherlock's abduction, but before Sherlock asks about the identity of the sponsor. After this they have a short exchange before the end of the scene.

### *Shooter*

In the seventh and last of the conversations in the material, the scene takes place after the murderer has been shot through a window by an unknown person, probably saving Sherlock's life. Sherlock is sitting at the back of an ambulance wearing a blanket. Lestrade arrives and they have a brief exchange about the blanket before Sherlock changes the subject to the shooter with his first utterance, starting the conversation. Lestrade is looking for the shooter and Sherlock offers clues that would be helpful in tracking them down. In this scene the abductions are attributes of the shooter, but Sherlock does not reveal the final result of his abductions to Lestrade. However, the audience gets to find out that he realises that the shooter was John. As Sherlock voices his abductions, he is shown to look in the direction of John who is standing behind a police line, appearing to be waiting for Sherlock. This is when Sherlock starts backtracking and walking away from Lestrade, towards John. He does not reveal the final result of his abduction, the identity of the shooter, to Lestrade, but the viewer gets to find out that it was John. This relates to Segals' (2010) notion about closure; although the mystery of the shooter remains unsolved for Lestrade who is searching for him, the viewer has the informational gap filled by, first, Sherlock's gaze towards John as he speaks and, then, as Sherlock and John talk about the matter in the next scene.

These conversations centre on Sherlock's argumentations for his abductions, which are integral for the plot. This section gave a delineation for the conversations and their different phases, as well as explained the context of each conversation. Because these conversations are translated by subtitling, it is relevant to explore subtitling as a form of audiovisual translation. Especially aspects that are characteristic for subtitling are relevant. This will be done in the next section.

### **3 Audiovisual translation**

Audiovisual translation means all translation where written text is accompanied with auditory and visual elements. The field of audiovisual translation encompasses translation of television programmes and films as well as video games and operas. (Oittinen & Tuominen, 2007.) The most common term used is Audiovisual Translation, but others are known as well. Film translation and cinema translation were among the first used, but later terms such as screen translation, (Multi) Media Translation and even Multimedia localisation have been in use. (Remael, 2010.) Audiovisual texts are composed of four different types of signs that Remael (2010) lists as “audio-verbal signs (words uttered), audio-nonverbal signs (all other sounds), visual-verbal signs (writing) and visual nonverbal signs (all other visual signs)” (p. 13). The most important forms of audiovisual translation are dubbing, voice-over and subtitling. In dubbing the voices of the original speakers are replaced with speakers of the target language. In Finland dubbing is mostly used in children’s television programmes or in nature documentaries. Voice-over means that the original sound is muffled and left in the background while the target language speaker reads over it. In Finland this is mostly in use in radio programmes. (Helin, 2008, pp. 131–132.) Pedersen (2011) adds that in voice-over there is usually a single narrator. Díaz Cintas (2010) includes also interpreting in the list of modes of audiovisual translating.

#### **3.1 Subtitling**

Subtitling means converting spoken words into a written form (Ingo, 1999, p. 35; Gambier, 2008, p. 85). Sometimes subtitlers must translate other elements beside the spoken language, i.e. written text appearing on the screen, such as doorplates and names (Järvinen, 1992, p. 16). Díaz Cintas (2010) describes subtitling to be “rendering in writing the translation [...] of the original dialogue exchanges uttered by the different speakers, as well as of all other verbal information that is transmitted visually (letters, banners, inserts) or aurally (lyrics, voices off)” (p. 344). A subtitled programme thus consists of three components, two of which are original (the spoken and/or written word and the image) and one that is added (the subtitles) (Díaz Cintas, 2010).

Subtitling is the most used form of audiovisual translation in Finland, as more than 80 percent of imported television programmes in Finland are subtitled. Subtitles are also used in all of the Nordic countries as well as in the Netherlands and Portugal, i.e. in countries with relatively small number of viewers per programme. Subtitling is much less expensive than dubbing, which in turn is in use for example in France, Germany and Spain, where there are more viewers. (Vertanen, 2008, pp. 149–150.) English is the most common source language in non-Anglophone Europe (Pedersen, 2011), and thus in Finland. The material for this paper has English as the source language, as well.

As Díaz Cintas (2010) explains, there are different types of subtitles. They can be open, which means they come together with the image and cannot be turned off (as in cinema) or they can be closed, in which case they are optional and can be added if desired (as in DVDs). Subtitles also differ depending on their language: subtitles are intralingual when they are in the same language as the original dialogue. Subtitling for the deaf and the hard of hearing is a type of intralingual subtitling, and this differs from other subtitles. For example, they often include several lines instead of just two, and contain more information, e.g. identifying the speaker and offering paralinguistic information (e.g. revving of an engine) as well as indications of music or whispering etc. Subtitles are interlingual when they are in a different language than the original, i.e. a translation. Interlingual subtitles can also be bilingual in geographical areas, such as Finland, where two or more languages are spoken. (Díaz Cintas, 2010, p. 347.)

Subtitling has its limitations. According to Pedersen (2011), many of the subtitlers' translation decisions would be difficult to understand if one did not know about the restrictions of subtitling. Pedersen lists three constraints: semiotic switch from spoken to written language, spatial constraints and temporal constraints. Commas, full stops and blank spaces among others all take up a character, italics need more space than unmarked text and letters like *m* take up more space than letters like *I* (Pedersen, 2011). Because the text should not cover too much of the image on the screen, the space for the translation is limited to one or two lines (e.g. Vertanen, 2008). Pedersen (2011) offers even three lines as a rare option and also adds that the subtitles usually appear at the bottom of the screen unless there is something there the text might obstruct. There is some variation in the number of characters that fit into one line of the subtitles, depending on who one asks. Vertanen (2008) says the traditional number is 30–34 characters per line, depending on the television channel, whereas Díaz Cintas (2010) offers 35, 39 or even 43 characters per line but remarks that the number restrictions are irrelevant today when new subtitling programmes allow for proportional lettering.

Another restricting factor is the viewer reading time, which results in a minimum of two or four seconds on-screen time for the subtitles, depending on whether it is a question of one line or two, respectively (Vertanen, 2008, p. 151). Like in the case of characters allotted, different sources offer different numbers of seconds of screen-time for subtitles. Díaz Cintas (2010), for example, writes that the screen-time of subtitles depends on the speed of the dialogue as well as assumed reading time of the viewers, but two full lines can be comfortably read in six seconds. However, even a single line should not appear for less than one second. In addition, Díaz Cintas (2010) states that reading speeds today are faster than they have been earlier, which suggests six seconds for two lines is too long. Even more time than usual needs to be reserved for reading if the programme is aimed at children or if the dialogue contains complex lexis and syntax, as well as if there is a large amount of information coming through the visual channel (e.g. action-packed scenes) (Pedersen, 2011). Díaz Cintas (2010) says that fansubbing is “pushing the boundaries of creativity and shaking the foundations of traditional subtitling” (p. 348). He states that the traditions of subtitling are being broken nowadays, as especially on the internet the two line constraint is often exceeded and the subtitles can appear anywhere on the screen instead of at the bottom.

Because the viewer cannot reread the subtitles, they should be easily understood and arranged in semantically and syntactically coherent and logical units (e.g. Díaz Cintas, 2010). Díaz Cintas (2010) writes that subtitles usually neutralise linguistic variation, and for example swear words are believed to be more offensive in writing than when spoken aloud. Following the syntactic structure of the source dialogue reinforces synchronisation and maintains the chronology of events as in the original, which, according to Díaz Cintas can be a way of avoiding criticism, as many today know enough English to “scrutinise” the subtitles (p. 346). These aforementioned constraints (time and space) lead to condensation, also known as reduction (Pedersen, 2011), which is the main strategy used in subtitling. Reduction can be partial (condensation) or total (deletion). The latter, also known as omission, will be further explained in the following section.

### 3.2 Omissions

Due to the aforementioned restrictions, everything said aloud in the programme cannot fit in the subtitles. This results in the subtitler leaving out the elements irrelevant at the time or already known to the viewer in favour for the factors important for the understanding of the plot (Pedersen, 2008, p. 152). In her study of condensing audiovisual translation, Koljonen (1996) found that about 30 percent of material is eliminated during the translation process from English to Swedish. She defines omission to mean that something is not given an equivalent in the target language, i.e. is not translated or included in the subtitles at all. Koljonen divided omissions in three categories: optional sentence constituents, elements typical for spoken language and fragments that contain information. According to Koljonen (1996), elements typical for spoken language, e.g. repetition and discourse markers, have no function in written text, and are often redundant. Optional sentence constituents are adverbs and attributive adjectives, which are secondary to the head word they modify. The third category is phrases that contain some informative proposition. This means mostly side comments in the dialogue.

However, according to Pedersen (2011), the viewer gets much of the information not included in the subtitles through other channels, especially through the image. Ingo (1999) writes that the viewer is not completely dependent on the subtitles for the understanding of the plot or dialogue, because they have the image and sound to tell them when people do or do not get along, or fear for their lives etc. Furthermore, as e.g. Díaz Cintas (2010) says, information that is clearly conveyed through the image need not be translated. The subtitler should focus on relevance and make sure that any information “of diegetic value” is not deleted (Díaz Cintas, 2010, p. 346). Pedersen (2008) suggests that it should be more important to convey the spirit of the original message than to follow it word for word, for example when dealing with Extralinguistic Culture-bound References (names of people, places and institutions, foods and customs). According to Järvinen (1992), as well, when translating for television, the aim is not to translate everything, but rather enough, so that the viewer is able to follow the progression of the programme. Short spoken lines (“Okay, I see”), obvious questions (“But why?”) and items evident from context etc. can be omitted from the subtitles. In addition, names are often obvious items that need not be written every time, only in the beginning when they introduce the characters.

Vertanen (2008, pp. 152–153) presents in his article some elements that usually are or can be omitted. These elements include introductory phrases that lead up to the main point of the sentence (e.g. *I think that, I'd like to say that*). In order to make space for other information, people's names and titles can be omitted if the characters are familiar to the viewer. In addition, names of places and time attributes can be left out depending on how essential they are to the story or whether they are familiar from previous references. If an attributive adjective does not tell the viewer anything essential, it can be omitted. Ingo (1999) says that the omissions must be logical, i.e. nothing relevant to the plot at the time or later in the programme should be left out.

In the next section, too, omission will be discussed among other translation strategies. The section will explore translation strategies on a more general level before the strategies chosen for this study are elaborated on.



## **4 Translation strategies**

One of the tools utilised in this study for analysing the translated conversations is translation strategies. In this section the concept of translation strategies will be clarified and some existing categorisations will be presented briefly before giving a more detailed account of the strategies adopted for the analysis of the translation of conversations in this study.

### **4.1 Different approaches**

There is “considerable terminological confusion” within the field of translation theory with regards to translation strategies, because the term “strategy” has been understood and defined differently by different scholars (Chesterman, 1997). According to Gambier (2010), Translation Studies has incoherent terminology because it borrows so much from other disciplines. As one of those ambiguous terms, “strategy” is used in different ways and it competes with several other terms, such as procedures, techniques, shifts, methods etc. Chesterman (1997) describes translation strategies as the ways in which translators attempt to reach the optimal translation in a given situation; “[a] strategy is thus a kind of process, a way of doing something (p. 88).” Chesterman understands translation strategies primarily as behavioural rather than neural processes, and more specifically as linguistic behaviour. That is to say, strategies are forms of textual manipulation which are observable in the target text (i.e. the translation) when it is compared with the source text. Translation strategies offer solutions for translation problems. (Chesterman, 1997.) Gambier (2010, pp. 413–415) discusses three different classifications of translation strategies that have been in use over the years. Gambier presents the first, which is concerned with the process of shifting between languages, by referring to several scholars in the field, such as Nida, Vinay & Darbelnet, Newmark and Chesterman. The second type of classification sees strategies as translator's tools for solving translation problems. Here Gambier mentions Lörscher and Jääskeläinen, among others, and highlights the fact that the term “problem” may be difficult to define. The third way of looking at strategies is related to the working process of translation, i.e. what strategies the translator uses before, during and after translating. (Gambier, 2010.)

Gambier (2010, pp. 412–413) feels that most publications that discuss strategy mainly deal with types of texts and/or types of problems. They are prescriptive rather than descriptive, i.e. they offer strategies for translating certain items rather than describing how a certain item has been translated in a real translation. Although several authors list the same amount of strategies, they rarely use the same terms to describe the same phenomenon, or define a term differently. Vinay & Darbelnet (1958/1995) distinguish between two methods of translating: direct and oblique translation. These two methods contain the seven translation procedures Vinay & Darbelnet (1958/1995) believe all translation methods can be condensed into. Three of these procedures are direct and four are oblique. The three direct translation procedures are borrowing, calque and literal translation, which are used when the content of the source text can be transferred into the target text element by element, whereas the oblique procedures are transposition, modulation, equivalence and adaptation, which are used when the message of the source text cannot be transferred quite as simply as with the direct procedures. These methods can be used individually or in conjunction with one or several other methods. (pp. 30–40.) Molina & Hurtado Albir (2002, pp. 498–499) consider translation methods, translation strategies and translation techniques to be process categories used to analyse translation. They use the term *method* in conjunction with the question “Which option has the translator chosen to carry out the translation project?” and the term *strategy* to answer the question “How has the translator solved the problems that have emerged during the translation process?”. Translation *technique*, however, is used to explain “how the result of the translation functions in relation to the corresponding unit in the source text” (Molina & Hurtado Albir, 2002, p. 498–499).

Molina & Hurtado Albir (2002, pp. 506–508) point out the confusion between existing categorisations and terms, and explain that different names have been given to the same concept. Classifications also cover different aspects and one term in one classification may overlap with another term in another classification. Molina & Hurtado Albir (2002) propose that there is confusion between translation process and translation result, and that this confusion begins with Vinay & Darbelnet, who used the term *procedure* to refer both to the translation process and the result. As a result, Molina & Hurtado Albir (2002) find that translation techniques have been confused with methods and strategies. In their opinion, a distinction should be made between translation method, which is “part of the process, a global choice that affects the whole translation” and translation techniques, which “describe the result and affect smaller sections of the translation” (Molina & Hurtado Albir, 2002, p 506). Translation method, therefore, affects the whole text, because it refers to the translator's objective with regards to how the translating process is to be

carried out. The method depends on the aim of the translation. Translation techniques, however, refer to how the micro-units within the text are translated, and should be consistent with the chosen translation method. They further suggest a distinction between translation techniques, which “describe the result obtained and can be used to classify different types of translation solutions”, and strategies, which “are related to the mechanisms used by translators throughout the whole translation process to find a solution to the problems they find” (Molina & Hurtado Albir, p 507). Translation strategies are procedures utilized by the translator in finding a solution for any translation problems they come across in the process of translating. The strategies result in solutions, which in turn materialise by using a specific technique.

## **4.2 Strategies for translating conversations**

Chesterman (1997, p. 92) says that strategies operate in the space between source and target texts. Chesterman (1997) distinguishes between two types of strategies: global strategies and local strategies. Global strategies concern the text as a whole on a general level, having to do with the translator's decisions about what kind of approach to take when translating this particular kind of text. Global strategies include decisions such as how “freely” to translate the text, for example. Local strategies, which are influenced by the global strategies used, deal with the translation on a more specific level, focussing on particular structures or items and their translation. Chesterman sees these strategies as conscious, at least potentially conscious, local strategies more so than global. Chesterman (1997, p. 92) further distinguishes between comprehension and production strategies, the first being used in the analysis of the source text and the second in the manipulation of the linguistic material in order to produce an appropriate target text. The heuristic classification Chesterman presents is for the production strategies.

The classification consists of three groups of strategies: those that are mainly syntactic or grammatical, those that are mainly semantic and those that are mainly pragmatic, although, Chesterman admits, there is some overlapping amongst these groups. Within each group there are ten different strategies (see Table 2 below). The semantic strategies manipulate meaning while the pragmatic strategies “primarily have to do with the selection of information in the TT [target text]”

and involve bigger changes from the source texts, often incorporating syntactic and/or semantic changes, as well. (Chesterman, 1997, pp. 93–112.)

Table 2. Translation strategies (Chesterman, 1997, pp. 94–112).

Syntactic strategies	Semantic strategies	Pragmatic strategies
literal translation	synonymy	cultural filtering
loan, calque	antonymy	explicitness change
transposition	hyponymy	information change
unit shift	converses	interpersonal change
phrase structure change	abstraction change	illocutionary change
clause structure change	distribution change	coherence change
sentence structure change	emphasis change	partial translation
cohesion change	paraphrase	visibility change
level shift	trope change	transediting
scheme change	other semantic changes	other pragmatic changes

Some of Chesterman's (1997) strategies have similarities with the other translation strategies mentioned in section 4.1 above, or even have counterparts. For example, Molina & Hurtado Albir's (2002) strategy by the name of *adaptation*, replacing a source cultural element with an element from the target culture, corresponds with Chesterman's pragmatic strategy of *cultural filtering*, whereas *amplification*, introducing details that are not formulated in the source text, corresponds to addition of information under the strategy of *information change*. Moreover, Chesterman's global strategies seem to refer to the same concept as Molina & Hurtado Albir's translation method. Vinay & Darbelnet's (1958/1995) seven procedures overlap with Chesterman's strategies, as well, although not to the same extent as Molina & Hurtado Albir's. Vinay & Darbelnet's *borrowing* and *literal translation* as well as *transposition* are present in Chesterman's syntactic strategies, where he, in fact, uses the same terms. *Modulation*, on the other hand has a likeness to Chesterman's semantic strategy of *converses*, because they both involve a change in the point of view during the translation. Similarly, *equivalence* seems to have something in common with Chesterman's strategy of *trope change*, as they both have to do with translation of figurative etc. elements by finding the target language equivalent. The seventh one, *adaptation*, seems to be the only one of Vinay & Darbelnet's procedures that corresponds to any of Chesterman's pragmatic translation strategies. It refers to translating items that are unknown in the target language, in which case the translation calls for

situational equivalence, i.e. replacing the source text item with one fitting the target culture. This closely resembles the pragmatic strategy of *cultural filtering*, where the source text can be adapted or domesticated for the target text. It is apparent that the majority of the others' translation strategies are not as pragmatic as Chesterman's are. For the study of translation of conversations these pragmatic strategies would seem to be the most useful ones. They are discussed in the following section.

#### **4.2.1 Pragmatic strategies**

The strategies used to analyse the material in this study will be Chesterman's, because his taxonomy seems to be the most extensive of the ones explored above. It offers a more detailed division of individual strategies. In addition, the strategies are divided into groups based on the level they affect in the translation process, unlike any of the other taxonomies. Because this study focuses on the pragmatic level, of the translation of conversations, the strategies utilised in the analysis are the pragmatic strategies in Chesterman's taxonomy. Next, an explanation of what Chesterman means with his pragmatic strategies is offered. Pragmatic strategies are often the result of the translator's global decisions on the translation of the text as a whole (Chesterman, 1997, p. 107).

##### ***1: Cultural filtering***

This strategy describes the way in which source language items are translated with target language equivalents (cultural or functional), so that they conform to target language norms. It is called naturalisation, domestication or adaptation. This strategy pertains particularly to culture-specific items. The opposite procedure is called exoticisation, foreignisation or estrangement, and it means transferring or borrowing aforementioned items directly. (Chesterman, 1997, p. 108.) There are no examples of cultural filtering in the material used in this study, nor does this strategy affect the translation of conversations on the structural level that is the focus of this study.

##### ***2: Explicitness change***

Explicitness can be changed either towards more explicitness (explicitation) or more implicitness (implication). Explicitation is one of the most common translatorial strategies. Translators add components explicitly in the target text that are only implicit in the source text. Implication is the

opposite change: the translator leaves some elements implicit, taking into account what the reader can be reasonably expected to infer. (Chesterman, 1997, pp. 108–109.) An example of explicitness change from the material is when in the original dialogue only the school's name *Barts* is mentioned but in the subtitles it is translated as *lääketieteellinen* ('*medical [school]*'). In the source text the type of school was never explicitly said, but it was inferable from the images and the context. This strategy is not discussed in the analysis section, because it does not cause any changes in the structure of the conversation in translation.

### ***3: Information change***

This means either the addition of new (non-inferable) information that is deemed to be relevant to the target text readership but that is not present in the source text, or the omission of source text information deemed to be irrelevant. Omission might also involve summarising. (Chesterman, 1997, pp. 109–110.) Omission is a frequent occurrence in the material, as an item present in the original dialogue is left out of the subtitles. This is discussed in depth in the analysis and discussion sections. All occurrences of information change in the research material for this study are omissions; there are no additions present. Therefore, from this point forward the term *information change* can be taken as interchangeable with *omission*.

### ***4: Interpersonal change***

This strategy concerns the overall style in the way of altering the formality level, the degree of emotiveness and involvement, the level of technical lexis etc. Interpersonal change pertains to anything that involves a change in the relationship between the text or author and reader. (Chesterman, 1997, p. 110.) For the purposes of this study this relationship is taken to refer to the relationship between the characters on screen, and will be discussed in section 6.4.

### ***5: Illocutionary change***

Illocutionary changes, i.e. changes of illocutionary acts, are usually linked with other strategies, as well. For instance, changing a statement into a request involves changing the mood of the verb from indicative to imperative. Other similar changes might involve, for example, the use of rhetorical questions and exclamations in a text. The changes can also occur within particular classes of illocutionary acts. For example, within the class of acts known as representatives (in this study

referred to as assertives [see section 5, or Searle, 1985]) a translator may shift from direct to indirect speech. (Chesterman, 1997, pp. 110–111.) There are examples of illocutionary change on a literal level that relate to conversation structure in the material. For example, a question *What do you think?* has been translated into an order *Arvaa* ('Guess'). Such changes will be discussed further in sections 6 and 7.

### **6: Coherence change**

Coherence changes have to do with how the information in the text is logically arranged, at the ideational level (Chesterman, 1997, p. 111). In other words, the change affects the way in which different parts of the text are linked to each other. This is relevant for the translation of conversations and is discussed further in section 6.1.2.

### **7: Partial translation**

This covers any kind of partial translation, including summary translation, transcription, translation of the sounds only, etc. (Chesterman, 1997, p. 111). This relates to the entire translations of the conversations in this study, and will be briefly elaborated on in section 4.2.2.

### **8: Visibility change**

This refers to a change in the authorial presence, or to the overt intrusion or foregrounding of the translatorial presence. For instance, translator's footnotes, bracketed comments (such as explanations of puns) or added glosses make the translator's presence explicit to the reader, so that the translator is no longer "transparent". The translator is thus visibly placed between original author and reader, and the author is temporarily backgrounded. (Chesterman, 1997, p. 112.) This, too, concerns the entire translated conversations in this study, because of the nature of subtitling (see section 4.2.2).

### **9: Transediting**

Transediting means the sometimes radical re-editing that translators have to do on badly written original texts: it includes drastic re-ordering, rewriting, at a more general level than the kinds of

changes covered by the strategies mentioned above. (Chesterman, 1997, p. 112.) There are no examples of this strategy within the material.

#### **10: *Other pragmatic changes***

One example of this strategy would be layout, and another is the choice of dialect (Chesterman, 1997, p. 112). This, too, will be touched upon in section 4.2.2.

Chesterman's (1997) pragmatic strategies seem the most applicable translation strategies for the purposes of this study, because the focus is on the translation of conversations. However, as mentioned in conjunction with some of the descriptions of the strategies above, not all of them affect the conversations. Moreover, there are other aspects of the pragmatic strategies, especially in relation to subtitling, that will be addressed in the following section.

#### **4.2.2 Pragmatic strategies and subtitling**

This section explores the utility of the chosen translation strategies for the purposes of this study. Because the translation strategies discussed, including those of Chesterman, are primarily intended for literary translation, there are aspects which are not entirely applicable to audiovisual translating such as they are. Some of the relevant points are addressed here, and they will be touched upon in the discussion section, as well.

Omission as a translation strategy differs in subtitling from literary translation. In Chesterman's (1997) taxonomy, the strategy of *information change* includes addition of new information as well as omission of “ST [source text] information deemed to be irrelevant” (p. 109). In subtitling omission is not limited to irrelevant information; omission is an inherent part of subtitle translation because of time and space constraints discussed in section 3.2. In addition, audiovisual translation, especially subtitling, can be said to be summarising, because the source text, i.e. the dialogue, inevitably has to be condensed in order to fit it into the written text on the screen, i.e. the subtitles. Therefore, the translation strategy of *partial translation*, which includes summary translation, is relevant practically for the entire translation. Additionally, Chesterman mentions summarising in conjunction with omission in the strategy of *information change*. Furthermore, summary translation



may be said to encompass omission in the case of subtitling, because omission is inevitable due to the limiting factors discussed in section 3.2. This results in the question whether omission can really be considered a translation strategy in the same sense as it is for literary translation. Similarly to *partial translation*, the strategy of *other pragmatic changes* is in effect for the entire translation, since Chesterman (1997) includes, for example, changes in layout in this strategy. The source text in this case is spoken dialogue and the target text written words, which certainly constitutes a change in the presentation of the text. Not only that, but the target text is further divided into subtitles, i.e. the lines on the screen, affecting the layout of the translation. Furthermore, since the translation of spoken words is presented in written form over the image, the strategy of *visibility change* is in use with everything that is translated into the subtitles.

Chesterman (1997) mentions compensation as motivation for translators. This means that if something is done (or not done) at one point in the text, a compensatory strategy may be used at another point. I believe this to be valid in subtitling because of the constraints of the translation; if at one point a great amount of original dialogue is included in the subtitles, it may be (and possibly is) necessary to omit something else. Granted, Chesterman seems to mean that the two points are not in the immediate vicinity of one another but possibly even a great distance apart. This is possible in the translation of literature and other written material, whereas in the case of subtitling compensation for space by omission is likely to occur in close proximity to what is compensated for. The form of subtitles presents special considerations for compensation by omission. In a dialogue, if one speaker's utterances are translated (close) to the full, the other speaker's utterances may have to be omitted within the same segment of dialogue, because the subtitles need to appear on-screen simultaneously to the audio. It would not be useful to translate both speakers' utterances in the aforementioned segment of dialogue and then omit something else later on in the episode, because the subtitles would not correspond to the original utterances with regard to their timing, unless the norm of giving the viewer enough reading time was ignored. The subtitles would appear too quickly to read.

It might also be relevant to point out that the two translations used in this study have adopted slightly different global translation strategies. The DVD translation follows the original sentence structure much more closely than the TV translation, which may result in differences in the amount of information that can be included in the subtitles. The pragmatic translation strategies that are most likely going to play the biggest roles in translating the structure of conversations are the

strategy of *information change*, because omission of parts of a conversation naturally changes its makeup, and the strategy of *illocutionary change*, because changing an illocutionary act affects its function in the conversation. Omissions have already been addressed in this section as well as the previous one, so in the next section the significance of illocutionary acts with regard to this study will be explored.

## 5 Illocutionary acts

For the scope of this study it is not pertinent to explore the theory concerning illocutionary acts (see Searle, 1969, 1985; Geis, 1995) too deeply. It will, however, be utilised as a guiding tool in determining the functions of different utterances and turns in the conversations. Therefore, they are relevant in the analysis, and so here is a brief overview of illocutionary acts.

Searle (1969) writes that “speaking a language is performing speech acts, acts such as making statements, giving commands, asking questions, making promises, and so on” (p. 16). He also uses the term *illocutionary acts* to refer to speech acts. There are different aspects to illocutionary acts; Geis (1995) writes that when a speaker utters a sentence, they perform a locutionary act of vocalising a sentence and also an illocutionary act, also known as a speech act, e.g. making a request, as well as a perlocutionary act, i.e. causing some kind of effect in the listener (p. 3). An illocutionary act can be performed directly or indirectly. Here is an example from Geis (1995): A request to turn out the lights can be communicated directly by using a sentence in imperative form (“Turn out the lights.”), but also indirectly by, for example, using a sentence whose literal meaning does not convey a request, such as “Could you turn out the lights?” In the latter case the literal act would be to request information about the listener's ability to turn out the lights, which would be the secondary act, while the primary act would be a request for action. That is, according to the traditional speech act theory. However, Geis (1995) proposes that the latter example above could actually be a direct request (p. 225), whereas an example of an indirect request could be “It's too bright in here”. Labov & Fanshel (1977) have a similar approach to indirect requests, as they see a sentence such as “Have you dusted yet?” as an indirect request for action, to dust (p. 83). In this study this latter view of Geis and Labov & Fanshel on indirect illocutionary acts will be adopted.

Illocutionary point is the purpose of an illocution. For example, Searle (1985) explains that the illocutionary point of requests and commands is the same, both attempt to get the listener do something (p. 3). According to Searle (1985), illocutionary acts can be categorised into five basic categories: assertives, directives, commissives, expressives and declarations. “The point or purpose of the members of the assertive class is to commit the speaker (in varying degrees) to something's being the case, to the truth of the expressed proposition” (p. 12). To state something would therefore be to perform an assertive illocutionary act. Directives are attempts by the speaker to get the listener to do something (such as requesting or ordering someone to do something, for example),

while commissives' purpose is to commit the speaker (in varying degrees) to some future course of action (e.g. promising). The category of expressives includes actions such as apologising and congratulating, since their point is to express feelings and attitudes. With declarations, "one brings a state of affairs into existence by declaring it to exist" (Searle, 1985, p. 16). It is possible to do several of these things at the same time (Searle, 1985, p. 29). The illocutionary point will be the main tool applied in analysing the material for this study, because it helps in determining the utterances' function within the conversations. As it will mainly be used to ascertain the function of an utterance in the conversation, the approach that will be adopted in the analysis will be more liberal with regard to the illocutionary point than in the theory. As far as using the categorisation of illocutionary acts in the analysis, any utterances will be identified with the name of the category (i.e. assertive, directive, etc.), if it is pertinent.

The conversations in the material for this study involve argumentative segments in the form of Sherlock justifying the conclusions he infers from his observations, i.e. he explains how he gets from an observation to a conclusion. Van Eemeren & Grootendorst (1984) define argumentation as follows: "Argumentation is a speech act consisting of a constellation of statements designed to justify or refute an expressed opinion and calculated in a regimented discussion to convince a rational judge of a particular standpoint in respect of the acceptability or unacceptability of that expressed opinion" (p. 18). Expressed opinion here means the subject of the argumentation, i.e. the conclusion or claim, rational judge basically means the person the speaker is trying to convince, and standpoint means the speaker's attitude towards the expressed opinion, i.e. if they are arguing for or against it. Van Eemeren & Grootendorst (1984) emphasise the dialogical nature of argumentation, where the rational judge participates in the discussion by, e.g. asking for further argumentation or rebutting the speaker's argumentation. Van Eemeren & Grootendorst are focussed on discussions whose purpose is to resolve disputes, which is really not the case here. However, both cases concern argumentation, so their observations about illocutionary acts in argumentative discussions are relevant to a degree here. Van Eemeren & Grootendorst disagree with Searle with regard to the number of sentences that can constitute an illocutionary act. They posit that several sentences (as opposed to just one) can make up one illocutionary act, because argumentation can consist of more than one sentence. They offer the concept of *compound illocutions* or *illocutionary act complexes*, which are composed of several *elementary illocutions* (instead of sentences). Thus, argumentation consisting of more than one sentence can function as one illocutionary act, known as illocutionary act complex.

Pedersen (2008) sees that “subtitling is a pragmatic form of translation and that what a speaker intends to get across to her/his addressees (and the TV audience) – his/her primary illocutionary point – takes precedence over the surface structures that are the vehicle which conveys this point” (p. 102). Subtitling is a pragmatic form of translating because of the need for condensation, which is why Pedersen (2008) is of the opinion that a speaker's primary illocutionary point, “what is meant to get across” (p. 101) rather than speech acts (or words or sentences) would be a good unit of translation. However, with subtitled films (and television series) the problem with the traditional speech act theory is that while there is a speaker and an addressee on the screen, as well as other participants, even eavesdroppers, the viewer is also part of the scenario. As Pedersen points out, the viewer is the reason for the fictional, scripted conversation. Furthermore, the conversation on screen is not the real communication that is taking place. The “original sender” is a group of people behind the programme: script writers, directors, producers etc., and the final audience is the viewer of the programme, as the communication occurs indirectly through the characters on screen. As a result, the ultimate illocutionary point of an utterance is that not of the character speaking but of the original sender.

For the purposes of this study, the conversations analysed will be handled as if they were natural conversations and as if the participants in the conversations were personally responsible for their utterances, while in reality, the dialogue is scripted, for the fictional characters of Sherlock, John and others, to tell the story and advance the plot of the episode. Within the scope of this study, the illocutionary intentions of the episode's writers and the producers are ignored and instead, the illocutionary intentions taken into account are those of the characters, although the purpose of the conversations as means of advancing the plot is taken into consideration to some extent.

## 6 Analysis of the translated conversations

The analysis section explores how the conversations have been transferred into the subtitles, specifically regarding the structure and composition of the conversations. The object of study here is not the content of these conversations, i.e. what is said, but rather the conversations on a more general level, the function of the different parts of the conversation, be it phases, turns or utterances. The examples that will be provided in this section to illustrate different points in the translated conversations will mostly focus on those aspects that have changed during translation, because the changes the conversations undergo during translation are of more interest here than what has been left unchanged.

In this analysis the assumed viewer of the subtitled episode is approached as if they have no competence in the English language whatsoever. A person who does not know the source language is the ultimate target audience of a translation, and the subtitles in this episode are not necessary for someone who knows enough English to understand the original dialogue by themselves. There are, of course, viewers that know some English but not enough to manage completely without the subtitles, but for the purposes of this study the viewer is assumed to not know a single word in English. In terms of the presentation of the examples below, the aspects that are discussed in connection with a specific example are underlined in the original dialogue. Even though some extracts may contain several different phenomena that relate to the aspects analysed in these conversations, for the most part only one phenomenon is discussed with reference to one extract.

The examples are numbered and presented in tables that are titled by the conversation and phase as well as the version of translation they are from. Moreover, in the extracts from the subtitles, a vertical line (|) indicates the separation of lines within one subtitle as they are displayed on the screen. If there is a vertical line at the end of a translation, it means that that translation is the first line of a two-line subtitle (see Example 1). If there is a vertical line in the beginning of a translation, it is the second line within a subtitle (see Example 6). A hyphen (-) within a subtitle indicates the start of a new turn by another speaker (see Example 7). However, if the hyphen appears at the end of a subtitle it indicates that the same speaker's turn continues in the following subtitle (see Example 2). Back translations of the subtitles are provided with the examples in brackets, following the original Finnish text in meaning and subtitle structure as closely as possible while still following

the grammatical rules of English within reason. If there are several separate subtitles in an extract they are separated by a blank space. It should be noted that the segment of original dialogue included in any example is not necessarily the entire turn but may also be only a part of a turn.

## **6.1 Aspects that affect the conversations on a general level**

There are some aspects to the composition of the analysed conversations that are not strictly related to one specific phase. These aspects are the omission of entire turns within the conversations and coherence, both of which can occur in any phase of the conversations. The omission of entire turns is likely the most noticeable difference between the original conversations and the translation, looking at the composition. Moreover, the viewer of the subtitled episode is probably more aware of this change than any other, depending on the context of the omission. Coherence can affect the conversation as a whole, but also some parts of it, as shown by the examples in section 6.1.2. Sometimes the strategy of *coherence change* is the strategy that causes the change, but often the change in coherence may be the result of another translation strategy, such as *information change*.

### **6.1.1 Omitted turns**

Omitting something changes the message in the process of translation from the source text to the target text. The situation differs in the cases of literary translation and subtitling, because in the latter the original text is present simultaneously with the translation. Even if it is not included in the subtitles, the viewer has access to audiovisual information which may reveal what was said in the original dialogue that was not translated for the subtitles. This depends on the viewer's command of the language spoken in the original dialogue. Subtitles are made for those who do not understand the original spoken language, so for the target reader of the translation an omission results in loss of information. In the material there are several instances of entire turns being omitted when the strategy of *information change* has been used. This changes the structure of the target text conversation in comparison to the original. If, in a short dialogue between two speakers, consisting of two turns of equal length for each speaker, one turn of one speaker is omitted, the resulting dialogue has the other speaker dominating the conversation. If both turns of one speaker are omitted, the dialogue turns into a monologue in the translating process.

In this example the strategy used is that of *information change*, i.e. omission, which has a changing effect on the structure of the segment of conversation. The example is from the conversation John2, which concerns Sherlock's observations about John and occurs in the taxi on the way to the crime scene. Sherlock has initiated the conversation by essentially inviting John to ask the questions that he obviously has. This first turn in the extract is separated from the rest by a double line to indicate that some turns in between have not been included in the example.

*Example 1. John2, initiation phase, DVD.*

<b>Sherlock:</b> Okay, you've got questions.	-Sinulla on kysyttävää.
<b>John:</b> Who are you? What do you do?	Kuka sinä olet ja mitä teet?   Veikkaisin, että
<b>Sherlock:</b> <u>What do you think?</u>	olet yksityisetsivä.
<b>John:</b> I'd say private detective.	[Who are you and what do you do?   I'd guess, that you're a private detective.]

Sherlock's turn *What do you think?*, a directive in the form of a question, has been omitted. Furthermore, the presentation of the translation of John's two turns is in the form of one subtitle, i.e. both turns are shown on screen simultaneously, making it appear as if they compose a single turn. This creates a change in the translation, changing the structure within this segment of the conversation from dialogic to monologic. The original omitted turn is, of course, still heard, but its place within the conversation may not be as clear as if John's turns were separated into two subtitles. This composition is likely the result of time constraints, which prevent two separate subtitles that would demand more time allotted for reading them.

This next extract is from the same conversation initiation phase, including partly the same lines. It is from the TV translation of this conversation. It exemplifies the same strategy, although the presentation of the translation is different.

*Example 2. John2, initiation phase, TV.*

<b>John:</b> I'd say private detective.	Veikkaisin yksityisetsivää -
---	------------------------------



<p><b>Sherlock:</b> <u>But...?</u></p> <p><b>John:</b> But the police don't go to private detectives.</p>	<p>[I'd guess a private detective -]</p> <p>mutta poliisi ei turvaudu etsivään.</p> <p>[but the police don't rely on a detective.]</p>
---	--

Sherlock's turn *But...?* is a directive, i.e. an illocutionary act that attempts to get the speaker to do something. In this case it is a question. This turn is omitted, and John's two surrounding turns are presented as if belonging to one turn. However, in this case the original turns have been separated by a subtitle break, having them appear separately. It is, nevertheless, clear that they are intended as one turn, as evidenced by the lack of full stop at the end of the first subtitle and the lower case *m* starting the second subtitle. This, then, also changes a dialogic exchange into a monologic one as a result of the strategy of *information change*.

This kind of structure change is not a rare occurrence within the seven conversations, and it occurs in all the phases of the conversations, i.e. it is not restricted to the initiation phase, from which the examples above are from. In other words, omission of turns affects the entire conversation in different points. Another aspect that can affect the conversations in whichever phase is coherence, as addressed in this next section.

### 6.1.2 Coherence

Coherence refers to the way in which different parts of a text are connected to each other to form a logical unit. Coherence, i.e. how the text is constructed as a whole, depends to a degree on cohesion, on connectedness on a word level. Therefore, the translation strategies in use would be semantic strategies as well as pragmatic ones. For the purposes of this study, however, the semantic strategies used to achieve coherence of any conversation or segment of conversation are not discussed. Coherence change is not discussed here in terms of it being the translation strategy used. Instead, the use of some other strategy has resulted in a change in the coherence of a conversation, as illustrated in the following examples.

This first example illustrates the type of coherence change that concerns the whole conversation. The conversation in question here is John2, which takes place in the taxi, where Sherlock explains who he is and how he knows what he does about John. This next example has extracts from the initiation phase and the ending phase of the conversation. The two extracts are separated by a double line in the middle to indicate several turns that are not included in the example. John's utterance in the first part of the example is what leads Sherlock to mention his observation the previous day about John having been in Afghanistan or Iraq. This in turn leads John to ask the question that initiates Sherlock's argumentation sequence. Sherlock's first utterance in the second part of the example from the same conversation occurs immediately after he has finished his explanation and, thus, ended the argumentation phase of the conversation. The sentences creating the coherence effect in the original conversation and their translations are underlined.

*Example 3. John2, initiation phase & ending phase, DVD & TV.*

<p><b>John:</b> <u>The police don't consult amateurs.</u></p> <p><b>Sherlock:</b> When I met you for the first time yesterday, I said “Afghanistan or Iraq?” You looked surprised.</p> <p><b>John:</b> Yes. How did you know?</p>	<p><u>Poliisit eivät pyydä neuvoja   amatööreiltä.</u></p> <p>[The police don't ask for advice   from amateurs.]</p> <p>Kysyin eilen: “Afganistan vai Irak?”   Sinä hämmästyit.</p> <p>[I asked yesterday: “Afghanistan or Iraq?”   You were surprised.]</p> <p>-Niin, mistä tiesit?  </p> <p>[-Yes, how did you know? ]</p>	<p><u>Eivät he kysele amatööreiltä.</u></p> <p>[They don't ask amateurs.]</p> <p>Tavatessamme eilen yllätyit,   kun kysyin: “Afganistan vai Irak?”</p> <p>[When we met yesterday you were surprised,   when I asked: “Afghanistan or Iraq?”]</p>
<p><b>Sherlock:</b> There you go, you see? You were right.</p> <p><b>John:</b> I was right? Right about what?</p> <p><b>Sherlock:</b> <u>The police don't consult amateurs.</u></p>	<p>Olit siis oikeassa.   <u>Poliisit eivät konsultoi amatöörejä.</u></p> <p>[So you were right.   The police don't consult amateurs.]</p>	<p>Sinäkin olit oikeassa.</p> <p>[You were right too.]</p> <p>Kuinka niin? - <u>Poliisit eivät   turvaudu amatöörien apuun.</u></p> <p>[How so? -The police don't   rely on the help of amateurs.]</p>

Here the original dialogue in the source language creates coherence within the conversation by using the same wording in the initiation phase and the ending phase. This ties the conversation together, as it were. The central part of the conversation, Sherlock's argumentations, is directly prompted by John's question *How did you know?*, but Sherlock caused John to ask that question by reminding John of his observations when they met for the first time. Sherlock does this because John's comment in this example, suggesting that Sherlock is an amateur, makes him want to prove that his is not an amateur. This is further supported by his repeating the same wording John used (*The police don't consult amateurs*) after he has finished showcasing his reasoning skills. Sherlock wants to make sure that John understands that he is not an amateur, which is why he makes a point of repeating John's initial assertive, making it clear that this is why he just explained his reasoning. In both of the translations the wording in the end differs from the wording in the beginning. In the DVD translation the wording in the beginning is *Poliisit eivät pyydä neuvoja amatööreiltä* (*The police don't ask for advice from amateurs*) and in the end *Poliisit eivät konsultoi amatöörejä* (*The police don't consult amateurs*). In the TV translation the same utterances are *Eivät he kysele amatööreiltä* (*They don't ask amateurs*) and *Poliisit eivät turvaudu amatöörien apuun* (*The police don't rely on the help of amateurs*), respectively. The differences in both cases make the connection between the two utterances less clear and thus resulting in a coherence change when compared to the original conversation. The change is, naturally, more noticeable here, where the original dialogue and the subtitles are written out and can be read several times, whereas in the episode the utterance in the initial phase is not immediately available when the utterance in the ending phase is reached. As a result, the effect is not as significant for the viewer in real time. It is clear, however, that a change has occurred in the coherence during the translation of this conversation.

Here is another example of a similar effect. Here, the translation strategy of *information change* in the form of omission affects the way in which turns uttered by two people within a conversation relate to each other. The following example is from the John1 conversation. John and Sherlock have just met for the first time and Sherlock has invited John to come and look at an apartment with him the following day. When John expresses his surprise to the invitation, Sherlock asks what the problem is. This extract follows that question.

Example 4. John1, argumentation phase, DVD & TV.

<p><b>John:</b> We don't know a thing about each other. I don't know where we're meeting; I don't even know your name.</p> <p><b>Sherlock:</b> <u>I know</u> you're an army doctor and you've been invalidated home from Afghanistan. <u>I know</u> you've got a brother who's worried about you, but you won't go to him for help because you don't approve of him—possibly because he's an alcoholic, more likely because he recently walked out on his wife. <u>And I know that your therapist thinks</u> your limp's psychosomatic, quite correctly I'm afraid.</p>	<p>Emme tiedä toisistamme mitään.   En edes tiedä nimeäsi. [We don't know anything about each other.   I don't even know your name.]</p> <p>Olet invalidisoitunut sotilaslääkäri.   Sinulla on huolestunut veli. [You're an invalidated army doctor.   You've got a worried brother.]</p> <p>Et pyydä häneltä apua.   Ehkä vaimon jättämisen takia. [You won't ask him for help.   Maybe because he left his wife.]</p> <p>Terapeutiksi mukaan ontumisesi   on psykosomaattista. Niin onkin. [According to your therapist your limp   is psychosomatic. So it is.]</p>	<p>Emme tunne toisiamme. En tiedä   osoitetta enkä edes nimeäsi. [We don't know each other. I don't know   the address and not even your name.]</p> <p>Olet sotavamman takia   kotiutettu sotilaslääkäri. [You're because of a war injury   demobilized army doctor.]</p> <p>Torjut veljesi avun. [You reject the help of your brother.]</p> <p>Paheksut häntä, koska hän on juoppo   tai siksi että hän jätti vaimonsa. [You disapprove of him, because he is a drunk   or because he left his wife.]</p> <p>Terapeutti pitää vammaa   psykosomaattisena ja on oikeassa. [(The) therapist considers the injury   psychosomatic and is correct.]</p>
---	--	--

Both translations have omitted the epistemic phrase *I know* in Sherlock's turn from the subtitles. In the DVD translation this breaks the direct link between Sherlock's claims and John's preceding turn,

in which he asserts that they do not know anything about each other. The repeating of the verb *know* creates coherence within the exchange in the original dialogue, which is missing from the translation. In the TV translation the epistemic phrase *I know* is likewise omitted, but there is no similar effect on the coherence, because John's turn does not include the verb *know* in the first sentence *Emme tunne toisiamme* ('We don't know each other') in the same meaning as in the original. This is why Sherlock saying "Tiedän, että olet..." ('I know you're...') would not create the same coherence effect as it does in the original dialogue. Vertanen (2008) would possibly categorise this epistemic phrase as an introductory phase that can be omitted (see section 3.2), but here the omission causes a change in the coherence, at least in the DVD translation.

As stated earlier, coherence change and omitted turns affect the conversation as a whole, or at least can affect any part of it. In the next section the translated conversations will be examined by observing the different parts that make up the conversation and illustrating the changes that have occurred during their translation.

## **6.2 Conversation structure**

In this section the composition of the conversations will be addressed and their transference into the subtitles analysed. The conversations are composed of three different phases, each playing a different role in the conversations as whole. All seven conversations have an initiation phase and an argumentation phase and all but one conversation have an ending phase. All of the phases have been translated in both translations, thus retaining the overall composition of the conversations. The initiation phase directs the subject of the conversation into the direction which leads to the argumentation phase, which is the core of the conversation, i.e. Sherlock's argumentation for his abductions. The ending phase is what follows the argumentation phase, referring back to the argumentation phase, but often also leading away from that conversation into the next one. Thus the initiation phase functions as a transition between the possible preceding conversation and the current one in the same way as the ending phase functions as the transition between the current conversation and the one following it. In addition to these transitions between conversations, the analysis of the structure of the conversations encompasses the transitions from one phase to the next

within the conversation. Turns and utterances that are of special interest in the analysis are those that appear at the beginning of the conversation and at the borders between two phases.

The argumentation phase containing the argumentation of Sherlock's abductions is essentially the most important part of the conversation, the core around which the conversation is built. This is especially true because these conversations are scripted for the purpose of building and advancing the plot of the episode. These conversations could be said to be many of the central ones in the episode, because in them Sherlock contributes to the solving of the crime by offering his insights into the mystery surrounding the murders. It is specifically the argumentation phase in which these contributions come about, so they are the focus of the conversations. That is why especially the transition to and the initiation of this argumentation phase are an aspect of interest in the analysis of the translated conversations. In the following subsections the translation of utterances and turns that begin the entire conversation are discussed first, then that of the utterances that lead to the argumentation phase. Lastly, special attention is given to the last phase in the conversations, the ending phase.

### **6.2.1 Conversation initiation**

Every original conversation in the material begins with an initiation phase before moving on to the abduction argumentation. Every initiation phase has been translated in both versions of the Finnish episode, so the first phase has been retained in every case. Every initiation phase is started by an utterance that functions as a directive (see section 5). This pertains both to utterances that comprise the entire initiating turn and to the last utterance within the initiating turn. Each initiation phase, in other words, begins with a directive that invites a response from another person, thus starting the conversation. This is understandable, because the function of a directive is to get the listener to make some action, which in the case of these conversations appears to be to offer some information in answer to a question, or otherwise respond. This, naturally, moves the conversation forward. If the last utterance in a turn in initial position was an assertive, it would not require the listener to do or say anything, and the conversation might not happen in the first place. As a result of this, the initial utterance in the form of a directive is an important one, and its translation is of particular interest to see if the conversations begin with one in the translated conversations, as well.

In the following example, the turn initiating the beginning of the conversation has been omitted, i.e. the strategy of *information change* has been used. This is the only case where the initiating directive has been omitted among the conversations included in this study. The example is from the beginning of the Victim conversation, after Sherlock has asked John to give his opinion about the victim and Lestrade has left the room.

*Example 5. Victim, initiation phase, DVD*

<b>Sherlock:</b> <u>Well?</u>	Mitä teen täällä?	Mitä pitää tehdä?
<b>John:</b> What am I doing here?	[What am I doing here? ]	[What am I supposed to do? ]

In most conversation initiations the initial directive has been retained in all the translations, but here the initiation *Well?* has been omitted in both versions. Thus, the translated conversations start differently from the original. The person uttering the first turn and thus starting the conversation changes from Sherlock to John. Sherlock's utterance is quick and quiet, and it is apparently meant to get John to take action by starting to examine the victim, which it does not achieve per se; John asks a question instead, leading them to have a brief exchange before John actually performs the action of examining the victim. However, by that time Sherlock has repeated his directive in another form in the course of the exchange, with his comment *Perfectly sound analysis but I was hoping you'd go deeper*, shown in the extract below.

*Example 6. Victim, initiation phase, DVD & TV.*

<b>John:</b> Fun? There's a woman lying dead.	-Tässä on kuollut nainen. [  -Here is a dead woman.]	Mitä hauskaa on ruumiissa? [What fun is there about a dead body?]
<b>Sherlock:</b> Perfectly sound analysis but I was hoping you'd go deeper.	Hyvä analyysi, mutta toivoin   enemmän yksityiskohtia. [Good analysis, but I hoped   for more details.]	Terävä havainto mutta toivoin   syvällisempää analyysiä. [A sharp observation but I hoped   for a deeper analysis.]

It is possible that the first turn *Well?* in Example 5 above has been omitted because it is so quick and quiet that it is almost inaudible. Furthermore, as the effect of the directive is not immediate, as John *puts off* the request for action (to use Labov & Fanshel's [1977] terms) by making a request of

his own, for information, Sherlock's initial utterance could be said to carry less meaning than the initial directives in the other conversations.

As stated earlier, the initial utterance has been translated in all other cases, but there is some variation in the way they have been transferred to the subtitles. This next example illustrates the use of the strategy of *illocutionary change* in the conversation initiating turn, i.e. the change in the illocutionary act. This extract is from the Suitcase conversation's initiation phase, where John turns his attention from the text message Sherlock had him send to the suitcase Sherlock takes out.

*Example 7. Suitcase, initiation phase, TV.*

<b>John:</b> <u>That's... That's the pink lady's case.</u>	Onko tuo Jennifer Wilsonin laukku?   - On
<u>That's Jennifer Wilson's case.</u>	selvästikin.
<b>Sherlock:</b> Yes, obviously.	[Is that Jennifer Wilson's case?   - Clearly it is.]

Here the illocutionary point has been retained, since both the original utterance and the translated one are directives; they attempt to get an explanation from Sherlock as to how he is in possession of the murder victim's suitcase. Neither the original nor the translated utterance does this directly, but rather seems to ask for confirmation. They are both questions in a way, although the subtitles here present it much more directly. The function the directive has in the conversation is to prompt Sherlock to tell how he got the suitcase, which is achieved in the translation, although the literal act has been changed. Sherlock, however, responds to the directive in the original conversation as if he interprets it as a request for confirmation and does not react to the ultimate point behind the utterance until John asks about the case more directly a little later in this conversation's initiation phase. This more direct question is illustrated in this next extract.

*Example 8. Suitcase, initiation phase, TV.*

<b>John:</b> How did you get this?	Miten sait sen?   - Etsimällä.
<b>Sherlock:</b> By looking.	[How did you get it?   - By looking.]
<b>John:</b> Where?	Mistä? [...] [Where?]

This more direct question *Where?* then initiates the argumentation phase of the conversation. The directive function of John's first utterance *That's Jennifer Wilson's case* in Example 7 above has



been translated for the subtitles, but it has been changed into a more direct one. In essence, the initiating utterance has been retained.

This next one is another example of an instance where the literal illocutionary act has changed, but the illocutionary point of the utterance, its function in the conversation, remains the same. This is from the John2 conversation, which occurs in a taxi when Sherlock and John are on their way to the crime scene. They have apparently sat quietly for a while, before Sherlock initiates the conversation.

*Example 9. John2, initiation phase, TV.*

<b>Sherlock:</b> <u>Okay, you've got questions.</u>	Onko kysyttävää?   - Minne olemme menossa?
<b>John:</b> Yeah. Where are we going?	[Do you have questions?   - Where are we going?]

Sherlock's utterance *Okay, you've got questions* in the original dialogue has the form of an illocutionary act of an assertive, which has changed during translation to take the form of a directive *Onko kysyttävää?* ('*Do you have questions?*'). If the literal act is taken as the primary act of these utterances, then the illocutionary act has indeed changed. The literal act is the illocutionary act that the literal meaning of the sentence would suggest (see section 5), in this case an assertive. However, since the original assertive is meant, or at least interpreted by John, as an invitation to ask the mentioned questions, it functions as a directive. Therefore, the illocutionary act has not changed from one category to another, but rather within the category of directives, more precisely to a clearer question. It should be mentioned that both the original directive and the translation, again, literally ask whether John has questions, not what the questions are, but, as stated above, the utterances function as prompts for asking said questions. The function, therefore, remains unchanged even though the literal act has been changed. However, in the original dialogue John actually answers Sherlock's indirect question with *Yeah* as if it was produced as a direct question, as it appears in the subtitles. In the subtitles, on the other hand, where this directive *Onko kysyttävää?* ('*Do you have questions?*') more prominently would call for a yes or no answer, there is none.

There are other initiation phases that start with the same kind of directive in the original conversation and in the translation, but because the focus here is more on the changes that occur, no

example of these more direct translations will be given here. However, it will be mentioned that the way in which the first turn is constructed changes in some translations, as it does in the previous extract. There is no *Okay* to start the turn in the subtitles. Similarly, in *Shooter* the translated conversation starts straight away with the directive, as does *Cabbie*. They both have lost the word *so* from the beginning. This means that the way in which the translated conversations start differs from how the original conversations do. The subtitles have the speakers go straight to the point with no transitional marker to signal the beginning of a new topic. According to Koljonen (1996), this is common in subtitling (see section 3.2).

### 6.2.2 Transition between phases

In the same way as with utterances that begin the conversations, the utterances which lead from the initiation phase to the argumentation phase seem to be directives in the original dialogue. This pertains to every conversation except for *Phone*, which has a different kind of initiation from the others. Again, the presence of a directive in the transitional position is to be expected for the same reasons as in the case of initiating utterances; the directive prompts the following turn. Without the directive the next phase might not commence. Therefore these utterances hold significance in the structure of the conversations, advancing them. This directive has been omitted in about a third of the translations of conversations that have a directive in the transitional position between the initiation phase and the argumentation phase.

This first example is from where *John2* initiation phase ends, i.e. moves into the core of the conversation, inducing *Sherlock's* argumentative abduction segment. *Sherlock* has told *John* that he is a consulting detective who helps the police when they ask for it, and *John* has made a comment about how “the police don't go to amateurs for help”. *Sherlock*, to prove he is no amateur, reminds *John* of their first encounter, which leads to the question by *John* that initiates the argumentation phase of the conversation. This question has been omitted from the translated conversation, so the strategy of *information change* has been used.

*Example 10. John2, initiation phase, TV.*

<p><b>Sherlock:</b> When I met you for the first time yesterday, I said "Afghanistan or Iraq?" You</p>	<p>Tavatessamme eilen yllätyit,   kun kysyin: "Afganistan vai Irak?"</p>
--	--

<p>looked surprised.</p> <p><b>John:</b> <u>Yes. How did you know?</u></p> <p><b>Sherlock:</b> I didn't know, I saw.</p>	<p>[As we met yesterday you were surprised,   when I asked: “Afghanistan or Iraq?”]</p> <p>Se ei perustunut tietoon   vaan havaintoon.</p> <p>[It wasn't based on knowledge   but on observation.]</p>
--	--

The turn that prompts the core of the conversation is omitted in the translation, affecting the structure. In the original exchange John initiates the argumentation part of the conversation by uttering a directive: he asks a question (*How did you know?*) which Sherlock in turn answers by explaining his observations and reasoning behind the assertions he made about John the previous day. In the translation, however, although the question can be heard, from the subtitles Sherlock appears to start his explanation without prompting. It is inferable from the context, seeing as Sherlock indeed starts explaining how he realised John had been in Afghanistan, that John requested this information in the omitted turn. Looking at the subtitles only, however, the prompting directive is missing, changing the dialogic extract into a monologic one. John's curiosity is not clearly indicated, and instead of answering a question, Sherlock launches into a speech without any encouragement from his companion. This effect is strengthened when Sherlock's turn that begins the next phase in the Finnish conversation starts with *Se ei perustunut tietoon vaan havaintoon* (*'It wasn't based on knowledge but on observation'*), as if Sherlock is continuing the same turn.

Here is another instance where the utterance which functions as the prompt for the core of the conversation is omitted with the use of the strategy of *information change*. This is an extract from the Suitcase conversation, from where the initiation phase transitions into the argumentation phase. John has asked about the suitcase, getting confirmation that it is the murder victim's, and now proceeds to try and find out how it came to sit in Sherlock's apartment.

*Example 11. Suitcase, initiation phase, DVD.*

<p><b>John:</b> How did you get this?</p> <p><b>Sherlock:</b> By looking.</p> <p><b>John:</b> <u>Where?</u></p>	<p>-Miten sait tämän?   -Etsimällä.</p> <p>[-How did you get this?   -By looking.]</p>
---	--

Here, John's question *Where?* is omitted from the subtitles, so that in the translated conversation there is no external trigger for Sherlock to start his recount, but he does it of his own accord. Again, the viewer has the information that something was uttered by John, probably a question, given the context. Additionally, the question was most likely related to the location where Sherlock looked for the suitcase, since that is what Sherlock then tells, but from the subtitles alone the directive does not come across.

The two previous examples were cases where the omitted utterance initiating the argumentation phase was a clear and direct directive. Here is another example where the utterance that induces Sherlock's explanation has not been translated for the subtitles, but the directive is indirect. This example is from the last conversation in the material, *Shooter*. It occurs after someone has shot the murderer, Cabbie, through a window right before Sherlock swallowed a potentially poisonous pill, and the police have arrived and searched the scene. Here Sherlock has brought up the subject of the shooter, inquiring whether he has been found. Lestrade tells him there is no sign of him and that it will be difficult to find him.

*Example 12. Shooter, initiation phase, TV.*

<b>Lestrade:</b> Got nothing to go on.	Yhtään johtolankaa ei ole.   - Onhan niitä.
<b>Sherlock:</b> Oh, I wouldn't say that.	[There aren't any clues.   - Yes there are.]
<b>Lestrade:</b> <u>Ok, give me.</u>	

Lestrade's last utterance *Ok, give me* is a directive, whose function is to get Sherlock to tell him who to look for for the shooting of Cabbie. In the translation, if one ignores the fact that the viewer may get the information from the original dialogue they hear, Sherlock yet again embarks on an abduction sequence without being asked to. This has the effect that the conversation rendered in the subtitles may make him appear more conceited than the conversation in the original dialogue. The use of omission in this transitional position therefore affects not only the structure of the conversation but also the characterisation of Sherlock in the episode, as he may appear different in the translation than in the original conversation.

This next example is from the Victim conversation, after Sherlock has examined the victim and right before he starts to present his observations about her to John and Lestrade. The first part of Lestrade's turn is rendered in the subtitles, but the utterance which prompts the argumentation has been omitted. The transitional utterance is shown underlined.

*Example 13. Victim, initiation phase, TV.*

<p><b>Lestrade:</b> Shut up, two minutes I said. <u>I need anything you got.</u></p>	<p>Pari minuuttia aikaa. [(You had) a couple of minutes.]</p>
--	---

Lestrade's second utterance *I need anything you got* in this turn is in the form of an assertive, but since its function in the conversation is to get Sherlock to perform the action of telling what he found out, it is taken as a directive. The translation covers the first original sentence, referring to the two minutes Lestrade gave Sherlock to find out what he can. The utterance omitted from the subtitles is the one which leads to the argumentation phase of the conversation, so the strategy of *information change* used here changes the structure of the conversations, because in the translation, there is no external prompt for Sherlock to start speaking. In this case it is more difficult for the viewer to infer the presence of the directive, compared to, for instance, Example 11, because it is uttered together with another sentence, so the viewer cannot differentiate the two. However, the retained part of the turn, which has been translated, may be interpreted as a directive also, in which case the omission would not affect the structure by omitting the directive that initiates the argumentation.

Another translation strategy besides the strategy of *information change* that affects the conversation in the transition between the initiation phase and the argumentation phase in some of the translations is the strategy of *illocutionary change*. The next extract, which exemplifies the use of the strategy of *illocutionary change* in the utterance that prompts Sherlock's reasoning segment, is from the Cabbie conversation. This conversation occurs between Cabbie and Sherlock, after Cabbie has explained the rules of the game he has played with all his victims. Sherlock has just asked in the beginning of the conversation why Cabbie has been killing people. Without answering, Cabbie initiates the next phase in the conversation with his directive.

*Example 14. Cabbie, initiation phase, TV.*

<b>Cabbie:</b> <u>Time to play.</u>	Pelatkaa. [Play. ]
-------------------------------------	-----------------------

In the original conversation the utterance *Time to play* is in the form of an assertive, a statement, whereas in the subtitles it is a directive in the imperative form: *Pelatkaa* ('Play'). The literal illocutionary act has then been changed. However, in the original dialogue Cabbie's purpose for the utterance, its illocutionary point, appears to be to get Sherlock to start playing his game, which is retained in the translation. The directive is only expressed more directly. Thus, the function of the utterance remains the same even though the literal act is different.

As mentioned earlier, the Phone conversation differs from the other conversations in that it does not have a similar initiation phase as the others, especially with regard to the transition to the argumentation phase. While all the other conversations' initiation phase consists of dialogue that pertains to the upcoming argumentation phase in some degree, leading up to it, here that is not the case to the same extent. On the contrary, in this case Sherlock tells everyone to be quiet so that he can think, but the dialogue that constitutes the initiation phase comprises of people talking despite Sherlock's request, even interrupting his thinking. The transition from this phase to the next is also different from the others. In the other conversations the initiation of Sherlock's argumentation is done by someone else via a directive, usually asking a question that Sherlock then answers with his argumentation, whereas here Sherlock initiates his abduction on his own. There is no initiating utterance from anyone else, rather some distracting ones. Sherlock himself starts thinking and has an epiphany, which leads him to talking.

*Example 15. Phone, initiation phase, DVD & TV.*

<b>Sherlock:</b> Oh. Ah. She was clever. Clever, yes! She's cleverer than you lot and she's dead.	Hän oli älykäs. [She was intelligent.]  Hän oli älykkäämpi kuin te,   mutta hän kuoli. [She was more intelligent than you,   but she died.]	Se nainen oli teitä ovelampi   vaikka onkin nyt kuollut. [That woman was more shrewd that you   even though she is now dead.]
---	---	--

Here there is no change in the way the argumentation phase begins between the original conversation and the two translations, apart from the omission of Sherlock's initial exclamations *Oh* and *Ah*. The structure of this conversation remains the same. In both the original and the translated conversation the abduction phase is self-initiated rather than prompted by an external directive. Another difference between this conversation and the others is that all argumentation phases except for *Phone* start with a new turn, Sherlock's. In this conversation, however, Sherlock snaps at Mrs Hudson, then has the epiphany and continues without anyone interrupting, so within the same turn.

The argumentation phase ends where the argumentation ends in all the conversations, whether that is within a same turn or between two separate turns. There is no transitional utterance in the same sense as there is between the initiation phase and the argumentation phase. The move from the argumentation phase into the ending phase does therefore not have a paradigm form or a recurring pattern among these conversations, and as a result does not hold a similar significance to the elements discussed above.

### 6.2.3 Ending phase

With the ending there is more variation between the original conversations with regard to their content and length than with the initiation phase, for instance. One conversation, *Victim*, does not have an ending phase at all, as the conversation ends when Sherlock exits the scene immediately after finishing his argumentation. This has, naturally, remained the same in both the translated conversations, as well. It is common for the ending phases to include some kind of reference to the previous phase, whether it is an evaluation of Sherlock's argumentation or some other comment pertaining to its content. These referring utterances have been translated in each case without fail, no matter what kind of reference it is. Here are a couple of examples. The first example is from the ending phase of *Cabbie*, where the reference to the previous phase is a kind of evaluation of Sherlock's abductions.

*Example 16. Cabbie, ending phase, TV.*

<p><b>Cabbie:</b> Oh... <u>You are good, aren't you.</u></p>	<p>Terävä tyyppi.   [A sharp fellow. ]</p>
--	--

Although the form of the utterance has been changed by using semantic strategies that are not addressed here, the function remains the same. Cabbie expresses his respect or admiration towards Sherlock and his observational and abduction skills. Another kind of reference to the argumentation phase is a reference to the content of the argumentation, such as is the case in the conversation Suitcase, where John makes a comment after the end of the previous phase that relates to what Sherlock just finished explaining: that the murderer has the victim's phone. Again, this aspect of the ending phase has been retained in the subtitles, as shown in the extract below.

*Example 17. Suitcase, ending phase, DVD.*

<b>John:</b> <u>Have you talked to the police?</u>	-Oletko puhunut poliisille?   [-Have you talked to the police?  ]
--	--

There is only one occasion where the ending phase includes a rebuttal of Sherlock's argumentation. This is an extract from the Phone conversation. It shows how Lestrade offers a kind of rebuttal of Sherlock's argumentation by uttering an assertive that refutes Sherlock's conclusion that the murder victim is leading them to her killer with the phone she planted on him. The utterance is translated and functions in the subtitled conversation in the same way as it does in the original.

*Example 18. Phone, ending phase, TV.*

<b>Lestrade:</b> <u>Unless he got rid of it.</u>	Ellei mies hävittänyt sitä. [Unless the man disposed of it.]
--	---

Thus far the examples in this subsection have focussed on the utterances that refer back to the previous phase in the conversation. This next example illustrates the difference an omission of a turn has in the beginning and at the end of the conversation. The effect on the conversation is different. The extract is the same one from the ending phase of the Phone conversation discussed in the previous example. Lestrade makes a comment on the validity of Sherlock's argumentation after Sherlock has asserted that the victim is leading them to her killer with the help of the phone she left in the killer's car. In the original conversation in the source language there is another turn after this before the phase and the conversation ends. It has been omitted, by the use of the strategy of *information change*.



Example 19. Phone, ending phase, TV.

<b>Lestrade:</b> Unless he got rid of it.	Ellei mies hävittänyt sitä.
<b>John:</b> <u>We know he didn't.</u>	[Unless the man disposed of it.]

Lestrade comments on the validity of Sherlock's argumentation by his utterance *Unless he got rid of it* and John defends it by saying *We know he didn't*. That is, in the original dialogue he does, but not in the translation. This is a case, as opposed to a question (as illustrated above in Example 11) where the content of the omitted turn is not inferable from the context. That is because this is where the conversation ends before a new subject is begun. Therefore, the viewer does not know what John says, unless they know enough English to retrieve the information from the original dialogue. However, as this is the end of the conversation, the omission does not significantly affect the conversation structure like an omission at the transitional position in the conversation does (see e.g. example 10 above). Here the focus is already moving away from the core of the conversation to the next conversation. In other words, the subject moves from Sherlock's revelation that the victim is leading them to her murderer to what they should do next.

To sum up the central findings in this section: in the case of the conversation initiating utterance, it has been transferred to the target language conversations in every instance except for one conversation (see example 5 above). In the majority of cases, the directive has thus been translated. Moreover, the strategy of *illocutionary change* has been used to alter the form of the directive in only in a few cases. Similarly, directives that function as initiating utterances for the argumentation phase have, in only a few cases, changed their form. In a third of the cases of transitional directives, the strategy of *information change* has omitted them altogether. In contrast, this strategy has not been used in the ending phases when it comes to the utterances that refer back to the argumentation phase. In the next section the focus will be on the argumentation phase of the conversations.

### 6.3 Argumentation phase

This section is dedicated to the analysis of the translation of argumentation phases, because each of the conversations chosen for material centres around argumentation. In some conversations the

amount of argumentation contained within the conversation is higher than in other, but nevertheless, argumentation plays a central role in each one. First, a few examples are presented to illustrate the translation of the structure of argumentative turns. Another aspect of argumentation addressed here is the utterances of other participants that contribute to the argumentation besides Sherlock, who is the main speaker in this phase.

### 6.3.1 Argumentation

Here is an extract from John2 to illustrate the translation of argumentation. The original segment of argumentation is divided into separate arguments in boxes (a–d) and then the translation has been divided accordingly. The last box, (d), contains the conclusion of this argumentation: John has been in either Afghanistan or Iraq. Each box before that (a–c) contains one or more arguments for a conclusion, and then these conclusions act as arguments for the final conclusion. The purpose of this example is to show how the argumentation's progression has been translated.

*Example 20. John2, argumentation phase, DVD.*

(a) <b>Sherlock:</b> Your face is tanned, but no tan above the wrists — you've been abroad but not sunbathing.	Kasvosi ovat ruskettuneet, mutta   ranteesi eivät. Et ole ollut lomalla. [Your face is tanned, but   your wrists are not. You haven't been on a holiday.]
(b) The limp's really bad when you walk, but you don't ask for a chair when you stand, like you've forgotten about it, <u>so</u> it's at least partly psychosomatic.	Sinä onnut, mutta et pyydä tuolia.   Vamma on psykosomaattinen. [You limp, but you don't ask for a chair.   The injury is psychosomatic.]
(c) <u>That says</u> the original circumstances of the injury were traumatic — wounded in action, <u>then</u> .	Loukkaannuit traumaattisissa   olosuhteissa, eli taistelussa. [You were injured in traumatic   circumstances, so in action.]
(d) Wounded in action, <u>suntan</u> — Afghanistan or Iraq.	Loukkaantuminen taistelussa,   rusketus: Afganistan tai Irak. [Being injured in action,   <u>suntan</u> : Afghanistan or Iraq.]

Here is how the argumentation is structured in the original conversation: Argument in box (b) leads to the conclusion that John's injury is psychosomatic, which in turn acts as an argument for the conclusion in box (c). Together conclusions (a) and (c) act as arguments to support the final conclusion of this argumentation segment in box (d). In the translation the overall structure is retained along with the order in which the arguments are presented, which is to be expected, because in subtitling the translation for the dialogue is shown simultaneously with the original. Therefore, the order of utterances is generally transferred without significant changes. That is why the boxes on the right for the translated argumentation correspond to the boxes on the left for the original argumentation in order and content, except for some omissions of modifiers, for example, within the arguments. In other words, the argumentation's progression is retained with regard to its overall structure.

However, within the argumentation, there are some differences that have occurred during its translation as a result of the strategy of *information change*, that is to say omission. In the original argumentation some of the utterances are linked to one another by connectives, i.e. words that express how the sentences relate to each other. These are underlined in the extract. For example, in box (b), the conclusion is shown to be a result of the previous clauses by the use of the word *so*, which does not occur in the translation, where the argument and the conclusion are divided into two separate sentences without any connective to link them together. Similarly, in the original argumentation the link between arguments in box (b) and box (c) is made clear with *That says*, while in the translation the sentence in box (c) is grammatically separate from the previous ones. The only linking word transferred from the original to the translated argumentation is in box (c), *then*, which has been translated with the word *eli* ('so'). The original argumentation also uses intonation to express the connection between arguments and conclusions, for example in boxes (a) (*Your face is tanned, but no tan above the wrists — you've been abroad but not sunbathing*) and (d) (*Wounded in action, suntan — Afghanistan or Iraq*). This is, in a way, illustrated in the extract through dashes. It is, of course, impossible to indicate intonation in the subtitles, but in this case the use of a colon in box (d) serves to express the connection between the arguments and the conclusion in a similar manner: *Loukkaantuminen taistelussa, rusketus: Afganistan tai Irak* ('Being injured in action, suntan: Afghanistan or Iraq'). The omission of connectives, or *illocutionary indicators* (van Eemeren & Grootendorst 1984), lessens the coherence of the argumentation. The following examples, too, relate to coherence.

When a turn is omitted in a dialogical exchange, the viewer can still hear that one of the participants says something even if there is no indication of that in the subtitles. However, in the case of omissions within a turn the situation is different, because in the continuous speech the viewer cannot tell if something has been omitted or what has been omitted. Therefore, in the case of omissions within Sherlock's turns consisting of argumentation, the viewer has no access to any omitted information, because they cannot infer the omitted content the way they can in the case of a question, for example (see e.g. example 11 above). A great deal of omissions concerns connectives within the argumentation, i.e. words that link arguments to each other and to the conclusion they justify. Omitting these causes a change in the coherence of the argumentation's progression.

This example illustrates what kind of effect the strategy of *information change* has on argumentation. The extract is from John2, where Sherlock explains, among other things, how he knew that John's brother recently left his wife.

*Example 21. John2, argumentation phase, TV.*

<p><b>Sherlock:</b> Expensive phone says wife, not girlfriend. <u>She must've given it to him recently</u> — this model's only six months old. Marriage in trouble, then — <u>six months on, and he's just giving it away?</u></p>	<p>Kalleus viittaa vaimoon. [Expensiveness refers to a wife.]  Puoli vuotta vanha malli.   Liitto rakoili. [A six months old model.   The marriage was in trouble.]</p>
--	---

Here the strategy of *information change* has been used to omit parts of the reasoning argument: *She must've given it to him recently* and *six months on, and he's just giving it away?*. There are no connectives, or illocutionary indicators, to link the assertions to each other, leaving it to the viewer to infer. There are not many connectives in the original argumentation either, but there the connection between different assertions is made clear through whole phrases as well as intonation patterns. It is made clear that the phone must have been given to Harry recently because the model is new, although the conjunction *because* is not present. Similarly, the assertive that the marriage is in trouble is given support with the next sentence. In the translation the assertions are not connected to form a unit, thus changing the structure of the argumentation.

Here is another example to illustrate the effect of the translation strategy of *information change* on argumentation, from Phone. Sherlock has had an epiphany about the case, after John, Lestrade and he have tried to understand the significance of the name *Rachel* the victim tried to scratch on the floor before dying.

*Example 22. Phone, argumentation phase, DVD.*

<p><b>Sherlock:</b> She didn't have a laptop, which means she did her business on her phone. <u>So it's a smartphone; it's email enabled. So there was a website for her account.</u> The username is her email address and, all together now, the password is...</p> <p><b>John:</b> "Rachel."</p>	<p>Hänellä ei ollut kannettavaa,   eli hän kävi netissä kännykällään.</p> <p>[She didn't have a laptop,   so she used the internet on her mobile.]</p> <p>Käyttäjätunnus on sähköpostiosoite,   ja salasana on "Rachel".</p> <p>[The username is the email address,   and the password is "Rachel".]</p>
---	--

In this case the logical advancement of the argumentation changes due to the use of the strategy of *information change*. In the original argumentation what the username is for (an email account) is mentioned, but in the translation of the argumentation that is not the case, and Sherlock only talks about the email address and password. The mention of the email account, which these are the username and password for, is omitted, making the logic of the argument much less clear compared to the original. It could be said that without understanding the spoken English words, the viewer might not be able to follow the argument. However, the main point made in this argumentation is that *Rachel* is a password and not just a name, so it is more important than the account. In addition, the surrounding turns in the conversation mention email, so the viewer does receive the information elsewhere. The structure of the argumentation, however, is changed.

### 6.3.2 Dialogic elements

The omission of entire turns within the argumentation phases is a rarer occurrence than elsewhere in the conversations. This is to be expected, because they largely consist of long turns in which Sherlock utters several sentences, making his turns in this phase much longer than the average turn

in other parts of the conversation. Moreover, these argumentation turns, which explain Sherlock's observations, are never among the omitted turns, presumably because they are central not only to the conversation but to the plot and the solving of the crime. Entire turns are not omitted in the argumentation phase of three of the conversations. In two of those, John2 and Shooter, the reason is quite obvious, because the phase consists of only one turn, i.e. Sherlock speaks for the entire length of the phase. In the case of Suitcase, however, the lack of omitted turns is likely a result of the bilateral nature of the interaction, as John is much more involved in the phase of the conversation than in the other conversations.

The argumentation phase is primarily focussed on Sherlock's argumentation, so any other participants that add anything to the conversation at that point mostly deliver utterances that contribute to the argumentation. This means that their utterances are moving the argumentation forward. Essentially that means that they are directives which request Sherlock to give further argumentation for a claim or conclusion or give more information. These can be direct, as the case is in Example 25, or indirect, as in Example 26 below. Another type of utterances that contribute to the argumentation is assertives that function as rebuttals. In this section the difference in the handling of these two different illocutionary acts in the translations will be illustrated.

Turns that contribute to the argumentations seem to be retained in the translated conversations for the most part. There are some instances where a directive that has a function of advancing the argumentation by acting as a request for further information has been omitted. But often even the omitted turns that cause the argumentation to continue are not actual requests for information in a strict sense. For example, John's turn *Sherlock?* has been omitted in Victim (Example 23), from where Sherlock has just stopped talking mid-sentence and made an exclamation of sudden realisation (*Oh. Oh!*). Therefore the purpose of the question is most likely inferable from the context, and the viewer can probably hear that the utterance is Sherlock's name, making its function even clearer.

*Example 23. Victim, argumentation phase, DVD.*

<p><b>Sherlock:</b> She colour coordinates her lipstick and her shoes. She'd never've left any hotel with her hair still looking like– Oh. Oh!</p>	<p>Hän valitsi huulipunansakin tarkkaan.   Hän ei lähtisi hotellista hiukset...</p>
<p><b>John:</b> <u>Sherlock?</u></p>	<p>[She chose even her lipstick carefully.   She wouldn't leave the hotel with her hair...]</p>

Another example of omitted turns that are not exactly requests for information is presented below.

*Example 24. Victim, argumentation phase, TV.*

<p><b>Sherlock:</b> Travelled from Cardiff today intending to stay in London for one night. It's obvious from the size of her suitcase.</p> <p><b>Lestrade:</b> <u>Suitcase?</u></p> <p><b>Sherlock:</b> Suitcase, yes.</p>	<p>Lähti Cardiffista tänään, laukusta   päätellen aikoi jäädä yöksi.</p> <p>[Left from Cardiff today, based   on the case intended to stay overnight.]</p>
---	--

Lestrade's utterance *Suitcase?* is a turn omitted at an earlier point in the same Victim conversation, where Sherlock has just asserted that the fact that the victim had intended to stay in London for one night was obvious from the size of her suitcase. The suitcase is not at the scene, nor has there been any indication of its existence before this, making Lestrade surprised to hear it mentioned. Thus his utterance seems more like a request for confirmation than a directive to give more information. At least that is how Sherlock seemingly reacts to it. Since Lestrade's question about the suitcase is not in the subtitles, Sherlock's response to it is also absent at the beginning of his next turn.

In the next example from the Phone argumentation, a directive that is clearly a request for information has been omitted. Sherlock asserts quite energetically that "Rachel is not a name", as they originally thought. John then requests for more information, apparently annoyed because Sherlock is adopting a patronising attitude, but this request has been omitted.

*Example 25. Phone, argumentation phase, DVD.*

<p><b>Sherlock:</b> Rachel is not a name!</p> <p><b>John:</b> <u>Then what is it?</u></p>	<p>[...] Rachel ei ole nimi.</p> <p>[Rachel is not a name.]</p>
---	---

John's question *Then what is it?* has been omitted with the strategy of *information change*, so this translated conversation differs from the original with respect to Sherlock's prompt for furthering his argumentation. After John's question Sherlock directs him to the email address written on the victim's suitcase. As he reads it aloud, Sherlock sits at the computer and, while logging on to the account, explains that *Rachel* is a password. In the original conversation Sherlock directs John to the address presumably because of John's request for information (*Then what is it?*), but in the translation, although John's turn is audible to the viewer, Sherlock does this with no external urging.

This seems like something Sherlock could do, but that is not the case in the original conversation, so the translated conversation has changed due to the omission.

In the next example the omitted turn is in the form of an assertive, but it still functions as a directive. In the Victim conversation Sherlock has asserted that the victim has come from Cardiff to London. A bit later in the conversation Lestrade wants to hear how Sherlock knows about Cardiff. Sherlock thinks it is obvious, as shown in the extract. John's next turn has been omitted.

*Example 26. Victim, argumentation phase, DVD.*

<b>Lestrade:</b> Cardiff?	-Entä Cardiff?   -Eikö se ole selvää?
<b>Sherlock:</b> It's obvious, isn't it?	[-What about Cardiff?   -Isn't it clear?]
<b>John:</b> <u>It's not obvious to me.</u>	

Even though the last turn *It's not obvious to me* is in the form of an assertive, it functions as a directive, because by uttering it John clearly wants Sherlock to explain his reasoning for claiming that the victim is from Cardiff. He does this in his next turn. John's turn, therefore, contributes to the advancing of the argumentation in the original conversation, but in the translated one Sherlock gives his arguments of his own accord. The viewer can possibly infer the content of John's utterance from the context, because even in the translation Sherlock asks "Isn't it clear?" and John can be heard answering. As Sherlock then launches on an explanation leading to Cardiff, it is reasonable to assume that John's asked something that would cause him to do that.

Directives that add to the argumentation by asking for more information or additional arguments seem to be omitted a few times in the translated argumentation phases. However, there is another kind of contribution other participants besides Sherlock are making at times: a type of rebuttal of a conclusion Sherlock offers. In these argumentation sequences there are no direct and definite rebuttals in the sense that someone comes out and says that Sherlock is wrong. Quite on the contrary, all of Sherlock's argumentations are accepted. Nevertheless, these almost-rebuttals occur in the form of offering an alternative explanation for something Sherlock asserts as true. These have always been translated. Here is an example from Victim:



Example 27. Victim, argumentation phase, DVD.

<p><b>Sherlock:</b> Someone else was here and they took her case. So the killer must've driven her here, forgot the case was in the car.</p>	<p>Joku vei laukun. Murhaaja toi hänet   autolla ja unohti laukun autoon.</p>
<p><b>John:</b> <u>She could've checked into a hotel, left her case there.</u></p>	<p>[Someone took the case away. The murderer brought her   by car and forgot the case in the car.]</p>
	<p>-Ehkä hän vei laukun hotelliin.   [-Maybe she took the case to a hotel. ]]</p>

Sherlock claims that the suicide was not a suicide but a murder, arguing for this point by saying that because the victim's suitcase is not at the scene of her death, someone else must have been there and taken it. John, perhaps trying to defend the suicide theory, offers another explanation for the absence of the suitcase (*She could've checked into a hotel, left her case there*). This is a kind of rebuttal of Sherlock's conclusion that then acts as instigation for Sherlock to defend his assertion with further argumentation. Similar instances can be found on a few more occasions within the argumentation segments, and these kinds of rebuttals are always translated.

## 6.4 Interpersonal aspects

As mentioned earlier, the purpose of the dialogue in the episode is not just to solve the crime and advance the plot that way, but also to develop the relationship between the characters, especially John and Sherlock who are the main characters in the episode and the whole series. In this section, the changes that have occurred during the translation of the conversations regarding the relationship between the people engaged in the conversation will be discussed. In other words, the focus is on interpersonal change as a result of some implemented translation strategy, even if the strategy of *interpersonal change* has not been used.

In the next example, the effect the strategy of *information change* has is not merely extended to the conversation, but also to the relationship between Sherlock and John. This exchange occurs in the middle of the argumentation phase of the Victim conversation, where Sherlock is explaining the reasoning behind the claims he made about the murder victim. The omitted turns are not related to

the subject as far as regarding the argumentation but rather to the interaction between Sherlock and John.

*Example 28. Victim, argumentation phase, DVD.*

<b>John:</b> That's fantastic!	-Upeaa.   -Tiedätkö, että sanoit tuon ääneen?
<b>Sherlock:</b> Do you know you do that out loud?	[-Fantastic.   -Do you know, that you said that out loud?]
<b>John:</b> <u>Sorry, I'll shut up.</u>	
<b>Sherlock:</b> <u>No it's... fine.</u>	

The last two turns are excluded from the subtitles, which not only results in only partial rendering of the conversation but also in not showing the viewer the development of Sherlock and John's relationship. There is little chance that the viewer could infer the meaning in the omitted turns from the surrounding conversation, because this short exchange where John admires Sherlock's observational skills is an aside in the conversation, a quick digression in between utterances that pertain to the core subject of the conversation. Nothing is uttered before or after this four-turn exchange that relates to it, so it is separate from the rest. Therefore, although the viewer can surmise that John is impressed, because Sherlock's translated response *Tiedätkö, että sanoit tuon ääneen?* ('Do you know, that you said that out loud?') can be interpreted as an annoyed one, the viewer misses the real tone of the exchange. This is one of the instances in the original episode that can be said to have been used to advance Sherlock and John's relationship. This relationship is a big part of the series, but here this aspect of the series is not transferred to the target text. Because the relationship changes during the translation process, the omission has an interpersonal effect on the conversation. At least the relationship does not come across in the conversations the same. It should be pointed out that there are of course several other occasions where this relationship is developed in the dialogue that have been translated, so the viewer of the translated episode does not miss it altogether. Nevertheless, in this instance there is an interpersonal difference in the conversations.

Here is another example where the interpersonal aspects of Sherlock and John are not carried over to the target conversation. In the initiation phase of the Suitcase conversation, from which this example is, Sherlock first confirms that the suitcase he is examining belonged to the killed woman and then adds the comment depicted in the example.

Example 29. Suitcase, initiation phase, TV.

<p><b>Sherlock:</b> Oh, perhaps I should mention: I didn't kill her.</p> <p><b>John:</b> <u>I never said you did.</u></p> <p><b>Sherlock:</b> Why not? Given the text I just had you send and the fact that I have her case it's a perfectly logical assumption.</p>	<p>On ehkä syytä huomauttaa,   että minä en tappanut häntä.</p> <p>[Maybe there's some reason for pointing out,   that I didn't kill her.]</p> <p>Tekstiviestistä ja matkalaukusta   voisi niin hyvinkin olettaa.</p> <p>[From the text message and the suitcase   one could very well assume so.]</p>
--	--

Here John's response *I never said you did*, in the form of an assertive, to Sherlock's first turn *Oh, perhaps I should mention: I didn't kill her* is not rendered in the subtitles. It may be possible that a viewer could infer the meaning of John's utterance from Sherlock's following turn, but it is unlikely. Therefore, the viewer misses the fact that John expresses his not assuming Sherlock to be a killer and only learns that Sherlock considers it a reasonable assumption. This could lead to the viewer of the original episode and the viewer of the translated episode to have different impressions of John's character, and the viewer of the translation could lose another moment where the relationship between John and Sherlock is developed.

It is difficult to determine whether this next example depicts a change in the conversation or not; in one of translated versions of the episode, a formal way addressing is used in some of the translated conversations. Because formal addressing is not marked in English as it is in Finnish, it is almost impossible to declare whether the form of addressing has been changed or not. This extract from the Cabbie conversation illustrates the use of the strategy of *interpersonal change* to create this change. The context for the example is that Sherlock has finished his abductions about Cabbie, coming to the conclusion that the murders are somehow related to Cabbie's children. When he asks what the connection is, Cabbie tells him that he cannot leave them a lot of money after he dies of his aneurysm because he does not earn much by driving a taxi. Sherlock comments that the same goes for serial killing, for which the cabbie responds by the utterance shown in this example.

Example 30. Cabbie, ending phase, TV.

<b>Cabbie:</b> You'd be surprised.	Voisitte yllättyä.   - Kertokaa minulle.
<b>Sherlock:</b> Surprise me.	[You could be surprised.   - Tell me.]

In the translated conversation between Sherlock and Cabbie they address each other formally, as in this case saying *voisitte* ('you could') and *kertokaa* ('tell') instead of the less formal *voit* ('you could') and *kerro* ('tell'). It is difficult to ascertain if this is a change from the original, because in English there is no difference in the form of verbs and the second person singular pronoun for such purpose, as there is in Finnish. Cabbie does address Sherlock as Mr Holmes, however, in the original dialogue, making the use of formal way of addressing understandable in the translation. Nevertheless, in the translation the formality is much more marked than in the original, due to differences in the languages, causing an interpersonal change between the original and the translation. As a result, there seems to be a greater personal distance between Sherlock and Cabbie in the subtitled conversation than there is in the original. Formal way of addressing is present elsewhere in the episode in this translation (but not within the analysed conversations), between John and Lestrade, for example, so the use of it here corresponds to the global strategy adopted by the TV translator to have some characters be more formal with each other. If one interprets the original dialogue using formal addressing, then this translation does not use the strategy of *interpersonal change*, but the DVD translation does, because in it formal addressing is not used.

The next case presents an instance where the strategy of *information change* has resulted in another kind of interpersonal change in the conversation. The extract is from the Cabbie conversation, where Sherlock is talking with Cabbie, who is the murderer. Sherlock abducts from Cabbie's clothes that he is dying.

Example 31. Cabbie, argumentation phase, DVD.

<b>Sherlock:</b> That you're a dead man walking.	Olet kuoleva mies.   Sinulla ei taida olla paljon aikaa.
<b>Cabbie:</b> <u>So are you.</u>	
<b>Sherlock:</b> You don't have long, though. Am I right?	[You are a dying man.   I don't think you have long.]

In the translated conversation segment Cabbie's turn *So are you* is omitted. This has the effect that in the translated conversation the man who has killed four people and might kill Sherlock, as well, does not threaten his possible intended victim, which he does in the original conversation. This

clearly changes the mood of the conversation and the level of hostility that Cabbie might express towards Sherlock. In other words, the translated conversation does not convey Cabbie as threatening as the original, which can change the viewer's impression of him or the intensity of the impending danger towards the main character. The viewer of the translated episode does not have as much reason to be worried for the main character in this situation, because they are unaware of Cabbie threatening him.

This analysis section has illustrated some of the aspects relevant in the translation of conversations with the help of different examples. The conversations were analysed with regard to different key parts of the conversations (e.g. initiating and transitional utterances) as well as other important aspects relating to the conversations (e.g. coherence and interpersonal aspects). The findings from the analysis will be discussed further in the following section.

## 7 Discussion

In this section, the findings from the analysis of the translated conversations will be discussed further, and a review of the central findings will be provided. In addition, the tools utilised in the analysis, translation strategies and illocutionary acts, will be evaluated in terms of usefulness.

The global strategies for translating the episode in the two translations are different. While the DVD translation adheres to the sentence structure of the original dialogue more closely, the TV translation formulates the utterances much more freely. This does not necessarily come across in the scope of these seven conversations, but looking at the subtitles for the entire episode this becomes obvious. This is relevant here for the following reason: attempting to retain a sentence structure that follows the original may lead to omissions due to shortage of space, if the loyal translation requires more characters than paraphrasing. Conversely, too generous reformulation of the utterances may not appeal to those viewers that know enough English to notice the difference between the original and the subtitles. For the purposes of this study the viewer is assumed to know not a word of English, but the situation in real life is that more and more people do know English. Therefore, the audience's experience of the perceived success of the subtitles may be affected by the formulation. Regardless, the global strategy adopted by the translator with respect to the amount of paraphrasing can have an effect on the translated conversation, because these global choices may limit the number of words or turns that can be included in the subtitles.

The general three-part outline of the conversations is retained in the translations, since all the phases are translated. However, on several occasions the aspects that would seem to be integral and essential parts in the makeup of a conversation are omitted. Of course, the material in this study is only a small sample, but the findings do reveal some trends with regard to translating different parts of the conversations. These will be addressed in this section. The most important phase in these conversations is the argumentation phase, which is why the transition into it is an essential aspect of the conversation's translation. Similarly, the initial phase is of importance, because it leads up to the argumentation. It is noteworthy that within the conversations, each one has an initiation phase but not necessarily an ending phase. The ending is not as important to the conversation, because it is essentially leading away from the subject into the next conversation. This is illustrated by Victim, which has no ending phase and ends as the argumentation phase ends. All this suggests that in translating these conversations the argumentation is the main point, and the phase leading up to it is

the next important part. These, therefore ought to be the parts of the conversation that are especially important to translate following the original composition as closely as possible. However, unexpectedly, several of the argumentation initiating directives have been omitted in the subtitles (see section 6.2.2).

Omission, or the strategy of *information change* (the two of which are practically interchangeable in this study), is a frequent strategy used within the conversations. The majority of the entire turns that are omitted seem to belong in the category of directives, i.e. illocutionary acts meant to get the listener make some action, in this case often questions asking for information. As illustrated in Examples 10–12, entire turns that can be omitted, based on this material, seem to be directives that prompt a new turn if the new turn is connected to the one before the directive. In other words, the viewer can be assumed to be able to infer the content, or at least the function, of the omitted turn if the previous turn and the response have the same topic. Entire turns in the form of an assertive seem to be translated much more frequently. This difference in “omissibility” is further demonstrated by the treatment of questions and rebuttals which advance the argumentation. While some of the directives in this position have been omitted, all the rebuttals have been translated (see Example 27). Omission of entire turns naturally changes the composition of a conversation, since as a result, the translated conversation has fewer turns and one of the participants becomes less active in the interaction. Of course, the viewer can always hear that a turn is uttered, but the representation of the conversation is affected. Moreover, omission of interactional, relationship-centred turns affects the characterisation of the speakers. The viewer of the translated episode does not get the same impression of them as the viewer of the original episode, nor are they privy to the development of the relationship that is advanced in the omitted interaction.

Due to time and space restrictions, coherence seems to suffer in the subtitles. That is because the omission of connectives that link together sentences (such as arguments and conclusions) lessens the coherence. This may not strictly speaking relate to the overall constitution of the conversation in the way phases and transitions do, but it can be seen to contribute to the conversation experience. For the recipient of Sherlock's argumentation in the episode a coherent argumentation, and for the viewer watching television a coherent speech would be more pleasant and easier to listen to and understand. Again, due to restrictions in time and space, subtitles also present the conversation differently in terms of what is displayed on screen. This could be said to affect the coherence, as well, outside the content and the words. Examples 1 and 2 illustrate this point, as two turns are presented as one when another turn is omitted from between them. These changes are significant,

because coherence is important in the conversations in terms of how the listener in the episode (and in this case the viewer of the episode) is able to follow the logic of the conversation.

The translation of the structure of the conversations will be discussed next. The first phases in all the conversations except for one follow a similar format when it comes to the initiation of the whole conversation. The initiation phases of the conversations start with a directive that prompts someone else to say something, thus starting the conversation. The initiating utterance, which constitutes an essential part of the conversation, is a directive in every conversation except for one (Phone) (see section 6.2). In all of these conversations except one (see Example 5) this initial utterance has been translated. However, the transitional markers present at the beginning of some of the utterances in the original dialogue in the source language are not transferred to the target language utterances (see section 6.2.1). This changes the way in which these conversations start in the source language and in the target language.

Similarly to the conversation initiating utterance, the last utterance within the initiation phase is also a directive. This directive prompts the argumentation phase. The Phone conversation differs from the rest in structure, as is mentioned in connection with Example 15. Although these directives have an important function in the conversation, because they initiate the central part of the conversation, in a third of the translated conversations they have been omitted. In other words, the strategy of *information change* has altered the conversations' structure. In some cases, however, the utterance has undergone an illocutionary change on the level of the literal act while retaining its illocutionary point. This means that the strategy of *illocutionary change* has been used in retaining the conversation structure rather than changing it.

Several of the ending phases of the conversations, although varying in structure and content, include an utterance that refers to the preceding argumentation phase. These referring utterances have been translated in the subtitles in every instance they occur. Another element, although relatively rare within the conversations, that has always been translated is a rebuttal of Sherlock's argumentation by someone else. These rebuttals contribute to the argumentation by getting Sherlock to give more arguments to support his claims. The argumentation is similarly moved forward with the utterance of directives that directly or indirectly ask for more arguments. However, while rebuttals have never been omitted, some of the directives have been. The difference between the two types of contributions to the argumentation is that the viewer can be assumed to be able to infer the content of a directive from its context but not the content of an assertive. As mentioned in section 3.2, it is



commonly seen as acceptable in subtitling to leave out short turns or anything that the viewer can infer from the context. Regarding the translation of the argumentation phase, the structure of argumentation is generally retained during translation, and arguments are presented in the same order in the original dialogue and the translation. This is to be expected, as subtitles appear on the screen simultaneously with the original dialogue. However, within argumentations there seems to be lessening in terms of coherence due to the tendency to omit connectives.

Subtitling is in effect about translating verbal communication, dialogue, so it differs considerably from literary translation. Therefore, the same translation strategies are not applicable in the same way for both forms of translation. This became evident with the use of Chesterman's (1997) translation strategies in the analysis of the translated conversations. Many of the pragmatic strategies, which beforehand seemed to be the most useful strategies for analysing the translation of conversations in subtitling, were incompatible. Several of the strategies that can be used for specific and individual translation problems in literary translation were actually in use for the entire translation of the audiovisual source text. Because subtitling is, for all intents and purposes, summarising translation due to the constraints that lead to omissions (see sections 3.1 and 3.2), the strategy of *partial translation* essentially concerns the entire translation. Similarly, the strategy of *visibility change* is not applicable in the same sense as it is in literary translation. This is because subtitles are displayed over the original dialogue in a written form, so the translator's presence is inherently explicit. A very prominent difference between literary translation and subtitling is omission. Omission is an inherent part of subtitling, so applying the translation strategy of *information change* as it is described in section 4 to subtitling is not practical. However, even researchers of subtitling refer to omission as a translation strategy (see section 3.1).

Nevertheless, if the pragmatic translation strategies that are most prominently in use in the translation of these conversations were to be listed, they would be the strategies of *information change* and *illocutionary change*. There are a few aspects about these that must be pointed out. The strategy of *information change*, which, in effect, means omission in this study (since addition is not present at all), is the one out of these two strategies that affects the conversation by changing it. This is achieved by leaving out turns or parts of turns or elements that create coherence. The strategy of changing an illocutionary act seems on the surface to have a changing effect, but in reality all the illocutionary changes in the key utterances within the conversations are those of literal acts, not primary acts. Literal act (as explained in section 5 as well as in conjunction with Example 9 in section 6.2.1) means the literal meaning of the uttered sentence, while primary act is its actual

illocutionary point. In other words, even when the strategy of *illocutionary change* is used, the illocutionary point of the utterance remains the same, i.e. the utterance still functions in a similar fashion as the original does. In effect, the strategy of *illocutionary change* contributes to the retainment of the function of the key utterances. The changes in the structure of the conversations during the translation process are mostly caused by the strategy of *information change*, i.e. omission, and the effects on the conversation seem to be some of the items listed in Chesterman's pragmatic strategies. In other words, omissions affect the conversations in terms of causing coherence change and interpersonal change, and these are given as translation strategies in Chesterman's list.

It should be pointed out that the material for this study, the analysis of which the translation strategies were applied to, does not encompass the entire dialogue of the episode. Therefore, although the strategies were not useful in analysing the aspects relating to conversation structure and other aspects, that is not to say that they were not used in the subtitling of the episode. For example, in the original dialogue Cabbie speaks with a more pronounced regional dialect than the other people in the episode, but this does not come across in the subtitles. The translation strategy of *other pragmatic changes*, which Chesterman associates with dialectal decisions, is therefore in effect. This does not show up within the conversations that serve as material in this study, since only one of the conversations includes Cabbie as one of the participants, and during it his accent is not very pronounced regarding dialectal markers. The episode, and therefore the subtitles, contains several more conversations and exchanges where all Chesterman's strategies might be in use, but in the scope of this study, which focusses on the conversations centring around Sherlock's argumentations, they were not as useful as beforehand was assumed.

However, saying that the strategies are not applicable for subtitling is not to be understood as a rejection of the usefulness of these strategies in this form for audiovisual translation altogether, as they are undoubtedly utilised in several ways. Instead, it should rather be taken as a suggestion that the translation strategies ought to be modified to function specifically for subtitling. For example, the role of omission would have to be revised to fit the parameters of subtitling as opposed to literary translation, because in subtitling omission is inevitable and the translator has to work around it in transferring the content of the source text into the subtitles, whereas in literary translation it is merely a strategy among others. Some of the other pragmatic strategies, too, cannot be regarded merely as strategies for dealing with individual translation problems. Although the strategies of *partial translation* and *visibility change*, for example, can be used to translate a specific point in the source text, they both are also inherently present in subtitling at all times. The

translation is inevitably partial and it is inevitably visible because of space and time constraints and because the overall nature of subtitles (see section 3.1). Other strategies, such as the strategies of *explicitness change* and *cultural filtering* can be applied to subtitling the same as they can to literary translation, because they target individual items that are to be translated.

Regarding the use of illocutionary acts in analysing the translations of the conversations, they were useful in determining what kinds of utterances constitute some of the essential parts in the conversations. These parts are, for instance, the initiating utterance as well as the utterance in the transitional position before the argumentation phase, not to mention the directives and assertives that contribute to the furthering of the argumentations. What is noteworthy in connection with the illocutionary acts presented in section 5 is that out of the five categories only directives and assertives played a key role in the conversations. The others, expressives, commissives and declarations, are not even mentioned in the analysis section. That is not to say, of course, that these illocutionary acts are not present within the conversations, because they most certainly are, but it seems that they do not function in structurally significant ways in the composition of these conversations.

To sum up this discussion, here is a brief comment on the findings: it is quite clear that the analysed conversations underwent several different changes when they were translated. These changes include both structural and other kinds of changes. The main contributor to the changes is omission, because leaving out parts of the conversations alters its structure. The changes the conversations were a subject to can be said to ultimately stem from the time and space constraints that govern subtitles, because they result in the summarising nature of this form of translation. Because there is no possibility of including everything in the subtitles, something has to be omitted, and the resulting omissions affect the translation of the conversations. However, the analysis of these seven conversations has revealed that there are several aspects about conversations that ought to be taken into consideration when translating them. For example, coherence and interpersonal aspects, as well as structurally central utterances should be considered when translating conversations, and an effort should be made to transfer these aspects from the original conversation to the translation.

## 8 Concluding remarks

The aim of this study was to examine how the structure of conversations changes when they are translated into subtitles, and how these changes are created in terms of translation strategies used. The material consisted of seven conversations from an episode of *Sherlock* and their translations. The theoretical tools utilised in the analysis of the translated conversations consisted of the understanding of the central concepts of subtitling as a form of audiovisual translation, a set of pragmatic strategies and an application of illocutionary acts.

As it turned out, the strategies chosen to serve as tools for the analysis of the conversations were revealed to be incompatible with subtitling, because they were designed for literary translation. In fact, several of the strategies were general ones that applied to the entire translation of the episode instead of to the conversations, and more than one of the strategies also ended up being the result of another strategy. The predominant strategy that affected the structure of the translations was omission, while another frequently used strategy, *illocutionary change*, did not ultimately cause any changes. This proved that the strategies used in the analysis were not applicable to this kind of translation. The main reason for the compositional transformation of the conversations resulted from the unavoidable presence of omission in the subtitles. It affected the construction of the conversations by eliminating certain the key utterances comprising some of the main parts of the conversations, as well as coherence and interpersonal aspects. Although the wording of some other key turns and utterances did not remain the same in the translated conversations as in the original, the strategy of *illocutionary change* contributed to the retainment of their function. The delineation of the conversation may have an effect on the results; if the starting and ending points of the conversations were placed somewhere else, and if the lines between different phases were moved, the results would, naturally, be different.

Although this is a small study with a limited sample as material, I find that the results can be generalised at least with regards to the effect of omission on the structure of translated conversations. Additionally, the discovery of the incompatibility of general translation strategies in the study of subtitling was valuable. It proves that subtitling as a completely different form of translation compared to literary translation requires completely different translation strategies. Studying the subtitling of different conversation in different genres would help to determine which translation strategies are best suited for subtitling. Moreover, it would be a worthy topic in itself.

## References

BBC One/Sherlock. (2014). Retrieved from

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b018ttws/features/about>

Chesterman, A. (1997). *Memes of translation: The spread of ideas in translation theory*.

Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub. Co.

Díaz Cintas, J. (2010). Subtitling. In Y. Gambier, & L. v. Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies* (1st ed., pp. 344-349). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub. Co.

Eco, U. & Sebeok, T. A. (1983). *The sign of three: Dupin, Holmes, Peirce*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Gambier, Y. (2008). Audiovisuaalisen kääntämisen tutkimuksen suuntaviivoja. In R. Oittinen, & T. Tuominen (Eds.), *Olennaisen äärellä: Johdatus audiovisuaaliseen kääntämiseen* (L. Salmi Trans.). (2nd ed., pp. 73-115). Tampere: Tampere University Press.

Gambier, Y. (2010). Translation strategies and tactics. In L. v. Doorslaer, & Y. Gambier (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies* (1st ed., pp. 412-418). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub. Co.

Helin, I. (2008). Av-median ja kääntämisen kulttuuriset kontekstit. In I. Helin & H. Yli-Jokipii (Eds.), *Kohteena käänös uusia näkökulmia kääntämisen ja tulkkauksen tutkimiseen ja opiskelemiseen* (pp. 131-148). Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.

Ingo, R. (1999). Tiivistävä käänös ja sen keinot. In I. Sorvali (Ed.), *Kääntämisentutkimuksen päivät Oulussa 4.12.1998* (1st ed., pp. 32-53). Oulu: Oulu University Press.

Järvinen, A. (1992). *TV-kääntäjän opas*. [Helsinki]: RTI tietopankki.

- Koljonen, T. (1996). Tv-kääntämisen erityispiirteitä. In I. Sorvali (Ed.), *Kääntämisentutkimuksen päivät Oulussa 12.12.1995* (pp. -). Oulu: Oulu University Press.
- Labov, W., & Fanshel, D. (1977). *Therapeutic discourse: Psychotherapy as conversation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Moffat, S. (Writer), & McGuinan, P. (Director). (June 5<sup>th</sup>, 2011). A Study in Pink [TV]. In Vertue, S. (Producer), *Sherlock*. BBC, London.
- Moffat, S. (Writer), & McGuinan, P. (Director). (2010). A Study in Pink [DVD]. In Vertue, S. (Producer), *Sherlock*. BBC, London.
- Oittinen, R., & Tuominen, T. (2007). Lukijalle. In R. Oittinen, & T. Tuominen (Eds.), *Olellaisen äärellä: Johdatus audiovisuaaliseen kääntämiseen* (2nd ed., pp. 11-14). Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Pedersen, J. (2008). High felicity: A speech act approach to quality assessment in subtitling. In D. Chiaro, C. Heiss & C. Bucaria (Eds.), *Between text and image: Updating research in screen translation* (pp. 101-116). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub. Co.
- Pedersen, J. (2011). *Subtitling norms for television: An exploration focussing on extralinguistic cultural references*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub. Co.
- Remael, A. (2010). Audiovisual translation. In Y. Gambier, & L. v. Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies* (pp. 12-17). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub. Co.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1985). A taxonomy of illocutionary acts. In J. R. Searle, *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts* (pp. 1-29). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Segal, E. (2010). Closure in detective fiction. *Poetics Today*, 31(2), 153-215. doi:DOI  
10.1215/03335372-2009-018
- Truzzi, M. (1983). Sherlock Holmes: Applied social psychologist. In U. Eco, & T. A. Sebeok (Eds.), *The sign of three: Dupin, Holmes, Peirce* (pp. 55-80). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Vertanen, E. (2008). Ruututeksti tiedon ja tunteiden tulkkina. In R. Oittinen, & T. Tuominen (Eds.), *Olellaisen äärellä: Johdatus audiovisuaaliseen kääntämiseen* (2nd ed., pp. 149-170).  
Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Vinay, J.-P., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). *Comparative stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation*. (J. C. Sager & M.-J. Hamel, Trans.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub. Co.  
(Original work published 1958)