

# **The Centre and the Edges. Linguistic Variation and Subtitling *Pygmalion* into Portuguese**

Alexandra Assis Rosa

## **1. Framework**

This paper analyses the Portuguese subtitling of different British English varieties as found in a descriptive study of two film adaptations of George Bernard Shaw's *Pygmalion* (1916). Several preliminary questions arose with respect to the object and aims of this study, all of them analysable in terms of centrality and marginality. First there was the question of the position of audiovisual texts within Translation Studies; second, the question of defining subtitling, both in its relation to other ways of translating audiovisual texts and in its relation to orality and writing; and finally, the issue of defining different linguistic varieties especially in regard to the way they are organized, in terms of a centre and edges, by the attitudes of native speakers. Since all these questions are significant for the description of subtitling, I shall comment on them briefly before seeing how they apply to our particular case study.

### **1.1. Translation Studies and audiovisual texts**

The growing linguistic, cultural, economic and political importance of translations of audiovisual texts (as stated by Lambert and Delabastita 1996) has led the scientific and academic community to focus attention on this phenomenon. Research generally started with the study of TV serials and films.

In Portugal, it was only in 1992 and 1993 that the public began to have access to private TV channels (SIC and TVI) and were thus given the choice between these and the two State-owned channels RTP1 and RTP2. Nowadays, a considerable part of the population of Lisbon can choose between more than 40 cable TV channels. On Portuguese channels, the vast majority of audiovisual texts are subtitled (which is also the case for cinema and video), despite the use of dubbing in a few special cases (advertisements, children's programmes and documentaries) and the growing presence of South-American soap operas dubbed in Brazilian Portuguese. This predominance of subtitling is now expanding into some cable TV channels, which began by airing dubbed

## *Subtitling Pygmalion*

programmes and have now complied with the preference or habit of the Portuguese audience for subtitling.

The growing importance of audiovisual communication has led Translation Studies to re-configure its centre of gravity, formerly occupied by the study of written and printed translations. Yet this is a recent trend, and despite the extent of material shown in Yves Gambier's 1997 *Language Transfer and Audiovisual Communication. A bibliography*, there still are relatively few articles on subtitling in general and almost nothing on subtitling in Portuguese.

### 1.2. Orality and writing

As stated by Gambier, "The anthropology of writing has shown how much power is based on writing and how much power the written word possesses" (1994: 373). However, the prestige associated with written language must now compete with the growing dignity and importance of oral language — witness the rise of Pragmatics in Linguistics, and of the study of conversation — as well as other types of audiovisual and mass communication.<sup>1</sup>

### 1.3. Subtitling and (the translation of) audiovisual texts

As a translation of audiovisual texts, subtitling is strangely marginal with respect to these texts: not only does it appear juxtaposed to them but it is also subordinate to the audiovisual messages it accompanies, never daring to attract the viewers' attention to itself. In this, it differs significantly from dubbing, where the oral verbal language of the source text is replaced by the centrality of the target text. Written printed translations, in contrast, assume their central position by substituting the source text, thus assimilating part of the prestige associated with printed texts and with literary writing in particular. The juxtaposition of source and target, characteristic of subtitling, finds its parallel only in the case of bilingual editions and consecutive interpreting.

Paradoxically, subtitling foregrounds its status as a translation of the source text it accompanies, whereas dubbing, by replacing the source text, often functions as a sort of underground or "camouflaged" translation, thus marginalizing its status as translation (Lambert and Delabastita 1996). So subtitling itself assumes simultaneously a marginal role with respect to the audiovisual text and a central role by openly manifesting its status as

---

<sup>1</sup> On the subject of orality and writing in subtitling see also Alexandra Assis Rosa (forthcoming).

translation.

#### 1.4. Definition of subtitling as translation

Within the framework of Jakobson's well-known article "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation" (1959), subtitling is here considered as an example of interlingual translation, i.e., as the creation of a Portuguese text based on an English one, and simultaneously as intersemiotic translation, since the source text is the oral discourse of actors and the target text is written, no matter how much it might pretend to be a representation of orality.

When analysing the present film adaptations, one should consider several stages of construction (as referred to by Gambier 1994) or indeed of translation: the adaptation of the Pygmalion myth, the creation of a screenplay, the re-configuration of the dialogues to be uttered by actors and, finally, interlingual translation of dialogues in subtitles (English/Portuguese) and the simultaneous intersemiotic translation (oral/written discourse and paraverbal or nonverbal behaviour/written discourse). However, here I will only focus on the last-mentioned aspects: the interlingual translation of sociocultural varieties from English into Portuguese, as well as intersemiotic translation.

#### 1.5. Linguistic variation, linguistic varieties

The motif of centrality vs. marginality is also manifest as far as linguistic varieties of British English and European Portuguese are concerned, namely in the way both are related to, evaluated and organized by the attitudes of native speakers.

The notion of interlingual translation requires some reformulation, for no language is a unitary system, but a group of systems and subsystems, a *diasystem* (Cintra 1989: 3). Thus, linguistic variation — the phenomenon by which one language is never the same if we consider a different time, place or social group — leads us to consider interlingual translation as an attempt to draw a correspondence between the group of different varieties of the source text language and the diasystem that corresponds to the target text language.

Linguistic varieties may be diachronic (different stages of the evolution of language in time) or synchronic (coexisting at a given historical moment). Among the latter there are diatopic or regional, diastratic or sociocultural, and diaphasic or situational varieties (resulting from the discursive situation: registers or styles, expressive modalities). In this study I mainly consider the translation of two sociocultural varieties: one of low sociocultural status

## *Subtitling Pygmalion*

(Cockney) and a second, simultaneously sociocultural and regional, which corresponds to the standard of British English (Received Pronunciation or RP and Standard English). It is interesting to see how the definition of these varieties is also related to situational varieties associated with registers/styles: writing and orality, literary language and nonliterary language.

When considering both languages as sets of linguistic varieties evaluated by native speakers on the basis of a culture-specific system of values, we find these varieties grouped in terms of a centre and fringes. The centre, considered prestigious and correct by native speakers, includes the standard varieties (sociocultural varieties) that native speakers also associate with writing, and literary writing in particular (register). At the same time, this centre configures fringes of lesser prestige. If we consider the case of the source text, these fringes incorporate a substandard, urban, low sociocultural variety (sociocultural variety) associated with orality (situational variety, register). Due to the distance separating this variety from the standard, it would fit into the definition of “falar” put forward by Cintra as a “dialecto empobrecido, que, tendo abandonado a língua escrita, convive apenas com as manifestações orais” (“impoverished dialect which, having abandoned written language, only partakes of oral manifestations”) (Cintra 1989: 4; my translation). The centrality of writing and the marginality of orality are thus clearly manifested.

When analysing these translations, I also use the definitions put forward by Trudgill and Hughes (1979). Apart from the distinctions based on extralinguistic criteria such as time, place, user and communicative situation, Trudgill and Hughes add one important distinction. Based on the level or rank of the linguistic markers that differ from one variety to another, the varieties can be classified either as pronunciations/accents (i.e. varieties of phonetic and phonological characteristics) or as dialects (varieties of morphological, syntactic and lexical characteristics).

Of the varieties included in the source texts, I will analyse Cockney, which is simultaneously an accent and a dialect since it not only incorporates phonetic and phonological characteristics but also differs from Standard English in terms of a specific vocabulary and usage, one of the most remarkable aspects of which is “rhyming slang”. It also corresponds, in extralinguistic terms, to an urban variety used by lower-class speakers in east London, traditionally those who are born within earshot of the Bow Bells. The standard varieties of British English are “Received Pronunciation” and “Standard English”, respectively standard accent and dialect. The standard accent, by the time *Pygmalion* was created (1916), was associated with even greater social prestige than nowadays, although it is still identified as marking high social status. As far as the standard dialect is concerned, the prestige of its status as a standard, as with the Portuguese language, is associated with its

usage as the official language of culture and education.

As for European Portuguese, the standard in terms of both pronunciation and dialect is identified as “as variedades faladas pelas camadas cultas das regiões de Lisboa e de Coimbra” (“the varieties spoken by the cultured classes of the regions of Lisbon and Coimbra”) (Ferreira et al. 1996: 484; my translation). Since the linguistic description of European Portuguese has so far concentrated on linguistic geography, the information on sociocultural varieties is still scarce (although studies are being carried out).

The first problem that arises here is the asymmetry of the two diasystems analysed. As Fernando Moser states in a 1984 article on his 1972 translation of *Pygmalion*, there is no Portuguese variety corresponding to a lower-class urban pronunciation like Cockney. In his words: “De facto, na nossa língua não existe nenhum falar que seja tão comunicativo na sua difícil inteligibilidade, nem que seja do mesmo modo aceite como susceptível de acarretar discriminação social, ou pelo menos grave preconceito” (“As a matter of fact, in our language there is no ‘falar’ which is as communicative in its difficult intelligibility or which is accepted in the same way as tending to cause either social discrimination or at least serious prejudice”) (1984: 223; my translation). Furthermore, I would add, there is no Portuguese accent associated with such high social prestige as is the standard pronunciation of British English, Received Pronunciation. This makes it even more interesting to see what solutions were found for the translation of these varieties.

## **2. Objectives: discovery of translation norms and strategies for subtitling in Portuguese**

In view of the above, the aim of my study is to discover the norms and strategies presiding over the choices made in this particular kind of translation. This study also has the purpose of providing a basis for one of larger scope on translation strategies of Portuguese subtitling. It focuses on the way the value systems that organize social facts around a prestigious centre also determine the activity of translation. This assumes that, as stated by Lambert and Delabastita, “le type exact de traduction que nous préférons rattacher à une ‘stratégie’ (largement inconsciente), ne manque pas d’être aussi influencé par des rapports de prestige ou de pouvoir, bref par des rapports entre des cultures et des institutions (systèmes de valeur)” (1996: 48). In more down-to-earth terms, the analysis must look for the solutions found to the “inescapable problem” mentioned by Hatim and Mason: “translators have to be constantly alert to the social implications of their decisions. The representation in a source text of a particular dialect creates an inescapable problem: which Target

## *Subtitling Pygmalion*

Language dialect to use?” (1990: 40).

With respect to source and target text linguistic varieties, I will interpret translation strategies as centralizing or decentralizing in two different ways.

(a) (De)centralization of *sociocultural varieties*

As far as the use of sociocultural varieties is concerned, we must check whether interlingual translation results in what might be called a “centralizing strategy”, i.e. in the translation of substandard British English varieties into standard European Portuguese varieties, or if, on the contrary, it shows an acceptable and adequate “decentralizing strategy”, i.e. producing a target text which is equally decentralized as far as the sociocultural variety is concerned.

(b) (De)centralization of *target text register*

With respect to the opposition of oral and written registers, the translation can also be interpreted in another way. The choice of a substandard variety in the target text, in what I called a “decentralizing strategy”, may be seen as an attempt to attain adequacy to the oral register of the source text, whereas the choice of a standard variety in the target text, in what I called a “centralizing strategy”, might correspond to a greater predominance of written-register norms, and thus to greater acceptability in terms of target text register.

### **3. Object**

The corpus considered is the Portuguese subtitling of two film adaptations of George Bernard Shaw’s *Pygmalion*. The first is a black and white film, with the same title, produced for cinema in 1938, directed by Anthony Asquith and Leslie Howard, based on a screenplay by George Bernard Shaw and starring Leslie Howard and Wendy Hiller. The second is an adaptation produced for television by Twentieth Century Fox, directed by Alan Cook in 1983, starring Peter O’Toole and Margot Kidder. Essential for the choice of this corpus is the fact that the use of a substandard variety of British English is central to the plot, which, as is well known, may be summarized as the teaching of the standard varieties to a speaker of substandard British English (i.e. a story of centralization). It is thus crucial that the target text portray this distinction between the substandard and the standard variety. If it does not, the audience that does not understand the spoken English version — i.e. the audience that needs subtitles — will not understand the centrality of this distinction to the plot.

More important than the fact that these films correspond to two different adaptations is that they present two different versions of subtitling, aired by two different Portuguese TV channels: Asquith's version was shown on 9 February 1994 by RTP, Canal 1; Cook's version was shown by SIC on 28 March 1995. We might thus add a further aim for this study, namely to carry out a comparative analysis of the translation strategies used by different Portuguese TV channels.<sup>2</sup>

#### 4. Analysis of two versions of subtitling

Our analysis has focused on three extracts illustrating different stages in the linguistic evolution of Eliza Doolittle (thus excluding the analysis of individual varieties of other characters). In the first extract she uses Cockney (part of the initial scene in which she talks to Freddy's mother and sister, Mrs and Miss Eynsford-Hill). In the second she hesitantly uses RP but still goes back to a substandard dialect (during Mrs Higgins' "at-home"). In the third, now bi-dialectal, she masters the standard varieties of British English (during the final conversation with Professor Higgins).

In the article commenting on his published translation of *Pygmalion*, Fernando Moser refers to his attempt to create a pseudo-variety of lower-class Portuguese by including "formas populares" (popular forms) or the "emprego reconhecidamente iletrado de alguns verbos" (the recognized illiterate usage of some verbs), "elisões e contracções diversas" (ellipsis and contractions) and "expressões populares" (popular expressions) (Moser 1984: 224-5; my translation). The justification for this procedure is that there is no study indicating a Portuguese correlative for the British substandard variety, Cockney. This strategy also seems justifiable because the analysis of the two film versions in English rapidly reveals that we are dealing not with a usage that might correspond to the linguistic description of these varieties but with stereotypes that are recognized by an average native speaker. The oral discourse of the actors is a "pseudo-Cockney" and a "pseudo-Received Pronunciation", as well as a "pseudo-spontaneous orality". It is discourse learnt

---

<sup>2</sup> The two public TV channels (RTP) have a Department for the Translation of Foreign Programmes with a team of translators who, after a period of professional training by senior subtitlers, do the subtitling or prepare the translated version for dubbing. Although the translators work on a freelance basis, the work is centralized in the department. The centralization is also geographical, since most of the subtitling is carried out in the premises of RTP. The two private TV channels (like the cable TV channels) do not have such a department. They use private companies to do the subtitling.

## *Subtitling Pygmalion*

by heart and spoken. This pseudo-orality is even more obvious in Cook's version, which follows Shaw's text very closely, a fact that will necessarily condition our findings.

In Excerpt I (see Appendix), there is a very obvious contrast in the source text between the use of Cockney and standard English varieties. In the case of the subtitles shown by RTP, the general strategy is one of *centralization* both of accent — there is not one alteration of spelling to represent marginality — and of dialect. It is only possible to find a tenuous correspondence for the syntactic marginality in line 29 (“if you was talking to a stranger” rendered as “ao falar com quem não conhece e se quer ser simpática”). The social difference between participants, which is obvious in the accents and dialects of the source text, is only patent in the use of forms of address in the target text: (lines 16 and 28) “boa senhora” and “a senhora”, although the significant “dear” in line 1 has been omitted.

The *centrality* of the written register is also revealed by the absence of parallels for some oral register markers which occur in the source texts. This concerns ellipsis, emphatic markers (line 1: “Nah than”), interjections (line 4: “Oh”; line 8: “Ow”), incomplete sentences (line 4: “Zif I adnt enough to do...”), hesitations (line 13: “Now, I’... Here’s a sh... six pence for you”) or even the usage of “dear” (line 1), “pray” (line 6) or “is e” (line 8). It is also worth pointing out that the word “pence” (line 14) is maintained instead of being translated into “dinheiro”. In this case, the technical limitation of two lines with thirty characters each was *not* imposed and the option not to translate reveals a “foreignizing” (as opposed to “domesticating”) strategy.

In the case of Cook's version, despite the fact that the substandard accent is perhaps only a little more obvious than in Asquith's version, the effort to *decentralize* is clearly patent in that the spelling marks a substandard accent by using representations such as (line 11) “sê filho”, (line 14) “nã o dêxava”, (line 52) “chamê-le”, or (line 42) “inha senhora”. The translation does not mark, however, the syntactic deviation of line 53, a fact that is compensated for by the spelling. It is also worth pointing out that the alteration of Portuguese spelling for the change of diphthong [ei] into monophthong [e] is not coherent (see lines 6 and 12). The monophthongization present in the change of spelling marks the choice of a regional dialect belonging to the group of central-southern dialects, instead of a corresponding sociolect marking low social class.

As for orality, unlike the translation of Asquith's version, the force of the expressive illocutionary act in line 5 is here transmitted partly through the choice of “p’ró lixo” (trashed/useless), which is clearly excessive if we draw a word-for-word parallel. Despite the omission of orality markers such as “dear” (line 1) or “pray” (line 8), there are several examples of graphic representation of ellipsis characteristic of oral discourse (lines 3, 7, 33, 42). Thus, the text is

also *decentralized* in terms of register, in an effort to mark features of oral discourse.

In the case of Excerpt II (see Appendix), Eliza's discourse, although standard as far as accent is concerned (and correspondingly using the standard spelling), is substandard in terms of dialect. The translation of Asquith's version marks this dialectal decentralization only in terms of lexical choice: "do in" as "despachar", "old woman" as "velha", "down her throat" as "pela goela", "pinched" as "fanou", "come through" as "safou-se". The translation does not show the corresponding syntactic deviations for "as how they done the old woman in" (line 5), nor for the use of the adjective "sudden" as an adverb (line 24), nor for "What I says is them what pinched it done her in" (line 38). Thus, *decentralization* is marked in lexical terms and omitted in syntactic terms.

As for orality markers, the most obvious seems to be the markedly oral, colloquial usage of the "Pretérito Imperfeito" instead of the "Condicional" in Portuguese (lines 12, 30, 33), a choice that is both adequate and acceptable. The incomplete sentence in line 14 is omitted, as is the interjection in line 16 ("Oh"). Nevertheless, there is some *decentralization* of register.

In the translation of Cook's version, the dialectal decentralization of the source text once again only finds a parallel in terms of lexical choice in the target text: "do in" "despachar" and "old woman" "velha", "down her throat" "pela goela abaixo" and "pinched" "fanou". Sequences such as "terá acontecido" (line 31), "segundo disseram" (line 3), "morreria" (line 10), even if not showing the syntactic deviation in part of Eliza's discourse, may perhaps be interpreted as a means of syntactic compensation for the difficulty of representing her over-careful accent through a change of spelling. Thus, there is *decentralization* in terms of lexical choice but *centrality* of the written register, which is also due in part to the almost complete absence of orality markers in the source text.

In Excerpt III (see Appendix) Eliza already masters the standard dialect and accent. The only deviation to be noticed is thus her voluntary change to Cockney (line 6 in Asquith's version, line 15 in Cook's). This change is very significant because of her perfect mastery of both dialects and accents. It had to be translated, and not omitted as happens in the translation of Asquith's version. As for the orality markers in this excerpt, the most obvious seem to be the intensity and expressive illocutionary force of "Now I know..." (line 1), "Oh, what a fool I was" (line 3) and "Now I dont give that" (line 8) — also stressed by her nonverbal and paraverbal behaviour, which is reduced to merely informative and scarcely expressive translations.

In the case of Cook's version, the voluntary change to Cockney is signalled by the spelling (which marks an ellipsis with an apostrophe) as well as by choice of vocabulary. As for orality markers, the interjection is omitted,

and the expressive force of Eliza's utterances is also considerably reduced in the translation. Thus, the substandard usage is *decentralized*, but the written register is predominant, which is also due to the already mentioned scarcity of orality markers in the source text.

## **5. Conclusion**

The conclusion to be drawn is that the effort to decentralize — both in terms of sociocultural varieties and of register — is obvious in the case of the subtitles shown by SIC in 1995, whereas the subtitles aired by RTP in 1994 are considerably more centralizing in terms of both sociocultural varieties and register. However, as far as orality markers are concerned, both versions are reductive.

This analysis was designed to help formulate questions for the study of a larger corpus, with further linguistic varieties. The questions that can be based on this very brief case study are the following:

1. In view of the differences between the 1994 and 1995 versions, could there be an evolution of subtitling towards a greater predominance of decentralization strategies as far as sociocultural varieties and registers are concerned?
2. Is the subtitling on private Portuguese TV channels less reductive and more decentralizing than the subtitling shown by State-owned TV channels?<sup>3</sup>
3. Is subtitling prone to reduce some features of oral discourse? (And why: due to technical limitations such as the number of characters per line, the average time of exposure of each subtitle — 4-6 seconds each? Due to reading speed?<sup>4</sup> Due to insufficient payment of subtitling, Esc. 2,850\$00 for 10 minutes? Or due to the above-mentioned marginality of subtitles in relation to the audiovisual message?)

---

<sup>3</sup> Based on my analysis and mainly on my experience as TV viewer, I would say that the private TV channels sometimes attempt to bring the edges to the centre. Public TV channels maintain the power of the centre, i.e. standard (written) European Portuguese. However, this requires confirmation through the analysis of a wider corpus than the one considered in this paper.

<sup>4</sup> In a telephone interview, a senior RTP subtitler mentioned one reason for the centralization of substandard varieties usually characteristic of subtitling, namely: reading speed. One has to read quite quickly in order to be able to understand, for instance, the change of spelling. Most viewers cannot or do not read at this speed, so such techniques are avoided. However, depending on the hour of broadcasting and on the channel (TV1 is more popular and TV2 is aimed at a cultured audience) the strategies might be expected to differ.

If, as Yves Gambier (1994) states, international audiovisual communication is nowadays oriented towards the key words of the market economy, namely “liberalization”, “privatization” and “competition”, it becomes interesting to ask whether these phenomena actually have consequences in terms of the subtitling strategies of programmes aired by different Portuguese TV channels. Further, it is intriguing to see whether these consequences can be interpreted as resulting from the influence of a centre of prestige, or on the contrary, as examples of “politically correct” procedures, of a valorization of the fringes, which are perhaps hints of other hegemonies.

## References

### 1. Texts

Shaw, G.B.

1916 (1973) *Pygmalion*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

1961 “Pigmalião”, in Marina B.L. Prieto, *Pigmalião. Análise da peça de Bernard Shaw, precedida da respectiva tradução portuguesa*, MA thesis, Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Coimbra, pp.23-162.

1972 *Pigmalião*, translated by Fernando Mello Moser, Lisboa: Verbo.

1987 *Pigmalião, edição bilingue*, translated by Mário César Abreu, Mem Martins: Publicações Europa-América.

1938 *Pygmalion*, film version directed by Anthony Asquith and Leslie Howard, subtitled by Ruth Saraiva, broadcast by RTP, Canal 1, February 2, 1994.

1983 *Pygmalion* (film version), directed by Alan Cook, subtitled by Eulália Ramos / Sintagma, broadcast by SIC, March 3, 1995.

### 2. Studies

Ben-Shahar, Rina

1994 “Translating Literary Dialogue: a Problem and its Implications for Translation into Hebrew”, *Target* 6:2, pp.195-221.

Catrysse, Patrick

1992 “Film (adaptation) as Translation. Some Methodological Proposals”, *Target* 4:1, pp.53-70.

Cintra, Luís F. Lindley and Celso Cunha

1989 (1984) *Nova Gramática do Português Contemporâneo*, Lisboa: Edições

## *Subtitling Pygmalion*

Sá da Costa.

Czennia, Bärbel

1992 "Zum Aussagewert motivgeschichtlicher Übersetzungsstudien", *Target* 4:1, pp.71-96.

Delabastita, Dirk

1989 "Translation and Mass-communication: Film and TV Translation as Evidence of Cultural Dynamics", *Babel* 35:4, pp.193-218.

Even-Zohar, Itamar

1990 *Polysystem Studies*, special issue of *Poetics Today* 11:1.

Ferreira, Manuela Barros, Ernestina Carrilho, Maria Lobo, João Saramago and Luísa Segura da Cruz

1996 "Variação linguística: perspectiva dialectológica", in Isabel Hub Faria, Emília Ribeiro Pedro, Inês Duarte and Carlos A.M. Gouveia (Eds.) *Introdução à Linguística Geral e Portuguesa*, Lisboa: Caminho, pp.479-502.

Gambier, Yves

1994 "Audiovisual Communication. Problems and Issues at Stake in Subtitling", in Heiner Pürschel (Ed.), *Intercultural Communication: Duisburg 23-27 March 1992*, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, pp.369-392.

1997 *Language Transfer and Audiovisual Communication. A Bibliography*, Turku: University of Turku.

Gimson, A.C.

1984 "The RP Accent", in Peter Trudgill (Ed.), *Language in the British Isles*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1989 *An Introduction to the Pronunciation of English*, London: Arnold.

Hatim, Basil and Ian Mason

1993 (1990) *Discourse and the Translator*, London: Longman.

Jakobson, Roman

1959 "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation", in R.A. Brower (Ed.), *On Translation*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp.232-239.

Lambert, José

- 1990 "Le sous-titrage et la question des traductions. Rapport sur une enquête", in R. Arntz (Ed.), *Übersetzungswissenschaft. Ergebnisse und Perspektiven*, Tübingen: Narr, pp.228-238.
- 1995a "Translation or the Canonization of Otherness", in Andreas Poltermann (Ed.), *Literaturkanon - Medienereignis - Kultureller Text. Formen interkultureller Kommunikation und Übersetzung*, Berlin: Erich Schmidt, pp.160-178.
- 1995b "Literary Translation. Research Updated", in J.M. Borilho (Ed.), *La Traducció Literària*, Castelló de la Plana: Universitat Jaume I, pp.19-42.

Lambert, José and Clem Robyns

- forthc. "Translation", in Roland Posner, Klaus Robering and Thomas A. Sebeok (Eds.), *Semiotics. A Handbook on the Sign-Theoretic Foundations of Nature and Culture*, Berlin: de Gruyter.

Lambert, José and Dirk Delabastita

- 1996 "La traduction des textes audiovisuels: modes et enjeux culturels", in Yves Gambier (Ed.), *Les transferts linguistiques dans les médias audiovisuels*, Lille: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion (Traductologie), pp.33-58.

Lambert, José and Hendrik Van Gorp

- 1985 "On Describing Translations", in Theo Hermans (Ed.), *The Manipulation of Literature*, London: Croom Helm, pp.42-62.

Moser, Fernando de Mello

- 1984 "Falares e idiolectos em Pygmalion de George Bernard Shaw, como problemas de tradução", in Günter Holtus and Edgar Radtke (Eds.), *Umgangssprache in der Iberomania. Festschrift für Heinz Kröll*, Tübingen: Narr, pp.223-228.

Ong, Walter J.

- 1982 *Orality and Literacy. The Technologizing of the Word*, London / New York: Methuen.

Prieto, Marina Brum Lopes

- 1961 *Pigmalião. Análise da peça de Bernard Shaw, precedida da respectiva tradução portuguesa*, MA thesis, Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Coimbra.

## *Subtitling Pygmalion*

Rosa, Alexandra Assis

(forthc.) “Features of Oral and Written Communication in Subtitling”,  
paper presented at Multimedia & Translation, Misano Adriatico,  
Italy, 26-27 September 1997.

Toury, Gideon

1995 *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, Amsterdam /  
Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Trudgill, P. and A. Hughes

1979 *English Accents and Dialects*, London: Arnold.

Ward, A.C.

1950 *Bernard Shaw*, London: Longmans / Green.

Wells, J.C.

1992 (1982) *Accents of English. The British Isles. Vol.2*, Cambridge:  
Cambridge University Press.

## Appendix

### Excerpt I

#### A.(ASQUITH)

1. FLOWER GIRL: Nah than, Freddy: look wh'y' gowin, deah.<sup>5</sup>
2. SUBTITLE: Vê onde pões os pés, Freddy!
3. FREDDY: Sorry.
4. FLOWER GIRL: Oh, all my voylets trod in the mad. Zif I adnt enough to do...
5. SUBTITLE: As minhas violetas estão na lama.
6. MRS. EYNSFORD<sup>6</sup>: How do you know that my son's name is Freddy, pray?
7. SUBTITLE: Como sabe que o meu filho se chama Freddy?
8. FLOWER GIRL: Ow, eez ye-ooa san is e?
9. SUBTITLE: É seu filho?
10. Wal, fewd dan y' de-ooty bawmz a mather should, eed now bwtttern to spawl a pore gel's flahrzn than ran awy athat pyin.
11. SUBTITLE: Se fosse bem educado, não estragava
12. as minhas flores nem fugia sem pagar.
13. MRS. EYNSFORD: Now, I' .Here's a sh... six pence for you.
14. SUBTITLE: Tome seis *pence*.
15. FLOWER GIRL: Thank you kindly, lady.
16. SUBTITLE: Muito obrigado, boa senhora.
17. MRS. EYNSFORD: Now'll you tell me how you know that young man's name?
18. SUBTITLE: Agora vai dizer-me como sabe
19. o nome dele?
20. FLOWER GIRL: I don't.

---

<sup>5</sup> The spelling chosen to represent the direct speech of the English film versions analysed is that of Shaw's text (whenever these two coincided) as published in the 1987 bilingual edition mentioned in the references.

<sup>6</sup> EYNSFORD = EYNSFORD-HILL.

## *Subtitling Pygmalion*

21. SUBTITLE: Não sei.
22. MRS. EYNSFORD: I heard you call him by it. Dont try to deceive me.  
23. SUBTITLE: Mas ouvi-a chamar-lhe Freddy.  
24. Não queira enganar-me.
25. FLOWER GIRL: Who's trying to deceive you?  
26. SUBTITLE: Quem quer enganá-la?
27. I called him Freddy or Charlie same as you might yourself  
28. SUBTITLE: Digo Freddy ou Charly como a senhora,  
29. if you was talking to a stranger and wished to be pleasant.  
30. SUBTITLE: ao falar com quem não conhece  
31. e se quer ser simpática.

### **B. (COOK)**

1. FLOWER GIRL: Nah than, Freddy: look wh'y' gowin, deah.  
2. FREDDY: Sorry.  
3. SUBTITLE: - Vê lá pr'onde andas, Freddy!  
4. - Desculpe.
5. FLOWER GIRL: Theres menners f' yer! Te-oo banches o voylets trod into the mad.  
6. SUBTITLE: Que maneiras! Dois ramos  
7. de violetas pr'ó lixo.
8. MRS. EYNSFORD: How do you know that my son's name is Freddy, pray?  
9. SUBTITLE: Como sabe que o meu filho se chama Freddy?
10. FLOWER GIRL: Ow, eez ye-ooa san is e? Wal, fewd dan y' de-ooty bawmz a mather should,  
11. SUBTITLE: É sê filho? Se fosse uma mãe  
12. às dirêtas,  
13. eed now bwtttern to spawl a pore gel's flahrzn than ran awy athat pyin.  
14. SUBTITLE: nã'o dêxava estragar as flores  
15. e fugir sem pagar.  
16. Will ye-oo py me f'them?  
17. SUBTITLE: Vai pagar-mas?

*Alexandra Assis Rosa*

18. MISS EYNSFORD: Do nothing of the sort, mother. The idea!  
19. MRS. EYNSFORD: Please allow me, Clara.  
20. SUBTITLE: - Não faça isso, mãe, que ideia!  
21. - Dás-me licença, Clara?
22. MRS. EYNSFORD: Have you any pennies?  
23. MISS EYNSFORD: No. Ive nothing smaller than sixpence.  
24. SUBTITLE: -Tens dinheiro trocado?  
25. - O mais pequeno são seis *pence*.
26. FLOWER GIRL: I can give you change for a tanner, kind lady.  
27. SUBTITLE: Posso trocar uma libra, 'inha senhora.
28. MRS. EYNSFORD: Give it to me. Now.  
29. SUBTITLE: Dá-me. Já.  
30. This is for your flowers.  
31. FLOWER GIRL: Thank you kindly, lady.  
32. SUBTITLE: -Tome pelas suas flores.  
33. - Mu't obrigado.
34. MISS EYNSFORD: Make her give you the change. These things are  
only a penny a bunch.  
35. SUBTITLE: Peça-lhe o troco,  
36. cada ramo custa só um *penny*.
37. MRS. EYNSFORD: Do hold your tongue, Clara.  
38. SUBTITLE: Toma cuidado com a língua.  
39. You can keep the change.  
40. FLOWER GIRL: Oh, thank you lady.  
41. SUBTITLE: - Pode ficar com o troco.  
42. - 'brigado, 'inha senhora.
43. MRS. EYNSFORD: Now tell me how you know that young gentleman's  
name.  
44. SUBTITLE: Agora diga-me como sabia o nome  
45. daquele senhor.
46. FLOWER GIRL: I did'nt.  
47. MRS. EYNSFORD: I heard you call him by it. Dont try to deceive me.  
48. SUBTITLE: - Nã' sabia.  
49. - Eu ouvi-a. Não tente enganar-me.
50. FLOWER GIRL: Who's trying to deceive you? I called him Freddy or  
Charlie  
51. SUBTITLE: Enganá-la?

## *Subtitling Pygmalion*

52. Chamê-le Freddy ou Charlie.  
53. FLOWER GIRL: same as you might yourself if you was talking to a stranger and wished to be pleasant.  
54. SUBTITLE: Nã' faz o mesmo com desconhecidos  
55. quando quer ser simpática?

### Excerpt II

#### A. (ASQUITH)

1. LIZA: My aunt died of influenza:  
2. SUBTITLE: A minha tia morreu de uma gripe.  
3. so they said.  
4. SUBTITLE: É o que dizem.  
5. But it's my belief as how they done the old woman in.  
6. SUBTITLE: Mas penso que deram cabo da velha.  
7. MRS. HIGGINS: Done her in?  
8. LIZA: Y-e-e-e-es, Lord love you!  
9. SUBTITLE: - Deram cabo...?  
10. - Sim, louvado Deus.  
11. Why should she die of influenza, when she come through diphtheria right enough the year before?  
12. SUBTITLE: Porque havia de morrer de gripe,  
13. se se safou da difteria um ano antes?  
14. PROF. HIGGINS: Perhaps it wasn't diphtheria. You see vicar...  
15. SUBTITLE: Talvez não tivesse sido difteria.  
16. LIZA: Oh, but I saw her with my own eyes. Fairly blue with it, she was.  
17. SUBTITLE: Vi-a com os meus próprios olhos.  
18. Estava toda azul.  
19. They all thought she was dead;  
20. SUBTITLE: Pensavam que estava morta,  
21. but my father he kept ladling gin down her throat  
22. SUBTITLE: mas o meu pai enfiou-lhe tanto gin  
23. pela goela,  
24. till she came to so sudden that she bit the bowl off the

*Alexandra Assis Rosa*

25. SUBTITLE: spoon.  
que acordou de repente e arrancou  
26. a ponta da colher à dentada.
27. MRS. EYNSFORD: Dear me!
28. LIZA: What call would a woman with that strength in her have  
to die of influenza?
29. SUBTITLE: Como é que uma mulher com tanta  
30. força ia morrer de gripe?
31. And what become of her new straw hat that should have  
come to me?
32. SUBTITLE: E o que aconteceu ao seu chapéu novo,  
33. que devia ter ficado para mim?
34. PROF. HIGGINS: Well, what?  
35. SUBTITLE: Bem, o que aconteceu?
36. LIZA: Somebody pinched it;  
37. SUBTITLE: Alguém o fanou.
38. and what I says is them what pinched it done her in.  
39. SUBTITLE: Quem o fanou deu cabo dela.

**B.(COOK)**

1. LIZA: My aunt died of influenza: so they said.  
2. SUBTITLE: A minha tia morreu com gripe,  
3. segundo disseram.
4. But it's my belief they done the old woman in.  
5. SUBTITLE: Mas para mim despacharam a velha.
6. MRS. HIGGINS: Done her in?  
7. SUBTITLE: Despacharam?
8. LIZA: Y-e-e-e-es, Lord love you! Why should she die of  
influenza?
9. SUBTITLE: Sim, o senhor nos proteja.  
10. Porque morreria de gripe?
11. She come through diphtheria right enough the year  
before.
12. SUBTITLE: No ano anterior,

## *Subtitling Pygmalion*

13. tinha resistido à difteria.
14. I saw her with my own eyes. Fairly blue with it, she  
was.
15. SUBTITLE: Vi com os meus próprios olhos  
16. que ela estava roxa.
17. They all thought she was dead;  
18. SUBTITLE: Pensavam que estava morta,
19. but my father kept ladling gin down her throat  
20. SUBTITLE: mas o meu pai continuou  
21. a deitar-lhe *gin* pela goela abaixo.
22. till she came to so sudden that she bit the bowl off the  
spoon.  
23. SUBTITLE: Veio a si tão de repente,  
24. que até mordeu a colher.
25. MRS. EYNSFORD: Dear me!  
26. SUBTITLE: Valha-me Deus!
27. LIZA: What call would a woman with that strength in her have  
to die of influenza?  
28. SUBTITLE: Como ia uma mulher deste calibre  
29. morrer de gripe?
30. What become of her new straw hat that should have  
come to me?  
31. SUBTITLE: Que terá acontecido ao chapéu  
32. de palha que eu ia herdar?
33. Somebody pinched it;  
34. SUBTITLE: Alguém o fanou.
35. and what I say is them as pinched it done her in.  
36. SUBTITLE: Cá para mim,  
37. quem o fanou foi quem a despachou.

### Excerpt III

#### **A. (ASQUITH)**

1. LIZA: Now I know how to deal with you.  
2. SUBTITLE: Agora sei como lidar consigo.
3. Oh, what a fool I was not to think of it before.  
4. SUBTITLE: Como fui parva em não ter pensado  
5. nisso antes.
6. Aha! Thats done you, Enry Iggins, it az.  
7. SUBTITLE: /
8. Now I dont give that for your bullying and your fine  
talk.  
9. SUBTITLE: Já sei, não ligo às suas ordens  
10. nem à sua bela conversa.

#### **B. (COOK)**

1. LIZA: Aha! Now I know how to deal with you.  
2. SUBTITLE: Agora sei como lidar consigo.
3. What a fool I was not to think of it before.  
4. SUBTITLE: Que tola fui  
5. por não ter pensado nisso antes.
6. You cant take away the knowledge you gave me.  
7. SUBTITLE: Não me pode tirar o conhecimento  
8. que me deu.
9. And you said I had a finer ear than you.  
10. SUBTITLE: E o senhor disse que eu tinha  
11. um ouvido melhor que o seu.
12. And I can be civil and kind to people, which is more  
than you can.  
13. SUBTITLE: Sei ser mais educada e amável  
14. do que o senhor com as pessoas.
15. Aha! Thats done you, Enry Iggins, it az.  
16. SUBTITLE: 'tá tramado, 'Enry Iggins!

## *Subtitling Pygmalion*

17. Now I dont care that for your bullying and your big  
talk.
18. SUBTITLE: Já não me ralo com a sua  
19. indiferença e grande lábia.