

**Analysing English as a Lingua Franca in Migration Movies:
Pragmalinguistic Features, Socio-cognitive Implications
and Translation Issues**

Pietro Luigi Iaia



**UNIVERSITÀ
DEL SALENTO**

2015

© 2015 Università del Salento – Coordinamento SIBA



<http://siba.unisalento.it>

eISBN 978-88-8305-112-8 (electronic version)

DOI Code: 10.1285/i9788883051128

<http://siba-ese.unisalento.it>

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	5
Chapter 1	
Film Construction and Translation.....	9
1.1 Cognitive and Communicative Dimensions of Film Construction.....	9
1.2 Multimodal Dimensions of Film Construction	12
1.2.1 Analysis of Images.....	14
1.2.2 Dialogues	18
1.3 Film Translation as a Communicative Process	19
1.4 Conclusions	21
Chapter 2	
Lingua-Franca Variations and Film Interactions	23
2.1 Defining ELF Research	23
2.2 Developing ELF Research.....	25
2.2.1 Scripted ELF Variations	26
2.3 Conversation Analysis in Migration Movies	29
Chapter 3	
The Selected Films and Research Objectives.....	33
Chapter 4	
<i>Bend It like Beckham</i>.....	35
4.1 Linguistic Dimensions of the Movie.....	35
4.2 Conversation Analysis.....	37
4.3 Target Script Analysis	38
Chapter 5	
<i>Blood Diamond</i>	41
5.1 Linguistic Dimensions of the Movie.....	41
5.2 Conversation Analysis.....	42
5.3 Target Script Analysis	46
Chapter 6	
<i>Brick Lane</i>	49
6.1 <i>Linguistic Dimensions of the Movie</i>	49
6.2 <i>Conversation Analysis</i>	51

Chapter 7

***It's a Free World...*53**
7.1 Linguistic Dimensions of the Movie53
7.2 Conversation Analysis55
7.3 Target Script Analysis56

Chapter 8

***Looking for Alibrandi*61**
8.1 Linguistic Dimensions of the Movie62
8.2 Conversation Analysis63
8.3 Target Script Analysis65

Chapter 9

***Lamerica*69**
9.1 Linguistic Dimensions of the Movie69
9.2 Conversation Analysis72
9.3 Target Script Analysis73

Conclusions77

References81

Introduction

The current, digital era allows people to communicate in various ways, which do not necessarily require the presence of speakers in the same place. By means of computers, consoles, smartphones, it is in fact possible to interact and have a say from different cities, countries, or nations. What is more, the technological development is providing innovative applications to favour interlingual communication, by means of real-time translation software. From a general perspective, though, due to the technological and political development of English-speaking countries, English is still the favourite channel for international and cross-cultural communication, and its importance in this sense is confirmed by its status as the language that allows human beings to overcome their linguistic and cultural differences.

In particular, when English is used in cross-cultural interactions, it is defined as a Lingua Franca, identifying the linguistic choice enabling communication between speakers from different linguacultural backgrounds. The research area going under the label of “English as a Lingua Franca” (ELF) investigates the several dimensions of cross-cultural interactions, from the linguistic, to the communicative ones (cf. Jenkins 2000, 2007; Seidlhofer 2011; Guido and Seidlhofer 2014). Several research issues are addressed, from how English is constructed, modified, adapted, to the analyses of how the non-native speakers’ linguistic and cultural backgrounds influence the features of their lingua-franca variations. It follows that several types of ELF are identified, according to the different speakers, to different political and economic factors, and to the status asymmetries between senders and recipients.

This book aims to develop the research on English lingua-franca variations by focusing on an area of investigation that is scantily explored, and by proposing an analytical method that could be applied to the earlier stages of mediators and translators’ training. This book will explore the adoption of lingua-franca variations in a selected corpus of film scripts, dealing with some scripted interactions that are not conventionally taken into account in the development of ELF studies, but which can actually offer insight into how actual exchanges are carried out, as well as into the native speakers’ cognitive expectations about the linguistic and communicative dimensions of cross-cultural interactions.

ELF scholars generally investigate cross-cultural interactions in order to examine the properties of the language employed. Their work has challenged the view of non-native speakers resorting to English as a second language (L2) acquired through education or personal experience according to the native-speaker standard norms of the English grammar, contending instead that non-native speakers’ lingua-franca variations develop from a

process of “language authentication” (Widdowson 1979), which defines the acquisition of a second or foreign language as a means for intercultural communication. According to this view, language acquisition encompasses the schema dimensions and the semantic, syntactic and pragmatic structures of the speakers’ native language (L1), which are transferred to the structures of the speakers’ respective ELF variations (Guido and Seidlhofer 2014: 10). ELF variations are therefore not to be considered as defective English uses, but it is also true that the distance between the participants’ linguacultural backgrounds once transferred to ELF may trigger miscommunication or misinterpretation (cf. Guido 2008).

Furthermore, ELF scholars reveal that native and non-native speakers have specific roles in allowing successful communication. For example, non-native speakers can be seen as creative contributors pursuing the “fullest communication possible” (Seidlhofer 2011: 18-19), thus justifying the differences from the standard norms. On the other hand, native speakers are expected to show a peculiar attitude according to which the cooperative imperative prevails over the territorial one (Widdowson 1983). The definition of the participants’ main roles entails that achieving a successful conveyance of the speakers’ intentionality is more important than notifying and correcting misspellings or mispronunciations, which may pass unnoticed (Mauranen 2012) along with the lexical and syntactic deviations. As a result, native and non-native speakers are members of discourse communities sharing a common communicative purpose (Swales 1990; Seidlhofer 2011: 87), along with the illocutionary forces and perlocutionary effects (Austin 1962), which are made accessible to receivers by means of accommodation and meaning-negotiation strategies (Jenkins 2000; Cogo and Dewey 2006; Mauranen 2007). Depending on the contexts, though, the cooperative imperative may not be predominant, and in fact Guido (2008) illustrates that in exchanges occurring in specific socio-cultural and political scenarios, such as those connected to migrations, participants can play a high or a low status. The latter type of speakers’ behaviour is important also in terms of the text types that will be analysed here, which mostly represent asymmetrical interactions, in the course of which the high-status participants aim to prevail.

Research on ELF variations covers a number of specific communicative contexts, passing from education (Mauranen 2012; Gotti 2014), to cross-cultural unequal encounters (Guido 2008) and computer-mediated business interactions (Poppi 2014). At the same time, audiovisual communication and translation are dimensions not thoroughly explored. For this reason, this book will enquire into the possibility of creating a contact between the studies on lingua-franca variations and the production and translation of film scripts, developing the earlier contributions that explore the rendering into dubbing and subtitles of the ELF cues from a group of films labelled as “migration movies” (Iaia and Sperti 2013; Iaia, Provenzano,

and Sperti forthcoming), which display the life conditions and issues of migrant workers and families in foreign countries.

A multidisciplinary perspective will be adopted, aiming at an interaction between ELF studies and audiovisual translation, which would contribute to both research areas insofar as it favours the exploration of the lingua-franca variations employed in scripted exchanges in both source and target audiovisual texts, as well as the investigation of the actual linguistic and communicative features used for the construction of film conversations.

Hence, after presenting the processes of film construction and translation as communicative acts, exploring the influence of the functional, socio-cultural and cognitive dimensions in the production and rendering of source scripts (Chapter 1), the topic of English as a lingua franca will be enquired into (Chapter 2). The linguistic and schematic notions connected to the cross-cultural interactions will be defined, eventually determining the main lexical, structural and pragmatic features of the scripted linguistic variations in the selected corpus of films. Then, the description of the selected “migration movies” (Chapter 3) will be followed by the analyses of the scripts (Chapters 4-9), which will detail how the linguistic dimensions may help to define the status asymmetries. The analyses shall also illustrate the structures of some relevant interactions, which will be characterised by the identification of new moves that are meant to exemplify the socio-cultural influence in the asymmetrical dialogues under analysis. Finally, the source and target versions will be compared, to enquire into the translators’ interpretation and rendering of the original illocutionary force and perlocutionary effects.

Chapter 1

Film Construction and Translation

This chapter will present a view of film construction and translation as communicative processes, according to which the multimodal dimension of movies, or the integration between the linguistic and extralinguistic features, is meant to convey specific meanings to the receivers. For this reason, the three levels of communication identified by Austin (1962) as well as the sources of the semantic dimensions will be illustrated, along with the need for sharing such a background knowledge to attain appropriate interpretations. The main notions from the grammar of visual design (Kress and van Leeuwen 2006) and the main aspects of audiovisual translation will be explored as well, in order to provide a framework that allows an investigation of the authors' intentionality in film scripts.

1.1 Cognitive and Communicative Dimensions of Film Construction

Human communication is characterised by specific rules governing the exploitation of the various resources, from language, to sounds and gestures, so as to produce successful interactions. Furthermore, in order to favour the appropriate reception of the messages, with no or little differences between the senders' desired intentionality and the receivers' interpretation, some background elements have to be shared, such as the socio-cultural and linguistic contexts, whereas it is generally assumed that speakers cooperate while participating in the exchanges.

These conventional rules are common to all communicative settings, from oral to written interactions, and it is contended here that any type of means allowing the circulation of messages—thus including movies and works of art—are equipped with communicative potential that receivers need to identify by decoding how the senders' linguistic and cultural contexts inform the actualisation of the semantic dimensions that they intend to express.

Since audiovisual texts—and therefore movies, as well—are presented as a kind of communicative processes, it is claimed that some notions from the linguistic and pragmatic studies can be adopted (and perhaps adapted) in the development of an approach aimed at the investigation of how those text types are exploited to convey a message, and to activate specific reactions from the receivers. It would be appropriate, then, to start from the basic assumption coinciding with the definition of grammar as a “resource for making meanings” (Halliday 1978: 192). Its application to multimodal texts entails that also the production and reception of audiovisual text types are

characterised by some conditions that are common to all communicative acts. As for the production, the verbal dimension integrates the visual and acoustic features in the construction of the messages and in the definition of the semantic dimensions; as for the reception, both senders and recipients need to share some background knowledge. Also when it comes to audiovisual texts, the contemporary presence of senders and recipients is not always guaranteed or required, due to their asynchronous nature, which may anyway represent one of the aspects that hinder the appropriate conveyance of the semantic dimensions, especially when texts are included in a communicative context with different socio-cultural and linguistic perspectives. For these reasons, also to audiovisual texts it is possible to apply the distinction between the notions of “text” and “discourse”, according to which the former indicates an abstract entity, or “the physical manifestation” of discourse (Christiansen 2011: 34), whereas the latter corresponds to “the pragmatic achievement of meaning in reference to text” (Guido 1999: 71). In other words, it is only when texts are received that it is possible to state whether the intended message is successfully communicated or not. At the same time, it is when movies are actively received that it is possible to decide whether the intended effects are prompted in the audiences or not.

Since texts are meant to put forth the author’s intentionality, the process of their construction is carefully planned in order to select specific elements according to what the authors want to say, as well as to what they expect the receivers will understand. The latter claim foregrounds the connection to the authors’ cognitive and cultural dimensions, since when preparing the “physical manifestation” (Christiansen 2011: 34) of texts, senders generally have an implied kind of receivers in mind, depending on the historical and social contexts in which the communicative act is developed. This view is applied also to audiovisual messages, since the choice of the verbal, acoustic and visual dimensions is influenced by the notion of “implied receivers”, creating a parallel construct to the “implied readers” of written texts (Fish 1970; Guido 1999), both representing the cognitive construct that contribute to the selection of the formal characteristics. Words, images, accents, dialects and linguistic varieties are hence chosen according to their potential as triggers of specific responses on the part of the receivers. Such components are defined as “resources”, denoting all those “actions and artefacts [that humans] use to communicate” (van Leeuwen 2005: 3), and which contribute to the identification of the denotative and connotative semantic dimensions. The resources have in fact theoretical and actual semiotic potential, respectively corresponding to the possible meanings that they may communicate, and the ones that instead prompt in the receivers, once “used for purposes of communication” (van Leeuwen 2005: 5). It follows that meaning is not a static notion: it is instead a

dynamic element that is produced in use, according to the producers' interests (Kress 1993) and cultural background.

Yet, if texts are presented as communicative processes, to consider only the senders' contribution is not enough, since a dynamic, interactive view is needed, accounting for the receivers' behaviour as well. Linguistic studies provide another interesting notion to define the different dimensions that interact at the time of determining the several meanings. The notion of "affordance" denotes "the potential uses of a given object" (Gibson 1979) from its observable properties, which may vary according to the observer. In this light, affordance thus confirms that, once a text is received—namely, once it is actualised as a type of discourse—a relationship between texts and recipients is activated, which is complementary to the relationship between texts and authors. The awareness of such interactions informs the consideration of text construction as a communicative act between senders and recipients, since even though the production and reception of messages can be asynchronous, and hence without an immediate feedback, they nonetheless depend on the influence of the participants' linguistic, social and cultural backgrounds, as well as on the cognitive processes that allow them to make sense of the textual world.

The cognitive dimension is relevant in text construction as well as in text reception, for if it is true that senders imagine the potential receivers, it is also true that the recipients interpret the multimodal construction of the messages by means of mental processes. The most important one is represented by "inferencing" (Yule 1996; Guido 2004), which consists in the influence of the receiver's mental schemata for the selection of the actual semiotic potential. It is at this stage that it is vital to share the linguacultural and social background, since the common codification of meanings eases the interpretation of the semantic and communicative dimensions. Anyway, also when the background knowledge is not the same, mental processes may still be required to close some textual gaps, or to process what is watched or heard, to derive useful information. In general terms, after the linguistic, cultural and cognitive processing of text construction and interpretation, if the receiver's responses coincide with the authors' expectations, the outcome of communication can be considered successful, since the intended message is identified and received.

The creation and reception of texts is also affected by the three dimensions that Austin (1962) defines as "locutionary", "illocutionary" and "perlocutionary" acts. In fact, at first the authors' intentionality (illocutionary force) is conveyed by means of the construction of written, oral, or—as explained in the following sections—multimodal texts. After the construction process, the textual and audiovisual resources that are selected correspond to the locutionary act. Then, once the message is received, specific effects on

the receivers are activated (perlocutionary level), which may (or may not) correspond to the ones intended by the authors.

The construction and reception of messages both depend on the linguacultural and social backgrounds, which also influence the development and activation of Austin's three acts. It is important, in fact, to share the codification of human experiences, to belong to the same "discourse communities" (Kramsch 1998), with common ways of experiencing reality, in order to activate appropriate meaning-making processes. Yet, also the common codification of meanings has to comply with specific rules, which are generally determined by the members who gain social power. For this reason, the process of codification and identification of meaning is generally labelled as both social and ideological. It is social because it is rooted in the identification of communities of people connected by the same linguistic, social and cultural features, which are actualised in the linguistic and extralinguistic elements of texts; it is ideological because those who gain power define how to interpret and actualise the experience, ultimately affecting the cognitive and pragmatic dimensions of the interactions.

The discipline that studies how ideology affects the production and interpretation of messages is Critical Discourse Analysis (Fairclough 2010; 2015), whose basic assumptions are here adopted to develop the multidisciplinary approach to the analysis of the production and translation of film interactions. The stages and results of Critical Discourse Analysis are sometimes downgraded and defined "biased" because they are affected by the analysts' socio-cultural and cognitive dimensions. Yet, the objectives and approaches of the discipline are nonetheless retained because they may help to underscore the extent to which the selection of specific semiotic resources in the selected corpus of films is ideological, insofar as this term entails the influence of the authors' socio-cultural background in the construction of the audiovisual messages.

To sum up, all text types (including audiovisual ones) can be considered as forms of interactions between senders and recipients, the former conveying their experiences and the latter interpreting the illocutionary force. Due to the peculiar construction of films, though, to enquire into their scripts only from a verbal perspective is not enough. Audiovisual texts are in fact multimodal, meaning that a multi-angle perspective of investigation is needed to explore how the different semiotic modes interact to produce and receive messages.

1.2 Multimodal Dimensions of Film Construction

In Linguistics, the notion of "modality" represents the truth-value of what the sender communicates (Halliday 1985), which is generally lexically actualised by the modal verbs. This view, which is usually related to the use of verbal

elements only, is developed by O'Toole (1994), van Leeuwen and Jewitt (2001), Kress and van Leeuwen (2006) and Kress (2009), in order to indicate that it is possible to indicate the truth-value also by means of images and sounds, when those extralinguistic elements are separately represented or, above all, when they interact with the linguistic features of texts.

The adjective “multimodal” and the noun “multimodality” describe the above process, corresponding to the interrelation between the acoustic and visual properties of music, dialogues, images, and entailing the exploitation of several semiotic modes to convey the senders' semantic dimensions. The multimodal approach preserves the basic notions of communicative acts, namely the importance of the cognitive, linguistic and socio-cultural dimensions for the appropriate reception of audiovisual texts, whereas also the selection of the extralinguistic features is strongly connected to the meaning potential of the resources. Once such resources are inserted in texts, in fact, a specific semantic dimension is activated, also due to the interaction and cooperation with the other elements that compose the message.

Besides being useful for the analysis of source scripts, the multimodal approach can also help to examine the rendering of source versions, thus justifying its adoption in the research areas connected to audiovisual translations (AVT), which generally investigates the adaptation of texts composed by words, images, sounds. Multimodality, in fact, can allow analysts to account for the integration between the linguistic and extralinguistic features, and its application is currently supporting the proposal of alternative approaches to the analysis of target versions (Chaume 2012; Perego and Taylor 2012), as well as the development of new research methods and objectives, such as the creation of models explicitly grounded in the exploration of the linguistic, acoustic and visual dimensions in the analysis and retextualisation of source texts (e.g., Chaume 2004; Guido 2012; Iaia 2015).

In multimodal terms, the analysis of source and target scripts accounts for the “composition” of messages, which defines “how the representational and interactive meanings of the images are related” (Kress and van Leeuwen 2006: 177). The distinction between “representational” and “interactive” meanings reveals the linguistic and semiotic origins of the multimodal analysis. In fact, such division seems to reflect the notions of theoretical and actual semiotic potential, which are adapted from a lexical perspective to suit the peculiar terminology developed in the discipline. In particular, the potential and actual potential of images are determined by different characteristics such as the “information value”, the “saliency” and the “framing” (Kress and van Leeuwen 2006: 177-179). According to the former, the elements have different levels of importance if positioned on the right or on the left of the scene, at the top or at the bottom, in the centre or in the margin. The notion of “saliency” defines the ability to attract the viewers'

attention by means of the size of images, as well as their contrast in colour and sharpness, or their position in the background or foreground of the scene. Finally, “framing” is connected to a particular aspect of the visual construction of the texts, namely the presence of lines that may connect or disconnect the elements of the representations.

While composing multimodal texts, the semiotic modes are integrated by means of spatial and temporal codes: the former corresponds to the arrangement of the represented participants; the latter operates in texts which unfolds over time, such as music, drama or films (van Leeuwen 1999), a notion that reminds their asynchronous nature. Images are integrated by sounds, soundtrack and acoustic scores in the communication of the intended meanings, and therefore, when approaching multimodal texts, analysts and receivers should identify at first what thing or who is represented, as well as what kind of connotative and symbolic meanings “are associated with these representations” (van Leeuwen and Jewitt 2001: 92). The multimodal approach confirms the development of the conventional notion of “texts”, which no longer defines the messages composed by words alone, but which includes the “semiotic construct comprising several signifying codes” that operate simultaneously “in the production of meaning” (Chaume 2004: 16). Images and sounds are in fact used to do things “to, or for, or with” people (van Leeuwen 2005: 120), and this entails that also multimodal texts can be considered as communicative acts that are meant to communicate the senders’ illocutionary force and to activate specific perlocutionary levels. In other words, “all the signs” of multimodal texts “combine to determine their communicative intent” (van Leeuwen 2005: 121).

For these reasons, it is important to provide analysts and students with theoretical and practical strategies of investigation and interpretation of multimodal texts in order to support the achievement of appropriate interpretations of the intended meanings in the selected text types. In the following sections, a number of notions are presented to indicate the most relevant aspects to take into account when analysing the selected corpus of film scripts.

1.2.1 Analysis of Images

As explained in Section 1.2, the linguistic notion of “modality” refers to the truth-level of the messages that one produces (see Halliday 1985), and in fact the use of different modal verbs, such as “might”, “can”, or “could”, may contribute to the identification of the different degrees of certainty of what is communicated. In a similar way, according to the multimodal grammar (cf. Kress and van Leeuwen 2006; Kress 2009), the use of specific modes of representation, the selection of the visual characteristics, or the insertion of particular acoustic scores can determine the author’s attitude towards what is

represented. Due to the connection between the processes of text production/reception and the communicative structure, also the integration between the linguistic and extralinguistic elements aims at attaining specific, expected perlocutionary effects and at conveying desired illocutionary acts. It follows that the images and sounds in audiovisual text types are therefore chosen in connection to the messages that the authors want to send.

Furthermore, when it comes to audiovisual translation, such communicative and multimodal framework can be applied to the retextualisation of source scripts as well. In this light, translators would be represented as receivers of the source texts first, who then become senders of the target versions aimed at receivers that belong to different socio-cultural and linguistic contexts. The cognitive dimensions also affect this scenario, in the course of both the rendering and reception activities. In particular, the former is characterised by the construct of the “ideal audience”, according to which the characteristics of the target scripts are generally selected, whereas by focusing on the latter it is possible to acknowledge the role of mental processes in order to make sense of the target versions.

Images and sound effects are the peculiar modes of representation that accompany the verbal components, with which they represent the locutionary dimension of audiovisual texts, thus creating a mutual relationship between the linguistic and extralinguistic features that is meant to reveal the illocutionary force. Kress and van Leeuwen (2006) describe two possible patterns for the inclusion of images in texts: “conceptual” and “narrative”. The conceptual pattern represents participants in terms of their classes, structures, timeless essence (2006: 79), and is a common means of representation in manuals, academic books, or in documentaries. The narrative pattern, on the other hand, is the one mainly adopted by other types of audiovisual texts, like movies, because it represents unfolding events or processes (Kress and van Leeuwen 2006: 59). Also the participants in the scenes are divided into two main groups: “interactive” and “represented participants”. The former define the producers and the receivers of texts, who interact in the production and reception of multimodal messages; the latter represent who and/or what is portrayed (cf. Kress and van Leeuwen 2006: 47-59). Additionally, also the creation of multimodal texts is ideological, insofar as it is determined by the socio-cultural context, meaning that the positions, the characteristics and the roles of the represented participants reflect specific ways of experiencing reality. Finally, to see the construction and translation of multimodal texts as communicative processes entails that the linguistic and extralinguistic characterisations of the represented participants are strategies that the interactive participants activate in order to share the author’s perspective on what is screened.

From an analytical perspective, visual representations can be processed from a micro- and a macro-perspective, in the sense that it is possible to focus

on the single elements of the images, such as the features of the represented participants, as well as to examine the overall processes that are depicted. Kress and van Leeuwen (2006) provide a list of the possible types of situations that can be represented, and as far as the selected corpus of films is concerned, “action” (2006: 63) and “reactional” (2006: 67) processes are the most common ones. In the case of action processes, the participants—human or human-like—are depicted in the development of a process. If the goal is not represented, the images belong to the category of “non-transactional action processes”; when instead the goal is visible, the action process is defined “transactional”. In the case of reactional processes, the participants are engaged in activities that involve their gaze, for example, they may be watching something. Also this group includes two categories, “transactional”, when the phenomenon that they are watching is represented, or “non-transactional”, when the phenomenon is not represented. Furthermore, a visual representation can be defined as a process when “vectors” are present. The noun denotes the creation of diagonal lines that generally start from the actors/reacters and point towards the goals/phenomena (Kress and van Leeuwen 2006: 46). The ability to observe and examine images would allow analysts to put into words the development of the process, by textualising the multimodal construction in order to create sentences that describe and help to interpret the represented processes.

Besides the distinction between reactional and action processes, images may also be classified in terms of the receivers’ response that they are supposed to demand. It is therefore possible to produce “offer” or “demand images”. The former label identifies the pictures that only represent an on-going process or situation, offering “the represented participants to the viewer [... as] object of contemplation” (Kress and van Leeuwen 2006: 119). The latter type of pictures demands a specific reaction from viewers, by locking eyes with the receivers, in order to establish relations “of social affinity” with viewers (Kress and van Leeuwen 2006: 118). Figure 1-1 below is an example of “offer image”:



Figure 1-1. “Offer Image”, from *Blood Diamond*.

Figure 1-1, from *Blood Diamond*, is offering the representation of the Revolutionary United Front taking prisoners from one of the African villages. It is an action process, and it can be textualised by identifying the actors, the phenomenon and the goal.

Consider now the following figure 1-2:



Figure 1-2. “Demand Image”, from *Blood Diamond*.

In figure 1-2 above, the RUF Commander is talking to the prisoners. Yet, due to the close shot and to his position, it can be surmised that the image aims at prompting a specific reaction on the part of the viewers, who can empathise with the prisoners that are the real target of the commander’s utterances.

The analysed examples show how different kinds of processes may be represented by means of images and how the socio-cultural schemata affect the way that they are composed and interpreted. In order to share the same ways of perceiving and representing reality, or what Halliday (1978) identifies as the ideational function of human communication, the interactive participants have to belong to the same social group. According to van Leeuwen (2005: 3-6), in fact, images are “means of social interactions”, and not merely “representation” of events.

Due to the multimodal nature of the text types under analysis, images interact with the verbal elements as well as with the acoustic dimension. The latter is crucial also in terms of audiovisual translation, since the original features can be modified or neutralised in order to prompt specific responses from the receivers, as happens in the adaptation of humorous discourse (cf. Iaia 2011; Guido 2012). As for the selected corpus of films, the acoustic dimension is represented by the accents and the phonological characteristics of the lines uttered by some speakers, and this strategy is equipped with semantic potential, coinciding with the representation of the non-native participants. The fact that they resort to non-conventional linguistic and phonological features actually triggers the identification of the intended semantic and functional dimensions. At the same time, the accents and phonological characteristics also reveal the influence of the authors’ linguacultural and social backgrounds in the definition of how non-native participants speak, as will be later contended (cf. Section 2.1.1). The

selection of the acoustic score is therefore influenced by the authors' perspective and in turn influences the receivers' interpretation (cf. Section 1.4 below), from the identification of the non-native and native speakers, to acknowledging the multimodal actualisation of the participants' status asymmetries.

1.2.2 Dialogues

Dialogues represent one of the ways human beings have to communicate, and as any types of communicative contexts, also interactions have to comply with specific characteristics. The latter are studied by Discourse Analysis, the discipline that concerns how the linguistic and structural features of the exchanges reflect the social relationships between the participants. One of the basic assumptions is that speakers cooperate (cf. Grice 1975), thus producing utterances that are relevant to the topic of the interactions, or being able to get some signals marking the possibility of taking the floor, or participating in a conversation. At the same time, the differences in the turn-taking sequences are connected to different types of exchanges, to the participants' status asymmetries, social roles and behaviour, as well as to the communicative situation. It is thus possible to define the higher and lower-status participants, or to determine who leads the conversation by focusing on the sequence of turns, or on the types of overlapping, which can determine asymmetrical or cooperative exchanges (cf. Tannen 1992). Turns are then characterised by an internal structure, consisting in the concatenation of moves and acts. Their identification is considered important also for the analysis of the scripted interactions such as the ones from the selected corpus of films, because they may reproduce the conventional actualisation of the status asymmetries or of the relationship between the speakers. A more detailed introduction of the dialogic structures of the movies under analysis will be provided in Section 2.1.2 below, whereas this section focuses on the multimodal construction of dialogues.

The visual dimension interacts with the acoustic and verbal one in defining the high-status participants and the different turns: sequences can in fact be realised “by means of various semiotic modes”, such as the “reaction shots” (van Leeuwen 2005: 249), which represent a specific strategy adopted by filmmakers, who show the listeners' reaction while the audience listen to what the speaker says. The audiovisual features may indicate the high-status and low-status participants, due to the latter's visual reaction or position in the scene, integrating the linguistic dimensions of their turns. Consider, for example, the figure 1-3 below, from *Blood Diamond*, when the fisherman Solomon speaks to two members of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees:



Figure 1-3. Solomon (on the right) and two men, from *Blood Diamond*.

The audiovisual actualisation of the dialogues integrates the conventional structures, which usually drops hints about asymmetric interactions, as exemplified by if and how someone takes the floor, or by the behaviour of the leaders of the conversations, thus communicating inequality between the parts (cf. Poynton 1985). In figure 1-3 above, Solomon is opposed to the two men, who play high status, as deduced from the position of the UNCHR member on the left, who is leaning towards Solomon with his body, but who is represented in a higher position than his interlocutor. Also notice that the other member, on the right, is not even watching Solomon.

Several dimensions interact in the construction of the messages that the senders (the authors of the films) prepare for the receivers (the viewers) by means of the audiovisual dimensions, and such dimensions have to be considered at the time of translating source scripts. Audiovisual translators are in fact both receivers and senders, and they are sometimes called to bridge different linguistic and cultural contexts despite dealing with the same semiotic resources. For these reasons, translators need to possess specific strategies that enable them to mediate between the linguacultural backgrounds, to decode and render the intended illocutionary and perlocutionary levels, preventing miscommunication or misinterpretations.

1.3 Film Translation as a Communicative Process

The adaptation of source versions for target receivers is seen as a process that stems from the translators' interpretation of the original semantic and pragmatic dimensions. In this light, also translation is a communicative process, since it involves the production of a message on the part of the translators, which is actualised by the integration between the linguistic and extralinguistic features, and which is meant to prompt the intended effects also for target receivers. In particular, since translators receive source versions before producing their retextualisations, it is possible to consider their role as that of mediating between the source and target linguacultural backgrounds, for the original message has to reproduce the perlocutionary and illocutionary dimensions for different audiences. Such premises are

crucial in the definition and investigation of the notion of equivalence in translation, which has to be connected to the identification and adaptation of the original meanings and functions, from a pragmalinguistic perspective that focuses on what texts say (the surface, denotative semantic dimension, as well as the locutionary and illocutionary levels) and on what texts prompts in receivers (the perlocutionary dimension, once the abstract entities are actualised as a discourse).

In other words, “equivalence” is related to both the denotative-semantic and connotative-pragmatic dimensions, but it is also affected by what the translators first, and the audience later, infer from their subjective relationships with the text, according to their mental schemata and background knowledge. When producing texts, authors have expectations in terms of the effects to activate in their ideal receivers, or in terms of the latter’s interpretation. At the same time, similar dynamics are activated by translators, who select the lexico-semantic, syntactic and communicative features of target versions in order to suit the implied audience’s expectations. Hence, also translations are the outcome of cognitive processes, for the translators’ interpretation is at the basis of various aspects of the target scripts, such as the adaptation of the original linguistic features, or the modification of some traits, in order to suit the receivers’ expectations.

For these reasons, in the definition of the semantic dimensions, the author’s intentionality, the formal features of the scripts and their interpretations on the part of the receivers interact (cf. Guido 1999: 76), and when it comes to audiovisual texts like films, such interpretation is connected to the overall multimodal dimension. This justifies the need to account for the audiovisual and linguistic characteristics when investigating how audiovisual translation is carried out, as well as how audiovisual translators are trained (cf. Chaume 2004, 2012; Díaz Cintas 2004; Denton and Ciampi 2012; Guido 2012).

The personal, subjective relationships that people engage with films are therefore ruled by the linguacultural and cognitive backgrounds. As already explained (Section 1.1 Above), if the experiential contexts are shared, it is more likely to achieve an appropriate interpretation of the intended message. At the same time, also the translation of texts is affected by two main cognitive processes, “bottom-up” (cf. Richards 1929) and “top-down” (cf. Bartlett 1932), which interact in order to produce equivalent versions that aim to convey similar messages as well as to prompt similar effects in the target receivers.

In the selected corpus of films, the main audiovisual translation mode is represented by dubbing, which is generally considered a “covert” type of audiovisual translation (Perego and Taylor 2012), since it allows the modification or adaption of the original lexical and structural dimensions (which are in fact covered by the target script), in order to suit some

ideological, culture-bound and schema-bound notions. This ideological trait is further confirmed by the presence of figures such as the one of commissioners, who have the final say on the linguistic and pragmatic features of translations, proposing or performing modifications to the source scripts in order to meet the networks' requests due to the scheduling of target versions, or to comply with the expected effects, according to criteria such as the age and gender of the implied receivers (cf. Iaia 2011, 2013). Indeed, the connection between audiovisual translation and ideology is deeply rooted in the Italian culture: actually, dubbing was introduced during the Fascist regime as a protection of the national language, in opposition to the inclusion of foreign words and terms (cf. Paolinelli and Di Fortunato 2005).

The main focus of the analysis of the selected corpus of films will be on the adaptation of the lingua-franca variations in the source scripts, which generally follows different rules according to the genres of the audiovisual texts. When the humorous discourse prevails in the analysed movies, or when the latter have less dramatic tones, the lingua-franca variations from the source scripts are replaced by Standard Italian, or by diatopically- and diastratically-marked variations. On the other hand, if the stories are more dramatic, the ELF variations are neutralised by means of Standard Italian, or rendered by introducing a scripted type of lingua-franca variations (see Section 2.1.1 below). The same presence of the scripted variations and the strategies for their adaptation unveil the influence of the authors' and translators' cultural and cognitive backgrounds, since both processes stem from the ways in which authors and translators imagine (and therefore develop) the language used by non-native speakers. It is for these reasons that, as will be discussed in Chapter 2, such variations are defined "scripted": they may share features with the actual interactions, but at the same time they reflect how authors' and translators' see non-native speakers—they definitely have a semiotic potential connected to the representation of the foreignness or the lower status of specific characters.

1.4 Conclusions

The presentation of film construction and translation as communicative processes requires the definition of a specific frame to represent how messages are communicated by means of the verbal, acoustic and visual features of the movies. Senders aim at conveying their illocutionary act by selecting specific semiotic resources according to their semantic and functional potentials, imagining at the same time the perlocutionary effects that will be prompted in the recipients. At the basis of the success of such communicative acts, authors and receivers are expected to share the linguistic, cognitive and cultural backgrounds, as well as to cooperate, so as to contribute to the appropriate interpretation of the messages.

Similar premises are also adopted to define a communicative framework for the process of audiovisual translation, which is grounded in the translators' double role as source-text recipients and target-text senders, in order to underscore the mediation between the source and target linguacultural backgrounds in the production of versions that should pursue equivalence from the linguistic and pragmatic perspectives. Besides the semantic dimensions, also the mental process of interpretation has to be accounted for in the definition of the notion of equivalence in translation (cf. Kussmaul 1995), since the translators/receivers' schemata affect their vision of the audiovisual, multimodal frame at the basis of the translators/senders' retextualisations of source scripts.

This book will propose an alternative view on the construction and translation of "migration movies" (Chapter 3 below), which arises from a multidisciplinary and multimodal approach to film analysis and translation. The selected films are considered as a valid tool for the training of intercultural mediators, as well as an innovative addition to the text types investigated when studying lingua-franca variations. In fact, the analyses of scripted and actual interactions can be integrated, to outline how the socio-cultural and linguistic contexts affect the development of human cross-cultural interactions. For these reasons, the following chapter will explore the general features of English as a lingua franca, eventually detailing the main features of the scripted variations identified in the selected corpus of movies.

Chapter 2

Lingua-Franca Variations and Film Interactions

This chapter focuses on the linguistic and communicative features of lingua-franca variations, starting from the general perspective of cross-cultural interactions, aimed to the exploration of more specific context concerning the selected corpus of migration movies. Such variations will be defined “scripted”, since they stem from the authors’ predictions of how lower-status, non-native speakers in interactions would attempt to authenticate the native varieties of the higher-status participants. Finally, this chapter also explores the notions of moves and acts in Conversation Analysis, in order to introduce a number of new moves identified in the examined scripts.

2.1 Defining ELF Research

The label “English as a Lingua Franca” (ELF) is connected to the investigation of the cross-cultural communicative contexts that involve non-native English speakers. Such interactions are generally analysed in order to identify the properties of the language employed as well as the participants’ attitude and the influence of the speakers’ cultural constructs and backgrounds in the use and development of their English variations.

In fact, according to ELF scholars, non-native speakers do not normally communicate by means of the type of English that is acquired through education as a second language. They contend instead that lingua-franca variations develop from a process of “language authentication” (Widdowson 1979), which consists in transferring to the lingo the cultural and experiential schemata, as well as the syntactic and pragmatic structures of the speakers’ native languages (cf. Guido and Seidlhofer 2014: 10). On the one hand, this justifies the structural and lexical deviations that are usually identified in the ELF variations; on the other, the cultural specificity of the process entails that high levels of schematic and linguistic differences may increase the cases of miscommunication or misunderstanding in cross-cultural interactions. In fact, specific cultural constructs may be “cognitively and linguistically inaccessible” (Guido 2008) and “conceptually unavailable” (Widdowson 1991) to the interlocutors, and therefore the distance between the senders’ and recipients’ background knowledge that inform the respective discourse communities (Carrell 1983) may lead to problems at the time of interpreting the intended messages. In this sense, and focusing on the participants’ behaviours, two mains approaches may be identified.

Firstly, ELF scholars reveal that in most of the communicative contexts non-native speakers may act like creative contributors to the locutionary levels of the messages, by producing neologisms or modifying the original

terms so as to pursue the “fullest communication possible” (Seidlhofer 2011: 18-19). According to this view, the conveyance of the speakers’ intentionality is more important than notifying and correcting misspellings or mispronunciations—which generally pass unnoticed (Mauranen 2012)—whereas utterances display a simplified, sometimes fragmented, syntactic structure, or the recourse to specific verb tenses (MacKenzie 2013). At the same time, also the native speakers’ role tends to be codified. It seems, in fact, that they let the cooperative imperative prevail over the territorial one (Widdowson 1983), namely, also native speakers are concerned about the communicative dimension of the interactions. Such achievement is pursued by means of processes that make the illocutionary force and perlocutionary effects (Austin 1962) accessible to the participants in a cross-cultural interaction, such as a number of accommodation and meaning-negotiation strategies (Jenkins 2000; Cogo and Dewey 2006; Mauranen 2007), or by asking for feedback about the participants’ intentionality. For these reasons, even though senders and recipients may come from different linguacultural contexts, once an ELF exchange respects the rules of cross-cultural cooperative interactions, one could consider both participants as members of cross-cultural discourse communities, who share a common communicative purpose (Swales 1990; Seidlhofer 2011: 87).

Yet, the cooperative imperative is not predominant in any contexts: Guido (2008), for example, shows that in specific socio-cultural and political scenarios, such as those connected to migrations, participants can play high or low status, due to the distance between the interlocutors’ linguacultural backgrounds. In similar cases, the high-status participants’ experience may inform the interpretation of the interlocutor’s intentionality (also cf. Halliday 1978), in order “to come to an understanding of the unknown communicative situation they are involved in” (Guido 2008: 23). As a result, though, the prevalence of the high-status participants’ schemata in cross-cultural, asymmetric interactions may cause misinterpretations of the illocutionary force – as in the case regarding the reformulation of migrants and asylum-seekers’ oral reports, or when rendering specialized interactions into another language in translation. In both cases, the cultural differences favour the misinterpretations of the speakers’ intentionality, due to the mental processes activated by receivers. It follows that the cognitive dimension is important in text production and translation (see Chapter 1 above), as well as in the active interpretation of cross-cultural interactions, since the prevalence of top-down cognitive processes may result in “displacement” (Guido 2008: 75) or “entextualization” (Urban 1996) processes that affect the success of the communicative acts. “Entextualization” denotes the attempt at “relocating the original instance of discourse to a new context” (Urban 1996: 21) by means of the editor’s decontextualisation of the received discourse from its original socio-cultural and pragmalinguistic surroundings. The discourse is then

retextualised into an alien context (cf. Guido 2008: 75), with possible differences in terms of the effects in receivers of the messages that have to be conveyed. In this book, the “entextualization” process will be adapted (Section 2.2.1) in defining the framework of audiovisual translation of the selected corpus of scripts.

2.2 Developing ELF Research

ELF research so far has enquired into the features of cross-cultural interactions in the communicative contexts of education (Mauranen 2012; Gotti 2014), immigration (Guido 2008) and computer-mediated business interactions (Poppi 2014). The approaches in literature are generally grounded in the analysis of the levels of speakers’ cooperation, as well as in discussions about the influence of the different schema-bound or culture-bound notions and constructs in the development of ELF variations. At the same time, English as a lingua franca is also the object of studies that describe the linguistic and communicative characteristics of specific university courses tailored to suit an international audience. Finally, ELF research also outlines the strategies of textualisation, interpretation and retextualisation of cross-cultural communication from both general- and specialised-discourse perspectives.

Yet, the area of investigation concerning audiovisual translation (AVT) is still to be explored. This may be due to the fact that film scripts may not be considered appropriate for the study of lingua-franca variations and cross-cultural interactions, since they do not generally represent real, natural occurring exchanges. Even though what happens in a film may not reproduce the actual dynamics of interactions, though, it is contended here that lingua-franca research could benefit from the investigation of such text types, if specific objectives and target receivers are indicated. The multidisciplinary investigation of audiovisual scripts is therefore developed in order to identify the influence of the native speakers’ cognitive and linguacultural backgrounds in the actualisation of the lingua-franca variations that are included in the selected corpus of films. Hence, it may be assumed that such a process reflects the “authentication” and appropriation processes of a language (Widdowson 1979), since the linguistic and communicative features of the non-native speakers’ utterances are interpreted through the senders’ schematic and cultural constructs. Furthermore, once this ideological nature of cross-cultural interactions in some films is identified, it is also possible to enquire into the structural and verbal characteristics of the utterances, thus contributing to the earlier stages of training of cross-cultural mediators. In this sense, films like the ones that will be examined are seen as an initial test to identify how high-status and low-status participants interact in

asymmetrical exchanges, as well as to develop the mediators' skills in terms of reception and interpretation of different language variations.

This book will develop the earlier investigations of the original and target versions of migration movies (Iaia and Sperti 2013; Iaia, Provenzano, and Sperti forthcoming) by means of a multidisciplinary perspective that aims at the interaction between ELF studies and audiovisual translation. This approach would contribute to both research areas, since it will favour the exploration of the lingua-franca variations adopted in source and target audiovisual texts, as well as the exploration of the linguistic, cognitive and communicative features of the scripted conversations. Migration movies can represent a valid addition to the text types studied in ELF research because they generally represent the confrontation of non-native and native participants in cross-cultural, asymmetrical interactions. At the same time, even though the film dialogues entail a scripted dimension since what is staged has been planned by writers, it is claimed that precisely the phase of planning interactions does reflect the cognitive, cultural and linguistic processes which authors (and translators, as well) activate when textualising and retextualising source versions. It follows that such scripted interactions are informed by what senders expect from the development of cross-cultural interactions, thus representing interesting objects of analysis from the linguistic and socio-cultural perspectives.

2.2.1 Scripted ELF Variations

The study of migration movies is connected to the proposal of a new terminology for the language variations employed in the selected corpus of films. They are in fact generally labelled as “broken” variants of a language (cf. Mangiron 2010), due to the lexical and structural deviations from standard norms. Yet, such definition does not convey the intercultural and communicative properties of lingua-franca variations, but it seems that the modification by means of the adjective “broken” entails some ideological reason. Broken languages are in fact associated with low-status participants and may contribute—for example in humorous discourse—to derogatory representations (also conveying native, high-status interlocutors' negative perception of non-native speakers).

For these reasons, the notion of “scripted lingua-franca variation” is introduced here to mark the non-native speakers' uses of language in both source and target versions. As for the source scripts, the notion of “scripted ELF variation” shall be adopted because the main language is English, due to the countries of production of most of the selected movies. When it comes to the analysis of target versions, instead, the label shall be turned into that of “scripted ILF variations”, for the analytical chapter mostly focuses on the Italian dubbing translations. It is claimed that the definition of “scripted ELF

variations” entails the peculiar lexical and structural features of the languages uttered by non-native speakers, as well as the cross-cultural dimension of production and reception of the corpus of “migration movies”. The latter expression labels those films that represent specific problems of migrants, such as the difficult integration in Western societies due to their relationships with the official institutions and the different socio-cultural and linguistic contexts they have to face. The scripted ELF variations result from the same processes of transfer of the L1 linguacultural and social backgrounds that is frequent in actual communicative contexts, and which is influenced by the participants’ cognitive frames (cf. Halliday 1978). Due to the text types under consideration, such transfer is actualised from a multimodal perspective, by means of the interaction between the verbal, visual and acoustic characteristics. In particular, the language uttered by non-native speakers, their position in space, their relationships with the native interlocutors, as well as their tones of voice or accents, provide indications about their status, the asymmetric characterisations of interactions, and the authors’ and speakers’ illocutionary force and perlocutionary effects (Austin 1962).

Furthermore, the multimodal analysis contributes to the identification of the asymmetric relationships from various perspectives. Firstly, the linguistic features may denote the difference in status, for the scripted variations are typical of the low-status participants. Then, as for the interaction between the visual and acoustic features, the participant who plays high status generally resorts to a higher tone of voice, or a more controlled, slow pronunciation, whereas his/her utterances are characterised by the absence of (or by limited) lexical and syntactic deviations. Also the acoustic dimension is crucial in the communication of the speakers’ intentionality, because mispronunciations or fragmented syntactic structures contribute to the characterisation of the low-status speakers. It is therefore evident that the production of scripted lingua-franca variations arise from top-down mental processes that underlie the construction and development of languages, and which indeed exemplify the script authors’ expectations based on linguacultural notions and constructs. Even though one may claim that such variations do not represent the actual features of natural occurring lingua-franca interactions, it is contended instead that their characteristics could help intercultural mediators and translators during the earlier stages of their training, to focus on how to cope with—and therefore avoid—cases of misinterpretation or misunderstanding, due to the different linguistic and cultural contexts.

Besides the production of language variations in source scripts, also their translations can be explored from a number of linguacultural, cognitive and communicative perspectives. The adaptation or omission of the original linguistic features are in fact connected to the translators’ interpretation of the source versions as well as to their expectations in terms of target receivers.

Indeed, the analysis will show that the Italian scripts are rooted in cultural and cognitive constructs, such as film genre, or implied audience. For example, according to the genre, the original variations may be rendered into Standard Italian by means of a neutralisation process, or they can be replaced by a scripted type of Italian lingua-franca variation. The latter is characterised by specific linguistic features, such as the selection of specific verb tenses like the present simple and the past simple, or syntactic deviations, from the lack of subject-verb agreement, to the fragmentation of sentences. In general, however, the main approach to translation is still represented by neutralisation, and if this may be justified by accounting for the time and cost requirements of the dubbing process, as well as for the implied audience's expectations, it is contended that the omission of scripted lingua-franca variations in target versions causes semantic shifts or loss, and does not contribute to the production of equivalent renderings.

The very process of translation can be seen as affected by the “entextualization” procedure (Urban 1996) mentioned above (Section 2.1), since the audiovisual translators that do not possess a specific competence to appropriately identify and adapt the scripted lingua-franca variations tend to decontextualise and recontextualise discourse, in order to convey their “preferred” interpretations of the source versions (cf. Urban 1996: 21; Guido 2008: 75). In other words, the audiovisual translation of migration movies—just like their production—seems to be grounded in the translators' socio-cultural and cognitive dimensions, and it is also for this reason that it is important to carry out more investigations into the linguistic and extralinguistic adaptations of the source semantic dimensions, to contribute to the production of equivalent scripts, as well as to develop the current research in ELF and audiovisual translation studies.

In order to outline the communicative framework for the audiovisual analysis and translation of migration movies (also cf. Section 1.3 above), this book shall consider now the four dialogic parameters which Guido (2008: 251-253) proposes for the identification of the rules that should govern cross-cultural interactions. Such parameters—namely, “implicature”, “inference”, “negotiation” and “acceptability”—are adapted to suit the interaction between senders (namely, film authors and translators) and receivers (namely, the audience).

The basis of the adaptation of the parameters above is the consideration of film production and reception as cross-cultural activities, since even though they are generally produced in Western countries, the current technological development and scenarios allows viewers to receive such films virtually anywhere. Then, it is stated that such scripted lingua-franca variations are connected to the pragmatic principle of “implicature” (Levinson 1983). In this light, the senders choose specific linguistic and extralinguistic features to mark some represented participants as non-native

and high-/low-status participants. Furthermore, the receivers are expected to recognise the author's intentionality by means of the mental process of "inferencing" (Yule 1996; Guido 2004), which allows them to activate the appropriate interpretations of the multimodal stimuli (i.e., to identify some represented participants as non-native speakers). The successful communication of such intercultural and linguistic characterisations depends on a specific form of "negotiation" between senders and recipients. In this perspective, the multimodal construction of the selected corpus of films is the result of a compensation between the former's and the latter's socio-cultural and experiential schemata in selecting the properties that would lead to the identification of the represented participants' status and roles. Finally, the audiovisual and verbal strategies to represent non-native speakers and cross-cultural interactions in films should be accepted by both senders and recipients, who resort to their socio-cultural and experiential backgrounds in order to convey and activate the appropriate illocutionary force and perlocutionary effect.

In the analytical chapters, the indication of the linguistic dimensions in the selected corpus of migration movies will be integrated by an investigation of the structure of the most relevant interactions, in order to identify the conventional moves representing the status asymmetries, as well as a number of new moves accounting for the cross-cultural specificity of the interactions under analysis.

2.3 Conversation Analysis in Migration Movies

Conversation Analysis is the discipline that investigates the socio-cultural conventions within human interactions. It is generally associated with two main models, the "US one", proposed by a group of ethnomethodologists (Firth 1957; Gumperz and Hymes 1964), and the "UK Model", developed by discourse analysts such as Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), Stubbs (1983), and Coulthard and Brazil (1992), both aiming to study natural occurring conversations.

According to the UK Model, conversations are structured into frames, which reflect the socio-cultural pattern internalised and "shared by the participants involved in an interaction, enabling them to communicate successfully" (Guido 2004: 346), and which are characterised by an internal organisation "within which every unit of each rank is composed by elements of the next smaller rank" (Guido 2004: 343). The smallest unit is the "act", and more acts are combined into "moves". The latter provide a primary structure to conversations, and for this reason they help to identify the differences of socio-cultural knowledge at the basis of miscommunication or non-expected responses to the interactions. As for the US Model, it defines the turn-taking system, and conversation is seen as a process whose

participants are supposed to respect the structure of turns, to contribute to successful communication. Obviously, different types of conversations, as well as different types of relationship between participants, may lead to several turn-taking patterns, one of which is represented by the principle of Adjacency Pairs, when turns are characterised by the alternation between expected (or even unexpected) cues. Finally, even though the Models were created to study natural-occurring conversations, they are adopted for the investigation of scripted interactions because the latter are actually influenced by the authors' linguacultural backgrounds (cf. Section 2.2.1 above). At the same time, the adoption of the conversation analysis models will provide a more appropriate analytical approach to the analysis of dialogues in film studies.

Due to the cross-cultural dimension of the interactions in the selected corpus of migration movies, some new moves shall be proposed. Their identification is meant to foreground the peculiar dynamics of the exchanges, in particular the speakers' confrontations generally based on culture-bound notions and constructs:

- **cross-cultural challenging.** This new move preserves the basic dynamics entailed by the "challenging" one, which is activated when one "asks for or defies a previous statement" (Guido 2004: 344). This basic application is now developed to account for the cross-cultural dimensions of the interactions, and in particular the attempts at downgrading the higher-status participants, or protesting over their leading roles in conversations, by means of references to the interlocutors' cultural background;
- **fake eliciting.** This new move develops the basic "eliciting" move, which may be generally identified when posing questions. The modification by means of the adjective "fake" is meant to exemplify the speakers' actual intentionality, when they are not really interested in knowing the interlocutors' responses. The move is generally adopted by high-status participants;
- **obeying/ordering.** This new pair of moves, which reminds a sequence of adjacency pairs, represents the sequence of turns in an interactional frame that is characterised by the alternation between the high-status participants' requests and the low-status ones' fulfilment of the interlocutor's demands, after acknowledging their subordinate roles;
- **raising.** Drawing upon the semantic dimension of gambling, this new move aims at representing the sections of conversations when speakers do not accept the imposition of the interlocutors' wishes. Such a move is generally identified in asymmetrical interactions, when participants aim to prevail and lead the conversation. In the

selected corpus of migration movies, the outcome generally depends on socio-cultural conventions, since the high-status participants are determined by means of the context in which the interactions develop, or by some properties in terms of economic or social power, which eventually contribute to the confirmation of the higher status.

The type of conversation analysis described here completes the multidisciplinary and theoretical framework that allows the investigation of the influence of the socio-cultural, cognitive and communicative dimensions in the production, reception and translation of migration movies.

Chapter 3

The Selected Films and Research Objectives

The following audiovisual texts are selected in order to provide a representation of the several dimensions connected to the migrations in movies, from the feelings of estrangement and alienation in different linguistic and socio-cultural contexts, to the stories connected to the Italians searching for better working and life conditions in foreign countries. The movies are also part of the “Cineforum” activity of the Master Course in “Cross-cultural Linguistic Mediation in Immigration and Asylum Domains” organised at the University of Salento. Specific types of interactions will be analysed: from those characterised by asymmetric relations, whose participants are in conflict due to their different cultures, to those marked by generational clashes, to even some examples of symmetrical exchanges, which are included in order to exemplify how the authors try to communicate such differences by means of specific linguistic and extralinguistic characteristics.

The selected movies are reported below:

- *Bend It like Beckham*, about the story of an Indian girl who lives in London, and who wants to be a successful football player, in opposition to the women’s role in her native society;
- *Blood Diamond*, which displays the sociocultural (and linguistic) fragmentation of Sierra Leone in 1999, by means of the opposition between the local people, the Revolutionary United Front, and the Western world;
- *Brick Lane*, which represents the inner struggle of an Indian woman that lives in London after her mother’s suicide, and after being forced to marry an elderly man;
- *It’s a Free World...*, about the story of an English woman who runs a recruitment agency to help migrant workers to find a job, refusing to hire illegal immigrants.
- *Lamerica*, which represents the clash between Italian and Albanian people, when the former see in the foreign country an opportunity to carry out a fraud based on a fictitious shoe company;
- *Looking for Alibrandi*, about the personal growth of Josie, an Australian girl with Italian origins, who tries to fit in the socio-cultural context she lives in, while struggling with her ancestry, mainly embodied by her grandmother.

After providing information in terms of the technical features and general plots, the analyses will be focused on some constant aspects. At first, the

linguistic dimensions will be indicated, to point out how the scripted variations contribute to the definition of the low-status of non-native participants by means of specific lexical and syntactic features. Then, the conversation analysis of some relevant dialogues will allow the identification of both conventional and new moves representing the asymmetric interactions and the speakers' attempts to communicate or impose their illocutionary force, depending on the types of exchanges. Finally, the source and translated scripts will be compared, in order to enquire into the retextualisation of the lingua-franca variations for the target receivers.

Chapter 4

Bend It like Beckham

Italian Title:	<i>Sognando Beckham</i>
Director:	Gurinder Chadha
Actors:	Anupam Kher; Parminder Nagra; Keira Knightley
Country:	United Kingdom
Year:	2002
Length	107 minutes

Jessminder is an Indian girl that lives in London and has a passion for football. In fact, she hopes to play like her idol, David Beckham, but she has to struggle against her parents, since according to their socio-cultural customs, women are supposed to make different choices, from education to the selection of the man to marry. By focusing on Jess's relationships with her friends and family, namely the two worlds the girl belongs to, the film exploits humorous discourse to deal with important issues, such as cross-cultural contacts and personal growth. A case in point is the following sarcastic comment on Western girls made by Jess's mother, who claims that it is no longer possible to distinguish them from boys by looking at their haircuts:

- (1) MRS BAHMRA: "Sometimes these English girls have such short hair... You just can't tell."

By means of the humorous lines above, the woman is actually communicating the different cultural customs and social codification of gender differences, one of the crucial issues of the film.

4.1 Linguistic Dimensions of the Movie

The linguistic features of the utterances in *Bend It like Beckham* contribute to the description of the outcome of the contact between the several cultural and social models presented in the movie. By means of language, it is possible to draw conclusions about the different attitudes and behaviours that are activated in relation to the types of participants and communicative situations. When people of different ages interact, the language is more formal and respectful of the social roles. As identified in another selected movie, *Brick Lane* (Chapter 6), two main linguistic dimensions co-exist: one represented by Standard English, and another represented by an Indian variation of English. The second dimension is integrated by the inclusion of expressions from the Indian linguacultural background, whose adoption is

nonetheless limited to specific acts, such as greetings, or interlocutors, when talking to elderly people.

When Jess and her sister meet their cousin Tony and his mother, for example, both girls open the conversation by using the woman's native language, adding foreign terms like "*Massi*", which denotes the aunt, and which is modified by the inclusion of "*ji*", a form that shows respect towards the interlocutors (00:05:29 – 00:05:36; 00:05:40 – 00:05:42):

(2) PINKY: "Yes, *Massi ji*. Mum's making samosas."

(3) PINKY: "Aw, thank you, *Massi ji*."

When different social relationships exist, Indian greetings and typical expressions are not adopted, as exemplified by the following dialogue between Pinky and her friends, when she is doing some shopping before her engagement party with Teetu:

(4) PINKY'S FRIEND: "Hi, Pinks! Are you all right? What are you doin' here? You haven't left everything to the last minute, have you?"

PINKY: "Yeah. One more day of freedom! Where did you get your contacts?"

PINKY'S FRIEND: "Like 'em? Just thought they went with my hair, innit?"

If the three extracts above are compared, one may realise that (2) and (3) come from a dialogue with an elderly person, which is hence characterised by a more correct structure and polite form of the utterances. The fact that the girl answers the woman's questions exemplifies the latter's high status and denotes a more asymmetrical relationship, even though participants share similar linguacultural contexts. It is therefore possible to say that Pinky's eliciting moves could be relabelled as supporting ones, which tend to confirm the woman's higher status. On the other hand, extract (4) contains fake eliciting moves, for the questions only aim at hiding the speakers' vanity and real illocutionary force, consisting in getting more information about the clothes and contact lenses.

Another instance of actualisation of the social relationships by means of conversation structures can be considered the following extract (5), which again shows the integration between English language and foreign terms, when Jess and her mother are discussing about football:

(5) JESS: "Anyway, I'm not playing with boys any more."

MRS BAHMRA: "Good! *Gaal Kathum*, end of matter!"

JESS: “I’m joining a girls’ team. They want me to play in proper matches. The coach said I could go far.”

MRS BAHMRA: “Go far? Go far? To where? Jessie, we let you play all you wanted when you were young. You’ve played enough.”

Also in (5) above it is possible to note that the characters resort to a variety of English that is integrated by typical expressions and sentences, like *Gaal Kathum*, which is eventually retextualised as “end of matter”. Such retextualisation may function an explanation of the meaning to both Mrs Bahmra’s daughter and the audience of the movie, in order to make the script more accessible to them.

4.2 Conversation Analysis

One of the most evident conflicts in the film is the one between Jess’s wishes and her mother’s will, since the latter does not accept that her daughter wants to play football. When considering again extract (5), Jess resorts to an informing move, to communicate that she has finally changed her mind to do something else, which her mother will hopefully support. Since Mrs Bahmra does not want her daughter to play football, she initially accepts and supports the decision. Yet, when Jess communicates her actual intent, she develops and explains her initial statement by means of informing and commenting moves. In the next turn, Mrs Bahmra reacts by using three eliciting moves followed by the informing and acknowledging ones, in order to prevail over her daughter and confirm her higher status, due to the cultural codification of the parents’ role. Similar structures in this sense will be identified in *Brick Lane* as well (see Section 6.2 below), even though the leading role will apparently pass to the father, Chanu.

The family relationships are differently characterised according to the cultural contexts, as exemplified when comparing dialogues (5) and (6). In the interaction below, Jules—one of Jess’s English friends—is talking to her mother, with different attitudes and features (00:15:19 – 00:15:29):

(6) JULES’S MOTHER: “I’m just saying—I saw that Kevin last night in the High Street with a blonde girl and it didn’t look like they were talking about the “Match of the Bleedin’ Day” either!”

JULES: “Kevin can shag whoever he bloody wants!”

Also Jules’s mother takes the floor to prevail in the exchange above, as illustrated by the challenging moves, and it is possible to realise that her intention is more explicitly pursued if compared to Jess’s mother, who uses fake eliciting moves in (5). In fact, though Mrs Bahmra asks how far and where her daughter is supposed to go, she does not really want to know the answers; the questions just represent a reaction to her daughter’s decision. As for (6), from a more detailed perspective, after Jules’s mother informs her daughter about Kevin, the girl actually faces the woman—since she does not like Kevin—and comments on the news by means of a challenging move with a more trivial lexis if compared to Jess’s utterances.

Finally, in order to characterise non-native participants, rather than focusing on the lexical and syntactic features of the utterances, the film leverages to the multimodal construction, particularly to the acoustic dimension, since some speakers have different accents that distinguish them from the native ones.

4.3 Target Script Analysis

The Italian dubbing translation of *Bend It like Beckham* is affected by some typical issues of this audiovisual translation mode, from the need to cope with the presence of a different level of multiculturalism in Italy (also in relation to the year of production and translation of the film), to the respect for the culture-bound view of family relationships, to the rendering of cultural terms. As for the family dynamics, consider the following extracts (7) and (8); in (7), Pinky is telling Mrs Bahmra what she thinks about one of her friends, who will wear the same pink dress at the speaker’s engagement party (00:02:25 – 00:02:27):

(7)	English script	Italian script
	PINKY: “I’m tellin’ you, Mum, that girl is a first-class bitch!”	“No, no! Ma io l’ho capita benissimo: dammi retta, quella stronza l’ha fatta apposta!”

Even though Pinky’s vulgar lexis is preserved and adapted for target receivers, it is important to realise that, from a verbal perspective, the reference to her mother is omitted in the Italian version. Since the girl is accompanied by Mrs Bahmra and Jess, it is not possible to understand to whom the girl is talking. A similar softening of the vulgar language is adopted in (8), which is the Italian translation of dialogue (6) above:

(8)	English script	Italian script
	JULES’S MOTHER: “I’m just saying—I saw that Kevin last	“Dico soltanto che ho visto Kevin ieri sera

<p>night in the High Street with a blonde girl and it didn't look like they were talking about the "Match of the Bleedin' Day" either!"</p> <p>JULES: "Kevin can shag whoever he bloody wants!"</p>	<p>che passeggiava con una bella bionda. E non aveva l'aria di parlare della partita di domenica scorsa, chiaro?"</p> <p>"Kevin può andarsene in giro con tutte le bionde che vuole!"</p>
---	---

Both the woman's and the girl's lines are modified in the target script, which results less vulgar, perhaps to deal with the functional and socio-cultural dimensions and expectations of the Italian audience. This leads to the production of a type of language that would be more appropriate and acceptable to the Italian receivers.

As for the cultural notions, two examples are finally examined: one concerning a part of the history of Indian culture, and one connected to the opposition between different socio-cultural backgrounds. In the course of a football game, Jess is offended by a player of the opposite team. As the following exclamation (9) reveals, the insult draws upon the historical contrast between Indians and Pakistanis, but such historic reference is not rendered for the Italian viewers (01:03:34):

<p>(9)</p> <p>PLAYER: "Piss off, Paki!"</p>	<p>English script</p>	<p>Italian script</p> <p>"Vaffanculo, brutta Hindi!"</p>
---	------------------------------	---

It is not easy to decide whether the modification in the Italian script is connected to a mistranslation, or to a lack of knowledge of specific historical and cultural backgrounds that are nonetheless included in the construction of film dialogues (cf. Sections 1.3 and 2.2.1 above). Furthermore, the feature of *Bend It like Beckham* consisting in adding foreign expressions to the dialogues is reflected also by the inclusion of "gora" and "gori", which are used to refer to white people in disparaging ways, but which are not preserved in the Italian version:

<p>(10)</p> <p>JESS'S DAD:</p>	<p>English script</p> <p>"[...] the bloody goras in their clubhouses made fun of my turban and sent me off packing!"</p>	<p>Italian script</p> <p>"[...] i maledetti bianchi dei circoli sportivi mi sfottevano per il mio turbante. E mi cacciarono</p>
--------------------------------	---	--

via.”

- (11)
- | | English script | Italian script |
|-------|---------------------------------|--|
| GIRL: | “Hey, who’s that watching her?” | “Ehi, chi è la bionda che la sta guardando?” |

In both (10) and (11), the terms “*goras*” and “*gori*” are neutralised as “*bianchi*” or “*bionda*”. This exemplifies that the audiovisual translations stem from “entextualization” (cf. Urban 1996; Guido 2008) processes according to which the original discourse is interpreted and reconstructed for a different linguacultural background, in order to meet the translators’ expectations in terms of audience’s reception and culture-bound accessibility and acceptability of the locutionary and illocutionary levels. In fact, even though it is true that both translations preserve the connotative semantic dimensions of the original version, it is also true that their neutralisation reflects the omission of the Indian characterisations of the dialogues for the Italian receivers and eventually provides a script that is not completely equivalent from a pragmalinguistic perspective.

Chapter 5

Blood Diamond

Italian Title:	<i>Blood Diamond – Diamanti di sangue</i>
Director:	Edward Zwick
Actors:	Leonardo DiCaprio; Djimon Hounsou; Jennifer Connelly
Country:	United States of America
Year:	2006
Length	143 minutes

The fisherman Solomon Vandy and his family are taken prisoner by the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) in Sierra Leone. While being in prison in Freetown, Solomon meets Danny Archer, a Rhodesian smuggler, and they decide to cooperate because of a pink diamond that the fisherman finds. The men are eventually joined by Maddy, an American journalist. As in *Bend It like Beckham*, the plot allows receivers to get acquainted with the internal conflicts in Sierra Leone, focusing at the same time on the political attitudes of Western countries towards them. Maddy's lines when the main characters are approaching one of the refugees' camps entail this distance between the Western and African contexts, by referring to the filter of the media in the representation of the situation of some foreign countries (00:52:24 – 00:52:28):

- (12) MADDY: “[Western audience] Might catch a minute of this on CNN, somewhere between Sports and Weather.”

5.1 Linguistic Dimensions of the Movie

The several perspectives that interact in the development of the main story are also represented by the main linguistic dimensions, which are Standard English, Mende and Krio variations. As for the Standard English, it is the language spoken by Maddy as well as the language of the media and the world of politics, and its inclusion foregrounds the distance between the rich countries and Africa, also exemplified by the redundancy and complex lexical and structural characteristics of political and institutional discourse. One scene, set in the course of the G8 summit, is significant in this sense: several politicians discuss about the destiny of African countries and the socio-cultural problems connected to the “blood diamonds”, which are generally first collected by poor people and RUF prisoners, and then smuggled on behalf of large companies. Yet, their commitment is not practical: despite their interest, they are actually far from the actual places of the social and violent conflicts.

Mende, the second main linguistic feature, is the variety of language spoken in particular by the poor native people like Solomon. Its inclusion in the movie is meant to represent the fragmentation of Sierra Leone from a sociolinguistic perspective; in fact, its adoption is mainly in contrast with the Krio variety spoken by the RUF members. In addition to this, Mende has also a functional use connected to the scripted dimension of the film. The smuggler, Archer, can in fact be considered as a sort of mediator, since he is the one that is able to speak both Standard English and Krio. On the other hand, he cannot understand Mende, and for this reason, despite his general ability to prevail and lead most of the exchanges (as explained in the following section, about the conversation analysis of the film), such variety allows Solomon to create intimate moments, or to protect some information from Archer.

Finally, the members of RUF mainly resort to Krio, whose adoption in the film is characterised by peculiar mispronunciations, as well as lexical, syntactic and phonological deviations from the standard norms. What is more, the utterances also include colloquial terms, such as *bru* and *shona*, and particular forms of verb tenses and possessive adjectives, which are exemplified in extract (13) below, when Captain Poison threatens the prisoners that are looking for diamonds (00:07:53 – 00:07:55):

- (13) CAPTAIN POISON: “Any bastard **tink** he would joke with **me** diamond, I **go cut he troat**.”
CAPTAIN POISON: “Any bastard thinks he would joke with my diamond, I am going to cut his throat.”

The two transcriptions of (13) respectively represent the peculiar Krio pronunciation and its rendering in Standard English. The comparison highlights the lack of the interdental sound in both “think” and “throat”, respectively pronounced “tink” and “troat”, with the dental, voiceless /t/. Furthermore, the possessive adjectives “my” and “his” are rendered as “me” and “he”, whereas the form “to be going to” in “I’m going to cut his throat” is replaced by the simple verb “go”—“I go cut”.

Besides exploiting the linguistic varieties in the movie, the socio-cultural context informing the relationships between the characters is also represented by means of the structures of the interactions, as illustrated by the following scenes.

5.2 Conversation Analysis

Also the dialogues in *Blood Diamond* represent the ethnic and socio-cultural clashes between rich and poor people, and between RUF and the locals. In particular, it is possible to identify three main categories of interactions,

mostly characterised by status asymmetries and by the imposition of the high-status participants' will. The three main categories are represented by the ethnic, economic, and bureaucratic reasons that determine the outcome of the verbal struggles activated between speakers.

As for the first type, consider the following scene (14), in which an RUF Colonel is talking to some men before taking them prisoners and deciding whom to use to search diamonds (00:05:05 – 00:06:14):

- (14) COLONEL: "Bring forward the next one! Bastard! Bring forward the next one!"
 RUF MEMBER: "Long sleeve or short sleeve?"
 COLONEL: "Young man, young man, you must understand! The government wants you to vote, OK? They gonna tell you say: "The future is in your hands". We now the future. So we take your hands. No more hands, no more voting. Chop him! Spread the word: the Revolutionary United Front is coming!"
 RUF MEMBERS: "R-U-F!"
 COLONEL: "Bring forward the next one! Bring him forward! Bring him forward!"
 RUF MEMBER: "Long sleeve or short sleeve?"
 COLONEL: "Chop him! Hold on, hold on! Wait! Wait! Wait! Not this one! Look at him! Put him in the truck! Let's go. Bring him to the mines! He can work! He can work. Move, move, move, move! Next one! Next one! Next one!"

The colonel clearly plays high status in (14), as indicated by his lines and by the supporting moves uttered by the members. As for the question "Long sleeve or short sleeve?", repeated twice, it actually represents a fake eliciting move, since the speaker is not interested in knowing the answers, but he will only mutilate the prisoners, especially those who are not appropriate to work. The colonel's social superiority is also confirmed by his frequent use of imperatives, and by the ordering and explaining moves, when he tells the other members the destinations of the prisoners. What is more, when the man presents the political and social situation, thus trying to justify his actions, he resorts to informing and supporting moves, with an apparently different attitude towards the recipients. Indeed, also this behaviour confirms his high status—after all, he is speaking to men that are going to be mutilated, or forced to search diamonds.

When the situation changes, the position of the commander changes as well. In the following interaction (15), between Archer and Captain Rambo,

the RUF leader's social role is not similar to the one of the colonel in (14), due to the Rhodesian smuggler's greater economic power (00:09:26 – 00:09:50):

- (15) ARCHER: “Where is Commander Zero?”
 CAPTAIN RAMBO: “I am Captain Rambo.”
 ARCHER: “Right, right. I've seen your films, huh? I'm
 looking for Commander Zero, huh?”
 CAPTAIN RAMBO: “He's inside. You talk to me! You are here
 to help us in our struggle against the
 government.”
 ARCHER: “I'm here to do business with Commander
 Zero, all right?”

An opening move is firstly identified. Commander Rambo, then, refuses to answer Archer's questions, due to ethnic reasons that create a conflict between their different ideologies. Archer is in fact a “White Rhodesian”, as the journalist Maddy will define him, and the RUF member is not keen on accepting orders from him. For these reasons, he tries to challenge the interlocutor's status, but the hostile characterisation of the interaction continues in the following turns, since Archer downgrades the commander by making a joke based on his name, “Rambo”. Also after such utterances, the latter tries to gain a leading position, by stating the supposed function and terms of Archer's cooperation. Anyway, it is the smuggler who eventually succeeds in achieving his goals, namely that of speaking to Commander Zero, in a dialogue that displays a similar turn-taking system ((16), 00:11:19 – 00:11:54):

- (16) ARCHER: “Then una boys dhem can use old rotten
 AK dehm against dehm government troop
 and their new weapons dehm, huh?”
 COMMANDER ZERO: “Maybe a could just kill you and take
 what you bring back!”
 ARCHER: “Then you get one more dead body?
 Instead of an airplane way full with
 grenade launchers. So a'm tink a go go to
 dehm government. Dehm government at
 least dehm go pay me huh?”
 COMMANDER ZERO: “Wait, wait, wait, my friend. Dis the tin
 you want? Ié. So many a noh no what do
 wid dehm all. Ehy, Archa, next time you
 bring satellite TV: I wanna see
 Baywatch.”

The interaction is mainly characterised by a sequence of questions and answers and by challenging moves. At the same time, the second turn is characterised by a raising move, since participants are acting as if they were gambling, trying to win the leading role in this exchange. An exchange that, even though Archer resorts to Krio (which exemplifies his role of mediator in the film), is ruled by the economic power rather than by the socio-linguistic features: in the end, Commander Zero accepts Archer's conditions because the man says that, if RUF did not meet his requests, he would talk to the government, indeed an enemy of the revolutionary army. A detailed analysis of Commander Zero's turn reveals that he is forced to respect Archer: in fact, even though he calls the man "a friend", he closes his lines with a cross-cultural challenging move, in the course of which he mentions *Baywatch*, a specific TV series that clearly refers to the Western (and American, in particular) lifestyle.

Finally, as for the bureaucratic reasons, consider the following dialogue (17) between Solomon and two men from the United Nations High Commissioner for the Refugees, to whom the fisherman asks for information about his wife and daughter (00:28:46 – 00:28:58):

- (17) SOLOMON: "Excuse me, my name's Solomon Vandy."
 MAN 1: "Check the list."
 SOLOMON: "I have checked the list."
 MAN 1: "File papers at the Office for Refugees."
 SOLOMON: "Sir, I have filed papers with the office."
 MAN 1: "Then God help you, because I can't."
 SOLOMON: "Please, Sir—"
 MAN 2: "Next!"

The above interaction is not between hostile participants, yet it is still characterised by status asymmetries, as exemplified by the alternation between ordering and obeying moves. Besides the conversation structure, it is also interesting to note that Solomon resorts to Standard English instead of Mende or Krio. This confirms the actualisation of the socio-cultural situations by means of language, namely that the linguistic dimensions are selected according to the participants' status and socio-cultural characterisations. From a structural perspective, the higher status of the two members of UNHCR is also conveyed by their use of the imperatives, but differently from the previous interactions, even though they prevail, a different attitude can be identified. Solomon, in fact, does not receive information about his family, so the expression "God help you" (turn 6), also reveals the men's impotence and frustration in the difficult situation—a shift in the expected behaviour of the

participants, suddenly cancelled by the final command, “Next!”, which officially puts an end to the interaction.

5.3 Target Script Analysis

Due to the cultural and linguistic features and peculiarities of the Italian dubbing, the original different varieties represent the main constraint for the translation of *Blood Diamond*, and in fact the target version is the result of neutralisation strategies, since only Standard Italian is used, whereas Krio is omitted, and the parts in Mende are subtitled. The analysis of the dubbing translation shall be focused on the functional and stylistic consequences of the inclusion of subtitles, on the rendering of culture-bound references, and on illustrating some cases of mistranslations.

Consider extract (18) below, from the first scenes of the film, when Solomon wakes his son up (00:01:03 – 00:01:22):

(18)	English script	Italian script
	SOLOMON: “Dia, [in Mende] don’t want to be late.”	“Dia, non devi fare tardi.”
	DIA: “[in English] English boys don’t go to school everyday.”	“[in Italian] I ragazzi inglesi non vanno a scuola tutti i giorni.”
	SOLOMON: “[in Mende] Everyday, just like you. So you can become a doctor, not mend the nets like your father. Now get out of my bed before I tan your behind with my fishing rod.”	“Tutti i giorni, come te. Così potrai diventare dottore, invece di rammendare reti come tuo padre. Forza, alzati, se no ti picchio con la canna da pesca.”

The dialogue is important because it still represents the cultural opposition between Western and African people, as well as Solomon’s desire of allowing his son to have a better job than his, by caring for the boy’s education. Yet, the Italian strategy of subtitled the parts in Mende does not provide an equivalent script, due to the typical features of subtitles, which recall the written style (Gottlieb 2005), more formal than the one generally used in the dialogues between a father and a son. At the same time, the Italian audience is not given the possibility of focusing on the boy’s different accent, as well as on the peculiar characteristics of the English uttered by Solomon, which for example lacks the subject “I” in the first turn.

Besides the linguistic varieties, the dialogues in the Italian script also have specific strategies connected to the adaptation of cultural notions. The following extracts (19) and (20) are interesting because they include Western-culture-bound events, with which Italian receivers should be familiar. Yet, the comparison between source and target versions reveals that, according to the translators, some cultural references like the ones included below may need to be made more accessible to viewers ((19), 01:14:31 – 01:14:36; (20), 01:16:03 – 01:16:08):

- | | | |
|------|--|--|
| (19) | English script | Italian script |
| | ARCHER: “I got sent away to South Africa in 1978 when the munts overran us.” | “Sono stato mandato in Sud Africa nel 1978 quando fummo cacciati dai ribelli.” |
| (20) | English script | Italian script |
| | MADDY: “My Dad came home from the war in ’69.” | “Mio padre è tornato a casa dal Vietnam nel ’69.” |

In both extracts the cultural references are made explicit, also the one concerning the war in Vietnam. Extract (20) in particular reveals that the translations stem from expectations in terms of the audience’s knowledge, for the year alone is not considered enough to activate in the receivers’ minds the association (by means of “top-down” processes) to a specific historical event. It is for these reasons that the processes of film production and translation are considered in this book as instances of dialogic, communicative structures between senders/translators and recipients/viewers, which are affected by the linguacultural and cognitive backgrounds, as well as ruled by specific parameters (cf. Sections 1.3 and 2.2.1 above). As for (20), the translators implicates that the audience may not get the mental connection originally prompted by the line “the war in ’69”, and therefore the conveyance of the semantic dimension is negotiated by means of an explanation process, in order to render the illocutionary force more accessible to target receivers.

Finally, (21) below only contains an example of mistranslation, when Archer tries to bribe a soldier he meets. Anyway also the following extract can provide information on some of the constant features of the Italian dubbing translations (00:13:39 – 00:13:49):

- | | | |
|------|--|--|
| (21) | English script | Italian script |
| | ARCHER: “Now, look, why don’t I just look the other way, all right? You take one | “Ora, perché non ti giri dall’altra parte, ok? Ti prendi uno o due |

or two of these stones sassolini, e compri un
and get something regalino a tua moglie, o
lacquer for the wife, or magari alla tua amante,
maybe the mistress, all eh?”
right?”

By saying “*perché non ti giri*”, the original message is completely modified: in fact, in the source text Archer is trying to communicate what he is going to do—namely, to bribe the soldier—whereas the subject of the sentences in the target version becomes the soldier. This may only seem a mistranslation case, without cultural or cognitive justifications. Actually, this different translation is connected to one of the following lines, namely the sentence “*Ti prendi uno o due sassolini*”, which contains the same object pronoun “*ti*”. The latter is in the form of a reflexive, more specifically its use corresponds to the typical feature of the diamesic, spoken variety of Italian defined as “*riflessivo apparente*” (cf. Jezek 2005). Even though one may contend that the latter strategy may be classified a diastratic variation that perhaps compensates for the lack of variation from Standard Italian, to Mende, to Krio, it is actually claimed that it may represent instead one of the characteristics connected to the production of dubbese, the artificial “television language” typical of dubbing (Antonini and Chiaro 2009: 111), which may alternate features from written and oral discourse, in the production of utterances that do not always correspond to those normally used by actual speakers (cf. Perego 2005: 26).

Chapter 6

Brick Lane

Director:	Sarah Gavron
Actors:	Tannishtha Chatterjee, Satish Kaushik, Christopher Simpson
Country:	United Kingdom
Year:	2007
Length	102 minutes

Nazneen, after her mother commits suicide, has to move from Bangladesh to London, where she marries Chanu, an elderly man without a permanent job. The film—based on Monica Ali’s book—explores Nazneen’s life in the Western city and her personal growth, from the earlier years, when she misses her native land, to the maturation of her love towards her husband and daughters, Bibi and Shahana. The letters that Nazneen receives from her sister Hasina represent the only link to Bangladesh, and in the course of the movie the female protagonist also falls in love with Karim, who helps her when she decides to work from home. Yet, after the terrorists attack the Twin Towers, on September 11, 2001, the main characters’ lives change, and religious and cultural separations emerge.

One of the central topics in *Brick Lane* is represented by the “home”, which is indeed a constant word in many dialogues, such as the ones between Nazneen and her husband, or between Nazneen and Karim, as well as in the female protagonist’s inner thoughts (00:05:30):

(22) NAZNEEN: “I think of my sister, think of home.”

The mental notion of “home” is generally connected to the places where the characters want to live, where they feel as part of the socio-cultural context, which does not always coincide with London. In this sense, one of the final dialogues is crucial in order to acknowledge Nazneen’s maturation: she accepts her role of leader of her family and eventually decides to stay in Britain; her husband, instead, decides to leave (01:27:32 – 01:27:55):

(23) NAZNEEN: “This is my home. I cannot leave.”
 CHANU: “I cannot stay. I cannot stay.”

6.1 Linguistic Dimensions of the Movie

The interactions are characterised by two main linguistic variations, represented by Bengali and the adoption of a scripted ELF variation,

particularly on the part of Chanu. His use of the scripted variation has socio-cultural and functional consequences, since he is actually opposed to the other English people and even to his daughter. In fact, Nazneen's family also embodies generational and cultural clashes, since Chanu constantly aims at becoming integrated in the London society, but he gets more and more frustrated because he constantly loses his jobs. As a result, he usually blames his English co-workers, who are defined by him as "ignorant types" or "uneducated".

Bengali identifies the scenes set in the past, when Nazneen still lived in Bangladesh, and the audiovisual construction conveys a dreamlike shade to such scenes, which result brighter if compared to the ones set in London, due to their music and photography. Furthermore, the parts in Bengali—which are subtitled in English—are generally connected to the notions of "home" and "native land", as confirmed by the fact that such linguistic dimension introduces Hasina's letters, which Nazneen reads for the viewers. In this sense, the latter can be considered as an "artistic" solution, since apart from the first lines, the letters are then continued in English, to preserve the level of accessibility of the film.

Besides the above scenes, and according to a strategy that was already identified in the construction of *Bend It like Beckham* (Chapter 4 above), also the dialogues between parents and children are sometimes opened and closed in Bengali or by using typical expressions such as "Abba" and "Amma". If, on the one hand, this choice contributes to preserve the accessibility of the film to the English audience, on the other hand this also entails that the characters still perceive their native land as part of their experience, of their inner thoughts, as a presence that parents aim at keeping alive, especially in younger generations.

As for English, whereas the language spoken by Bibi and Shahana is closer to the Standard variety, Chanu's English could be labelled as a scripted ELF variation, characterised by specific syntactic deviations. One of such deviations is exploited in the quarrel between Shahana and her father that takes place in (24) below, when the girl says that she does not want to go back to Bangladesh (00:24:30 – 00:24:34):

- (24) CHANU: "What is the wrong with you?"
SHAHANA: "You mean, 'what is wrong with you?'"

Once Shahana reproaches and corrects her father, the latter decides to pour all his frustration on English itself, as exemplified by (25) below (00:24:41 – 00:24:57):

- (25) CHANU: "From now on, no one speaks English."
SHAHANA: "You said that last time."

- CHANU: “Your behaviour is getting bad to worse!”
NAZNEEN: “[in Bengali] Leave her!”
CHANU: “This is what they teach you at the school?
This is what they teach you? I will not allow
this to happen! To learn manners and to respect
her father!”

As in (24), also (25) contains some deviations from standard rules that mark the man’s variation as a scripted type of lingua franca, such as the addition of the article “the” in “the wrong”, from extract (24) and the inclusion of the same article in “at the school”, from (25). It can be surmised that those strategies have the functional dimension of characterising the man as a non-native speaker, and in particular of actualising the difficulties that he faces when using English. Once the mistakes are notified, in fact, he wants everyone to speak Bengali, his L1, which is therefore reminiscent of the experiential dimensions of safety and home. Finally, also consider the transfer of some cultural notions from Chanu’s native context, when he lists the qualities that his daughter should possess. “To learn manners and to respect her father” are two of the achievements that Shahana should pursue, but Chanu’s turn is again marked by a fragmented syntactic structure that is connected to the scripted ELF variation. Because of such deviations, though, it is not possible to infer the appropriate semantic and communicative dimensions only by focusing on the verbal elements. The man only says “To learn manners and to respect her father”, with a possible source of ambiguity in understanding whether he is describing what should be taught at school, what she should learn at home, what he aims to attain by means of his punishment. In fact, the real intentionality can be acknowledged from a multimodal perspective, since the man’s voice and the development of the scene (which follows the dialogue under analysis) help to infer the appropriate illocutionary force.

6.2 Conversation Analysis

The structure of the interactions may vary according to specific factors mainly connected to the speakers’ social roles, as already illustrated by the above dialogue between Shahana and Chanu. Although the man is supposed to play high status, his lines entail that he has indeed a different role in relation to English speakers and his daughters as well, who has a “Westernised” behaviour, by opposing her father.

In fact, in considering exchange (25) again, it is possible to identify a typical structure where two speakers are confronting, both of them challenging the interlocutor’s statements. What is more, eventually Nazneen takes the floor to support her daughter, and this undermines Chanu’s social

role. When Chanu reacts, he tries to mention the appropriate behaviour by resorting to two fake eliciting moves, which only serve to introduce the explanation of what he thinks education should be like.

Finally, the different structure of the dialogues whose participants are on the same level are taken into account, such as the following one between Nazneen and Karim, which takes place when they have an affair (extract from 00:52:12 – 00:52:49):

- (26) KARIM: “[...] Your Westernised girl, into going out, having a laugh, short skirts as soon as she’s out of her father’s sight. Then you have your religious girl. You think they’d be good wife material but they ain’t, ’cos all they wanna do is argue.”
- NAZNEEN: “So, what about me?”
- KARIM: “You... you’re the real thing. A girl from the village.”

From Karim’s lines it is possible to infer what he thinks about the condition of women and in particular about the “Westernised” girls, who are different from Nazneen, a girl from the village. It is also important to say that the dialogue takes place before the attack to the Twin Towers. That historical event marks the beginning of Karim’s extremism, and leads Nazneen to put an end to their romantic liaison. Yet, since in (26) the two participants are still on the same level, the structure does not display challenging or cross-cultural challenging moves, like in *Blood Diamond*. Karim instead is actually replying to the woman’s questions, justifying and explaining his ideas, by means of supporting moves. Indeed, it is not by chance if this is one of the dialogues that are composed by questions directly followed by actual answers, to mark the different type of interpersonal relationship.

An analysis of the Italian version is not provided because the movie has not an Italian distribution: it was only presented during the XXVII Turin Film Festival, with subtitles.

Chapter 7

It's a Free World...

Italian title:	<i>In questo mondo libero...</i>
Director:	Ken Loach
Actors:	Kierston Wareing; Juliet Ellis; Leslaw Zurek
Country:	United Kingdom
Year:	2007
Length	96 minutes

Angie is an English woman that runs a recruitment agency in order to help migrants find a job. Yet, since she becomes eager to do whatever it takes to build the business, she gets involved in illegal affairs. Besides the common themes of homelessness, of the difficult aspects of integration, and of the sense of misplacement in a different cultural background, the film also explores the women's role in society. In fact, Angie decides to open her recruitment agency after quitting her job due to an episode of sexual harassment from a colleague. At the same time, even though *It's a Free World...* includes both symmetrical and asymmetrical interactions between native and non-native speakers, some lines by Karol, a Polish man who helps Angie, clarify that the level of socio-cultural separation is high (01:01:58 – 01:02:15):

- (27) KAROL: “England is hard place. It's in the...their eyes when they—when they hear my voice, when they look at us, when they give an order. I'm a man, I'm not a servant.”

7.1 Linguistic Dimensions of the Movie

The main kinds of social roles are actualised by the different variations of English uttered by the speakers. The migrant workers resort to scripted ELF variations, which display specific syntactic features and fulfil the communicative need of conveying cross-cultural exchanges from a multimodal perspective. By way of example, consider the dialogue (28) below, when a man protests over pay (00:36:44 – 00:37:07):

- (28) ANGIE: “That's your hours, that's your tot. If you don't like it, there's the guy, you can go.”
 MAN: “Oh, no, no, no, no.”
 ANGIE: “Look! Tax, national insurance, where do you reckon we get it from?”

- MAN: “Your tax isn’t my problem.”
ANGIE: “What? Do you reckon we just pick it from a tree?”
MAN: “I—er... I worked for you all week. You must pay me 200 pounds per week.”
ANGIE: “We will sort it out later.”
MAN: “...you asked me. Where is my money? Where is payslip?”
ANGIE: “[to Karol] Can you tell him if—if—if he doesn’t go to work, he will have no job? Can you tell him?”

The representation of the non-native participant is multimodally rendered, since it is possible to listen to his Polish accent that integrates the verbal dimension of his scripted ELF variation. At the same time, the man speaks slower than Angie, and his lines contain repetitions, such as “no, no, no, no”, and hesitations, is “I—er... I worked”, which are connected to his attempts at communicating his illocutionary force by resorting to a foreign language.

The characteristics of the scripted ELF variation in (28) are also illustrated in (29) below, when another man describes the migrants’ conditions (01:00:31 – 01:00:46):

- (29) MAN: “This is the third time is happening. Liverpool, Birmingham and now. This is not good. We have families, we came here to work, we work very hard. You treat us like animals, we work very hard, we’re desperate. We need money now. We can’t wait anymore.

(29) displays some deviations from the standard norms in terms of sentence construction, like the omission of the subject in “the third time [it] is happening”. Furthermore, there are also repetitions of similar sentences, whereas the choice of the verb tenses underscores the preference for the present simple or past simple. The utterances of this man are composed by a succession of short sentences, whereas “You treat us like animals” and “we’re desperate” entail that he is aware of his low status (also cf. Section 7.2 below). Finally, as in the construction of (28), also in this case this man’s characterisation exploits the audiovisual channel, since it is possible to hear his accent and deviating phonetic realisations, like the voiced labial-velar approximant /w/, in “we”, for example, which tends to be pronounced as the fricative labiodental /v/.

As already said, the script also has symmetrical cross-cultural interactions, such as the one represented in extract (30) below. Angie and Karol are at a bar, and the woman wants to thank him for his help with some translations from Polish (01:02:23 – 01:02:42):

- (30) ANGIE: “It’s for your help. You really, really helped me out, all right? All your translating?”
 KAROL: “Cash?”
 ANGIE: “Yeah.”
 KAROL: “And you know the old saying, ‘Never return a favour, pass it on’?”
 ANGIE: “You sound like my Dad. You should meet him, actually. There you go.”
 KAROL: “Pass it on. Not everything is money.”

Karol’s English may be labelled as a scripted ELF variation, which has some deviating syntactic structures, for example in his last turn, where “Not everything is money” subverts the conventional order seeing a subject followed by verbs and objects. The formal and lexical characteristics integrate the acoustic dimension, and extract (30) is included in this section in order to illustrate the differences between the source and target versions in characterising the asymmetrical and symmetrical dialogues (see Section 7.3). At the same time, extracts (28) and (30) will be also the object of the conversation analysis, since they symbolise the main kinds of social interactions identified in *It’s a Free World...*

7.2 Conversation Analysis

In the film, the interactions between native and non-native participants are mainly asymmetrical, except as far as Angie and Karol are concerned, since the two characters had an affair and are now friends. As for the asymmetrical exchanges, let us consider extract (28) again. It can be surmised that both speakers want to prevail over their interlocutor. In fact, Angie’s backchannel move after the man’s statement about taxes represents an attempt to explain and justify why the workers are not paid. Yet, since the man continues to complain, adding information about his life conditions, Angie decides to immediately end the conversation. This decision may also be connected to the non-native participant’s use of “must”, in “You must pay me 200 pounds per week”, which can be interpreted as a subversion of the status quo in terms of who leads the conversation. The man’s utterances are in fact also characterised by challenging moves, but it is Angie who eventually prevails, also by means of her action of turning to Karol using an eliciting move followed by a backing item, in order to illustrate that she does not care about what her interlocutor has to add.

As for Karol, instead, his role contributes to the exemplification of the different conversation structures. In dialogue (30) above, Angie acts more relaxed and willing to cooperate, in fact her repetition of “really” in “You

really, really helped me out” serves to avoid miscommunication, to better communicate her intentionality and her different attitude towards the man. At the same time, it can also be interpreted as a way to justify the fact that she is going to pay him for his translations. The differences in her approach are more evident if it is considered that she is not angry with him when he refuses her money posing first a further question, “Cash?”, and then repeating “Pass it on”, a sort of backchannel, when he mentions the old saying. The woman in fact does not end their conversation or adopts hostile moves such as challenging or raising ones, but she only makes a comparison between Karol and her dad.

The different conversation structures are also multimodally conveyed, and even though it is true that Karol and Angie are separated by a table in the bar, it is also true that they tend to get closer to each other, when the woman passes the money to him, or when she leans towards him while speaking. In opposition to (30), in extracts such as (28) and (29) the conflicting connotation is also actualised through the tones of voices, by the speakers’ faster rhythm and body movements, since they try to physically and verbally overcome each other.

The main types of interactions, and the various levels of asymmetries are generally respected in the Italian version, but a specific linguistic choice is used, as explained in the following section.

7.3 Target Script Analysis

The dubbing translation of *It’s a Free World...* follows a different path if compared to the movies examined so far, since it resorts to a scripted ILF variation, which is generally associated with the Polish accent. From a functional perspective, the strategy of producing a lingua-franca variation also for target receivers contributes to the conveyance of the participants’ different, lower-status positions from a multimodal perspective, as evident from the rendering of dialogue (28), when the worker protests over pay:

(31)	English script	Italian script
ANGIE:	“That’s your hours, that’s your tot. If you don’t like it, there’s the guy, you can go.”	“Queste sono le ore che hai fatto, questa è la paga. Se non ti sta bene, quella è l’uscita, puoi andartene.”
MAN:	“Oh, no, no, no, no.”	“No, no, no.”
ANGIE:	“Look! Tax, national insurance, where do you reckon we get it from?”	“Ci sono le tasse! Paghiamo l’assicurazione, per tutti voi. Questi soldi da dove li prendiamo?!”
MAN:	“Your tax isn’t my	“Le vostre tasse non sono

- | | | |
|--------|--|---|
| | problem.” | problema mio.” |
| ANGIE: | “What? Do you reckon we just pick it from a tree?” | “Credi che noi i soldi li troviamo sugli alberi?” |
| MAN: | “I—er... I worked for you all week. You must pay me 200 pounds per week.” | “Io ho lavorato per tutta la settimana. Voi dovete pagare 200 sterline a settimana. Tu mi hai chiamato...” |
| ANGIE: | “We will sort it out later.” | “—di questo ne parliamo dopo.” |
| MAN: | “...you asked me. Where is my money? Where is payslip?” | “...dove sono i miei soldi?” |
| ANGIE: | “[to Karol] Can you tell him if—if—if he doesn’t go to work, he will have no job? Can you tell him?” | “[a Karol] Gli vuoi dire che se ora non va a lavorare non avrà più un lavoro, che la faccenda la risolviamo dopo? Glielo dici, per favore?” |

Besides introducing a scripted ILF variation marked by syntactic deviations from the standard norms, the dubbing translation tries to multimodally render the speaker’s non-native status, since a Polish accent is reproduced. As for the syntactic dimension, consider the omission of the non-definite article, “*un*”, in “*le vostre tasse non sono [un] problema mio*”. A similar strategy is also adopted for the translation of extract (29) above:

- | | | |
|------|--|--|
| (32) | English script | Italian script |
| | MAN: “This is the third time is happening. Liverpool, Birmingham and now. This is not good. We have families, we came here to work, we work very hard. You treat us like animals, we work very hard, we’re desperate. We need money now. We can’t wait anymore.” | “Questa è la terza volta che non ci pagano. Liverpool, Birmingham e ora qui. Questo non è buono. Abbiamo una famiglia e veniamo qui a lavorare. Lavoriamo tutto il giorno, ci trattate come animali, lavoriamo tutto il giorno e siamo disperat[e]. Vogliamo soldi ora. Noi non possiamo aspettare più.” |

The omission of the articles is one of the most common features of the scripted lingua-franca variations: this strategy is in fact shared by the original and target versions, and in the above extract it can be identified in “*Questa è [la] terza volta che non ci pagano*”, where the definite article is not included. At the same time, “*Questo non è buono*” can be marked as a non-conventional lexical choice for a native Italian speaker, since the latter would use a different adjective, for example “*bello*”, ‘nice’, or a different syntactic structure that would include a noun to accompany the adjective – as, for example, “*Questa situazione non è buona*”, ‘This is not a good situation’.

The production of the scripted ILF variations in (31) and (32) confirms that the translators draw upon their native linguacultural background for the identification of peculiar deviating features that could support the audience’s accessibility to the illocutionary level, consisting in marking the non-native status. It is nonetheless interesting to note that the inclusion of a scripted lingua-franca variation is not the only adaptation strategy adopted for the dubbing translation. In fact, a different language is given to Karol, whose Italian is only marked from a phonological perspective. As a result, he does have a different accent, but his utterances and lines are not lexically- and syntactically-marked, as illustrated in (33) below, when he and Angie are at the bar:

- (33)
- | | English script | Italian script |
|--------|--|--|
| ANGIE: | “It’s for your help. You really, really helped me out, all right? All your translating?” | “Per l’aiuto che mi hai dato. Mi sono servite davvero moltissimo, sai, le tue traduzioni.” |
| KAROL: | “Cash?” | “Contanti?” |
| ANGIE: | “Yeah.” | “Sì.” |
| KAROL: | “And you know the old saying, ‘Never return a favour, pass it on’?” | “Lo conosci il detto: ‘Non pagare mai un favore, ricambialo’?” |
| ANGIE: | “You sound like my Dad. You should meet him, actually. There you go.” | “Mi sembri mio padre! Avrei dovuto fartelo conoscere. Tienili!” |
| KAROL: | “Pass it on. Not everything is money.” | “Ricambialo: non tutto si può comprare.” |

Karol’s last turn exemplifies the different aspects of his multimodal characterisation as a non-native speaker who does not play low status (at least when talking to Angie). “*Non tutto si può comprare*”, in fact, is not syntactically-marked as a deviating sentence like the original counterpart, in extract (30). On the contrary, it respects the standard norms of Italian, and

hence it may be inferred that the different characteristics actualise the translator's cognitive, top-down interpretation of the source script. The original semantic and communicative dimensions are therefore adapted from a multimodal perspective, to allow the Italian receivers easily deduce the different status of the non-native characters. It seems that according to the translators' interpretations, the focus is on the different structures of the exchanges between Angie and Karol, rather than on his non-native status. Actually, it is contended here that the scripted ILF variation should be preserved also for Karol, since the audiovisual features of the film could help the audience acknowledge the structural and pragmatic differences without modifying the original linguistic dimensions. In fact, by preserving a phonetically-, lexically- and syntactically-marked scripted lingua-franca variation, a more credible and equivalent rendering of the original characterisation could be provided.

Anyway, besides the differences in Karol's Italian, if the translations for the dubbing and the subtitles are compared, it is actually possible to consider the former as more appropriate to achieve pragmalinguistic equivalence. This is due to the fact that the subtitles are characterised by a style that is reminiscent of written discourse, also because of the inclusion of Standard Italian for all the characters. Even though this choice could be connected to the respect for the spatial and temporal limitations of this AVT mode (Neves 2009), it is claimed that a scripted ILF variation should be planned also for the subtitles, in order to account for and preserve the original characterisations.

Chapter 8

Looking for Alibrandi

Italian title:	<i>Terza generazione</i>
Director:	Kate Woods
Actors:	Greta Scacchi; Pia Miranda; Anthony La Paglia
Country:	Australia
Year:	2000
Length	103 minutes

Josie is an Australian girl with Italian origins in search of her personal identity, since she feels suspended between two worlds, the land where she was born and where she is growing up, and the world mainly represented by her grandmother, Katia. The woman, in fact, is reminiscent of her condition as a member of a family of immigrants. The film, based on a novel by Melina Marchetta, could be compared to *Bend It like Beckham* (Chapter 4) because both scripts are centred on the figure of a girl who tries to deal with different social dimensions and struggles against the traditional cultural habits.

The topic of homelessness, of searching a place where to live in and to feel at home is crucial in the movie and is one of the main concerns of Josie and her best friends. Yet, what the girl does not see is that the misplacement feeling is not just her own, but it is experienced by most migrants, like her relatives, as communicated by Katia when she recalls her experiences when she moved to Australia (00:31:45 – 00:31:47):

(34) KATIA: “I was in a place, Josie, where I did not belong.”

Katia’s and Josie’s feelings are therefore universal and in fact shared also by the younger generations, as explained by Sara, one of Josie’s friends, when she illustrates the supposed rules to form couples (01:16:07 – 01:16:13):

(35) SARA: “Listen: the poor marry the poor. The Wogs marry the Wogs. The Westies marry the Westies and the North shore marry the North shore.”

According to Sara, “wogs” (or, the Italians) can marry other wogs only, this claim representing a type of awareness that results from acknowledging that integration may actually be an achievement that is constantly pursued, but not constantly reached.

8.1 Linguistic Dimensions of the Movie

English is the main language in the movie, whereas the scripted ELF variations are included to mark the elderly people. This choice has a pragmatic connotation, for it characterises those who emigrated to Australia, whose language is still influenced by their Italian linguacultural background. At the same time, such linguistic dimension also activates the connection between the speakers' actions and their past, as for example in *Brick Lane* (Chapter 6), where Hasina's letters are opened in Bengali. The relation between the languages and the authors' illocutionary force is further exemplified when younger people's English is analysed, since the latter is closer to the standard rules. Also this approach has similar examples in the movies analysed so far, from *Bend It like Beckham* to *Brick Lane*, and supports the communicative and cognitive view of the inclusion of the scripted lingua-franca variations proposed by this book (see Sections 1.3 and 2.2 above).

Consider, for example, the following dialogue between Josie and Katia, when the girl claims she is not her grandmother's property (00:18:21 – 00:18:32):

- (36) JOSIE: “Who do you think I belong to? Go on, who? Yeah, I bet you wish I did belong to you.”
 KATIA: “You misintrepid everything!”
 JOSIE: “Oh, it's ‘misinterpret’!”

Exchange (36) has similar features with (24) above, when Shahana corrects her father. Josie performs a similar action, in telling her grandmother how to pronounce the word “misinterpret”. It is interesting to note that differently from the previous extracts, in the case under analysis the mispronunciation could stem from Katia's L1 transfer, since by ending the word as “trepid”, she creates a sound association to the Sicilian dialect, which is the language she used to speak in Italy. In other situations, the variation of English uttered by the woman is in fact completely mixed by Italian words, as in (37) below (extract from 00:17:45 – 00:17:58):

- (37) JOSIE: “*Nonna*, I'm not eating! Do you understand English?”
 KATIA: “I was taught to speak English before your mother was born, *maleducata*!”

Whereas Josie's “*Nonna*” is reminiscent of similar uses of foreign epithets, like “*Abba*” and “*Amma*”, and “*Massi Ji*”, respectively from *Brick Lane* and *Bend It like Beckham*, Katia's “*maleducata*” activates instead a clear reference to the woman's cognitive frame concerning how the relationships between parents, children and even grandparents are seen in Southern Italian

families. Similar examples are identified in the extract (38) below (00:26:48 – 00:26:55), when Katia tells how she learnt English, and in (39) (00:31:20 – 00:31:37), when Josie knows one of her grandmother’s experiences once she arrived in Australia:

- (38) KATIA: “*Signor* Sandifordi teach us the English.”
 PATRIZIA: “That’s why English we speak well.”

In (38) two examples of language authentication (Widdowson 1979: 159-167) can be identified, besides the inclusion of “*Signor*”: the presence of the definite article in “the English” as well as the syntactic structure of Patrizia’s lines. As for the former, the expression respects the Italian structure “*l’inglese*”, which is not correct in English, whereas the second woman’s utterances are a word-to-word rendering of the Italian sentence structure. In fact, it does not follow the typical English syntactic structure with the subject followed by the verb and then by the direct object. “That’s why English we speak well” can be considered instead as a reproduction of the Italian conventional sentence “*È per questo che l’inglese lo parliamo bene*”, where the direct object (“English”) is put before the subject (“we”) and the verb.

- (39) KATIA: “And the men... Uh! The way they look at me! I was most beautiful than all! Some of the men even said, ‘Forget Francesco *e* run away with me’.”

In (39), the scripted ELF variation illustrates specific features, like the prevalence of the present simple (“look” instead of “looked”), which respects one of the characteristics of actual ELF variations (cf. MacKenzie 2013) and which is also included in (38), when the grandmother uses “teach” instead of “taught”. Due to the multimodal construction of films, the verbal, syntactic and lexical features integrate the audiovisual dimension, as exemplified by the way Katia pronounces her utterances with some phonetic deviations. For example, the dental sound replaces the interdental one in the definite article and in “with”, which is pronounced [wit], whereas the form “ranwei” originates from merging “run” and “away”. Katia’s pronunciation is displayed in (40) below:

- (40) KATIA: “And **de** men... Uh! **De** way they look at me! I was most beautiful than all! **Som** of the men even said, ‘Forget Francesco *e* **ranwei wit** me’.”

8.2 Conversation Analysis

The dialogues from *Looking for Alibrandi* can be divided into a number of macro-groups. In fact, there are mainly cultural and social reasons behind the

relations between the participants who have different opinions in terms of the integration between Australians and migrants. Furthermore, from a social perspective, the language of the dialogues may also change depending on the speakers' age, gender and nationality, along with the level of asymmetry between the interlocutors.

Interaction (41) will be now analysed, which is the complete exchange between Katia and Josie, partially analysed in (37) above (00:17:45 – 00:17:58):

- (41) JOSIE: “No hungry—It’s too hot.”
 KATIA: “For the McDonald’s you’re always hungry!”
 JOSIE: “*Nonna*, I’m not eating! Do you understand English?”
 KATIA: “I was taught to speak English before your mother was born, *maleducata!*”

Josie’s opening and informing moves in the first turn actually provide a justification to the girl’s behaviour, since she does not want to spend time with her grandmother. The latter, though, uses a cross-cultural challenging move, since she mentions a specific brand, just like Commander Zero does when he refers to “*Baywatch*” in dialogue (16) from *Blood Diamond* (see Chapter 5). Both examples confirm the importance of the proposal of this new move, and in particular of its characterisation as a “cross-cultural” one. Its inclusion in fact allows analysts to infer the culture-bound construction of the selected films, whose semantic dimensions, illocutionary force and perlocutionary effects are conveyed by means of the interaction between the authors’ and viewers’ linguacultural backgrounds. From a denotative perspective, the inclusion of specific brands or entertainment shows the cultural and ethnic clashes that may be activated when involved in intercultural exchanges. From the connotative, communicative perspective, the same elements may contribute to increase the receivers’ accessibility to the intended messages, by resorting to their implied knowledge (cf. Section 1.3 above).

Near the end of the movie, the relationship between the two female protagonists changes, once the girl knows her grandmother’s story, marked by the attempts at integrating in the Australian society and by secrets from her past such as Katia’s secret liaison, or her husband’s violent temper. The shift is reflected by the different structure of the following interaction (42), when an eliciting move is followed by an answering one—which Katia says in Italian, since she is remembering an intimate event from her past (01:28:16 – 01:28:48):

- (42) JOSIE: “Why didn’t you stay with him forever?”
 KATIA: “*Mi pregava. Ma io... io non volevo buttare vergogna*”

a mia famigghia. Che ci succedeva a mi' figghia? Pensi che gli Italiani la lassavano giocare co' suoi figghi o l'Australiani l'accettavano? You must believe me, Josie, everything, everything, all thing I did, was for Christina."

8.3 Target Script Analysis

The dubbing translation of *Looking for Alibrandi* neutralises the linguistic variations of the original script, adding only a Sicilian diatopic/diastratic variety that replaces the parts that in the source version are uttered in Italian. The original “English-Italian” switching thus becomes a “Standard Italian-Diatopically marked Italian” switching. Even though similar strategies are generally employed in the dubbing translations of film, due to the influence of Italian regionalisms (Rossi 2007) on the adaptation of source scripts, the omission of the scripted lingua-franca variation does not allow the target audience to get acquainted with the different semantic and functional dimensions that the alternation between different linguistic situations activates. By way of example, consider the Italian translation of interaction (36) (00:06:09 – 00:06:16):

(43)	English script	Italian script
	JOSIE: “Who do you think I belong to? Go on, who? Yeah, I bet you wish I did belong to you.”	“Non sono mica nata sotto un cavolo! Ti piacerebbe? Già, ma sono sangue del tuo sangue, che tu lo voglia o no!”
	KATIA: “You misintrepid everything!”	“Tu male intrepidi tutto!”
	JOSIE: “Oh, it’s ‘misinterpret’!”	“Oh, ‘male interpreti’, casomai!”

Besides including some typical features of Italian dubbese, such as the use of “*Già*” as a synonym of “Yes” (cf. Guido 2012: 70-71), the target script is not focused on Josie’s origins or on the semantic dimension of the girl’s life as an object that belongs to someone. Such notions are indeed mentioned only when the first turn ends. This shift has consequences on the illocutionary force of the girl’s utterances, since Katia is no longer challenged by the girl’s refusal of her Italian ancestry. As for the original “misintrepid”, it is rendered as “*male intrepidi*”, with a non-standard pronunciation of the verb “*interpreti*” that reflects the features of the Sicilian dialect the woman uses in alternation to English.

The second adaptation strategy of the target script, namely the replacement of Italian with the Sicilian dialect, is illustrated in (44) below, from a scene set in the “Tomato Day”, when Katia predicts Josie’s destiny (00:02:57 – 00:03:02):

- | | | |
|------|--|--|
| (44) | English script | Italian script |
| | KATIA: “ <i>Questa si sposa un Australiano e i figli li cresce a fish and chips.</i> ” | “Sposa n’Australiano e pe’ mangiari ci duna <i>fish and chips.</i> ” |

The use of the Sicilian dialect is exemplified by typical phonetic variations, such as “*figghi*”, instead of the standard “*figli*”, or the final vowel of the verb “*mangiare*”, which is uttered as “*mangiari*”. Finally, the dubbed script also exemplifies specific retextualisations of the label “Wogs”, which is given to non-Australian people, with disparaging connotations. Since an equivalent term does not exist in Italy, some alternative translations are selected, which are nonetheless meant to preserve the racist and disparaging shades, thus adapting the original message in a way that would activate equivalent effects in target receivers. Scene (45) below, when Josie comments on the tradition of the “Tomato Day”, represents a case in point (00:01:59 – 00:02:05):

- | | | |
|------|--|---|
| (45) | English script | Italian script |
| | JOSIE: “Oh, in case you’re wondering, this is ‘Tomato Day’, or as I prefer [...] ‘The National Wogs Day’.” | “Oh, nel caso non l’aveste capito, questa è ‘La giornata della conserva’, o come prefisco chiamarla, ‘La festa nazionale dei pastasciuttai’.” |

“Wogs” is rendered in (45) as “*pastasciuttai*”, a term that conveys a culture-bound, disparaging representation of Italians, since it is focused on “pasta”, one of the distinguishing elements of their culture. The solution is appropriate, since it reproduces Josie’s will to distance herself from her origins—indeed one of her objectives, at least at the beginning of the movie. Similar strategies are activated when “Wogs” is used in other contexts. When the word is uttered by Carly, a racist Australian girl, it is rendered as “*zotici con la coppola*” (00:09:22 – 00:09:25). In this case, the reference is to the stereotypical association between Italians and Mafia, due to the presence of “*coppola*”, the flat cap associated to Sicilian people and to the conventional representations of the figure of “Mafioso”. The girl’s illocutionary force is preserved for target receivers, but it is interesting here to note that the analysis of the two ways of rendering the same expression foregrounds the mental processes of interpretation and retextualisation of source texts: after

identifying the speaker's intentionality (bottom-up mechanism), translators come up with different solutions to compensate for the lack of exact lexical equivalence between source and target scripts, while accounting for the conveyance of the disparaging, native-culture-bound representations of lower-status participants (top-down processes).

In the next – and last – analysis of a migration movie, a different path will be followed. The film is in fact produced in Italy, and for this reason the analysis will first focus on the scripted ILF variation, eventually enquiring into the scripted ELF variation included in the English translation for the subtitles.

Chapter 9

Lamerica

Director:	Gianni Amelio
Actors:	Michele Placido; Enrico Loverso; Carmelo Di Mazzarelli
Country:	Italy
Year:	1994
Length	116 minutes

Lamerica is included in the selected corpus of films in order to enquire into the production and translation of migration movies also from a reversed perspective. This chapter will therefore illustrate how a scripted Italian lingua-franca variation is used in the source version to actualise the socio-cultural and linguistic dimensions also explored in the other films. At the same time, it will also contribute to the investigation of the adaptation strategies when English represents the target language for the international release. *Lamerica* is about two businessmen, Fiore and Gino, who are in Albania to create a shoe company, even though they aim to carry out a fraud. Since the country is impoverished by the fall of communism, they aim at making money out of the poor people, but when they meet Spiro, actually an Italian ex-soldier from the Second World War, Gino is forced to experience the local, dramatic socio-economic conditions.

Some features are shared with the other films analysed so far, such as the native speakers' higher status, the conflicting structures of some interactions, the selection of specific adaptation strategies for the English subtitles. In particular, despite the fact that the inclusion of a scripted ELF variation in the subtitles is not a common solution in audiovisual translation, it is nonetheless considered an appropriate choice to attain pragmalinguistic equivalence.

9.1 Linguistic Dimensions of the Movie

The alternation between Standard Italian and a scripted ILF variation is meant to represent the status asymmetries between the higher-status Italians and the lower-status Albanians, in a script that contains also instances of bureaucratic language with specific lexical and syntactic features, as well as a multimodal actualisation of the participants' illocutionary and perlocutionary levels. In other words, as in *It's a Free World...* (Chapter 7), the linguistic characteristics accompany the audiovisual construction, representing different levels of proximity or division between the speakers by means of their positions and the objects that appear in the scenes.

In the following interaction (46), Fiore wants to convince an Albanian woman to become the chairman of “Alba Calzature”, the shoe factory the Italian men are pretending to open in the foreign country (00:07:57 – 00:08:29):

- (46) FIORE: “Signora, a Lei piace la scarpa italiana? Il cuoio morbido, la confezione moderna, il piede che poggia in un velluto.”
WOMAN: [Speaking Albanian]
INTERPRETER: “L’ha visto in TV. Le scarpe italiane sono migliore al mondo.”
FIORE: “Noi dobbiamo dare ad ogni Albanese un paio di scarpe nuove. Nella fabbrica ci sarà soltanto manodopera locale. Utilizzeremo pellame albanese di primissima qualità: vaccariello, capretto, agnellino... Lei, signora, sarà Presidente della Società ‘Alba Calzature’.”

The interpreter embodies the non-native speaker’s status also due to his scripted ILF variation, which is characterised by non-conventional pronunciation and syntactic structure. Italian shoes are in fact defined “the best in the world”, with a deviating inclusion of the singular form of the adjective, “*migliore*”, instead of the plural version that agrees with the noun “shoes”. On the other hand, Fiore’s utterances are characterised by complex syntactic structure and formal lexis, which aim to promote the quality of the shoes that their factory will produce, justifying in this sense the use of adjectives such as “new” or “local” – respectively referring to the shoes or the manpower – or the specification of “the highest quality” of the skins.

Similar characteristics are identified in another dialogue, between Gino and an Albanian female doctor, when he wants to know more about Spiro, the ex-soldier they meet (00:34:51 – 00:35:18; 00:36:48 – 00:37:01):

- (47) GINO: “È grave?”
DOCTOR: [Speaking Albanian]
GINO: “No, non capisco: parla italiano!”
DOCTOR: “Ah, italiano. Come dice...? Asfissia, asfissia... Ma, non grave—ehm... ora bene. Bene. Voi parente?”
GINO: “No, che parente?! Io sono italiano!”
DOCTOR: “Lui parla italiano con me.”
GINO: “Che vuol dire? Qua tutti ‘parla’ italiano. [...] Le

- scarpe dove sono?”
- DOCTOR: “Non avevo scarpe. Non avevo.”
- GINO: “E io come faccio a portarmelo via? Scalzo? Mi procuri un paio di scarpe, le pago. Pago.”
- DOCTOR: “Mi dispiace ma... non posso aiutarla.”

The doctor’s scripted ILF variation generally displays omission of phrasal elements, like “*si*” in “*come [si] dice*”, or “*non grave—ehm... ora bene*”, where the verbs are not present. If uttered by a native speaker, in fact, the sentence would include the present simple tense of “to be”—“*non è grave*”—and the verb “*stare*” in “*ora sta bene*”. Furthermore, the doctor also resorts to simplified verb forms, which are mainly used in the present simple. Additionally, the latter feature helps to define the high-status participant’s attitude. Since the woman is not helping Gino with his search, the man produces a disparaging representation of his interlocutor by mocking her lingua-franca variation, in “*Qui tutti parla italiano*”. In this sentence, the verb “*parlare*”, ‘to speak’, is uttered in the singular form—“*parla*”—instead of the plural, “*parlano*”. The same simplification of verb tenses is also in the past dimension, when the doctor informs that Spiro was not wearing shoes when he arrived at the hospital. In fact, she says, “*non avevo scarpe*”, with again a simplified form, that of the first singular person, which replaces the appropriate third singular person—namely, “*non aveva scarpe*”.

So far, extracts (46) and (47) have illustrated the Italian men’s higher status. Actually, when Gino is imprisoned, the latter’s condition changes. In extract (48) below, he has a conversation with a police officer that, despite being a non-native Italian speaker, leads the development of the exchange. A similar subversion of roles is also in *It’s a Free World...*, but whereas in the latter case the Italian version reproduces such socio-cultural shift by giving a different language variation to Karol (see Section 7.3 above), in *Lamerica* the linguistic properties of the Albanian police officer are not modified. It follows that, as claimed after the analysis of the target version of Ken Loach’s movie, it is also possible to convey connotative semantic dimensions also by means of the integration between the verbal and audiovisual construction of the scenes (also cf. Section 9.2 below) (01:32:50 – 01:33:50):

- (48) POLICE OFFICER: “Tuoi bagagli sono sequestrati.”
- GINO: “Che volete da me?”
- POLICE OFFICER: “Nome, cognome, e dove è nato.”
- GINO: “Cudrali Luigi, Agrigento, 30 gennaio ’63.”
- POLICE OFFICER: “Fai parte di questa società chiamata Alba Calzature?”
- GINO: “Ci lavoro. Lavoro con loro.”
- POLICE OFFICER: “Rispondo sì o no, ti prego.”

GINO: “Sì.”

The police officer’s high status may be inferred by the fact that he makes questions and Gino politely answers. At the same time, the syntactic dimension of the non-native participant’s utterances is still divergent from the standard norms. For example, the definite article “i” is omitted in “[I] *Tuoi bagagli sono stati sequestrati*”, whereas he alternates the less formal and more formal structures within the same dialogue. At first, his language is emotionally closer to Gino, since he uses “*Tuoi*”, ‘your’, in “*Tuoi bagagli*”; in the third turn, though, the social deixis is modified, when he says, “*dove è nato*”, with a more formal language. Actually, the register changes again in the other questions he poses.

The analysis of dialogue (48) confirms what was contended when analysing the Italian translation for the dubbing of *It’s a Free World...*: due to the multimodal construction of audiovisual texts, it is not necessary to change the linguistic features to indicate shifts in the participants’ status: the same perlocutionary effect and illocutionary force can be successfully conveyed by means of the extralinguistic characteristics, which contribute to the interpretation of the interactions in audiovisual scripts.

9.2 Conversation Analysis

In extract (46) and (47) Italians have a higher status, which is conveyed by the multimodal features of the scenes. As for dialogue (46), Fiore and the woman are separated by a desk, and this spatial organisation is significant because it will be repeated for the interaction between Gino and the police officer. At the same time, the different illocutionary forces in (46) and (47) determine different ways of communicating the asymmetric status, as reflected by the conversation frames.

In (46), Fiore’s rhythm is slow and his tone of voice aims to convince the woman to accept her role at “Alba Calzature”. On the other hand, when Gino speaks to the female doctor in (47), he has a completely different attitude, which includes the disparaging representation of non-native speakers by mocking their linguistic variation. In that scene, Gino only wants to find Spiro, and the fact that woman cannot be of any help is interpreted by the Italian man like an obstacle to reach his objective. In terms of conversation analysis, he does not resort to informing moves, as Fiore in (46), but he challenges the doctor, by ordering her to speak Italian, using imperatives. At the same time, he downgrades the woman’s assumptions, when she thinks that he is one of Spiro’s relatives. Later, when the woman says that the old man had no shoes, he poses a series of questions, using fake eliciting moves followed by an ordering move and a backing item, with the intent of confirming his higher status and imposing his will.

It is important to state that the different behaviours are not necessarily connected to the recipients' gender: both Fiore and Gino are speaking to women, so it can be surmised that the structures of the conversations are only connected to the men's intentionality and objectives, and to economic and personal reasons. Finally, when it is the Albanian police officer who plays high status, at first Gino tries to react, when he asks why he is being interrogated, but then he gets aware of his different position and answers to the officer's questions. He even repeats one of his utterances, "*Ci lavoro. Lavoro con loro*", in order to clarify how he is connected to "Alba Calzature".

9.3 Target Script Analysis

The analysis of the target script is meant to illustrate how the scripted ILF variation has been turned into a scripted ELF variation for the subtitles. In this section only the lexical and syntactic deviations will be explored (as it was made for the previous films), but the subtitles also display some specific features in terms of register and phonopragmatic features (cf. Iaia, Provenzano, and Sperti forthcoming).

The scripted ELF variation is marked by the omission of phrasal elements and simplified verbal forms, thus identifying some common features with the other variations used in the migration movies under analysis. By way of example, consider the English translation of extract (46):

(49)	Italian script	English script
	<p>FIGLIORE: "Signora, a Lei piace la scarpa italiana? Il cuoio morbido, la confezione moderna, il piede che poggia in un velluto."</p> <p>WOMAN: "[Parla in albanese]"</p> <p>INTERPRETER: "L'ha visto in TV. Le scarpe italiane sono migliore al mondo."</p> <p>FIGLIORE: "Noi dobbiamo dare ad ogni Albanese un paio di scarpe nuove. Nella fabbrica ci sarà soltanto manodopera locale. Utilizzeremo pellame albanese di primissima qualità:</p>	<p>"Do you like Italian shoes? Soft leather, modern manufacturing, feet wrapped in velvet."</p> <p>"[Speaking Albanian]"</p> <p>"She say Italian shoes best in world, she see on television."</p> <p>"We must give every Albanian a pair of shoes. We'll use local manpower in the factory and choice Albanian skins: lamb, kid, calf. And you will be the chairman of our</p>

vaccariello,	capretto,	company,	Alba
agnellino...	Lei,	Calzature.”	
signora,	sarà		
Presidente	della		
Società	‘Alba		
Calzature’.”			

From a technical perspective, the subtitles are shorter than the uttered lines, due to the temporal and spatial limits, but the target script preserves the distinction between the native and non-native speakers. In fact, the interpreter resorts to a deviating form of the verb “to say” in the present simple tense, without the “s” marking the third singular person in “She say Italian shoes best in world”. At the same time, a sentence is also characterised by a simplified syntactic structure, without the definite article “the” and the verb “to be”.

Similar structures are also identified in the rendering of the female doctor’s utterances in (50) below:

- | (50) | Italian script | English script |
|------|---|--|
| | GINO: “È grave?” | “Is it serious?” |
| | DOCTOR: “[Parla in albanese]” | “[Speaking Albanian]” |
| | GINO: “No, non capisco: parla italiano!” | “I don’t understand, speak Italian.” |
| | DOCTOR: “Ah, italiano. Come dice...? Asfissia, asfissia... Ma, non grave—ehm... ora bene. Bene. Voi parente?” | “Ah, Italian. How do you say...? Asphyxia, but not serious, better now. You family?” |
| | GINO: “No, che parente?! Io sono italiano!” | “He had no shoes.” |
| | DOCTOR: “Lui parla italiano con me.” | He speaks Italian with me. |
| | GINO: “Che vuol dire? Qua tutti ‘parla’ italiano. [...] Le scarpe dove sono?” | “So? Everyone here speaks Italian. [...] Where are his shoes?” |
| | DOCTOR: “Non avevo scarpe. Non avevo.” | “He had no shoes.” |
| | GINO: “E io come faccio a portarmelo via? Scalzo? Mi procuri un paio di scarpe, le pago. Pago.” | “How am I supposed to take him away? Could you get me some shoes? I’ll pay.” |

DOCTOR: “Mi dispiace ma... non posso aiutarla.” “I’m sorry, I cannot help.”

In the ninth turn, the linguistic actualisation of the different participants’ status is represented by the fact that Gino’s question is posed with a correct and more formal syntactic construction—“How am I supposed to take him away?”. On the contrary, the doctor’s utterances “Are you family?” and “but not serious, better now” have more simplified structures and are characterised, as illustrated in the examples from the previous films, by the omission of articles and verbs. In the case under investigation, the subject and the verb are not present in “but [he is] not serious, [he is] better now”, or in “[Are] you family?”.

It is worth repeating that the creation of a scripted lingua-franca variation in target scripts is not common, and in fact if several extracts from *Lamerica* are compared, one may notice that the specific lexical and syntactic features have not a common frequency. This may be due to the lack of appropriate translators’ training—indeed, one of the reasons for the proposal of the definition of “scripted lingua-franca variation” in this book—and therefore it is vital to provide analysts, mediators and future translators with specific knowledge that would encompass the linguistic, extralinguistic and functional types of competence, in order to contribute to the appropriate interpretation and adaptation of the linguistic actualisation of the socio-cultural and semantic dimensions in film scripts.

Conclusions

The definition of the processes of film production and translation as communicative and interpretative acts has informed the identification of how the illocutionary forces and perlocutionary effects are conveyed by resorting to the interaction between the linguistic and extralinguistic dimensions of the scripts. In this sense, a sort of dialogic relationship is ideally theorised between the authors and receivers –defined by Kress and van Leeuwen (2006) as “interactive participants” – who are considered as senders and recipients of the messages embodied by the migration movies under analysis.

The label “migration movie” itself is proposed to mark a specific type of films, belonging to both comedy and dramatic genres, which are focused on representing the experiences of non-native speakers when they come into contact with foreign countries and different linguacultural backgrounds. Common themes are therefore the difficult steps of integration, the interactions between cultures, as well as the peculiar linguistic variations that are adopted in cross-cultural exchanges.

The analysis of the scripts reveals the multimodal actualisation of the senders/authors’ expectations and cognitive constructs connected to the behaviour of and the language uttered by the non-native speakers; at the same time, the selected migration movies also represent native participants as capable of mediating between different cultures or determined to impose their will. Such conclusions are attained by adopting a multidisciplinary approach to the investigation of source and target scripts, which is meant to provide analysts, translators and mediators with resources that allow them to focus on how the speakers’ cognitive, linguistic and socio-cultural backgrounds influence the production of the messages.

Furthermore, from a pedagogic perspective, the adoption of migration movies in the earlier stages of the training of intercultural mediators may contribute to the examination of the behaviours that prevent speakers from successfully developing cross-cultural communication, as identified by the studies on ELF (e.g., Seidlhofer 2011). In this sense, the analysed scripts show a range of interactions that reflects the actual communicative situations, from the speakers’ creative contribution rooted in the prevalence of the cooperative imperative (Widdowson 1983), to the asymmetrical exchanges typical of cross-cultural migration contexts (cf. Guido 2008), where the interpretation of the non-native participants’ intent is filtered through the native ones’ cognitive and linguacultural backgrounds, eventually leading to miscommunication.

The analysis of the selected corpus of migration movies has started from the proposal of the notion of “scripted lingua-franca variation”, generally characterised by fragmented syntactic structures, by lexical deviations or by the selection of specific verb forms (mainly present simple

and past simple). The inclusion of the scripted variations is seen as a communicative strategy activated by the authors/senders, in order to convey the represented participants' non-native status. What is more, the definition of scripted lingua-franca variations has also a functional connotation, since it is meant to replace the conventional label of "broken languages". Differently from the latter, the alternative notion entails the cross-cultural nature of the analysed interactions, where different linguistic, social and cultural contexts come into contact, whereas its identification as "scripted" also allows receivers to account for the cognitive transfer process (Widdowson 1991) activated by the senders at the time of deciding what lexical and syntactic features to include.

Actually, the scripted variations are affected by the authors' implicature, according to which specific characteristics are selected in order to prompt appropriate reactions on the part of the viewers. The latter, in fact, would recognise the illocutionary dimension by means of inference, a cognitive process that is activated once the specific structures and words are received. It follows that the identification of some characters as non-native, and generally low-status, participants stems from processes of meaning negotiation and acceptability, insofar as both senders and recipients accept a specific type of multimodal representation of some people, thus favouring the successful communication of the author's intentionality.

Similar premises are also applied to the notion of film translation, for translators are seen as both source-script receivers and target-script senders, whereas the renderings usually stem from an "entextualization" process (Urban 1996). It follows that the reproduction of the original scripted lingua-franca variations depends on how the translators interpret the audiovisual and linguistic features of the source texts, as well as on their cognitive construct of "implied receiver". For these reasons, according to the expected features of the film receivers, as well as on the linguistic, extralinguistic and functional competence of the translators, some features are omitted, neutralised, or equivalently rendered.

Further research could and should be carried out on the topic, as even though lingua-franca variations (and ELF in particular) are investigated in actual, non-scripted communicative scenarios, it is contended that the development of the dimensions here investigated can actually improve the knowledge of how the speakers' native background actually influences the expectations and behaviours that are eventually projected onto the development of actual exchanges. Secondly, the study of scripted variations may inform the final knowledge of mediators, who could exploit migration movies in the earlier stages of their training. Thirdly, by proposing the new, shared definition of "scripted lingua-franca variations", also audiovisual translators may be helped, at the time of receiving specific scripts, to decide how to render specific lexical and syntactic features. In particular, the

process-based approach to translation (Kussmaul 1995; Iaiá 2015) could be exploited to enquire into the activation of specific cognitive mechanisms at the time of rendering such variations for target receivers, to confirm the association between film translation and the “entextualization” process. Furthermore, it could be also interesting to consider the possibility of involving actual non-native speakers in the production of scripts, to define lexical, syntactic and communicative features closer to the actual uses of lingua-franca variations.

The notion of integration needs to be separated from that of homogenisation. The differences of human beings have to be preserved, for personal growth is connected to the discovery of the others, of their specificities, of their diversities. Research on lingua franca is blessed by such diversity as well, and hopefully this book has illustrated that also movies can contribute to this research area, although their production, reception and features may be different from the conventional sources of linguistic investigation. Diversity and fragmentation may lead to a universal happy ending.

References

- Antonini, R., and Chiaro, D. 2009. "The Perception of Dubbing by the Italian Audiences". In J. Díaz Cintas, and G. Anderman (eds.), *Audiovisual Translation: Language Transfer on Screen*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 97-114.
- Austin, J.L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bartlett, F.C. 1932. *Remembering*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carrell, P.L. 1983. "Some Issues in the Role of Schemata, or Background Knowledge, in Second Language Comprehension". *Reading in a Foreign Language* 1, 81-92.
- Chaume, F. 2004. "Film Studies and Translation Studies: Two Disciplines at Stake". *Meta* 49(1), 12-24.
- Chaume, F. 2012. *Audiovisual Translation: Dubbing*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Christiansen, T. 2011. *Cohesion: A Discourse Perspective*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Cogo, A., and Dewey, M. 2006. "Efficiency in ELF Communication: From Pragmatic Motives to Lexico-Grammatical Innovation". *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 5(2), 59-93.
- Coulthard, R., and Brazil, B. 1992. "Exchange Structure". In M. Coulthard (ed.), *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*, London: Routledge, 50-78.
- Denton, J., and Ciampi, D. 2012. "A New Development in Audiovisual Translation Studies: Focus on Target Audience Perception". *LEA - Lingue e letterature d'Oriente e d'Occidente* 1(1), 399-422.
- Díaz Cintas, J. 2004. "In Search of a Theoretical Framework for the Study of Audiovisual Translation". In P. Orero (ed.), *Topics in Audiovisual Translation*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 21-34.
- Fairclough, N. 2010. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. 2015. *Language and Power*. London: Routledge.
- Firth, J. 1957. "The Techniques of Semantics". *Papers in Linguistics 1934-51*, 7-33.
- Fish, S.E. 1970. "Literature in the Reader: Affective Stylistics". *New Literary History* 2, 123-162.
- Gibson, J. 1979. *The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Gotti, M. 2014. "Cooperative Meaning-making Strategies in ELF University Courses". *Textus* 27(1), 17-33.
- Gottlieb, H. 2005. "Multidimensional Translation: Semantics Turned Semiotics". In H. Gerzymisch-Arbogast, and S. Nauert (eds.), *MuTra 2005 - Challenges of Multidimensional Translation: Conference Proceedings*, 33-61. <http://www.euroconferences.info/proceedings/>

- 2005_Proceedings/2005_Gottlieb_Henrik.pdf.
- Grice, H.P. 1975. "Logic and Conversation". In P. Cole, and J.L. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, New York: Academic Press, 41-58.
- Guido, M.G. 1999. *The Acting Reader: Schema/Text Interaction in the Dramatic Discourse of Poetry*. New York/Ottawa/Toronto: Legas Publishing.
- Guido, M.G. 2004. *Mediating Cultures: A Cognitive Approach to English Discourse for the Social Sciences*. Milan: LED.
- Guido, M.G. 2008. *English as a Lingua Franca in Cross-cultural Immigration Domains*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Guido, M.G. 2012. *The Acting Translator: Embodying Cultures in the Dubbing Translation of American Sitcoms*. New York/Ottawa/Toronto: Legas.
- Guido, M.G., and Seidlhofer, B. 2014. "English as a Lingua Franca: Theory and Practice". *Textus* 27(1), 7-16.
- Gumperz, J., and Hymes, D. 1964. *The Ethnography of Communication*. Washington: American Anthropological Association.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1978. *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1985. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Iaia, P.L. 2011. "Adaptation Processes of Taboo-words in the Italian Dubbing of *Family Guy*". *Lingue e Linguaggi* 5, 173-180. <http://siba-ese.unisalento.it/index.php/linguelinguaggi/article/view/11448/10493>.
- Iaia, P.L. 2013. "Humour Strategies of Scientific Popularization: A Case Study on the American Sitcom *The Big Bang Theory*". In S. Keramas, and T. Christiansen (eds.), *The Popularization of Specialized Knowledge across Communities and Cultures*, Bari: Edipuglia, 187-202.
- Iaia, P.L. 2015. "Introducing the Interactive Model for the Analysis and Translation of Multimodal Texts". *Lingue e Linguaggi* 13, 199-209. <http://siba-ese.unisalento.it/index.php/linguelinguaggi/article/view/14334/13060>.
- Iaia, P.L., Provenzano, M., and Sperti, S. forthcoming. "ELF Reformulations of Italian 'Lingua Franca' Uses in the Subtitling of the Migration Movie *Lamerica*. A Functional and Pragmatic Approach". In L. Lopriore, and E. Grazi (eds.), *Intercultural Communication: New Perspectives from ELF*. Rome: Roma TrE-Press.
- Iaia, P.L., and Sperti, S. 2013. "An ELF Phonopragmatic Approach to the Analysis of 'Migration Movies' in Pedagogic Contexts: Linguacultural Dimensions of Scripted Interactions". In S. Bayyurt, and S. Akcan

- (eds.), *Pedagogic Implications of ELF in the Expanding Circle*, Istanbul: Bogazici University Publications, 283-293.
- Jenkins, J. 2000. *The Phonology of English as an International Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. 2007. *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jezek, E. 2005. "Interazioni tra aspetto e diatesi nei verbi pronominali italiani". *Studi di grammatica italiana* 23, 239-281.
- Kramsch, C. 1998. *Language and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kress, G. 1993. "Against Arbitrariness: The Social Production of the Sign as a Fundamental Issue in Critical Discourse Analysis". *Discourse and Society* 4(2), 169-193.
- Kress, G. 2009. *Multimodality: A Social Semiotic Approach to Contemporary Communication*. London: Routledge.
- Kress, G., and van Leeuwen, T. 2006. *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design*. London: Routledge.
- Kussmaul, P. 1995. *Training the Translator*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- MacKenzie, I. 2013. "Lexical Inventiveness and Conventionality in English as a Lingua Franca and English Translation". *The European English Messenger* 22(1), 47-53.
- Mangiron, C. 2010. "The Importance of *Not* Being Earnest: Translating Humour in Video Games". In D. Chiaro (ed.), *Translation, Humour and the Media*, London: Continuum Publishing Group, 89-107.
- Mauranen, A. 2007. "Hybrid Voices: English as the Lingua Franca of Academics". In K. Fløttum (Ed.), *Language and Discipline Perspectives on Academic Discourse*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Mauranen, A. 2012. *Exploring ELF: Academic English Shaped by Non-native Speakers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Neves, J. 2009. "Interlingual Subtitling for the Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing". In J. Díaz Cintas, and G. Anderman (eds.), *Audiovisual Translation: Language Transfer on Screen*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 151-169.
- O'Toole, M. 1994. *The Language of Displayed Art*. London: Leicester University Press.
- Paolinelli, M., and Di Fortunato, E. 2005. *Tradurre per il doppiaggio. La trasposizione linguistica dell'audiovisivo: teoria e pratica di un'arte imperfetta*. Milan: Hoepli.
- Perego, E. 2005. *La traduzione audiovisiva*. Rome: Carocci.
- Perego, E., and Taylor, C. 2012. *Tradurre l'audiovisivo*. Rome: Carocci.
- Poppi, F. 2014. "Balancing the Territorial and Cooperative Imperatives in Computer-mediated Communication". *Textus* 27(1), 69-83.

- Poynton, C. 1985. *Language and Gender: Making the Difference*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Richards, I.A. 1929. *Practical Criticism*. New York: Harcourt Brace and Co.
- Rossi, F. 2007. "La lingua adattata". In G. Massara (ed.), *La lingua invisibile: Aspetti teorici e tecnici del doppiaggio in Italia*, Rome: Nuova editrice universitaria, 87-106.
- Seidlhofer, B. 2011. *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, J.M., and Coulthard, R. 1975. *Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English Used by Teachers and Pupils*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Stubbs, M. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Swales, J. 1990. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tannen, D. 1992. *You Just Don't Understand - Women and Men in Conversation*. London: Virago.
- Urban, G. 1996. "Entextualization, Replication and Power". In M. Silverstein, & G. Urban (eds.), *Natural Histories of Discourse*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 21-44.
- van Leeuwen, T. 1999. *Speech, Music, Sound*. London: Macmillan.
- van Leeuwen, T. 2005. *Introducing Social Semiotics*. London: Routledge.
- van Leeuwen, T., and Jewitt, C. 2001. *Handbook of Visual Analysis*. London: Sage.
- Widdowson, H.G. 1979. *Explorations in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H.G. 1983. *Language Purpose and Language Use*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H.G. 1991. "The Description and Prescription of Language". In J.E. Alatis (ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics. Linguistics and Language Pedagogy: The State of the Art*, Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, 11-24.
- Yule, G. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

© 2015 Università del Salento – Coordinamento SIBA



<http://siba.unisalento.it>

eISBN 978-88-8305-112-8 (electronic version)

<http://siba-ese.unisalento.it>