



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Multimodal Corpus Analysis of Subtitling: The Case of Non-standard Varieties*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/153529/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Magro Ramos Pinto, S orcid.org/0000-0003-4552-0037 and Mubaraki, A (2020) Multimodal Corpus Analysis of Subtitling: The Case of Non-standard Varieties. *Target: International Journal of Translation Studies*, 32 (3). pp. 389-419. ISSN 0924-1884

<https://doi.org/10.1075/target.18085.ram>

© John Benjamins Publishing Company. This is an author produced version of a journal article published in *Target: International Journal of Translation Studies*. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Multimodal corpora analysis of subtitling:

The case of non-standard varieties

Sara Ramos Pinto, University of Leeds, UK

Aishah Mubarak, University of Hafr Al Batin, Saudi Arabia

This article proposes a new methodology for corpora multimodal analysis. It does so by particularly focusing on the issue of the translation of non-standard varieties. This new methodology, which is significantly influenced by the works of Iedema (2003), Jimenez Hurtado and Soler Gallego (2013), Pastra (2008) and Ramos Pinto (2018), is capable of identifying the modes and resources at play, the relations identified between them as well as how such relations participate in the construction of the non-standard varieties' communicative meaning. It also accounts for the impact of the introduction of subtitles in preserving, cancelling or modifying the intermodal relations identified in the source text and, consequently, the diegetic functions they support, that is, the function they assume in the fictional world of the film. It assumes, in this regard, a clear translational perspective.

Keywords: Audiovisual Translation, subtitling, multimodality, corpora analysis, linguistic variation

1. Introduction

It has become commonly acknowledged that one of the main challenges in dealing with highly complex multimodal products, such as film, is their reliance on different channels and the multitude of possible modal combinations which produce meaning (Kress et al. 2001; Bateman 2014). This has certainly had an impact on the type of studies conducted and the type of methodologies used to study multimodal products. However, arguably one of the main reasons that multimodal products are so challenging to study is the fact that academic research is dominated by the written mode. On the one hand, the analysis of visual and aural modes resists

the written mode in which it is conducted and presented to others. On the other hand, the collation and analysis of corpora of multimodal products is further complicated by the fact that corpus techniques have been developed primarily for textual analysis.

The study of audiovisual translation (AVT) is, naturally, not immune to these challenges. The difficulty in dealing with different channels and their possible combinations becomes all the more flagrant in translation given the new communicative setting imposed by a different language, culture and audience. In addition, AVT researchers have found it difficult to reconcile the study of multimodal meaning production with the gradual move from a case-study to a corpus studies approach. Such a move has allowed us to identify distinctive features and patterns of behaviour on the basis of large collections of texts which, in turn, supported more solid generalisations (Remael et al. 2012). However, it also seems to have led to a growing focus on the verbal (Diaz-Cintas 2008). The nature of the tools available and the resources and time necessary to conduct a descriptive multimodal analysis of even just a single film have resulted in the apparent distinction between textual corpus analysis (which often takes advantage of quantitative data analysis) and multimodal qualitative analysis of one film or a few singular scenes. There have been commendable attempts to compile multimodal corpora in AVT, namely the *Forli Corpus of Screen Translation* (Valentini 2008), the *TRACCE* corpus (Jimenez and Seibel 2012) and the *Pavia Corpus of Film Dialogue* (Freddi 2013). However, the labour and resources this type of corpora demand impose serious restrictions on the type of studies conducted by individual researchers. Without a more innovative framework, capable of addressing the multimodal nature of meaning creation in a subtitled film in large corpora, the study of subtitling will remain focused on the verbal mode or limited to a few case studies.

Following on from the work of scholars such as Iedema (2003) Jimenez Hurtado and Soler Gallego (2013), Pastra (2008) and Ramos Pinto (2018), this article will take a step towards addressing the challenges of combining a multimodal approach to subtitling with corpus analysis. Concentrating on the issue of translating non-standard varieties in particular, this article will propose a methodology focused on the type of intermodal relationship identified (between the visual resources, audio resources and subtitles) along with the functions they fulfil.

The methodology presented in this article is doubly motivated. Firstly, to acknowledge that subtitling is part of a larger product and needs to be understood in its multimodal context: that is to say, it should be considered in the context of the intermodal relationships identified. As a result, one should abandon the notion of subtitles as solely the written counterpart of the

speech mode¹ in a foreign language. Limiting analysis to the binary relationship between subtitles and the speech mode disregards that translation is about meaning (i.e., language in context) and reduces linguistic information to what is expressed in the speech mode. This does not mean disregarding the relationship of equivalence that subtitles maintain with the speech mode nor their condition of being an additional mode to an already finished product; on the contrary, it means that the study of subtitling will have to consider that subtitling involves translating meaning which results from the intermodal relationships identified in the source product. By contributing to this already complex network, subtitles have the potential to preserve, cancel or modify those same intermodal relationships.

Secondly, the foundations of this framework are based on an acknowledgement of the intricate nature of the relationships between the different modes in a film and the difficulty in distinguishing the contribution provided by each mode. Despite the doubts raised by Stöckl (2004) regarding the independent existence of contributions, it is important to keep in mind that the end result is more than the sum of the different parts and that the meaning derived from the combination of different modes can be worth more than the meaning we derive from each individual mode (Lemke 1998). For the study of subtitled products this means that it is essential to closely consider the meaning derived from the intersection of the different modes and how the intermodal relationships contribute to the construction of such meaning (Chaume 2004). That is to say, without disregarding the importance of identifying the different modes and resources at play in the construction of specific lines of meaning, our analysis also cannot be limited to a taxonomic exercise of listing possible connections. We need to look beyond that and consider the meaning derived from specific combinations of modes and their assumed diegetic function in the film.

Bearing all this in mind, for the corpus analysis of the translation of non-standard varieties it is thus essential to allow for the identification of modes and resources at play, the intermodal relationships identified between them as well as the way in which such relationships participate in the construction of the non-standard variety's diegetic purpose. Furthermore, when considering the translational perspective informing the analysis, it is crucial to incorporate a study of the impact of subtitles in preserving, cancelling or modifying the source texts' intermodal relationships and, consequently, the function and meanings being constructed.

This article builds on and advances the work of Brodovich (1997), Dimitrova (2002),

¹ When referring to modes, we will be using the terminology proposed in Pérez-González (2014).

Leppihalme (2000), Rosa (2004), Ellender (2015) and Silvester (2018), by extending the corpus analysis (in these studies focused exclusively on the verbal) to include a consideration of visual and aural resources participating in the multimodal meaning-creation process. It also builds on Baños (2013), Pastra (2008) and Ramos Pinto (2018) by operationalising the categories suggested in these studies for the analysis of the diegetic functions and developing a scheme of classification from which statistical frequency data associated with the multimodal dimension of the meaning-making process can be collected. Such data can be used to support the qualitative analysis of the diegetic functions assumed by non-standard varieties in a given film and, at a later stage, the study of the sociocultural context in which the translation took place.

Section 2 offers a brief discussion of the principles governing the presence of non-standard discourse in fictional contexts, such as films. Section 3 presents a detailed account of the corpus-based methodology and quantitative analysis being proposed, offering illustrative examples from an analysis conducted of six Portuguese subtitling cases of the films *Pygmalion* (1938 and 1981) and *My Fair Lady* (1964). It will not be possible in this article to present a full account of the study and analysis conducted, but given that the aim and focus of this article is to present a multimodal corpus methodology, we believe that the examples given provide sufficient detail to allow replication.

2. Subtitling of linguistic varieties

Linguistic varieties have long been used as a filmic resource for the depiction of characters, the interpersonal relationship identified between them and discursive situations (Hodson 2014). Directors take advantage of the sociocultural meanings associated with linguistic varieties which organise linguistic varieties into a continuum of prestige and position their speakers accordingly. The standard variety, supported by the education system and its well-defined rules, conventions, and orthography, is normally taken as ‘correct’ and a more prestigious use of language. Other varieties are devalued as they diverge in their lexicon, grammar, and phonetics/orthography from the standard norm. The easy recognition of the varieties and the meaning they import into the fictional world has proven to be a powerful resource for indirect depiction of characters and situations. It is, however, a fictional resource employed with specific diegetic purposes and one which takes advantage of linguistic stereotypes developed over time to ensure easy recognition of the characters’ speech in terms of social standing, education level, geographical positioning or ethnic group (Blake 1981; Kozloff 2000; Hodson

2014). It is, therefore, embedded within the author's aesthetic, narrative, thematic or stylistic objectives. It is also used to fulfil specific diegetic functions such as characterisation and introduction of authenticity, definition of interpersonal relationships of power or solidarity (Hatim and Mason 1990), introduction of a comedic moment or introduction of point of view (especially when the narrator is the one employing non-standard discourse).

Given the intrinsic link between linguistic varieties and the sociocultural context in which they are embedded, along with the diegetic function they are expected to fulfil, it is not surprising that translating this dimension of texts has often been considered an impossible task (Lane-Mercier 1997). The difficulty does not lie so much in translating the linguistic varieties themselves, but in translating its communicative meaning, i.e. the existing relationship between the linguistic varieties and their associated extralinguistic sociocultural meaning. Following a functionalist approach to translation, as put forward by authors such as Hatim and Mason (1990) and Hatim (1990-91), communicative meaning refers to the relation identified between the linguistic variety and its position in the scale of prestige previously established and shared by the viewers. As a result, the linguistic variety serves the purpose of depicting the characters and positioning them in the social hierarchy, i.e., the textual-linguistic elements, based on previous knowledge, are analysed as a code which, associated to a subcode of extratextual elements, reveals the function of characterisation of characters.

It is not possible to offer in this article a full account of all the studies focused on the translation of linguistic varieties, but we would highlight the three *inTRAlinea* special issues on "The Translation of Dialects on Multimedia" (2009, 2012, 2016) and the contributions of Antonini (2005), Bucaria and Chiaro (2007), Ellender (2015), Fuentes Luque (2003), Kovacic (1995), Ramos Pinto (2009, 2010), Rosa (2004, 2015), Silvester (2018) and Yu (2017). Assuming a rigorous descriptive approach, these studies have been able to identify the different strategies and procedures used to translate linguistic varieties, ranging from a complete standardisation of discourse and neutralisation of variation through the adoption of solely the standard variety (Toury 1995) to the opposite strategy of dialectisation and exclusive use of non-standard varieties (Brisset 1996; Mejdell 2017). In between, it has been possible to identify different levels of 'recreation' (Rosa 2004) and preservation strategies (Ramos Pinto 2009; Ellender 2015), that is, strategies by which the linguistic variation is not neutralised and non-standard varieties are included in the TT (target text) to a more or lesser degree. These strategies have been organised in a cline (Rosa 2004, 2015) that recognises a centre of prestige with the standard variety and a periphery of less prestigious varieties. This allows us to account for different levels of (non-)preservation and identify situations in which the linguistic variation

was kept in the TT, but with a diminished visibility either because of a lower frequency or the use of varieties/discourse markers closer to the centre of prestige.

As discussed by Lane-Mercier (1997), each of these strategies incurs risks in relation to meaning creation, meaning loss, ethnocentricity, unauthenticity, conservatism and/or radicalism. This is arguably one of the main reasons behind the frequently identified tendency for discourse standardisation (see Ellender 2015 for a review). Besides identifying the strategies used, these descriptive studies have also shown that no strategy can be truly understood outside of its broader sociocultural context as it is often mediated by a wide range of factors, including: the ideological context, which can be more or less supportive of creative uses of discourse and work either as a creative or conservative influence; the established tradition for the translation of non-standard varieties in literature, theatre or film; the status recognised to subtitling and subtitlers; the target audiences' profile; and translators' working conditions. More recently, some attention has been paid to how those strategies are received and assessed by viewers.²

Despite their great contribution, the textual analysis proposed in these studies provide AVT researchers with neither the tools required to consider the intermodal relationships identified between the different modes participating in the construction of the non-standard variety's diegetic purpose in the ST (source text), nor those to study the impact the strategies have on preserving, cancelling or modifying the intermodal relationships identified in the ST and/or the diegetic function they fulfil. Without taking into consideration the intermodal relations and how they might change in translation, it is easy to fall into the trap of assuming that a strategy of standardisation, for example, equates with eliminating meaning when this might not be the case. After all, meaning may be expressed through other modes, through the tradition identified for the translation of non-standard varieties in a given target context and the sociocultural context mediating the viewers' interpretation. In this article, we propose a corpus-based quantitative analysis capable of identifying: the linguistic varieties and their associated extralinguistic meaning, the intermodal relationships and the diegetic functions they fulfil, and finally, the strategies used in translation and their impact on preserving, cancelling or modifying the ST intermodal relationships as well as the diegetic functions they accomplish. The importance of the sociocultural context of any translation makes incomplete any analysis that does not include the study of the possible correlations between the general tendencies

² See, for example, Chiaro 2007, 2008; Bucaria 2008; Caffrey 2008, 2009; Perego et al. 2010; Bairstow 2011; Kunzli and Ehrensberger-Dow 2011; Tuominen 2011.

extrapolated from the corpus analysis and its possible mediating contextual elements. In this article, however, we will be focusing on the corpus-based quantitative analysis, given the aim of proposing a corpus multimodal analysis and for reasons of space.

3. Corpora analysis of subtitled films with non-standard discourse

A comprehensive study capable of accounting for all the issues raised in the previous section demands a methodology organised in three different levels: textual dimension, diegetic dimension and sociocultural dimension (Ramos Pinto 2018). In this article, we will focus on the first two dimensions. The textual dimension will be examined through an initial quantitative analysis of the units in the corpus focused on identifying the non-standard varieties and the features used in their translation in the source and target texts. This will allow us to identify patterns pertaining to the kind of variety and its communicative meaning, as well as the procedures used in translation, and to extrapolate the more general strategies adopted. The analysis of the diegetic dimension will include a further quantitative exploration of the identified intermodal relationships as well as a qualitative analysis of the assumed diegetic functions. As mentioned before, the aim of annotating the corpus according to intermodal relationships is to collect frequency data on the type of identified intermodal relationships and extrapolate the diegetic functions non-standard discourse assumes in the source product. It also considers how these might have changed in translation. The main advantage of this type of annotation and descriptive analysis is that it allows for the examination of patterns in a larger corpora. It is, however, important not to reduce the analysis to a taxonomic exercise. Instead, one should take such frequency data as an initial step towards a more comprehensive analysis, one which enables a consideration of sociocultural elements and explores the factors mediating the choices made. In this article, as mentioned before, for reasons of space, we will be focusing on the textual and diegetic level of analysis and will not be able to discuss sociocultural level of analysis in detail, but good examples can be found in Rosa (2004), Ramos Pinto (2010), Yu (2017) and Silvester (2018).

In this article, we will describe each level of analysis, discussing the different steps, from corpus building to the development of the typologies used to classify the units in the corpus. This will be achieved using an illustrative case-study focused on the Portuguese translations of the films *Pygmalion* (1938 and 1981) and *My Fair Lady* (1964). The categories here presented were defined for this specific case-study, but the methodology followed to define the categories is sufficiently flexible and adaptable to different language pairs and

sociolinguistic contexts.³ Due to the case-study's illustrative function and natural limitations of a journal article, it is important to note that the focus of the article will remain on the discussion of the methodology followed and not on presenting a detailed analysis of the results obtained in the case-study.

3.1. Corpus

The corpus includes six subtitled target texts of three films: *Pygmalion*, 1938 (dir. Anthony Asquith and Leslie Howard); *My Fair Lady*, 1964 (dir. George Cukor); and *Pygmalion*, 1983 (dir. Alan Cooke). Despite the fact that these are three different films and that one is a musical, their scripts present a remarkable resemblance as they are all based on Bernard Shaw's play *Pygmalion* (1916). Figure 1 presents more details on the source and target texts included in the corpus. For those unfamiliar with the storyline, this is a comedy about a professor of phonetics (Professor Higgins) who makes a bet with a friend (Colonel Pickering) that in six months he can train a dishevelled cockney flower girl (Eliza Doolittle) to pass for a duchess at an ambassador's garden party by teaching her to assume a more genteel manner and 'impeccable speech'. Eliza, unaware of the bet, embarks on this venture because 'speaking properly' will allow her to work in a shop. The play is a sharp satire of the rigid British class system of the day and a visible attempt to highlight the issue of women's independence. Central to the plot is the use of cockney – a particular non-standard variety of British English. It is central for the production of comedy and one of the main elements driving the social critique of the play.

³ Mubarak (2019) applies a similar methodology to analyse an English-Arabic corpus, confirming that this is indeed a sufficiently flexible methodology to account for different language pairs and sociocultural contexts.

	Subtitled Target Texts	Broadcasting date	Distribution platform	Source text	TT Number of Units	TT Number of Words
TT1	<i>Minha Linda Lady</i>	1987	State TV channel - RTP	<i>My Fair Lady</i> (1964)	313	1882
TT2	<i>Pigmalião</i>	1994	State TV channel - RTP	<i>Pygmalion</i> (1938)	320	2257
TT3	<i>Pigmalião</i>	1995	Private TV channel - SIC	<i>Pygmalion</i> (1983)	478	3366
TT4	<i>Minha Linda Lady</i>	1996	Private TV channel - SIC	<i>My Fair Lady</i> (1964)	361	2043
TT5	<i>Minha Linda Senhora</i>	1994	DVD	<i>My Fair Lady</i> (1964)	372	2132
TT6	<i>Pigmalião</i>	2001	DVD	<i>Pygmalion</i> (1938)	378	2342

Figure 1. Source and target texts included in the corpus

The collation of the corpus involved gathering together the subtitled target texts of the films under analysis and the transcription of the speech and subtitles modes. To ensure the homogeneity of the corpus, the self-contained musical moments episodically inserted in *My Fair Lady* were not transcribed or included in the corpus. The transcripts were later a) divided in units of analysis corresponding to the sentences⁴ of the target product and their corresponding utterances in the source film, b) organised in a parallel corpus, and c) grouped according to the scenes they belong to. The term ‘scene’ is here taken as a segment of film usually taking place in a single time and place (exceptions taken with montage sequences) and often with the same characters (Bordwell and Thompson [1979] 2008). The corpus included nine scenes, but in this article, for reasons of space, we will be focusing the discussion on the main character Elisa and the translation of the five scenes in which this character participated. Scene 1 takes place under the arches of the Covent Garden theatre and brings together the high-class and smartly-dressed theatre goers (that remain under the arches after the play to avoid the heavy rain while waiting for a taxi) and a variety of sellers and flower-girls like Elisa looking disheveled and in poor and dirty dark clothes. Prof. Higgins is taking notes of what is said due to its interest in phonetics, but is thought to be a police officer, creating confusion and a comic scene that sets the stage for the bet between colonel Pickering and Prof. Higgins. Scene 2 takes place in Prof. Higgins house when Elisa comes to pay him a visit to convince him to teach her

⁴ Sentence is here defined as “a sequence of words initiated by a word in capital letters and concluded with a punctuation mark” (*The Oxford Dictionary of English Grammar*).

to speak 'properly' so that she can get a job in a flower shop. Elisa's poor and dirty clothes (and somewhat rude behaviour) contrast sharply with the extremely organised and clean high-middle class house as well as the propriety of the characters present. In Scene 3 Elisa has joined the tea party organised by Prof. Higgins' mother taking place in her house (*Pygmalion*) or the Ascot Races (*My Fair Lady*). Elisa is now beautifully dressed as a lady is expected to dress, and her pronunciation is perfect, but the topics of conversation and vocabulary used are far from those expected for such an event creating a famous moment of comedy. In Scene 4 Elisa is back and Prof. Higgins house after the ambassador's ball. Elisa is beautifully dressed and in complete command of her discourse. Prof. Higgins self-congratulation makes Elisa furious at him and an argument ensues in which she switches from standard English to cockney when she wants to support her argument. The fact that Elisa is now in complete control of her speech is made even more noticeable in Scene 5 taking place in the house of Prof. Higgins' mother. Elisa and Prof Higgins are arguing again about Elisa's future and she switches from standard English to cockney at will to make her point.

3.2. Textual dimension

Following on from the work of Brodovich (1997), Dimitrova (2002), Leppihalme (2000), Rosa (2004) and Hodson (2014), the annotation scheme built for this level of analysis has one main governing principle. The focus of the analysis will not be on evaluating the varieties' real-world accuracy and consistency, but rather on identifying the extralinguistic meanings conventionally associated with those same varieties, meanings which are then imported to the film's fictional world.⁵ In this sense, the scheme used for the classification of the corpus under discussion in this article includes categories that express the communicative meaning associated to those varieties by viewers (see Figure 2)⁶ and not the meaning potentially recognised to them by linguists using a standard linguistics' typology.

⁵ This means that the scheme will necessarily change according to the language/cultural system under analysis, but it is also what ensures that this methodology is sufficiently flexible to be applicable to different contexts/studies.

⁶ The communicative meanings associated to the varieties identified in this case-study by the general audience shown in Figure 2 have been established with the help of existing studies on the subject (Rosa 2004) and confirmed by a questionnaire made to 55 university students.




Figure 2. Typology of fictional non-standard varieties and the communicative meanings associated to them

This particular scheme was built to account for the extra-linguistic and communicative meaning associated to linguistic varieties in the English and Portuguese source and target context in question. It should thus be taken as an illustrative example. Other studies focusing on different sociolinguistic contexts or films might find it difficult to apply the same categories; however, the principle of defining categories of classification on the basis of the varieties communicative meaning should apply to any sociolinguistic and filmic context.

The varieties are organised in a cline according to their level of prestige in relation to the standard variety to which we associate the highest level of prestige. In that sense, a first distinction was made between ‘standard’ (units with features interpreted as the accepted standard) and ‘non-standard’ (units marked by the presence of features deviant from the standard). To express the different levels of prestige recognised to the non-standard varieties, a second distinction was made between ‘oral’, ‘regional’ and ‘substandard varieties’. The category ‘oral’ distinguishes those units in which features of oral speech (e.g., contractions),⁷ despite technically not being non-standard features, are used to mark the discourse as less prestigious (this seems particularly effective in the subtitles’ written discourse given that deviations from the orthographic norm visually mark the discourse as deviant and less prestigious).

Example taken from *My Fair Lady* (transl. 1987)

Contraction that typically happens in oral discourse (my underline):

Elisa: *Isso nem chega pr'a uma violeta!*

[Standard Portuguese: Isso nem chega para uma violeta!]

7

The category ‘regional’ is used to distinguish the units with features expressing belonging to a particular region but which are not interpreted as particularly less prestigious than the standard.

Example taken from *Pygmalion* (transl. 1995)

Example of a change of ‘v’ for ‘b’ that typically happens in the northern dialect (my underline):

Elisa: Eu nem sabia como estaba bem.

[Standard Portuguese: Eu nem sabia como estava bem.]

The final category of ‘sub-standard varieties’ distinguishes units with features reflecting a very low level of education, low social status and associated with low-prestige discourse.

Example taken from *Pygmalion* (transl. 1995):

Example of metathesis and addition of vowel at the end of a word, typical sociolectal features expressing low level of education (my underline):

Elisa: Num foi pru mal.

[Standard Portuguese: Não foi por mal]

The further distinction between sub-standard regional and social comes in light of the fact that, at times, these substandard varieties may also indicate a connection to a specific region or social group.

In addition to the general classification of units, we propose a second level of classification focused on the features used in the translation of non-standard varieties. We recognise four main types of features: morpho-syntactic, lexical, phonetic (to be used in the analysis of the speech mode) and orthographic (to be used in the analysis of the subtitles mode in addition to the previous ones).

Example of a morphological feature taken from *My Fair Lady* (transl. 1996):

Morphological change of the verb and syntactic structure of the sentence (my underline):

Elisa: Ora amostre lá qui escreveu de mim

[Standard Portuguese: Ora mostre lá o que escreveu de mim.]

Example of a phonetic feature taken from *Pygmalion* 1938 english edition (given the difficulty of offering an example of a phonetic feature in writing without the use of a phonetic alphabet, we chose to offer the example and annotation given by Bernard Shaw himself):

Elisa: *And to pay for them tə-oo: make no mistake.*

Example of an orthographic features taken from *Pygmalion* (transl. 1994):

Example of changes in the orthography to express the non-standard phonetic form. An example is the use of apostrophes as in ‘*screveu* instead of *escreveu* or the change of vowels such as in *dezia* instead of *dizia*.

Finally, it will be important to note that the process of annotation took the ‘sentence’ as the unit of analysis assuming that the categories used were exclusive, meaning that one could not use two categories to annotate the same unit (the number of units in each TT is presented in Figure 1). Assuming viewers will interpret the discourse on the basis of the most prominent variety/features used, units with features from two or more varieties were classified only once and according to the most prominent variety. Prominence was determined according to the prestige associated to that variety, i.e., the least prestigious the variety the more prominent its features were assumed to be.

Example of a uni ‘non-standard oral’ (ellipsis of initial vowel when followed by an *s*) and features identified as ‘sub-standard regional’ (change of *v* for *b*). The unit was classified as ‘sub-standard regional’, given that those features are more prominent. Example taken from *Pygmalion* (1944):

Elisa: Como é que sei que é berdade o que screbeu de mim? (my underline)
 (Como é que sei que é verdade o que escreveu de mim?) (Standard Portuguese, my underline)

The classification of each unit included in the corpus according to this typology produced frequency data for each source and target texts. The results pertaining to the source texts presented in Table 1:

Table 1. Relative results regarding standard and non-standard fictional varieties in the source text

	Prestigious variety	Less prestigious variety	Non-prestigious variety
	Standard	Oral	Substandard social
Scene 1	11% [7]	28% [18]	62% [40]
Scene 2	14% [17]	27% [33]	60% [74]
Scene 3	63% [30]	19% [9]	19% [9]
Scene 4	83% [52]	16% [10]	2% [1]
Scene 5	85% [148]	14% [25]	1% [1]

Looking at the data collected, the first aspect that immediately stands out is the fact that the preservation of non-standard varieties is highly prominent in the first two scenes and that it gradually becomes less visible towards the last scene, where only 15% of the units could be classified as non-standard. This is hardly surprising given the film’s storyline, but it does confirm the central communicative and diegetic role of the non-standard discourse in the film. Taking the model previously discussed (Figure 2), we can conclude that discourse is participating in the clear depiction of Elisa in the first two scenes as someone with low educational level and low social status. Later in the action, her character evolves towards a profile similar to other characters with a high educational level and high social status. It is also interesting to note that features typical of oral speech (and which would not necessarily be used to depict the speaker as having a low educational level and low social status) are here used for that purpose and play a prominent role in the last two scenes in which they become the non-standard variety with the highest visibility. This picture becomes even more interesting when we look at the type of non-standard features employed, as presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Average results regarding the type of features used in the source texts’ fictional non-standard varieties

	Features of non-standard varieties					
	Lexical		Phonetic		Morpho-syntactic	
Scene 1	22%	[13]	38%	[22]	40%	[23]
Scene 2	24%	[26]	37%	[40]	38%	[41]
Scene 3	61%	[11]	17%	[3]	22%	[4]
Scene 4	9%	[1]	55%	[6]	36%	[4]
Scene 5	12%	[3]	50%	[13]	38%	[10]

Turning our attention to the target subtitled films, some patterns start to emerge regarding the strategies and procedures followed. The first level of analysis followed similar steps to the analysis of the source text - once the classification of all units in the target texts was completed, we proceeded with an initial quantitative analysis focused on examining the relative weight of the frequency results. We then organised the data chronologically and according to the platform in which the target translations were distributed (see contextual data in Figure 1). This allowed

us to identify certain patterns regarding the strategies and procedures followed in the TTs and to notice that the results clustered into three different groups that coincided with the platform in which the target translations were distributed, suggesting that medium might have been in this case a strong mediating factor. Given the illustrative nature of this study, Table 3 presents the results regarding the varieties and features used the target texts already organised according to the three clusters identified: Group 1 includes the translations broadcasted in RTP (the state television channel); Group 2 includes the translations broadcasted in SIC (a private television channel) and Group 3 includes the translations distributed on DVD.

Table 3. Percentages of the non-standard varieties in the target texts

		Prestigious variety		Less prestigious variety		Non-prestigious variety	
		Standard		Oral		Substandard social	
GROUP 1							
Scene 1	TT2	35	78%	5	14%	4	8%
	TT1	33					
Scene 2	TT2	70	79%	8	11%	6	9%
	TT1	62					
Scene 3	TT2	30	86%	2	11%	1	3%
	TT1	26					
Scene 4	TT2	42	100%	0	0%	0	0%
	TT1	41					
Scene 5	TT2	117	100%	0	0%	0	0%
	TT1	115					
GROUP 2							
Scene 1	TT4	29	61%	6	11%	15	28%
	TT3	42		6			
Scene 2	TT4	59	65%	10	10%	25	25%
	TT3	83		12			
Scene 3	TT4	25	73%	4	9%	87	18%
	TT3	37		3			
Scene 4	TT4	48	100%	0	0%	0	0%
	TT3	63		0			
Scene 5	TT4	133	100%	0	0%	0	0%
	TT3	174		0			
GROUP 3							
Scene 1	TT6	51	98%	1	2%	0	0%
	TT5	50		1			
Scene 2	TT6	95	97%	3	3%	0	0%
	TT5	94		3			
Scene 3	TT6	37	97%	1	3%	0	0%
	TT5	37		1			
Scene 4	TT6	51	100%	0	0%	0	0%
	TT5	49		0			
Scene 5	TT6	139	100%	0	0%	0	0%
	TT5	137		0			

Table 4. Percentages of the non-standard features in the target texts

Features of non-standard varieties							
		Lexical		Ortographic		Morpho-syntatic	
GROUP 1							
Scene 1	TT1	5	46%	3	32%	2	22%
	TT2	4		3		2	
Scene 2	TT1	11	53%	6	28%	4	19%
	TT2	7		4		3	
Scene 3	TT1	0	5%	0	0%	0	0%
	TT2	0		0		0	
Scene 4	TT1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	TT2	0		0		0	
Scene 5	TT1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	TT2	0		0		0	
GROUP 2							
Scene 1	TT3	4	19%	17	73%	2	8%
	TT4	4		15		2	
Scene 2	TT3	8	19%	31	75%	2	6%
	TT4	7		26		2	
Scene 3	TT3	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%
	TT4	1		0		0	
Scene 4	TT3	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	TT4	0		0		0	
Scene 5	TT3	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	TT4	0		0		0	
GROUP 3							
Scene 1	TT5	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
	TT6	1		0		0	
Scene 2	TT5	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%
	TT6	3		0		0	
Scene 3	TT5	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
	TT6	1		0		0	
Scene 4	TT5	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	TT6	0		0		0	
Scene 5	TT5	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	TT6	0		0		0	

Note: the tables exclude categories with no results.

Table 3 shows that all three groups present strategies of preservation as they all show the presence of non-standard varieties in the target subtitles. Having said this, it is also clearly visible that they show very different levels of preservation in the sense that Group 3 presents a strategy of almost complete standardisation of discourse, while Groups 1 and 2 present a much clearer effort to include non-standard discourse.

Directing our initial attention to group 3, it is impossible not to notice the overwhelming presence of the standard variety (always above 97%). There are instances of less prestigious ‘oral’ features in the first three scenes expressing a certain, although extremely limited, evolution of the character. This, however, seems to be compromised by the low frequency of such features (never higher than 3%), allowing us to conclude that the communicative meanings introduced in the target text through subtitling are almost contrary to those found in the source text. If in the source text, Elisa’s discourse presented her as a character with low social status and low educational level (see Figure 1), the Elisa brought forward in the subtitles presents a discourse typical of a character with high social status and high educational level. Elisa is at that stage placed closer to characters such as Prof. Higgins (with a high level of education and a high social status) and consequently further away from other working-class characters (whose discourse distinguishes them as characters with low social status and low educational level).

Group 2, although presenting a more standardised discourse than the source texts, allows the non-standard varieties to assume a much more prominent role and visibility. It is undeniable that the standard variety always assumes a higher percentage than any other category (always higher than 60%); however, the less and non-prestigious varieties are present in more than a third of the units in the first two scenes, showing a clear intention to portray Elisa’s low social status and educational background. This seems to be confirmed by the fact that the ‘substandard social’ category always assumes a higher frequency when compared to the ‘oral’ category. As a result, and given the visibility that non-standard features assume in written discourse (see discussion in section 2), one could argue that Elisa’s profile is indeed similar to that erected in the source text. The data collected regarding the type of features used seems to support this assumption: morpho-syntactic features are almost absent, but the presence of lexical (19% in the first two scenes) and orthographic (73% and 75% in the first two scenes) items in particular is quite noticeable. Particularly, when taking into account the concern with readability always present in subtitling, and the fact that orthographic features are even more present than phonetic features in the ST.

Group 1 could be placed somewhere in-between the two previous approaches. The movement of standardisation is not as extreme as the one identified in Group 3, but it is far more visible than in Group 2. Contrary to what could be identified in the source text, the category ‘substandard social’ always assumes the lowest frequencies. This seems to point towards an effort to depict Elisa with a profile of low social status and educational background, while staying closer to the standard written discourse by opting for ‘oral’ features, interpreted

as less deviant from the more prestigious standard variety. This seems to be confirmed by the type of features employed as the data shows a clear preference for lexical features (46% and 53% in the first two scenes) in relation to morpho-syntactic features (never above 22%), commonly taken as grammatical mistakes, or orthographic features (never above 32%), deviant from the orthographic norm. The use of different strategies and the different characterisations resulting from them is summarised in Figure 3.

Example from Act 1, Scene 1: (To avoid using the phonetic alphabet necessary to transcribe the ST, the example was taken from Shaw's published english edition from 1938)			
Elisa: <i>Yer just show me what you've wrote about me.</i> [Standard Portuguese: Então mostre o que escreveu sobre mim.]			
Group	TT	Example (The underlined words show the deviation from standard Portuguese)	Communicative meaning
Group 1	TT2	<i>Mostre o que <u>'screveu</u> de mim.</i>	The use of features associated to oral discourse present a noticeable deviation from the orthographic norms and distinguishes Elisa as someone with low educational background.
Group 2	TT4	<i>Ora <u>amostre lá qui</u> escreveu.</i>	The use of features understood as substandard Portuguese distinguishes Elisa as someone with low social cultural status and educational background.
Group 3	TT6	<i>Então mostre o que escreveu.</i>	The use of standard Portuguese distinguishes Elisa as someone with a good level of education.

Figure 3: Examples of the different strategies used and the different characterisations resulting from them.

The typologies here proposed support the collection of frequency data relating to the kind of varieties and types of features used to recreate non-standard varieties both in the source and target products as well as supporting the identification of general tendencies. Organising the categories into a continuum allowed us to start interpreting those tendencies and to identify movements towards varieties/features with either a similar or dissimilar connotation. However, this remains a solely descriptive level of the verbal resources used and does not account for the fact that those resources perform a larger diegetic function in conjunction with other modes. This will be the focus of the next section focused on the diegetic dimension.

3.2. Diegetic dimension

Following in the footsteps of authors such as Perego et al. (2010) and Taylor (2003), we aim in this section to analyse subtitling in its broader multimodal context. We also propose a

methodology which allows us to identify the existing intermodal relationships in the source product as well as the impact of subtitling in maintaining or reshaping those relationships and diegetic functions. Having identified the varieties used and the features employed, it is important to identify other resources at play in the construction of meaning and the function of the participating varieties as a way of identifying the intermodal relationships through which such meaning is conveyed.

The classification scheme here presented acknowledges the existence of different networks of modes and submodes (Chaume 2004; Stockl 2004), but builds more specifically on Pastra (2008), Pérez-González (2014), Ramos Pinto (2018), and Bordwell and Thompson ([1979] 2008). Three modes are taken into consideration: speech mode, *mise-en-scène* mode, and subtitles mode. The speech mode recognises two categories: *accent* and *vocabulary/morpho-syntax*. The classification scheme presented earlier will provide detailed data on the varieties, type of vocabulary and morpho-syntactic features used, but *accent* is another element to consider for its important role in the immediate identification of the character's speech variety. The *mise-en-scène* mode includes three categories: *costume and makeup*, *figure behaviour* and *setting*. These three categories will allow us to account for the character's appearance, actions and the location of such action, which are essential resources in the construction of meaning and the identification of the diegetic function.

Other resources such as lighting, camera angles or types of shot are also important in the meaning creation process in film, leading us to question the sustainability of an analytical framework and methodology that only takes into consideration part of the resources in the film. The choices made in this respect stem from the assumption that non-standard discourse plays a role in fulfilling specific diegetic functions (see section 2) in conjunction with specific visual and aural resources. These resources were thus selected for the quantitative analysis, leaving the outstanding resources to a broader qualitative analysis if deemed necessary. This is not to say that some resources are more important in film than others, but only that not all the resources in a film participate in all lines of meaning with similar prominence (Baldry and Thibault 2006). Related to this, it is important to consider that selection is also part of the reception and translation moments, in the sense that viewers and translators must be selective in their allocation of attention. As Bateman and Teseng put it, “the dynamic unfolding of audiovisual representations in real-time would otherwise overwhelm the viewer rather than giving rise to the broadly similar responses to film actually observed” (2015, 131). This appears to be in line with results in perceptual psychology showing that perception is selective – “we attend to objects that bear salient meaning for certain goals” (Gibson 1979, 48). Additionally,

given that film is a mediated and constructed product, there is a good reason to assume that any perceptual guidance offered in a given film is intended and that the possibility of identifying certain resources as more salient or participating more prominently in the construction of a specific line of meaning is also purposefully embedded in the film.

Overall, we propose an additional level of classification in which we collect data on the intermodal relationships identified between the meaning expressed by the linguistic varieties identified in the first level of classification and each of the resources included in this second level of classification. The framework used for the identification and definition of the intermodal relations took into consideration the COSMOROE model (Pastra 2008), a framework that “looks at cross-media relations from a multimedia discourse perspective, i.e., from the perspective of the dialectics between different pieces of information for forming a coherent message” (Pastra 2008, 306). This is a very complete and refined model on the basis of which one can account for the different types of intermodal relations between any two or more resources of an audiovisual product. However, given the focus of the corpus methodology proposed in this article on the translation of linguistic varieties, a less detailed framework was developed out of the COSMOROE model: one focused mostly on the lines of meaning in which the linguistic varieties participate and the potential intermodal relations between non-standard discourse and the resources previously discussed in this section as shown in Figure 4.




Figure 4. Model of intermodal relations (based on the COSMOROE model, Pastra 2008)

Given the translatorial perspective motivating this methodology, an extra category of confirmation has been added to Pastra’s model. The choice of strategy or procedure is often mediated by the consideration of having the same meaning being expressed in modes other than the speech mode. This framework we propose in this article recognises two core intermodal relations of *confirmation* and *contradiction*. *Confirmation* refers to situations in which the meanings expressed between modes corroborate each other either because they are

semantically equivalent or because they complement each other. In this sense, the intermodal relation of *confirmation* is further divided into two subtypes: equivalence (equivalent to the category ‘token-token equivalence’ in Pastra’s model) and complementary (equivalent to the category ‘apposition complementarity’ in Pastra’s model). *Equivalence* refers to situations in which what is expressed by the different modes is semantically equivalent. For example, in the case of the Covent Garden workers in *Pygmalion*’s first scene, the speech mode presents a non-standard variety with very low prestige, depicting the characters as having a low level of education and low social status, and in the visual *mise-en-scène* mode we find characters dressed in poor clothing and gesturing in ways commonly interpreted as ‘poor manners’ and associated to the working class of the time. *Complementarity* refers to situations in which what is expressed by one element provides information on the other. This relation is different from the previous one as it is linked to a specific context and not promoted as generally valid. An example could be the Covent Garden setting in which the workers appear: having a character appear in Covent Garden does not immediately portray that character as poor, with low educational level and low social status, but in combination with the other resources it does confirm and complement such line of meaning. The final category to consider is *contradiction*. It refers to situations in which resources either convey opposite meanings or are semantically incompatible. In this case, each of the resources are distinct (sometimes opposite) and can stand on its own, but their combination creates a larger multimedia message (equivalent to the category ‘contradiction independence’ in Pastra’s model).

Going back to our illustrative case-study, the classification of units according to the intermodal relations identified between the resources in the speech and *mise-en-scène* modes in the source films and between the subtitles and the speech and *mise-en-scène* modes in the target versions allowed us to collect data on the preservation, cancelling and modification of the ST’s intermodal relations.

Table 5. Intermodal relations between non-standard discourse in subtitles mode and resources from the speech and *mise-en-scène* mode

		Intermodal relations between linguistic varieties and elements of the speech and mise-en-scène modes		Source texts	Target Texts		
					Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Scene 1	Prestigious variety	Confirmation	Accent, Costume and Makeup, Figure behaviour, Setting	0%	0%	0%	0%
		Contradiction	Accent, Costume and Makeup, Figure behaviour, Setting	11%	78%	61%	98%
	Less prestigious varieties	Confirmation	Accent, Costume and Makeup, Figure behaviour, Setting	0%	0%	0%	0%
		Contradiction	Accent, Costume and Makeup, Figure behaviour, Setting	89%	22%	39%	2%
Scene 2	Prestigious variety	Confirmation	Setting	14%	79%	65%	97%
		Contradiction	Accent, Costume and Makeup, Figure behaviour	14%	79%	65%	97%
	Less prestigious varieties	Confirmation	Accent, Costume and Makeup, Figure behaviour	86%	20%	35%	3%
		Contradiction	Setting	86%	20%	35%	3%
Scene 3	Prestigious variety	Confirmation	Accent, Costume and Makeup, Figure behaviour, Setting	64%	86%	73%	98%
		Contradiction	Accent, Costume and Makeup, Figure behaviour, Setting	64%	86%	73%	98%
	Less prestigious varieties	Confirmation	Accent, Costume and Makeup, Figure behaviour, Setting	42%	14%	27%	3%
		Contradiction	Accent, Costume and Makeup, Figure behaviour, Setting	42%	14%	27%	3%
Scene 4	Prestigious variety	Confirmation	Accent, Costume and Makeup, Figure behaviour, Setting	83%	100%	100%	100%
		Contradiction	Accent, Costume and Makeup, Figure behaviour, Setting	83%	100%	100%	100%
	Less prestigious varieties	Confirmation	Accent, Costume and Makeup, Figure behaviour, Setting	17%	0%	0%	0%
		Contradiction	Accent, Costume and Makeup, Figure behaviour, Setting	17%	0%	0%	0%
Scene 5	Prestigious variety	Confirmation	Accent, Costume and Makeup, Figure behaviour, Setting	85%	100%	100%	100%
		Contradiction	Accent, Costume and Makeup, Figure behaviour, Setting	85%	100%	100%	100%
	Less prestigious varieties	Confirmation	Accent, Costume and Makeup, Figure behaviour, Setting	15%	0%	0%	0%
		Contradiction	Accent, Costume and Makeup, Figure behaviour, Setting	15%	0%	0%	0%

The data collected on the source texts shows that the non-standard discourse identified different intermodal relations with the resources in other modes and, as a result, participated in the fulfilment of different functions throughout the five scenes under consideration. Focusing on the main character Elisa, we can conclude that, in the first scene, the non-standard discourse (89%) previously identified is in confirmation with all the resources of the speech and mise-en-scène modes. This fulfils the diegetic function of character characterisation and portrays Elisa as having a low educational level and low social status. It also helps to define clear power relations between her and characters speaking standard English, as well as solidarity relations between her and other characters speaking cockney. In the second scene, the relations of confirmation are maintained with all the modes with exception of one: the setting, now a more formal environment in which one would not expect to find non-standard discourse. In this case, the non-standard discourse maintains the character's profile while also participating in the production of comedy. In the third scene, the non-standard discourse appears only in specific moments, and in a striking contradiction with all the other resources which now express the

opposite meaning; this results in unforgettable comedic moments. In the last two scenes, it is possible to find similar intermodal combinations, but now to show that Elisa masters the difference between standard and non-standard discourse and emerges as a confident and educated woman capable of deciding her own future. This confirms that similar intermodal relations can be fulfilling different diegetic functions.

If we turn our attention to the target texts, we notice without surprise that Group 3 includes the texts in which the intermodal relations identified in the ST seem to have been modified the most. Taking into consideration that subtitling guidelines used in the broadcasting channels in question ask subtitlers to assume that the viewers have no knowledge of the source language, the complete standardisation of discourse leaves the visual resources as the ones mostly responsible for constructing Elisa's profile as a poor and uneducated character. Considering that the subtitling tradition has accustomed Portuguese viewers to a highly standardised discourse in subtitling, it would not be surprising if, despite the loss of realism, the character's profile (together with the interpersonal relations of power and solidarity) is still maintained in the first two scenes. Only a reception study could give us more certainty in this matter, but it seems safe to assume that viewers would prioritise meaning expressed through visual resources and not interpret Elisa as an educated/high class lady disguised as a flower girl, for example. In this case in particular, given the fact that the source language is English, one can also assume that at least part of the viewers will have sufficient knowledge of English to notice the difference between the standard and non-standard English. This prioritisation of the visual resources and resulting fulfilment of the diegetic function in which the non-standard varieties participate seems, however, more challenging to achieve in subsequent scenes in which the visual resources change and progressively establish relations of contradiction with the speech mode (now of confirmation with the subtitle mode) in support of comedic moments. Despite the occasional non-standard feature (3%) in the last two scenes, it is reasonable to assume that the comedic moments have been highly attenuated or eliminated and that the viewer is left slightly confused. It is possible to conclude that in target contexts with a strong association between standard and written discourse, standardisation of discourse does not necessarily result in the elimination of meaning when the intermodal relations in the ST are of confirmation. However, other resources of compensation would have to be employed when the intermodal relationship is of contradiction.

This seems to be confirmed by the analysis of Group 1. Although following a strong standardisation strategy, the TTs maintain a larger number of relations of confirmation than in Group 3, even if fewer than in the ST and attenuated in value. They also make more use of

elements such as forms of address to clarify interpersonal relationships. Particular care in having non-standard features more frequently is noticeable after the first scene, showing awareness of the risk of elimination of meaning in situations dominated by a relationship of contradiction in the ST. This is mostly achieved by the use of oral features as shown by the textual analysis, but the subtitling tradition established and the strong association of written discourse with standard orthography would promote the interpretation of these features as substandard.

Group 2, as already identified in the textual analysis, shows a very different attitude. The preservation strategies identified resulted in target translations with a distribution of intermodal relations closer to the one identified in the ST, leading us to assume that the character's profile and diegetic functions were also maintained. This shows, in the context of a strong standardisation tradition of the Portuguese target context, an innovative and defiant attitude regarding the verbal resources used to recreate linguistic variation. It also reveals a novel approach to non-verbal resources traditionally seen as able to carry the full meaning on their own. This seems to point towards the conclusion that the preservation of linguistic varieties results in the natural preservation of the ST's intermodal relations and characters' profiles. That could, however, be interpreted as a naïve assumption as the target context might in specific settings promote different interpretations of both the resources in the *mise-en-scène* mode and the intermodal relations between them and the verbal mode.

4. Concluding remarks

In this article, we have proposed a corpus methodology for the study of the translation of linguistic varieties in subtitled audiovisual products. Our objective was to offer analytical tools that, based on a large corpus, were capable of identifying: a) the communicative meaning non-standard varieties import into the fictional source text; b) how these meanings and varieties are recreated; c) the intermodal relationships maintained between non-standard varieties and the resources in other modes; d) the diegetic functions they fulfil; and finally, e) the impact of specific translation strategies on preserving, cancelling or modifying the intermodal relations and diegetic functions.

Assuming a multimodal approach, this methodology understands subtitling as an added mode that comes to participate in the network of intermodal relations of the target product. This means that, on the one hand, subtitling strategies have the potential to preserve, cancel or modify those same intermodal relations and diegetic functions in which they participate. On

the other hand, it means that a comprehensive analysis of subtitling cannot remain focused on the verbal mode alone and needs to account for the intermodal network in which subtitling participates. As a result, this methodology focuses on the communicative meanings imported by the non-standard varieties to the fictional world of the source and target products, and the intermodal relations identified between modes. Existing methodologies proposed in previous studies have allowed us to identify non-standard varieties, the communicative meanings imported and the strategies and procedures followed in translation. Building on previous work, this methodology takes a step forward and additionally allows the study of the diegetic functions in which the non-standard varieties participate and the multimodal context in which they are constructed, by means of a corpus approach. As it was possible to conclude with our illustrative case-study, this allows us to examine the impact of translation strategies in preserving, cancelling or modifying the ST's intermodal relations, but also to consider translation strategies in a larger diegetic context. The scenes previously discussed allowed us to understand that a strategy of standardisation and the cancelling of specific intermodal relations do not necessarily mean loss of meaning when certain conditions are met, the most important being the existence of an intermodal relation of confirmation between *mise-en-scène* and speech modes. More empirical evidence is necessary on how viewers interpret scenes in which a strategy of complete standardization of discourse was followed. Our experience as viewers does seem to support the conclusion that in situations of intermodal relationships of confirmation, other resources in the visual mode can play a compensatory role and ensure that the diegetic function is not cancelled. However, our analysis has also allowed us to conclude that the opposite is also true: one cannot assume that visual resources will always be sufficient to compensate for the strategy of standardization when the intermodal relations are of contradiction.

As mentioned earlier this article focused on the first two levels of a more comprehensive methodology that includes a third level of analysis in which the TT's sociocultural context is taken into consideration. Going back to our illustrative case, it would be relevant to examine, among other contextual factors, the apparent existing correlation between the strategies identified in the quantitative analysis and the broadcasting platform along with the sociocultural role they fulfil. It seems plausible to suggest, for example, that the sociocultural role assumed by RTP (the state channel responsible for the TTs in group 1) as 'public service' has promoted a stronger standardization strategy, while SIC (responsible for the TTs in group 2), presenting itself as 'independent television' (the channel's motto) and an "innovative alternative to RTP" (my translation, SIC website), would be comfortable promoting a less

standardized discourse in subtitling. The study of the mediating factors of translation is not something new in Audiovisual Translation, but the analysis on the basis of a large corpus taking into consideration the ST's multimodal nature will support a more comprehensive examination of the potential correlation between general patterns of translational behaviour and contextual factors. We believe the corpus methodology here proposed is an important tool to achieve that goal.

References

- Antonini, Rachele. 2005. "The Perception of Subtitled Humor in Italy." *Humor* 18 (2): 209–225.
- Baldry, Anthony, and Paul Thibault. 2006. *Multimodal Transcription and Text Analysis: A Multimedia Toolkit and Coursebook with Associated On-line Course*. London, New York: Equinox.
- Baños, Rocio. 2013. "'That is so Cool': Investigating the Translation of Adverbial Intensifiers in English-Spanish Dubbing Through a Parallel Corpus of Sitcoms." *Perspectives* 21 (4): 526-542.
- Bateman, John. 2014. *Text and Image: A Critical Introduction to the Visual/verbal Divide*. London: Routledge.
- Bateman, John, and Chiao Tseng. 2015. "The Establishment of Interpretative Expectations in Film." In *Multimodality and Cognitive Linguistics*, edited by María Pinar Sanz, 131-146. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Blake, Norman. 1981. *Non-Standard Language in English Literature*. London: Andre Deutsch.
- Bordwell, David, and Kristin Thompson. [1979] 2008. *Film Art: An introduction*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Brodovich, Olga 1997, "Translation Theory and Non-Standard Speech in Fiction." *Perspectives* 5 (1): 25-30.
- Brisset, Annie. 1996. *A Sociocritique of Translation: Theatre and Alterity in Quebec, 1968-1988*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Bucaria, Chiara, and Delia Chiaro. 2007. "End-user Perception of Screen Translation: The Case of Italian Dubbing." *TradTerm* 13: 91-118.

- Chaume, Frederic. 2004. "Film Studies and Translation Studies: Two Disciplines at Stake in Audiovisual Translation." *META* 49 (1): 12–24.
- Diaz-Cintas, Jorge. 2008. "Audiovisual Translation Comes of Age." In *Between Text and Image. Updating Research in Screen Translation*, edited by Delia Chiaro, Christine Heiss and Chiara Bucaria, 1-9. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dimitrova, Brigitta. 2002. "Orality, Literacy, Reproduction of Discourse and the Translation of Dialect." In *Dialektübersetzung und Dialekte im Multimedia*, edited by I. Helin, 121-139. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Ellender, Claire. 2015. *Dealing with Difference in Audiovisual Translation: Subtitling Linguistic Variation in Films*. Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Freddi, Maria. 2013. "Constructing a Corpus of Translated Films: A Corpus View of Dubbing." *Perspectives* 21 (4): 491-503.
- Fuentes Luque, Adrián. 2003. "An Empirical Approach to the Reception of AV Translated Humour." *The Translator* 9 (2): 293-306.
- Gibson, James. 1979. *The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Hatim, Basil, and Ian Mason. 1990. *Discourse and the Translator*. London: New York: Longman.
- Hodson, Jane. 2014. *Dialect in Film & Literature*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Iedema, Rick. 2003. "Multimodality, Resemiotization: Extending the Analysis of Discourse as Multi-semiotic Practice." *Visual Communication* 2 (1): 29-57.
- Jimenez Hurtado, C., and Claudia Seibel. 2012. "Multisemiotic and Multimodal Corpus Analysis in Audiodescription: TRACCE." In *Audiovisual Translation and Media Accessibility at the Crossroads*, edited by Aline Remael, Pilar Orero and Mary Carrol, 409-425. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Jiménez Hurtado, C., and Soler Gallego, S. 2013. "Multimodality, Translation and Accessibility: A Corpus-based Study of Audio Description." *Perspectives* 21 (4): 577–594.
- Kovacic, Irena. 1995. "Reception of Subtitles – The Non-existent Ideal Viewer." *Translatio (FIT Newsletter)* 14 (3-4): 376-383.
- Kozloff, Sarah. 2000. *Overhearing Film Dialogue*. Berkeley, LA: University of California Press.

- Kress, Gunther, Carey Jewitt, Jon Ogborn, and Charalampos Tsatsarelis. 2001. *Multimodal Teaching and Learning: The Rhetorics of the Science Classroom*. London, New York: Continuum.
- Lane-Mercier, Gillian. 1997. "Translating the Untranslatable: The Translator's Aesthetic, Ideological and Political Responsibility." *Target* 9 (1): 43-68.
- Lemke, Jay. 1998. "Multiplying Meaning: Visual and Verbal Semiotics in Scientific Text." In *Reading Science: Critical and Functional Perspectives on Discourses of Science*, edited by J.R. Martin and Robert Veel, 87-113. London: Routledge.
- Leppihalme, Ritva. 2000. "The Two Faces of Standardization: On the Translation of Regionalisms in Literary Dialogue." *The Translator* 6 (2): 247-269.
- Mejdell, Gunvor. 2017. "Et Dukkehjem in Arabic Translation." *Ibsen Studies* 17 (1): 28-53.
- Mubaraki, Aishah. 2019. *Representation and Subtitling of Linguistics Varieties in Egyptian Films*. Doctoral Dissertation. Leeds: University of Leeds.
- Pastra, Katerina. 2008. "COSMORE: A Cross-Media Relations Framework for Modelling Multimedia Dialectics." *Multimedia Systems* 14: 299-323.
- Perego, Elisa, Fabio Del Missier, Marco Porta, and Mauro Mosconi. 2010. "The Cognitive Effectiveness of Subtitle Processing." *Media Psychology* 13: 243-272.
- Ramos Pinto, Sara. 2009. "How Important is the Way You Say It? A Discussion on the Translation of Linguistic Varieties in Different Media." *TARGET: International Journal in Translation Studies* 21 (2): 289-307.
- Ramos Pinto, Sara. 2010. *Tradução no vazio: A variação linguística nas traduções portuguesas de Pygmalion, de Bernard Shaw, e My Fair Lady de Alan Jay Lerner*. Doctoral Dissertation. Lisbon: University of Lisbon.
- Ramos Pinto, Sara. 2018. "Film, Dialects and Subtitles: An Analytical Framework for the Study of Non-standard Varieties in Subtitling." *The Translator* 24 (1): 17-34.
- Remael, Aline, Pilar Orero, and Mary Carroll. 2012. "Audiovisual Translation and Media Accessibility at the Crossroad. In *Audiovisual Translation and Media Accessibility at the Crossroads*, edited by Aline Remael, Pilar Orero and Mary Carrol, 13-22. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Rosa, Alexandra. 2004. *Tradução, poder e ideologia: Retórica interpessoal no diálogo narrativo dickensiano em português (1950-1999)*. Doctoral Dissertation. Lisbon: University of Lisbon.
- Rosa, Alexandra. 2015. "Translating Orality, Recreating Otherness." *Translation Studies* 8 (2): 209-225.

- Silvester, Hannah. 2018. "From Paratext to Polysemiotic Network: A Holistic Approach to the Study of Subtitled Films." *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series: Themes in Translation Studies*, 14: 71–83.
- Stöckl, H. 2004. "In Between Modes: Language and Image in Printed Media. In *Perspectives on Multimodality*, edited by Eija Vetola, Cassily Charles and Martin Kaltenbacher, 9-30. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Taylor, Christopher. 2003. "Multimodal Transcription in the Analysis: Translation and Subtitling of Italian films." *The Translator* 9 (2): 191-205.
- Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Valentini, Cristina. 2008. "Forlì 1 – The Forlì Corpus of Screen Translation. Exploring Macrostructures." In *Between Text and Image. Updating Research in Screen Translation*, edited by Delia Chiaro, Christine Heiss and Chiara Bucaria, 37-50. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Yu, Jing. 2017. "Translating 'Others' as 'Us' in *Huckleberry Finn*: Dialect, Register and the Heterogeneity of Standard Language." *Language and Literature* 26 (1): 54-65.