Δηλαδή, τι δηλαδή: an interlingual investigation into functional patterning of a Greek discourse marker

PHILIP KING

EISU, The University of Birmingham, UK

ABSTRACT
The present paper is one part of an intended larger corpus-based investigation into the function of the Greek discourse marker δηλαδή. In this part we examine the evidence provided by parallel texts in English and Greek, our main focus being on what patterns there may be in the English text that trigger the choice of δηλαδή by the Greek translators. Further investigation, which is not covered in this paper, is intended to consider evidence from monolingual Greek corpora.

WORD PROFILE
First, a profile of δηλαδή. It is a frequent word in Greek overall, as measured by its relative frequency in various corpora of Greek.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORPUS</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>RANK FREQUENCY</th>
<th>% OCCURRENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ILSP</td>
<td>20 million</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press briefings</td>
<td>1.5 million</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU debates 1996</td>
<td>1.2 million</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: data from corpora on δηλαδή

The rank frequency and % occurrence figures for all corpora combine the values for the form δηλαδή with those for δηλ., the latter being taken simply as a graphological variant – indeed in the EU debated data δηλ. is the form almost always used in the translations from English and Swedish, while it is hardly ever used in the translations from other languages. As can be seen, δηλαδή is approximately the hundredth most frequent word form in all the corpora. If lemmatised frequency lists were taken as a basis, this would have the effect of pushing it down the frequency list somewhat.

The difference in % occurrences is marked, δηλαδή being twice as frequent (0.12% is equivalent to about 1 per 800 words of running text) in the Press briefings as in the ILSP corpus. This suggests an association with spoken discourse. The ILSP data is mainly or entirely from written sources; the EU data comprises many written statements which are read out, and many set-piece speeches, while the Press briefings contain a certain proportion of prepared statements, but largely consist of spontaneous question-and-answer sessions.

The bilingual dictionary profile of δηλαδή is not particularly illuminating. Stavropoulos (1977), typically, gives the English equivalent as namely, that is, that is to say and viz; nowhere is there any indication of any problem or complexity in the translation of this item. Recent monolingual Greek dictionaries have more of interest. Thus, the University of Thessaloniki dictionary (1998) (henceforth UTD) devotes 18 lines to it, including copious examples. The main divisions of meaning are (i) explains something previously referred to; (ii) in questions (a) used alone in dialogue when we wish our interlocutor to explain more clearly or simply something mentioned previously which we have not understood; (b) introduces the speaker’s evaluation of something just said; (c) expresses doubt; (d) expresses disapproval; (e) expresses irony or sarcasm; (f) expresses strong disapproval or annoyance. The examples given for all the subdivisions of the second category are formulated as questions. Babiniotis (1998) recognises three divisions of meaning: (i) (explanatory) indicated that its context clarifies what was said previously; (ii) (inferential) it follows that, it is clear; (iii) strengthens and stresses the content of a question. Babiniotis also briefly considers synonyms of δηλαδή and their etymologies.

These two dictionaries present a clearly overlapping picture, the UTD placing more emphasis on functions in context, and presenting its role in questions more analytically, although it should be said that some of the examples given could equally well be punctuated with a simple full stop (δηλαδή νομίζεις ότι είσαι αναντικατάστατος; could be regarded as a proposition if it was not ended with a question mark – there does not seem to be any difference to the meaning of δηλαδή here to go with the difference in punctuation).

Archakis (2001) has analysed δηλαδή along with three other markers, θέλω να πω, μ' άλλα λόγια and ή μάλλον, and distinguishes between their uses. Briefly, δηλαδή is a hypernym of the other three expressions, which only partly overlap with each other. His analysis is based on ten

---

2 The ILSP website says there is no spoken data. Some of the citations found in its corpus however appear to come from transcripts of Greek government press briefings.
hours of transcribed classroom discourse, again suggesting that spoken discourse is a prime source, which provided 203 instances of ἰδιάδη. This compares with a total of 16 occurrences of the other three discourse markers he investigates. The present study is not concerned with these or other possible replacements for ἰδιάδη, but Archakis' findings are interesting set alongside the current research, which suggests that although English does have one or more markers (namely, that is) which have some comparable functions, the marking in English may be nothing like as regular or as prominent in Greek. Namely is 7569th in frequency in Cobuild data, for example.

DATA FROM A PARALLEL CORPUS
The present analysis is based on data from a 1.2 million word sub-corpus of Greek, from which reference is made across to the parallel data for English. The sub-corpus as defined here is part of a larger corpus of parallel texts which was put together for an EU-funded Lingua Multilingual Parallel Concordancing project. It consists of the transcripts of many of the 1996 sessions of the European parliament. One day's proceedings in one language constitute a single text file; for the Greek text file for one day, for example, part of these proceedings will be in Greek SL, and part in Greek TL from contributions to the debate in any of the other official languages. For this analysis, only contributions originally in Greek (by Greek MEPs) or contributions originally in English have been included. Greek TL translations of original contributions in other languages such as French, Finnish, German, Portuguese etc have not been taken into account, although a multilingual parallel study is a possibility for the future. The transcripts are mainly of the spoken contributions by MEPs to each day's debate, although occasionally written questions and answers are included. No attempt has been made here to distinguish between the two. Most of the spoken contributions appear to be prepared speeches or comments – the transcripts show a high level of grammatical complexity and well-formedness, with none of the hesitations or repetitions etc which we might expect to have been in the raw data. However, there are points where members are clearly speaking unrehearsed, reacting to the previous speaker, and so on. No specific claim is made for the moment that the language is representative of anything other than itself, although it can be expected to have close similarities to other genres of Greek.

3 The project, involving University institutions in a number of EU countries, was directed by Francine Roussel, of Nancy II University, France, and ran from 1993 - 1998. For accounts of it, see King (1998) and King and Woolls (1996), or http://web.bham.ac.uk/johnstf/lingua.htm
The Greek transcripts consist in the main of translations from the other languages used in the European parliament, but also, as noted, contain original Greek contributions. Methodologically, the question is, why use translated documents as evidence for anything in Greek? Would it not be better to start from original Greek texts? The answer to these questions is that this part of what it is hoped will become a more general investigation starts as a focus on translator behaviour. We can distinguish two questions: what does the English translator decide to do about an instance of δηλαδή made by a Greek discusssant? and (since the word is our central concern) where a Greek translator uses δηλαδή, what was happening in the English (or FL) text that prompted this decision? We might hope by this means to discover patterns which we could then look for in monolingual untranslated texts. As Arkhakis points out too, Levinson (1983:87-88) posits the existence of discourse markers in languages generally, and a cross-linguistic comparison would therefore be potentially illuminating. We also start from the informal observations that, firstly, there does not appear to be a corresponding lexical item to δηλαδή in English, either in terms of overall frequency or in terms of range of functions; and, secondly, that items which are of relatively high frequency in a language, as suggested by the corpus frequency lists, deserve study because they are likely to be salient for native speakers of the language, and therefore important for foreign learners.

The data analysed here consist of 82 English - Greek pairs of English-original extracts where the Greek translator has used δηλαδή, and 15 Greek - English pairs of Greek-original extracts where δηλαδή was used by the Greek speaker. In most cases the extracts are sentence length, but occasionally in one or both languages, the span of the items linked by δηλαδή may be more than one sentence.

GREEK TO ENGLISH
The fifteen instances of δηλαδή used by Greek speakers are translated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>namely</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in other words</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that is</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that is to say</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Greek - English translations of δηλαδή

Apart from the two instances of zero (no corresponding word or phrase in the English), this conforms fairly closely to the dictionary equivalents. The two instances where there is no discourse marker in English are these:
In (1), the English translation moves away from a close rendering of the Greek at grammatical level; in the Greek text, δηλαδή links ιδιωτική with its explanation στο σπίτι του. In the English text, we have two parallel adjuncts, at home, and purely for his own enjoyment, which answer respectively the questions where? and why? In (2), δηλαδή links the general αυτό που είπε with the particular για την ανάγκη, while the English is slightly less general with the term comments, but links this with a standard collocation concerning. As we are not concerned here with alternative possibilities that might have inserted an overt marker, but only with actual translator behaviour, the question of whether one could have been inserted will not be considered. It will not have escaped the eye of the discerning reader that there are other matters which would repay discussion from the point of view of translator choices, but they are beyond the scope of this paper.

**ENGLISH TO GREEK: EQUIVALENCES AT LEXICAL AND PUNCTUATION LEVELS**

As might be expected, the question of what it is in the English texts that triggers the use of δηλαδή in Greek is more complex, only partly because there is more data available. As table two shows, a wide variety of lexical and other devices in English may constitute the "trigger" for a Greek translator to use δηλαδή. And while, in the Greek – English direction, the bilingual dictionary equivalents accounted satisfactorily for twelve out of the fourteen instances (86% of instances), in the opposite direction, the dictionary equivalents (whether we look up the English items in an English – Greek dictionary, or δηλαδή in a Greek – English dictionary) account for twenty four of the eighty two instances (29% of instances).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DICTIONARY EQUIVALENT TRIGGERS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>namely</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that is</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that is to say</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.e.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER LEXICAL TRIGGERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which is/was/are/were</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which means</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that means</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that (= ότι)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that of</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in terms of</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUNCTUATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZERO (no punctuation, no specific lexis)</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3: what δηλαδή translates*

This classification is reasonably clear-cut, although some clarification is necessary. The question of what is serving as the trigger is put here in terms of specific lexis or punctuation, and many of the lexical equivalences will seem self-evident. Some cases may be slightly more open to argument as to the equivalences proposed. But these items can also be seen as exponents of particular functions, and it may be that the trigger is in some sense provided by the function rather than by the string of actual characters. This is consistent with the (functional) explanations given in the Greek dictionaries quoted above. At this point, illustrations and a commentary would be useful. A few examples of the lexical triggers first:

(3) I am sure many colleagues from other countries have experienced the same problem that very often young people in prison, who may not in fact be addicted when they go in, come out addicted.

(4) First of all, concerning the recovery of the funds for exceeding the milk quotas, we are recovering the funds in four years which means in four equal
tranches.

(5) He has now been sent back to Yazd which was the place where he was sentenced to death and he can now face the death penalty again.

(6) Visually-impaired people cannot access Parliament's documentation available to the general public in their preferred format of braille, tape or large print;

(7) It is important to approach the issue from the angle that you have chosen, and you have put the accent on people.

(8) When we look at those questions and see that they relate to an extremely sensitive issue, that of possible commercial espionage ...

Notice first of all that a very narrow item-to-item assignment is not always possible, and this is where the equivalences may be open to argument. For instance (3) I have classified as an equivalence of that and δηλαδή, and (8) as an instance of that of and δηλαδή, although in both cases there is another item in the Greek which is more closely equivalent to that or that of. These could therefore have been classed as either comma equivalent or zero equivalent. However, there is a case for saying that the relationship which is indicated by δηλαδή in Greek is in some sense triggered by the larger complex in English, and the word-to-word relationship is only part of the whole story. To give a zero equivalence here would be to ignore the role of that of in the ST in setting up the motivation for the selection of δηλαδή in Greek.

In detail, in (3) the relationship in the ST is that the that-clause spells out what the problem is. In Greek, this is an explanatory relationship, corresponding to definition (i) in both UTD and Babiniotis. In (4), which means provides an alternative interpretation, or additional supplementary information (how is the recovery over four years to be effected?). Grammatically it takes the sentence off in a different direction, while
δηλαδή, as Archakis points out, leaves the grammar unaffected. δηλαδή also appears to indicate here an equative relationship between what is on either side, that is, ας τέσσερα χρόνια is equivalent to ας τέσσερας δόσεις. In (5), in the ST we have a non-defining relative clause which gives us information about Yazd. In the TT, δηλαδή again marks an equative relationship (Yazd = the place where...). In addition, the use of δηλαδή here seems to throw emphasis on the following part of the sentence – Yazd has importance because of what happened there. In (6), their preferred format of braille, tape or large print ... is again an equative expression, albeit with different syntax. (one of braille, tape or large print = their preferred format). The same relationship holds between the corresponding parts of the Greek sentence, i.e. μορφή = braille etc. In (7), similarly, in the TT, the γνώση = να υπογραμμίσετε. In the ST the relationship between the parts is different here, with a parataxis. Note that rephrasing as and you have chosen to put the accent on people would be possible with little change to the overall meaning. Finally in (8) while the precise mapping of items may be disputed, it is clear in general that we have the same equative relationship in both languages between issue and that of, and θέμα and αυτό της.

These examples show that a prominent feature in the TT is an equative relationship marked by the presence of δηλαδή, the equation consisting of an item on the left-hand side (generally a noun, although cf 4, where arguably a whole phrase is explained), and an item which may be a noun, a phrase or a clause on the right-hand side. In the ST, there has to be something which is interpretable, regardless of the actual syntactic structure, as an equative relationship. In fact the ST syntax can be quite varied, as the examples show. We may also note here that the explanation involves typically moving from a general word (issue, problem) to a specific spelling out of the particular issue or problem at hand.

Cases where there is only punctuation in the ST are frequent as table 3 shows. A few examples:

(9) Finally, a comment on the fourth issue, flight crew licensing.

(10) So family planning, as I said before, is part of that service and should include prevention and treatment of reproductive tract infections and sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV-Aids
και των ασθενειών που μεταδίδονται
σεξουαλικά, περιλαμβανομένου του 1ον
HIV, δηλ. του AIDS

(11) The summit is also important
because it brings together members of
the Council of Baltic Sea States and two
of the three leading institutions of the
EU: the Council and the Commission.

Η διάσκεψη είναι επίσης σημαντική διότι
φέρει σε επαφή τα μέλη του Συμβουλίου
tων Χωρών της Βαλτικής με δύο από του
τρίον πηγών θεσμικών οργάνων της
ΕΕ, δηλ. με το Συμβούλιο και την
Επιτροπή.

(12) Some of the points the honourable
Member has made would carry greater
force if he did not say something which
is manifestly untrue about democracy in
Cuba.

Ορισμένα από τα σημεία που έδιξε ο
αξιότιμος βουλευτής θα είχαν πολύ
μεγαλύτερη βαρύτητα εάν δεν έλεγε κάτι
που είναι οφθαλμοφανώς ανακριβές, δηλ.
για τη δημοκρατία στην Κούβα.

In (9), the ST shows a common construction, the appositional relationship,
as in this sentence. The TT here shows a very similar construction to that
used in (8). In (10), the transcript of the ST is a little puzzling – it would be
useful to have here a recording of how the speaker said the phrase. As it is,
it looks as if HIV-Aids is a single concept or name for a condition or disease
consisting of the two terms bundled together. In contrast, the TT has a much
more analytically explicit rendering. The question of whether we have here
an equative relationship is complex. On one interpretation, the language
seems to imply that HIV = AIDS, but this would be bad science. It is of
course possible that the translator wanted to preserve a certain fuzziness
in the original. In (11) the ST again employs a regular device of English, the
colon, to precede an enumeration, while in the Greek, we can see an equative
relationship between δυο and Συμβούλιο and Επιτροπή. Finally, (12) is a
case of a zero item in English. The context is useful here in disambiguating
the English. The speaker in (12) was replying to a remark by a previous
speaker, who had said "having visited Cuba and the US a number of times, I
have to say that in many ways Cuba is a more democratic society than the
USA where both major parties are owned by corporate America." Thus the
import of (12) is that he had said something manifestly untrue about the
quality of Cuban democracy.

The division on which we have been operating so far, into lexical,
punctuational, or zero equivalence, can clearly not be the whole story. On
the whole the lexical equivalence is easy to see, and the range of ST items is
not surprising, when we consider the working of language in context. It is
hard to see how the same kind of meaning can be contained in an item of
punctuation, and in the case of a zero item in the ST, we need to begin
looking more widely at the ST context. As has already been suggested
indirectly in the dictionary definitions, the function of explanation is often overtly marked for Greek by δηλαδή. We have also noted that in many cases, the explanation involves an identity statement, that one thing is equated to another. In addition, the equation can involve a move from the general to a more specific detail, and this could be seen as the dynamic establishment of a hierarchical quasi-hyponymic relationship, which may be unique to one particular (stretch of) text. Thus in (12), the issue (general term) is flight-crew licensing (the specific term), and the particular hyponymic (or hyponymic) relationship is one which is valid for this particular stretch of text only. Similarly in (3), the problem (general term) is (specifically) that young people are often addicted to drugs when they come out of jail.

FUNCTIONAL PATTERNS
In the STs, two regular functional patterns stand out, and between them account for almost half of the 82 citations. The first is the one already discussed, the presence of a general noun, followed by a more explicit spelling out of what the noun refers to cf examples 3, 8 and 9). In this use, the noun can be regarded as having a cataphoric function. There are 25 instances of this pattern in the STs. Nouns found as the left-hand term, the explicandum, as it were, include issue (3), problem (2), point (3), allegation, promise, procedure, item, position, step, area, compromise, objectives, basis, philosophy, proposals, purpose, measures, solution, and situation. The pattern is generally maintained in the TT, where the left-hand term is represented by items such as θέμα, πρόβλημα, θέση, προτάσεις, λύση, σημείο, κατάσταση, καιρός, διαδικασία, βήμα. Often, the Greek structure is Ν οτί δηλαδή ..., where N is one of the nouns in the list. Interestingly, in at least one instance where the ST does not employ this type of construction, the TT introduces a general word, which is then further defined by way of explanation:

(13) I believe that this is where we need to start if we are going to achieve the win-win situation that I mentioned earlier.

Πιστεύω ότι από το σημείο αυτό πρέπει να ξεκινήσουμε εάν θέλουμε να φτάσουμε στην κατάσταση που περιγράφαμε νωρίτερα, δηλ. μόνο νικητές.

Here, the relevant information is grammatically coded into the pre-head of the English noun phrase as the win-win situation, while in Greek, an explanatory relationship holds between κατάσταση and μόνο νικητές.

Of interest here is the list of nouns we have given above as introducing a specifying explanatory phrase. The present list overlaps considerably with two sets of noun lists developed by grammarians of English. The first is the list given in CoBuild (1998, p 108ff) of general
nouns which can take a specifying that-clause. This list is open-ended as it
only gives the more frequently occurring nouns showing this pattern. The
other is a similar overlapping and open-ended list in Francis (1986), of what
she calls anaphoric nouns. Francis analyses these into various subgroups,
items such as allegation and proposal falling into the utterance noun
category (ibid, p11 ff for her typology); issue and problem into her
ownerless nouns category. In Francis’ analysis, these nouns are used
anaphorically to encapsulate, often with a value judgement, a previous
stretch of discourse. She recognises that they may also function
cataphorically, which is arguably the relationship in the examples of the
present survey. It may be this cataphoric relationship that frequently triggers
the insertion of δηλάδή by translators, and might entitle us to regard one
of the functions of δηλάδή as a marker of this type of general - specific
cataphoric relationship.

The second pattern is much less common, with 7 examples, but
stands out nonetheless. It is where we find a numerical value, which is then
interpreted in some way, either in terms of another number or an evaluation.
Examples from STs are in four years, which means four equal tranches, and
365 members, an absolute majority. In English, the interpretive element
seems to have less need of a marker; in Greek it appears that use of the
marker δηλάδή is typical. Further examples are:

(14) According to the Commission, in
1992, the last year for which statistics
were available, advertisement revenue in
telephone ‘white’ and ‘yellow pages’ was
ECU 3.7 billion which accounted for 7.5
% of total media expenditure in the
Union.

(15) In addition, 20,000 calves have
been slaughtered since 29 March, 4,000
a week.

Although in the English originals there may be no discourse marker as such,
in a general sense the ingredients for a marking are there; in (14) we may
regard which accounted for as introducing an interpretation or explanation.
In (13) and (14) there is no general term which is going to be explained at a
more precise level of detail, but simply a figure and a unit (3.7 billion ECU;
20,000 calves) which is then linked to another calculation or another way of
presenting the picture.
Naturally occurring data being the way it is, these categories, which are in any case pattern-based, are not hard-and-fast. The attribution of 25 and 7 citations to each category should be seen as an approximate figure, with an error of say plus or minus one. An example of the two patterns is exemplified in the following (the only one of its kind in the data):

(15) It says 3.3 there, while the sixth report of the Commission on structural funds says the figure is 2.1. Taking into account the GDP of Ireland as it is today, I think that the figure is actually on average over the six years of the programme around 2.5.

ΔΗΛΑΔΗ;
At this point we can ask the so-what question, δηλαδή; with respect to two issues: what we have shown, and what the consequences and implications are for lexicography, language-learning, and the theory and practice of translating.

We have shown that on a set of data which is extensive in one direction (the Greek and English subcorpora totalling some 2 million words), but limited in scope (it is all European Parliament data, and therefore restricted to a single, though complex genre), there are certain patternings in the English which can trigger the use of δηλαδή in the Greek TTs. An explicit discourse marker in English, such as namely, is much rarer than δηλαδή, and it is often the case that a certain functional relationship in the STs can motivate the selection of the discourse marker in Greek.

On the assumption that this patterning is not unique to this genre, although it might be less frequent in a less expository one, there are a number of implications. Firstly, the treatment in bilingual dictionaries is considerably divergent from what the evidence shows. In the Greek to English direction, the dictionary account reflects the practice indicated here quite closely, although the sample size is clearly very small. In the other direction however, the dictionary only gives a faint indication of the possibilities; translators are clearly alert to a much wider range of equivalences. At the same time it is true that words which are grammatically...
oriented or discursively oriented in their meaning are often the most difficult to treat adequately in a dictionary, which works most happily on a heavily semantic set of equivalences. Also the question we are in effect asking, how many different items or features in the SL texts provide an opportunity for selection of a particular TL item, is not one that dictionaries are set up to answer – in other words a dictionary can answer a question like "what is the Greek for namely", but not a question like "how many different things in English can be translated as δηλαδή?". Also dictionaries are not good at showing a null equivalence, even though this may be statistically well established. Punctuation across languages is a complex and understudied notion, but see El-Shiyab (2000) for a cross-linguistic comparison of punctuation problems.

Language learning in an institutionalised setting is characterised in the early stages by a reliance on simple equivalence reinforced in the form of vocabulary lists among other practices. As students move to a more advanced stage of the language, this sense of equivalence has to be replaced with a more sophisticated model of the two language systems for the student to make successful progress. Research of the present kind, whether done off-line by the teacher, or on-line by the student, can lead to a better appreciation of the complexity of the notion of equivalence, as well serving as a practical guide to actual patterns of a language. It could also suggest to non-native users of English possible broadenings of their repertoire of devices in English.

In terms of translation theory, the findings presented here may constitute support for the view that translations tend to be less divergent (lexically and grammatically) than the SL which gives rise to them. It should be noted however that the present investigation only weakly supports this notion, since one would have to analyse a broader set of data to resolve this point. In particular, one would need to investigate whether for example there are examples of namely which are not translated as δηλαδή: since the present research is entirely centred on the presence of δηλαδή in Greek TTs, it is obviously not geared to answering this question directly. Future research possibilities include extending the analysis in this direction, and broadening the scope of the enquiry to other language pairs such as Greek and French, and Greek and German, to see what the patterns are that come up, and how similar or different they are to those found in the case of the English and Greek translations.
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