



Jan Kochanowski University Press

This is a contribution from *Token: A Journal of English Linguistics*
Volume 7/2018.

Edited by John G. Newman, Marina Dossena and Sylwester Łodej.
Special Editors for volume 7: Marina Dossena and Polina Shvanyukova.

© 2018 Jan Kochanowski University Press.

Translating cultural references in the Italian dubbing and re-dubbing of *E.T. The Extra-Terrestrial*

Larissa D'Angelo

Università degli Studi di Bergamo

ABSTRACT

By adopting a comparative perspective, the present paper aims to investigate how and why differences are found in the dubbing and redubbing of the major motion picture *E.T. The Extraterrestrial* by Steven Spielberg. In particular, the analysis focuses on the translation and retranslation of culture-specific references (CSRs). The study is based on three different versions of the movie script: the original version in English (1982), the dubbed version in Italian (1982) and the redubbed version, still in Italian (2002). After an initial quantitative analysis of the three different scripts, a qualitative analysis was carried out adopting Vinay – Darbelnet's (2000) taxonomy to categorize the translations of CSRs, as cases of Direct Translations or Oblique Translations. The study confirms Berman's (1990) Retranslation Hypothesis on literary retransmissions and indicates that the two decades that divide the first and second dubbing of the movie have been culturally and linguistically crucial, widening the cultural and linguistic horizons of contemporary Italian viewers.

Keywords: dubbing, redubbing, culture-specific references, CSRs, Retranslation Hypothesis.

1. Introduction

Film redubbing, a term that refers to the retranslation into the same target language of the same audio-visual text, has become standard procedure in the Italian film industry. So much so that the redubbing activity and the existence of different dubbed versions of the same movies have attracted the attention of various scholars (Chaume 2007; Khreis 2006; Maraschio 1982; Nornes 2007; Paolinelli 2004; Valoroso 2000; Wehn 1998). This interest

is not surprising, because film retranslations allow scholars to “investigate the evolution of translational norms and practices in the audio-visual field” (Zanotti 2015: 110) and at the same time, they provide evidence of new forms audio-visual translations due to changes in viewers’ habits and cultural expectations (Zanotti 2015: 110). Our cultural expectations and the way we utilise language and perceive foreign linguistic elements do change over time, calling for a constant redefinition of the audio-visual material. Redubbing also complies with the so-called ‘retranslation hypothesis’ (Berman 1990; Gambier 1994) that justifies a retranslation of texts (mostly canonical) because the text has aged and needs to be updated and therefore improved. This hypothesis explains why in most cases the analysis of a first translation is found to be more target-oriented, whereas the retranslation provides a more accurate product that is source-oriented and manages culture-specific references differently. This said, the present paper focuses on the culture-specific references (CSRs) found within the translation and retranslation of a major motion picture, *E.T. the Extraterrestrial*, a movie that abounds with cultural elements that have proven to be a challenge for the translators that worked on its initial dubbing in 1982 and the following redubbing in 2002.

Since the 1950s, dubbing has become Italy’s favoured form of audio-visual translation (AVT), confirmed by the substantial presence of movies and TV programs imported from abroad, mostly from the US, but also from other English-speaking countries where the film industry thrives. Today, although for other purposes, the dubbing and redubbing of foreign material still allows producers to control language and modify content for target users, whenever deemed necessary.

Although the Italian dubbing industry is always in need of translators, this professional role carried out within the film industry has never been clearly defined and the work itself is more the result of teamwork than the effort of a single translator. An audio-visual translator must cooperate with adapters, dialogue writers, dubbing actors and directors so it is hard to define to what extent the dubbing of a film is carried out by the translator. Because of this passage between translators and adapters, Díaz Cintas – Remael (2007) have noted that AVT has long been considered a form of ‘adaptation’ rather than a real translation: audio-visual translators do translate the dialogues as needed but adapters have the authority to modify the translation to comply with the spatial and temporal constraints of AVT (Pavesi – Perego 2006). The end product, therefore, can be far from the actual translation provided by the audio-visual translator, so much so that the role of the adapter has

gained more prestige than the role of the translator (Pavesi – Perego 2006). It is undeniable, however, that the adaptation process calls for creative work on the one hand and a significant degree of freedom on the other.

2. The classification and translation of culture-specific references (CSRs)

CSRs have always represented a problematic issue in translation studies both in literary translations as well as in audio-visual material (Leppihalme 1994, 1997, 2011; Toury 1980, 1995; Pedersen 2005, 2011). Although a systematic definition and classification of CSRs does not exist yet, a number of scholars have defined these culture-specific elements as elements that “stand out from the common lexical context, they distinguish themselves for their heterogeneity, and consequently they require a reinforcement of attention in order to be decoded” (Finkel 1962, cited and translated in Ranzato 2010: 85). Vlahov – Florin (1969, cited and translated in Ranzato 2010: 85) proposed a more precise definition of CSRs, renamed as *realia*:

[...] words (and composed locutions) of popular language which constitute denominations of objects, concepts, which are typical of a geographical environment, of a culture, of the material life or of historical-social peculiarities of a people, a nation, a country, a tribe, and which thus carry a national, local or historical colouring; these words have not precise equivalents in other languages.

The fact that CSRs raise numerous problems for the translator is inferred clearly by a number of scholars such as Leemets (1992), who deems CSRs so problematic as to be untranslatable due to cultural, geographical and historical differences producing words reflecting concepts that may not be represented in another language.

Mailhac (1996), as Ranzato (2010, 2014) also underlines, has emphasized the existence of a cultural gap between source culture and target culture, so that foreign references introduced in a receiving culture are inevitably characterized ‘by a degree of opacity’, rendering the interpretation of the text highly subjective. Descriptive Translation Studies consider translation the result of an activity that is first of all embedded within a specific social context and, secondly, an activity that respects a set of norms. Toury (1980: 51) defines these norms as “the translation of general values or ideas

shared by a certain community – as to what is right and wrong, adequate and inadequate – into specific performance-instructions appropriate for and applicable to specific situations”. Toury’s studies have helped to change the translators’ attitudes toward what Lefevere (1992) has defined as the universe of discourse (objects, customs and beliefs) found in a source text in relation to the universe of discourse of a target society, rendering the final product more target-oriented, i.e. focusing on the needs of the receiving culture. However, Toury (1980), like Even-Zohar (1990), also believes that a source text inevitably changes when introduced into a new cultural system and, even more importantly, that the target culture itself changes when exposed to foreign material. The way the Italian language has modified itself in the last few decades, acquiring an increasing number of foreign words, expressions and calques, is evidence of how the introduction of foreign texts, especially Anglo-American ones, has modified the receiving language as well as its culture (Pavesi 2006).

If defining CSRs is not a straightforward process, neither is classifying them, as numerous scholars have noted (Nida 1945; Newmark 1988; Ramière 2006; Rantanen 1990; Ranzato 2010; Mailhac 1996; Kwiecinski 2001). Newmark (1988: 95), in particular, suggests five cultural categories adapted from Nida (1945), relating to different lexical fields pertaining to a culture-specific lexicon:

- 1) Ecology (terms relating to flora, fauna, winds, plains, hills);
- 2) Material culture (artefacts, such as food, clothes, houses and towns, transport);
- 3) Social culture (work and leisure);
- 4) Organisations, customs, activities, procedures and customs (political and administrative, religious, artistic);
- 5) Gestures and habits.

Just as Ranzato (2010) has noted, Gottlieb (1992), Ivarsson – Crofts (1992), Kovacic (1996) and Lomheim (1999) have also provided interesting classifications, but for the present analysis, Vinay – Darbelnet’s (2000) taxonomy was preferred, as explained in the following section.

3. Methodology and corpus data

By adopting a comparative perspective, the present paper aims to investigate how and why differences are found in the dubbing and redubbing of the

1982 major motion picture *E.T. The Extraterrestrial* by Steven Spielberg. The twentieth-anniversary edition of 2002, in fact, offered the public an extended version of the film with altered, special effects, computer-generated images and a meticulous revision of the original dialogues. The data under discussion here comprise three different versions of the movie script: the original version in English (1982), the dubbed version in Italian (1982) and the redubbed version, once again, in Italian (2002). As can be seen in Table 1, the total number of words found in the corpus is 11,974 and the wordiest script in the corpus is the 1982 version in English, with 4,501 words.

Table 1. Number of words per subcorpus

Total n. of words in the 1982 script (English)	4,501
Total n. of words in the 1982 script (Italian)	3,575
Total n. of words in the 2002 script (Italian)	3,898
Total n. of words in the corpus	11,974

Although a word count already shows in which script version Italian translators and dubbers were more or less prolific, indicating that the two translations display different vocabulary and pragmatic choices, the present analysis also considers how many lines are in the script and, most of all, how many script lines show differences between the 1982 and the 2002 dubbings (see Table 2). The total number of lines constituting the original script is 808. Comparing the 1982 and 2002 translations of the script, it can be noted that 194 lines show notable differences in translation. In reviewing this set of lines, it was found that 166 lines show variation that is presumably not attributable solely to the different interpretative styles the dubbing actors employed in the two versions. Indeed, the 2002 dubbing sees an increase of 11% in the number of words compared to the 1982 version, due to a faster speech delivery in the redubbed version. In the second version, actors tend to speak faster, using more fillers and a more spontaneous style. This figure is confirmed by the fact that 171 lines are longer in the second dubbing than in the first, whereas in the 1982 version only four lines are longer than in the previous version. The longer lines in the 2002 version show frequent use of fillers that are typical of contemporary Italian speech, such as *'beh'*, *'allora'*, *'ehi'*, or colloquialisms such as *'amico'* or *'senti'*.

Once the quantitative data were generated, Vinay-Darbelnet's (2000: 84-94) taxonomy, which has often been applied to culture-specific elements found in texts, was employed here to categorize the translations of CSRs, as cases of Direct Translations or Oblique Translations (see Table 3).

Table 2. Quantitative data in the corpus under study

Corpus data	
Total n. of lines found in all three scripts	808
Lines that are different in the dubbed (1982) and redubbed (2002) version	194
Lines that present differences in the dubbed (1982) and redubbed (2002) version (not due to differences in acting styles)	166
N. of lines that are longer than in the 2002 script (compared to the 1982 script)	171
N. of lines that are longer than in the 1982 script (compared to the 2002 script)	4

Table 3. Vinay – Darbelnet's (2000: 84-94) taxonomy

Direct Translation (DT)	Oblique Translation (OT)
Borrowing	Transposition
Calque	Modulation
Literal Translation	Equivalence
	Adaptation

Listed under Direct Translations (DT), are Borrowing, Calque and Literal Translation. Borrowing is a stylistic device that leaves foreign and exotic elements unaltered so that the target text becomes 'foreignized'. Calque instead consists in the translation of a word or of the components of a phrase from a source language into a target language to create a new lexeme in the target language, whereas literal translation is applied to an expression or a phrase, maintaining the grammatical structure of the source text. Among Oblique Translation (OT) techniques, we have Transposition, Modulation, Equivalence and Adaptation. Transposition allows parts of the speech to change their sequence when they are translated (*red pen* becomes *pennarossain* Italian). In a sense it is a shift of word class due to different grammatical structures. Modulation is defined by Hardin – Picot (1990: 21) as "a change in point of view that allows us to express the same phenomenon in a different way" and, one could add, through a more idiomatic expression. Equivalence attempts to find equivalent idiomatic expressions in a target language so that the original meaning in the source text is not changed during the translation process. It is a technique commonly used with clichés, proverbs and idioms. Finally, Adaptation is used when the source language content is unknown to the target community, in which case translators have to create

a new, equivalent situation, using linguistic elements with which the target community is familiar. Because of its accuracy, Vinay – Darbelnet's (2000) taxonomy will be applied to the present research and each difference found in the translation and retranslation of CSRs will be categorized following this taxonomy.

4. Comparing the 1982 and 2002 dubbing of *E.T. The Extraterrestrial*

By applying Vinay – Darbelnet's (2000) taxonomy to the analysis of the 166 lines that differ linguistically, an array of OT and DT are seen to occur, very often within the same line, as in (1).

Original version	Dubbing (1982)	Redubbing (2002)
(1) Michael: How about throwing a spell over the pizza man?	(1a) Michael: Perché non lanci un incantesimo alla pizzeria?	(1b) Michael: Perché non fai un incantesimo al fattorino della pizza?

This first example, which is just one of the many found in the analysis, shows three different techniques employed in the 1982 translation. Modulation is used to render '*How about ...*' into '*Perché non ...?*', thus changing the original point of view slightly, but maintaining the same meaning. A Literal Translation is applied to the words that follow, rendering '*throwing a spell*' into '*lanci un incantesimo*', whereas in the 2002 version, we see that the translator has opted for Modulation, using '*fai un incantesimo*'. Finally, in 1982 having a pizza delivered by a pizza man was not a common occurrence in Italy, though it was in the United States; therefore, the Italian translator had to apply Adaptation to make Italian viewers understand the line. In the 1982 version, '*pizza man*' became simply '*pizzeria*', whereas in 2002, when pizza delivery was finally common in Italy too, the translator was able to use '*fattorinodella pizza*', i.e. we no longer see a source culture reference but an intercultural reference, therefore Modulation was possible, rather than Adaptation.

Example (2) is another clear demonstration of how the second dubbing is a careful revision of the first one. In both translations, the Italian preposition '*con*' has been added to Modulate the original meaning and render Greg's telephone conversation more comprehensible for Italian viewers. The 1982 translation of the word '*pepperoni*' into '*peperonata*' is an example of Adaptation due to a cultural reference that is not actually missing

in the target culture (spicy salami is a product imported from Italy, brought to the US by the Italian-American community), but in the 1980s, in Italy, spicy salami was not usually found on pizza. By 2002 that cultural (and culinary) gap had been filled, and the line reads '*salamepiccante*', rendered through Equivalence.

Original version	Dubbing (1982)	Redubbing (2002)
(2) Greg: Plenty of sausage and pepperonis. Everything but the little fishies.	(2a) Greg: Con molta salsiccia, e peperonata. Con tutto tranne le acciughine.	(2b) Greg: Con molta salsiccia, e salame piccante. Con tutto tranne i pesciolini.

The final part of the line that initially reads '*Everything but the little fishies*' sees two different approaches: in 1982, the translator understood that Greg was referring to anchovies but decided not to translate it literally, employing the correct terminology (anchovies - acciughe) instead, but keeping the diminutive of the original translated in Italian with the suffix '*-ine*'; the 2002 version instead opts for a Literal Translation ('*pesciolini*').

In (3) Elliott tries to attract his mother's attention because he heard something in the garden toolshed. In (3b), the term '*toolshed*' was translated with '*rimessa*', whereas in (3a) it is omitted, producing a translation shorter and less detailed than the original line. The classic American toolsheds were still a distant reality for the Italian public of the early 1980s, so the translator might not have found an equivalent term at that time. Twenty years later instead, the product appeared on the Italian market as well, and the translator was probably sure that the average viewer would understand what Elliott was referring to, thus opting for Adaptation (3b). Another advantage of using Adaptation in (3b) is that the speech delivery needs to be faster, as in the original version (3). Although the meaning does not change from one dubbing to another, the interpretation in (3b) renders the original more faithfully, adding a nuance of impatience that was missing in (3a).

Original version	Dubbing (1982)	Redubbing (2002)
(3) Elliott: There's something out there! In the toolshed. It threw the ball at me.	(3a) Elliott: Mamma, c'è qualcosa là fuori! E mi ha tirato la palla.	(3b) Elliott: Mamma, mamma, fuori c'è qualcosa! È nella rimessa e mi ha tirato la palla.

Another example of Modulation and Adaptation being employed in the dubbing and redubbing of the movie is the following example, where we see the first translation of the directive *'Go as a goblin'* rendered by a conditional (4a) while we find a negative query in (4b), a solution that indeed maintains the same overall meaning but makes the second translation less incisive.

Also interesting in (4) is the translation provided for *'goblin'*. In 1982 it was translated as *'folletto'*, whereas in 2002 the translator opted for *'gnomo'*, both examples of Adaptation. Today if a third redubbing were proposed, we would probably see *'goblin'* used in Italian as well, through the Borrowing technique, but in the early 1980s and early 2000s *'folletto'* and *'gnomo'* were functional analogues of a third culture reference coming from northern Europe. Translators have probably opted for two Italian words able to recreate the idea of fantasy creatures.

In (5) we see a similar case: both the fantastic creatures present in the original are translated, but if a Calque is available for *'elf'* (*'elfo'* in Italian), in the first dubbing, *'leprechaun'* posed a problem for the translator, because it was a third culture reference that did not have an equivalent or a Calque in the target language. *'Leprechaun'* was therefore first Adapted with the expression *'orconano'* (5a), whereas in the redubbing the term was deleted (5b), and the translator inserted the adverb *semplicemente*, 'simply', to cover for the time taken by the articulation of the word *'leprechaun'*. The choice of this adverb may be motivated by articulation compatibility with the name *'leprechaun'*, given the similarity between vowel sounds [e] and [ɛ] and the presence of the plosive [p] in both words.

Original version	Dubbing (1982)	Redubbing (2002)
(4) Michael: Go as a goblin.	(4a) Michael: Ti potresti vestire da folletto.	(4b) Michael: Perché non ti mascheri da gnomo?
(5) Michael: Maybe an elf or a leprechaun.	(5a) Michael: Magari era un elfo, o un orco nano.	(5b) Michael: Magari era semplicemente un folletto.

In (6), instead, we do see Borrowing utilized, but only in the redubbing of the movie. In 1982, the source culture reference *'cowgirl'* did not have a direct equivalent in Italian, therefore *'cowboy'* was preferred (see 6a). In 2002, instead, we see that the SCR *'cowgirl'* had fully entered the Italian vocabulary through Borrowing (6b).

Original version	Dubbing (1982)	Redubbing (2002)
(6) Gert: I'm going as a cowgirl.	(6a) Gert: Io voglio vestirmi da cowboy.	(6b) Gert: Io volevo vestirmi da cowgirl.

The redubbing of E.T. saw the frequent use of Borrowing, but as mentioned above, only in the redubbed version, as can be seen in (7), where Elliott mentions a type of candy called Pez. The Italian translator had to rely on an invented brand, 'Spritz', in (7a) because Pez was not marketed in Italy before the 1990s, and nothing equivalent existed at the time. In 1982 the adapters had to find a clever solution to translating this source culture reference that had no correspondence in the Italian culture. Since the brand name Pez was distinguishable in the frame and also Elliott is framed in the foreground, it was probably necessary to invent a name whose articulation was similar to Pez, as 'Spritz'. In (7b), instead, the translators could use the original brand name 'Pez', because it was commonly found in Italy by then.

Original version	Dubbing (1982)	Redubbing (2002)
(7) Elliott: See? This is Pez. Candy.	(7a) Elliott: E questi sono Spritz. Dolci.	(7b) Elliott: Vedi? E questi sono i Pez. Dolci.

In (8) we see how the names of Elliott's toys are different in the two versions: in (8a) we find that the use of Adaptation and a set of invented words ('*Testa di Maglio*'; '*UomoTricheco*'; '*Denti in Fuori*') were utilized, whereas in (8b) the original English names were retained through Borrowing. The characters Elliott was indicating are action figures that in 1982 probably represented a source culture reference as they did not have a correspondence in Italian. In 2002, after the release of the second Star Wars trilogy (Lucas 1999-2005), the cultural reference was perceived as an intercultural reference and the translator opted for Borrowing the original action figures' names.

Original version	Dubbing (1982)	Redubbing (2002)
(8) Elliott: And then this is Hammerhead. You see? This is Walrus Man. And then this is Snaggletooth.	(8a) Elliott: E questo è Testa di Maglio. Vedi? Questo è l'Uomo Tricheco. E poi questo è Denti In Fuori.	(8b) Elliott: E questo è Hammerhead. Vedi? Questo è Walrus Man. E poi questo è Snaggletooth.

In (9) the word *popcorn* was initially Adapted to '*noccioline*' ('*peanuts*') – see (9a). At the time, although popcorn was already marketed in Italy, buying

peanuts was more common in cinemas; therefore, the first translator chose a product the public could recognize. By 2002, popcorn was commonly found in cinemas and was no longer a potential cause of referential opacity.

Original version	Dubbing (1982)	Redubbing (2002)
(9) Elliott: Remember when he used to take us out to the ball games and take us to the movies, and we had popcorn fights?	(9a) Elliott: Ricordi quando papà ci portava a vedere le partite? E ci portava al cinema e le battaglie con le noccioline?	(9b) Elliott: Ti ricordi quando papà ci portava a vedere le partite? E ci portava al cinema e facevamo le battaglie con i popcorn?

In (10), Elliott recognizes his father's aftershave on the shirt he found, but in (10a) the brand name '*Old Spice*' is replaced by the generic name of the product, '*dopobarba*' (aftershave), which renders the line comprehensible to Italian viewers. At the time of the second dubbing, '*Old Spice*' had entered the target culture and no longer needed Adaptation.

What happens in (11) is somewhat different but stems from another SCR. In correcting his brother, Michael mentions the name of another aftershave, '*Sea Breeze*', which is presumably the after-shave that he could smell on his father's shirt. In (11a) we see how, instead of correcting his brother with the name of the right aftershave, Michael makes it clear that the smell that he detects does not belong to his father, but to a certain Samantha who perhaps is the woman with whom their father went to Mexico, abandoning their mother. Given the foregrounding of the scene, it is conceivable that the choice of that name is driven by the will to match the two words on the isosynchronous plane.

Original version	Dubbing (1982)	Redubbing (2002)
(10) Elliott: Old Spice.	(10a) Elliott: Dopobarba.	(10b) Elliott: Old Spice.
(11) Michael: Sea Breeze.	(11a) Michael: Samantha.	(11b) Michael: Sea Breeze.

What is also interesting to note is that, unlike Zanotti (2015), who reported a toning down of the expletives that occasionally surface in Elliott's brother's speech, in the present analysis it has been noted that most of the expletives that were eliminated in the first dubbing of the movie were actually restored in the second dubbing, rendering the 2002 version more faithful to the original and therefore rich in strong language, as can be seen in the following example:

Original version	Dubbing (1982)	Redubbing (2002)
(12) Tyler: You geek, man.	(12a) Tyler: Hai dato i numeri.	(12b) Tyler: Hai dato i numeri. Imbranato.

In (12) we note that Modulation is followed by the Adaptation '*Hai dato i numeri*' in (12a) and (12b), but (12b) presents an addition: the statement is followed by '*Imbranato*' a more precise translation of '*geek*'. It is possible that, as a slang term, the 1982 adaptation did not find any correspondence in Italian and preferred to translate the expression into a periphrasis that would yield a more or less equivalent meaning.

The translation of (13) was left to the inventiveness of the adapters that in the two versions opted for different solutions. In (13a) the intent of mocking Elliott has been interpreted by translating the expressions '*creeps*' and '*creepy*' with a neutral '*pisciasotto*', that is however capable of rendering the illocutionary meaning of the original statement. In (13b), instead, the adaptation has tried to use an expression whose meaning is much closer to (13). The version proposed by (13b) recalls, as in (13), something that crawls and '*vermeverminoso*' manages to reproduce a word play in which the root '*creep*' has been declined in two ways, thus maintaining structure, alliteration and meaning.

Original version	Dubbing (1982)	Redubbing (2002)
(13) Greg: Creeps. Creepy.	(13a) Greg: Pisciasotto.	(13b) Greg: Sei un verme verminoso.

Example (14) introduces a form of colloquial speech, '*douchebag*', that is a slang expression commonly used as an insult, but that originally defined an intimate hygiene practice. Both adaptations have borrowed the association with intimate parts, but with different results: in (14a) the metaphor is replaced with '*anti-fecondativo*' (contraceptive), a word that is not part of a young person's world. In (14b) the line becomes an exhortation to get purged. Both lines show similarities to the original but with some significant differences. On the one hand, the first dubbing and the original express the same asseverated act represented by a nominal phrase, unlike (8b) where we see a directive realized through an imperative verb. On the other hand, the original and the second dubbing feature a lexicon more accessible to the type of character that speaks.

Original version	Dubbing (1982)	Redubbing (2002)
(14) Greg: Douchebag.	(14a) Greg: Anti fecondativo.	(14b) Greg: Fatti una purga, Elliott.

Finally, in (15), Michael dismisses his sister by referring to her as *'little twerp'*, a depreciative that does not appear in (15a) but only in (15b) (*'scema'*); in Italian both structures are rendered as questions, and not as affirmatives, thus employing Modulation. As in the previous examples, we see a toning down or an elimination of strong language in the first dubbing of the movie, perhaps because the original translators deemed these expressions inadequate for a family film. In the redubbing, instead, the original expletives are restored.

Original version	Dubbing (1982)	Redubbing (2002)
(15) Michael: They're only feet, you little twerp.	(15a) Michael: Sono piedi, che piedi vuoi?	(15b) Michael: Sono piedi, che piedi vuoi, scema?

Sometimes, however, the first dubbing proposes instances of *'dubbese'* (Antonini 2009), i.e. words that do not exist in everyday vocabulary and are invented on the spot by dubbing audio-visual translators. In (16a), for example, the word *'lame'* has been translated with *'spillato'*, a term not in use in contemporary Italian. Twenty years later, the translator opted to provide viewers with the actual translation of *'lame'* (16b) that reads *'poverofesso'*.

Original version	Dubbing (1982)	Redubbing (2002)
(16) Michael: You're so lame, Elliott.	(16a) Michael: Sei uno spillato, Elliott.	(16b) Michael: Elliott, sei un povero fesso.

Another type of Adaptation is found in (17), when Gerty refers to English. Here we see a SCR that raised a number of problems. Adopting a literal translation would not have made sense for Italian viewers, nor would substituting *'English'* for *'Italian'*, as in *'don't you understand Italian?'*, because Italian viewers are well aware that the story is not set in Italy. As a consequence, translators had to opt for an Adaptation, eliminating the reference to a specific language and using the Italian idiom *'Non tiseilavato le orecchiestamattina?'* (*'haven't you cleaned your ears this morning?'*) in (17a) and (17b).

Original version	Dubbing (1982)	Redubbing (2002)
(17) Gerty: Can't you understand English? He said "phone".	(17a) Gerty: Non ti sei lavato le orecchie stamattina? Ha detto "telefono".	(17b) Gerty: Non ti sei lavato le orecchie stamattina? Ha detto "telefono".

One of the few examples of Transpositions found in the dubbing and redubbing of the movie is in the memorable line proposed in (18). The 1982 translations opted for a Transposition and changed the speech sequence from *'home... phone'* to *'telefono... casa'* (*'phone... home'*). The 2002 version, as has been noted numerous times in the present analysis, renders a more faithful translation by applying a Literal Translation (see 18b).

Original version	Dubbing (1982)	Redubbing (2002)
(18) E.T.: E.T. Home, phone. E.T. phone home.	(18a) E.T.: E.T. Telefono, casa. E.T. Telefono casa.	(18b) E.T.: E.T. Casa, telefono. E.T. Telefono casa.

In addition, one of the many examples which demonstrate that the subsequent redubbing of this motion picture was carried out not only to modernize the translation but also to eliminate any inaccuracies is found in (19). Here the cultural reference to an urban myth that originated in the United States in the 1930s (New York Times 1935) was recognized in the 1982 version and a wrong subject was attributed to the verb – see (19a). Michael seems to refer to a particular person who may have reported this fact, unlike in (19b), where the character correctly uses a more generic third person plural pronoun.

Original version	Dubbing (1982)	Redubbing (2002)
(19) Michael: You know how they say there are alligators in the sewers? Maybe it was a pervert or a deformed kid.	(19a) Michael: Sai, dice che ci sono gli alligatori dentro le fogne. Forse era solo un ragazzino deforme, o simili.	(19b) Michael: Sai che dicono che ci sono gli alligatori dentro le fogne? Forse era solo un pervertito o un bambino deforme.

In the second part of the line instead, censorship surfaces again, and the word *'pervert'* is eliminated, as it has a negative sexual connotation that

was culturally unacceptable in Italy, in a family movie of the early 1980s. Differently, in (18b) we see how in the second adaptation the term is appropriately translated with *'pervertito'* (*'pervert'*), thus eliminating a taboo.

5. Conclusions

First of all, the present analysis has confirmed that, by applying Vinay – Darbelnet's (2000) taxonomy to the Italian dubbed and redubbed versions of *E.T. The Extraterrestrial*, a prominent use of Direct and Oblique translation techniques emerges. The varied use of Adaptation, Modulation, Calque, Borrowing and Literal Translation, for example, shows the careful editing the redubbed version of the movie has undergone, thus rendering the text more precise, accurate and authentic.

Berman's (1990) Retranslation Hypothesis on literary retransmissions has been confirmed, as the first translation of this famous motion picture has been found to be oriented more towards the target culture, while the latter is oriented more towards the source culture. SCRs, in particular, have often been perceived as intercultural references in the 2002 redubbed version and have been translated for the Italian public using Adaptation, Borrowing and Literal Translation. The two decades that divide the first and second dubbing of the movie have been culturally and linguistically crucial, widening the cultural and linguistic horizons of contemporary Italian viewers. If the first translation of the movie's SCRs started introducing source culture references in the Italian culture of the early 1980s, in the retranslation we find that a significant number of SCRs that were deemed problematic in the previous version had become part of the target culture and had been completely assimilated. Lefevere (1985) refers to the translation of cultural references as one of the ways through which the public can become more receptive to foreign elements. The first dubbing of *E.T.* has undoubtedly contributed to the expansion of cultural and linguistic horizons that have allowed the second translation to be oriented more towards the source text.

Besides being more accurate and receptive regarding the use of strong language, the second dubbing displays a high number of fillers and informal constructions typical of spontaneous speech. This analysis therefore also confirms what Freddi – Pavesi (2009) have noted, i.e. that Italian redubbed films of the last decades appear to be rich in colloquialisms and strong language. The characters of the first adaptation of *E.T. The Extraterrestrial* employ a more formal vocabulary than those of the second adaptation. This

formality makes the dialogues of the first version more artificial, a problem that has been successfully addressed in the redubbed version.

Although the beneficial results of a retranslation are clear, the public's reaction is often negative. This is necessarily related to other aspects that go beyond the technical parameters of a retranslation (Bakewell 1987). Like all great classics, *E.T. The Extraterrestrial* has become a generational cultural reference loved by the public, that deems it historically and culturally significant. The fame the film has acquired over the years implies that any change in detail and the inevitable use of different actors in its dubbed versions can be perceived as a potential threat that could compromise even a well-packaged product. Nonetheless, redubbing can provide a language that is more in line with the spontaneous speech of the linguistic community that it represents, and in particular with that of the new generations watching the film for the first time. In the new version this new generation of viewers will undoubtedly find a representation of reality with which they can identify more easily (Vanderschelden 2000).

REFERENCES

Sources

- E.T. the Extra-Terrestrial*. 1982. Dir. Steven Spielberg. Universal Pictures. DVD.
E.T. the Extra-Terrestrial: The 20th Anniversary Celebration. 2002. Dir. Laurent Bouzereau. Universal Pictures. DVD.

Special studies

- Antonini, R.
 2009 "The perception of dubbed cultural references in Italy", *InTRAlinea* 11, www.intralinea.org/archive/article/The_perception_of_dubbed_cultural_references_in_Italy, accessed March 2018
- Bakewell, M.
 1987 "Factors affecting the cost of dubbing", *EBU Review* 38 (6), 16-17.
- Berman, A.
 1990 "La retraduction comme espace de la traduction", *Palimpsestes* 4, 1-7.
- Chaume, F.
 2007 "La retraducción de textos audiovisuales: Razones y repercusiones traductológicas". In: J.J. Zaro Vera – F. Ruíz Noguera (eds.) *Retraducir:*

- una nueva mirada. La retraducción de textos literarios y audiovisuales.*
Malaga: Miguel Gómez Ediciones, 49-63.
- Díaz Cintas, J. – A. Remael
2007 *Audiovisual Translation: Subtitling*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Even-Zohar, I.
1990 "Polysystemtheory", *Poetics Today* 11 (1), 9-26.
- Finkel, A.M.
1962 "Ob avtoperevode", *TKP*, 104-125.
- Freddi, M. – M. Pavesi
2009 *Analysing Audiovisual Dialogue. Linguistic and Translation Insights*. Bologna: CLUEB.
- Gambier, Y.
1994 "La retraduction, retour et détour", *Meta* 34 (3), 413-417.
- Gottlieb, H.
1992 "Subtitling-a new university discipline". In: C. Dollerup – A. Loddegaard (eds.) *Teaching Translation and Interpreting: Training, Talent and Experience*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 161-170.
- Hardin, G. – C. Picot
1990 *Translate: Initiation à la pratique de la traduction*. Bordas, Paris: Aubin Imprimeur.
- Ivarsson, J. – R.F. Crofts
1992 *Subtitling for the Media: A Handbook of an Art*. Transedit.
- Khris, S.
2006 "The whys of redubbing. Toward a theoretical approach to redubbing". Paper presented at *MuTra – Multidimensional Translation Conference* (University of Copenhagen, 1-5 May 2006).
- Kovačič, I.
1996 *Subtitling Strategies: A Flexible Hierarchy of Priorities*. Bologna: Clueb.
- Kwiecinski, P.
2001 *Disturbing Strangeness: Foreignisation and Domestication in Translation Procedures in the Context of Cultural Asymmetry*. Toruń: WydawnictwoEdytor.
- Leemets, H.
1992 "Translating the 'untranslatable' words". In: H. Tommola – K. Varantola – T. Salmi-Tolonen – J. Schopp (eds.) *Papers Submitted to the 5th EURALEX International Congress on Lexicography, in Tampere, Finland. Part 2*. Tampere: University of Tampere, 473-478.
- Lefevere, A.
1985 "Why waste our time on rewrites? The trouble with interpretation and the role of rewriting in an alternative paradigm". In: T. Hermans (ed.) *The Manipulation of Literature*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 215-243.
1992 *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London: Routledge.

- Leppihalme, R.
 1994 *Culture Bumps: On the Translation of Allusions*. Helsinki: Helsinki University.
 1997 *Culture Bumps. An Empirical Approach to the Translation of Allusions*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
 2011 "Realia". In: Y. Gambier – L. van Doorslaer (eds.) *Handbook of Translations Studies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 126-130.
- Lomheim, S.
 1999 "The writing on the screen. Subtitling: A case study from Norwegian Broadcasting (NRK), Oslo". In: G. Anderman – M. Rogers (eds.) *Word, Text, Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 190-207.
- Mailhac, J.-P.
 1996 "The formulation of translation strategies for cultural references". In: C. Hoffmann (ed.) *Language, Culture and Communication in Contemporary Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 132-151.
- Maraschio, N.
 1982 "L'italiano del doppiaggio". In: G. Nencioniet al. (eds.) *La lingua italiana in movimento*. Firenze: AccademiadellaCrusca, 137-158.
- Newmark, P.
 1988 *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Nida, E.A.
 1945 "Linguistics and ethnology in translation problems", *Word* 2, 194-208.
- Nornes, A.M.
 2007 *Cinema Babel. Translating Global Cinema*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Paolinelli, M.
 2004 "Nodes and boundaries of global communications: Notes on the translation and dubbing of audiovisuals", *Meta* 49 (1), 172-81.
- Pavesi, M.
 2006 *La traduzione filmica. Aspetti del parlato doppiato dall'inglese all'italiano*. Roma: Carocci.
- Pavesi, M. – E. Perego
 2006 "Profiling film translators in Italy: A preliminary analysis", *The Journal of Specialised Translation* 18, 99-144.
- Pedersen, J.
 2005 "How is culture rendered in subtitles?". *MuTra 2005 – Challenges of Multidimensional Translation: Conference Proceedings*, www.euroconferences.info/proceedings/2005_Proceedings/2005_Pedersen_Jan.pdf, accessed March 2018
 2011 *Subtitling Norms for Television*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ramière, N.
 2006 "Reaching a foreign audience: Cultural transfers in audiovisual translation", *The Journal of Specialised Translation* 6, 152-166.

- Rantanen, A.
 1990 "Culturally-bound material and its treatment in literary translation", *International Journal of Translation* 2 (2), 49-59.
- Ranzato, I.
 2010 *La traduzione audiovisiva: analisi degli elementi culturospecifici*. Roma: Bulzoni.
 2014 "'You're Talking Like the Computer in the Movie'. Allusions in audiovisual translations", *Parole Rubate* 9, 81-107.
- Toury, G.
 1980 *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics, Tel Aviv University.
 1995 *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Valoroso, N.
 2000 "Il doppiaggio nel cinema d'animazione: i lungometraggi animati Disney". In: A. Castellano (ed.) *Il doppiaggio. Profilo e storia di un'arte negata*. Roma: AIDAC, 109-114.
- Vanderschelden, I.
 2000 "Why retranslate the French classics? The impact of retranslation on quality". In: M. Salama-Carr (ed.) *On Translating French Literature and Film*. Vol. 2. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1-18.
- Vinay, J.-P. – J. Darbelnet
 2000 "A methodology for translation". In: L. Venuti (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*. London: Routledge, 84-94.
- Vlahov, S. – S. Florin
 1969 "Neperovodimoe v perevode. Realii", *Masterstvooperevoda* 6, 432-456.
- Wehn, K.
 1998 "Re-dubbings of US-American television series for the German television: The case of *Magnum, P.I.*". In: Y. Gambier (ed.) *Translating for the Media*. Turku: University of Turku, 185-199.
- Zanotti, S.
 2015 "Analysing redubs: Motives, agents and audience response". In: R.B. Piñero – J.D. Cintas (eds.) *Audiovisual Translation in a Global Context. Palgrave Studies in Translating and Interpreting*. PalgraveMacmillan: London, 110-139.

Address: LARISSA D'ANGELO, Dipartimento di Lingue, Letterature e Culture Straniere, Università degli Studi di Bergamo, Piazza Rosate 2, 24129 Bergamo (Italy).

ORCID code: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3565-6280>.