

## 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.