Measuring Audiovisual Translation: A Model for the Analysis of Intralingual Live Subtitling

Carlo Eugeni

Intersteno, Rome, Italy

Live subtitling is more and more popular as an audiovisual translation mode. Many broadcasters all around the world make use of it so as to ensure 100% accessibility to their output in favor of their deaf and hard-of-hearing audience. However, the studies of live subtitling are not that numerous and many gaps are still to be bridged. One of these is a model accounting for the product of intralingual live subtitles in strategic terms. This paper tries to propose such a model by starting to analyze the most influential proposals put forward by several scholars in the field of interlingual pre-recorded subtitling, both in terminological and strategic terms. Then, an effort will be made in order to adapt such models of analysis to the specificities of live subtitling. In doing so, we will try and avoid reducing the analysis of intralingual live subtitles to comparing words. In particular, our focus will be on units of analysis and on the strategies that live subtitlers employ to adapt them to subtitles. However, to be effective, a model should also allow for a general evaluation of the end product. That is why a final consideration will also be taken into account both in semantic and semiotic terms. In case it should prove sufficiently acceptable to fulfil the researcher's needs and expectations, the proposed model of analysis will be a step forward in the study of live subtitling.

Keywords: live subtitling, respeaking, strategies, model of analysis, deaf and hard-of-hearing

Introduction

Over the past five years or so, professionals (Marsh, 2004), researchers (Eugeni & Mack, 2006; Arumí Ribas & Romero Fresco, 2008), and software developers (Lambourne, 2007) have investigated many aspects (editorial, technical, professional, didactical, and social) of respeaking from a more or less empirical standpoint. This has rapidly opened the way to new audiovisual scenarios both on a research and on a professional level, thus driving the attention of both the academia and the labour market to live subtitling, an area of little interest for both of them until then. Basically, what the abovementioned have done is to translate the daily practice of a limited number of professionals into words. Most of the works produced mostly concentrate on respeaking as a process and as an intellectual activity, and do not take the subtitles as they appear on screen and as the end users perceive them into consideration. What is still missing is a first work on the theory of the final product, which is the produced live of subtitles.

In an attempt to partially bridge this gap, in this article, the author will outline a model for the analysis of live

---

Carlo Eugeni, philosophy Doctor, Intersteno.

subtitles as the TT (target text) of a process starting with the listening of a ST (source text) and passing through the production of a mid-text (Eugeni, 2008) or crossover (Arumí Ribas & Romero Fresco, 2008). To do so, firstly the author will briefly discuss the notions of strategies, tactics, techniques, procedures, and the like; then the author will try to make an overview of some of the major models of analysis developed so far by researchers working on subtitling; finally the author will propose a model suitable for the analysis of live subtitles.

Procedures, Methods, Techniques, Equivalents, Tactics, and Strategies

The history of Translation Studies has been characterized by a multitude of labels that have been more or less consciously attributed to those operations translators make. They appear at the product level as stylistic "changes", but they imply a reasoning among two communicational systems and the mastering of specific skills. For this reason as Zabalbeascoa (2000) reminded us, since Vinay and Darbelnet (1958), the issue of labelling such changes has never been unproblematic. Vinay and Darbelnet were deeply aware of the importance of words and they could not avoid using two different concepts in their volume: the one of "méthode" to address the overall process of translating; and the one of "procédés techniques" to address the changes on the lexical, morpho-syntactical, and message levels produced by a translator in order to produce good translations. These definitions have been extremely important in the history of translation studies and have influenced many other authors (Vázquez-Ayora, 1977; Newmark, 1988; Delisle, 1993; Podeur, 2002).

However, both "method" and "technical procedure" imply a certain degree of partially conscious automatism in the mind of a translator when producing the TT. Moreover, the fact that the "technical procedures" are closed and limited in number suggests that once a translation student has mastered them, he/she can easily start his/her career as a professional translator by simply applying them. The strong evidence that has been produced so far both by professionals in their daily life and by researchers in the results of their studies shows that this view of translation can be useful, but it is quite limited and conservative (Molina & Hurtado Albir, 2002). The reason is that translating is not just changing things stylistically in order to make the TT become more acceptable to a given speech community accustomed to different stylistics, but a much more complicated intellectual communication process. A similar reasoning can be done about Nida's (1964) "techniques" and "equivalents" which mainly refer to differences in the form and not in the content or in the translational process. Finally, Chesterman (1997) introduced the concept of "strategy", but he seemed to blur things further. First of all, because he considered them as synonyms of tactics and procedures, and then because when looking at the 30 strategies, he proposed one realizes that the most frequent one is a "change" either on the syntactic, semantic, or pragmatic level.

At this stage of the review, six labels have been produced for no more than two meanings: procedures, methods, techniques, equivalents, tactics, and strategies. In order to find a terminological way out, Molina and Hurtado Albir (2002) proposed to make a distinction between four labels: objective, method, techniques, and strategies. According to them, the translator's objective is "a global option that affects the whole text"; the translation method "refers to the way a particular translation process is carried out in terms of the translator's objective"; translation techniques are "the way micro-units of the text are translated"; and strategies are "the procedures (conscious or unconscious, verbal or nonverbal) used by the translator to solve problems that emerge when carrying out the translation process with a particular objective in mind" (Molina & Hurtado Albir, 2002, pp.

507-508). Gambier (2006) further simplified this frame by making use of a tripartite taxonomy composed of goal, strategies, and tactics. In particular, Gambier (2006) focused on the centrality of "global strategies which try to match the goal of translation with the available means (procedures, techniques, etc.) in given work conditions" (p. 29; the author's translation). In comparative terms, Gambier's goal and strategy correspond to what Molina and Hurtado Albir call objective and method respectively, while Gambier's tactics include both Molina and Hurtado Albir's strategies and techniques. This interpretation seems to be much more effective since it does not consider "changes" or "shifts" on the product level as mechanical operations but as the result of a more important cognitive effort made to meet a given goal. Moreover, Gambier talks of goal of translation while Molina and Hurtado Albir talk of translator's objective which gives a higher priority to the translator's personal objective (which may simply be making a living) than to the final product.

All this being said, since the model that will be discussed later does not aim at stating what strategies to put into practice to be good live subtitlers, but simply at looking at how the goal of a translation is met, the words strategies and tactics will be used to respectively refer to the main pre-established aim of live subtitling, and to the operations that are visible in the product as a result of their more or less voluntary application by the subtitler.

Taxonomies in Subtitling

As Gottlieb (2000) reminded us, subtitling is the only form of "prepared communication using written language acting as an additive and synchronous semiotic channel as part of a transient and polysemiotic text" (p. 15). Consequently, when subtitling and analyzing the subtitles of any programme, it is important to remind that the titles are not *the* TT, but *part* of it. To explain this notion, Gottlieb even attempted to quantify the semiotic impact of subtitles in the TT. In particular, he (2005, p. 46) started by claiming that in the case of a standard film, images account for 55%, speech for 25%, sound effects for 18%, and finally writing for 2%. Once this same film is subtitled into another language, the semiotic impact of its channels varies enormously: Images lose almost one third of their importance (40%), speech loses almost two thirds (10%), sound effects keep their impact level (18%), and writing rises to 32% of the TT (Gottlieb, 2005, p. 46). Even if 32% is a very important impact, this piece of data shows that two thirds of the TT's meaning is not expressed by subtitles. It also shows that subtitles do not have the same semiotic impact as the original speech (25%). This is all the more true when considering a film subtitled intralingually for the Deaf and the Hard-of-hearing. Here, according to Gottlieb (2005, p. 46), the semiotic impact of images jumps to 65% and the one of subtitles to 35%, because they should compensate partially for 18% of the sound effects (only the most semiotically relevant are translated into subtitles) and partially for 25% of the speech (a part of it may be compensated for by lip-reading). For all these reasons, in order to analyze subtitles, one cannot simply compare them with the original dialogues, but should consider the original film (audio and video verbal and non-verbal components) as the ST, and the film subtitled in the target language (audio and video verbal and non-verbal components plus the extra video verbal component of subtitles) as the TT. In other words, if the goal of subtitling a film (either for hearers or for deaf and hard-of-hearing people) is to be met, one cannot simply concentrate on tactics, but should also take the use of global strategies into more serious consideration.

However, if we look at the history of taxonomies in subtitling, we realize that this concept has neither been fully considered nor applied. In his well-known taxonomy one of the first scholars to focus on subtitling, Gottlieb (1991) talked of 10 different tactics:

Eksplicitering: Something culturally clear in the source language is made explicit in the target language;

Parafrase: An expression in the source language is syntactically modified in the target language;

Transponering: The ST is translated wholly without changes at the scheme or trope levels;

Identitet: *Realia* or foreign language speech or songs are not translated;

Transskibering: Bizarre terminology or phonology is maintained in the TT;

Konformering: The effect of a word or a text is maintained to the detriment of its content and/or form;

Kondensering: A faithful and correct translation is made shorter without omission of content information;

Decimering: The translation is shortened further and important parts of the original are omitted;

Annullering: Complete sentences or turns of speech are omitted;

Lakune: Something important is not translated because no translation solution is found. (pp. 77-94)

After having analyzed *Young Frankenstein*, Gottlieb shows how some of the abovementioned tactics can be mixed thus generating other tactics. However, the most recurrent ones are *transponering*, *paraphrase*, and *kondensering*, because normally subtitling is a question of translating and of translating under spatial-temporal constraints.

A different approach is the one proposed by Lomheim (1995) who proposed more general categories to be added to what he gave for granted, *transfert équivalent*:

Effacement: Part of the original dialogue is omitted;

Condensé: Form, not content, of the original dialogue is reduced;

Addition: A word or sentence is explicated further for comprehension sake;

Hyperonymie: A term is replaced by a more general, thus more comprehensible (or shorter), one;

Hyponymie: A term is replaced by a more specific, thus more comprehensible (or shorter), one;

Neutralisation: A taboo or "untranslatable" word is rendered with a neutral term. (pp. 291-292)

After having analyzed three films subtitled into Norwegian, Lomheim (1995) said that effacement, condensé, and hyperonymie are the most used tactics. Interestingly, Lomheim stressed two important aspects: First of all, he recommended the subtitler reach the goal of semantic and stylistic equivalences between the original dialogues, thus avoiding to denaturise the view of the film; then he showed how the notion of film genre is an important variable for the distribution of the abovementioned tactics. The more literal the film, the lower their rate.

A more structured taxonomy is the one proposed by Lambert and Delabastita (1996, pp. 39-40) who based their work on a previous one by Delabastita (1989). To them, subtitling is a translational process in which the subtitler has to continuously find a compromise between three major aspects of his work: competences, norms, and performances. The kind of relations between them depends on the different semiotic components of any audiovisual product (acoustic verbal/non-verbal and visual verbal/non-verbal). Competences include the AVT (Audiovisual Translation) form and the different possible tactics: *Repetitio:* formal correspondence between ST and TT; *Transmutatio*: change in the order of meaning elements; *Adiectio*: addition of elements; *Detractio*: subtraction of elements; and *Substitutio*: an umbrella term including formal equivalence, paraphrase, specification, generalisation, modulation, and substitution of given elements.

Once again, the application of tactics can be changed depending on the subgenre of the audiovisual product (in the case of a documentary some tactics can be applied for translating interviews and other tactics for translating the voice-off). What is interesting here is also the two scholars' attempt to stick to quantitative, more objective, aspects of subtitles that are their external forms as compared to the film as a whole. This is very useful, because it makes it possible for the researcher to see a tactic (e.g., *detractio*) not in itself (e.g., as a simple

reduction in the form of dialogues), but in the light of a super-ordinate strategy (e.g., saving words when context makes them redundant). Another important step forward is the condensation of more tactics into a bigger one, *substitution*. This does not only simplify the taxonomy, but allows seeing the picture as a whole and not as a kaleidoscope of minor tactics.

In the frame of the Hallidayan functional grammar, Kovačič (1996, pp. 297-305) further simplified this picture by showing how subtitles aim particularly at preserving the ideational function of language rather than the interpersonal one, which is favoured by dialogue. Moreover, the phatic dimension of the ST, typical of spoken language, is almost removed in subtitles. This theoretical framework moves the focus of the researcher to a more pragmatic view of subtitles, which become a functional component of the whole audiovisual text they are part of. This brings to the reduction of the number of the tactics available to subtitlers: *omission* and *condensation* of parts of dialogues. These two tactics mainly depend on three factors: the type of programme, the end users, and the aesthetics of language. This view is partially the same as the one adopted by Ivarsson and Carroll (1998, pp. 85-127) who created a hierarchy of tactics with *condensing/abridgment* as the major operation made by subtitlers by means of omission, paraphrase, and compression. To follow, other tactics used by subtitlers to produce a readable TT which are more technical than editorial and are aimed at a more fluent reading by viewers: the *merging* of dialogues when they are too many for the spatial constraints imposed by reading time; the use of *syntactic simplification*, of *simple vocabulary*, and of *borrowing time* (that is distributing the text produced by one speaker in a more homogeneous way during the time he or she is speaking on the screen); and finally the use of punctuation and typographic conventions for signalling a voice-off, a quotation, a speech turn, etc.

Another attempt to classify tactics specific to subtitle is made by Schwarz (2002) who started from Gottlieb's taxonomy and reduces their number to: *Text reduction*: including *kondensering*, *decimering*, and *annullering*; *Simplifying syntax and vocabulary*; *Summarising*: If more than two speech turns are short and rapid they are merged into less turns; *Fonts and figures*: Words containing tight letters like "i", "j", and "l" are used to replace synonyms containing wide letters like "m", "o", and "w" (this is only valid when the subtitling software uses fonts varying in width); and numbers are used instead of letters for rendering figures, dates, etc.

This taxonomy is useful, because it reduces the number of editorial tactics to the first two, the last two being more technical than linguistic.

One last interesting example is offered by Gambier. In his attempt to put an order in what he (2006) saw as "floating and not sufficiently deepened; where tactics are often superposed; and where the focus is essentially on the single words or on the sentence" (p. 33; the author's translation), he (2006) tried to consider "all most important elements at once and to detach from the written model which reduces the analysis of subtitles to a question of compatibility between words" (p. 33; the author's translation). To do so, he first of all implied that the goal of translation is to make an audiovisual product accessible to a foreign language audience. Then he (2006) noted that "Subtitling is not a loss but a relevant communication solution" (p. 34; the author's translation), the main strategy (a target-oriented strategy) being following the pace of the speech while respecting the norms of the target written language. Finally, he (2006) suggested three main macro-tactics to make this strategy a reality:

> *Réduction*: It can be partial or total and includes *compression* (summarising redundant occurrences on the lexical or morphological level, the merging of two or three speech turns) and *elimination* (deletion of verbose or too rapid parts of an audiovisual product, mainly in cases where there is compensation by the visual non-verbal component);

Simplification of syntax: It embraces the simplification of both the order of clauses within a period and of words within a clause; the coordination of subordinate clauses; the nominalisation of clauses; vertical and horizontal synonymy; the neutralisation of culture-specific terms;

Expansion: It includes explication, paraphrase, direct borrowing, and dynamic equivalence. (p. 35; the author's translation)

The model proposed by Gambier is useful not only because it makes use of clear-cut concepts underlying the work of the subtitler (goal, strategy, and tactics), but also because the macro-tactics proposed are so general it is much easier to "apprehend all most important elements at once" without having to hesitate between one category and the other.

A Model for the Analysis of Live Subtitling

The aim of this paper is to propose a model for the analysis of intralingual live subtitles as part of an audiovisual TT. To do so, it is first of all necessary to go a little further into detail and precisely define the research object. That is why in the following paragraph the author will first of all investigate live subtitling as a product. Then drawing on the pros and cons of previous taxonomies, the author will try to discuss the needs and expectations of possible future users of the model into question. Finally, the author will describe how the model has been designed and consequently what are its limits.

Live Subtitling: The Product

The TT to be analyzed, as it is intended here, is not the text of live subtitles, but the programme as a whole, as it is offered to the end users, and that is the ST plus the subtitles produced while it is on air. This includes live, semi-live, and pre-recorded programmes subtitled live, but not those programmes whose subtitles are produced by means of any technique for live subtitling (Eugeni, 2005) but are pre-recorded and eventually post-edited.

Once the object of research is identified, it is important to understand its positioning in the panorama of the many forms of translation. To this purpose, Gottlieb (2005) has ideated a categorization which is based on the following parameters: "(1) Semiotic identity or non-identity between source and target texts (…); (2) Possible changes in semiotic composition of the translation (…); (3) Degrees of freedom for the translating agent (…); and (4) Presence or absence of verbal material in source and/or target texts (…)" (p. 35).

According to these, a live-subtitled programme as compared to the ST is to be considered as: (1) intersemiotic (visual verbal and non-verbal components in the TT are used to translate the acoustic verbal and non-verbal components of the ST); (2) supersemiotic (extra visual verbal and non-verbal components are added to the ST, covering just the most negligible part of its visual component); (3) conventionalized (the ST is not only predictable to a certain extent by the subtitles, but it is almost wholly present in the TT). However, it is important to stress that depending on language directionality (interlinguistic/intralinguistic) and on the editorial policy the live subtitler is asked to follow (*verbatim*/edited), live subtitling will be more or less conventionalized; and (4) a type of translation where verbal and non-verbal elements are introduced.

After this long but necessary definition, it is important to highlight something that has emerged from the third point, which is the question of language directionality and of editorial policy. As far as the former is concerned, one must note that there are basically two different types of live subtitling: (1) intralingual: The target language is the same as the source language; and (2) interlingual: The target language is different from the source language.

In the professional landscape, it is common knowledge that the largest amount of live subtitling is intralingual, its main purpose being the social inclusion of the deaf and hard-of-hearing population through mass media accessibility. Another aspect, which has to be defined and which influences the nature of the TT, is that of editorial policy. To this purpose, Eugeni (2008, p. 358) pointed out that depending on the intended addressee, respeaking (but this is true for all forms of live subtitling) will be either *verbatim* or *non-verbatim* (or edited): (1) Verbatim: a very faithful transcription of the ST (…). For readability sake as in non-verbatim respeaking, all non-lexical events are removed and punctuation introduced; and (2) Non-verbatim: a real reformulation, consequently a quantitative reduction, of the ST (…).

The Model: Needs and Expectations

Looking at the abovementioned, taxonomies have allowed for a deep understanding of the advantages and disadvantages of each of them. Considering the model that will be discussed below, it is necessary to: (1) suit any kind of programme (live, semi-live, and pre-recorded) of any genre (documentary, the news, talk-shows, etc.); (2) be flexible enough to be adapted to the analysis of both strategies: *verbatim* and edited live subtitling; (3) be precise enough to account even for minor changes that occur within the double translational process (the live subtitler produces the mid-text and the machine produces the TT), which is intralingual; (4) allow for both a general and a specific analysis of the tactics used by the subtitler; and (5) include a sufficiently structured taxonomy, with a few clear-cut categorizations that can combine among them thus generating useful hybrids.

The Model: Description

In order to fulfil the abovementioned, the model has been designed around three main pillars: (1) segmentation and alignment of ST and TT; (2) categorization of tactics; and (3) multimodal analysis.

Segmentation and alignment of ST and TT. The first procedural step to accomplish in order to start analyzing the product of live subtitling is to segment both the ST and the TT to be able, in the following steps, to compare them first from a linguistic point of view, then from a larger communicational standpoint. To do so, it is important to define the units of analysis and in particular the smallest one. In subtitling in general and in particular in live subtitling, the notion of idea-unit, which is "where a proposition or key information is given" (ITC (Independent Television Commission), 1999, p. 27), is something there is wide consensus upon. That is why idea-units will be the basis of our segmentation and consequent alignment of ST and TT. However as Eugeni (2009, pp. 36-37) suggested, since live subtitling is usually projected on screen word by word and not in blocks, it is important to consider idea-units not in terms of blocks of subtitles (as usually happens with pre-recorded subtitling) but as follows: (1) micro-units: all relevant pieces of information in a clause (lexical units like subject groups, verb groups, adverbs, etc.) contributing to the global meaning of a bigger meaning unit; and (2) macro-units: every clause providing a finite self-standing set of information (e.g., a defining relative clause, an embedded clause, an incidental clause, etc.).

Macro-units will be the shortest units into which the flow of subtitles will be segmented, and micro-units the smallest units of analysis where tactics can also be applied.

Categorization of tactics. Comparing the text of the subtitles with the acoustic verbal and non-verbal

components of the ST means comparing only the linguistic and paralinguistic components of both ST and TT. This will not result in a sterile comparison of words missing or being added. On the contrary, it is a step forward to a full understanding of the way the subtitler helps the ST's sender to communicate with the TT audience. For this reason, the taxonomy in question has been designed so as to allow the researcher the most scientific work possible. One aspect that needs to be immediately pointed out and which is of paramount importance in the case of live subtitling is the question of mistakes. As Eugeni (2009, p. 39) showed mistakes play two main roles in live subtitling: They either prevent the comprehension of a macro-unit or they impact (more or less heavily) on a micro-unit thus making the audience's comprehension process of a macro-unit more difficult but not impossible. Mistakes are also something that should be included in the analysis of a final product. However they cannot be considered as tactics, but as "side-effects". The adopted solution is to include them in the taxonomy, but in two separate columns depending on the effects of their occurrence. As for the other tactics, the taxonomy only includes the most clear-cut ones and structures them in such a way as to make it immediately possible for the researcher to have a clear view of the whole work of subtitlers. To meet this goal, macro-units have first been divided into two macro-categories: (1) *Non-rendered*: It is not possible to understand a given ST's macro-unit from subtitles only; and (2) *Rendered*: The subtitles fully or acceptably deliver the meaning of a given ST's macro-unit.

Non-rendered macro-units include: (1) *Omissions*: an entire macro-unit; (2) *Obstructive tactics*: A macro-unit is no longer intelligible because of the application of a tactic; and (3) *Errors*: A macro-unit is no longer intelligible because of a software lack of accuracy or a subtitler's mistake.

Rendered macro-units include: (1) *Repetitions*: A macro-unit is repeated word for word; (2) *Errors*: A micro-unit is no longer intelligible because of a software lack of accuracy or a subtitler's mistake; and (3) *Variations*: A macro-unit is modified in the form with or without repercussions on the content.

Since this last tactic is in fact an umbrella-term, it has been further subdivided into: (1) *Expansions*: Characters are added to an orthographic transcription of the ST; and (2) *Reductions*: Characters are subtracted from an orthographic transcription of the ST. Reductions can occur either for the *omission* or for the *compression* of a micro-unit.

Table 1 illustrates the above.

Table 1

Taxonomy of Tactics for Live Subtitling

Non-rendered macro-units			Rendered macro-units				
						Alterations	
Omissions	Obstructive tactics	Errors	Repetitions	Errors	*Expansions*	*Reductions*	
						Omissions	*Compressions*

The researcher now possesses a wide view of both the strategy and the tactics used by the subtitler to meet the goal of translation, which is accessibility to an audiovisual text for those who cannot fully or can only partially access it (deaf and hard-of-hearing people, foreigners, people working or living in noisy places, and learners). However, this is not enough. To avoid "reducing the analysis of live subtitles to a question of compatibility between words" or even between characters in the case of morphological synonymy (technically "will not" is an

expansion of "won't"), it is important to include one last important analysis criterion, semiotic relevance.

Multimodal analysis. Since Grice's (1961) cooperative principle and maxims, a more pragmatic view of language has developed, based more on pragmatics than on semantics. On the basis of Grice's assumptions two principles of relevance have emerged: (1) *cognitive principle*: Human cognition is geared to the maximisation of relevance; and (2) *communicative principle*: Utterances create expectations of optimal relevance.

These have given a rise to what is known as the Relevance Theory (Sperber & Wilson, 1986). Applied to the analysis of subtitling tactics and main strategy, the Relevance Theory gives the final contribution to a full comprehension of the work of a live subtitler, which will allow for a meaningful evaluation of the final result: Whether the goal of the translation has been met and how. In particular, every macro-unit is to be further investigated in order to move the categorization of tactics from a mere comparative linguistic to a communicational perspective. In particular every single categorized tactic is to be viewed in the light of its semiotic implications for communication and evaluated accordingly. For example, the omission of a macro-unit cannot be semiotically relevant if the information it delivers is provided by other semiotic channels. In this case, one cannot talk of omission of a macro-unit, because the meaning of the ST's macro-unit is expressed by the TT (even if not by subtitles). To assist the researcher in this risky step, one solution is offered by multimodal analysis.

Baldry and Thibault (2005) proposed a model specifically for the analysis of audiovisual texts based on the concept that a text is the result of many semiotic components which, together, build the meaning of any text. In this context, the non-verbal component no longer plays a supporting role, but a leading one. As a consequence, to fully understand the meaning of a text, it is important to carry out what they call multimodal analysis considering all phases and sub-phases of a text (which in the case of live subtitling correspond to macro- and micro-units), and all semiotic resources used to build each of them, in particular: (1) time-codes; (2) the non-verbal visual component, including proxemics and kinaesthetics; (3) the relation between the text and the audience; and (4) the verbal and non-verbal, extra and paralinguistic acoustic components (speech, extra sounds, and music).

In the case of a live-subtitled programme, one should add: (1) the number of words per minute in ST and TT; (2) the time span between the pronouncing of the ST and the appearing of the related subtitle in the TT; (3) written information on the screen (the subtitles translating the whole ST, displays, etc.); and (4) the position of subtitles on the screen (which could hide semiotically important elements).

Thanks to multimodal analysis, the researcher will finally be able to evaluate whether a tactic has led to a more or less relevant rendition/non-rendition of a macro-unit or to a rendition/non-rendition of a macro-unit which is not relevant at all. The final version of Table 1 is as follows (see Table 2).

Table 2

Taxonomy of Tactics for Live Subtitling After Multimodal Analysis

Non-rendered macro-units			Rendered macro-units				
Omissions	Obstructive tactics	Errors	Repetitions	Errors	Alterations		
					Expansions	Reductions	
						Omissions	*Compressions*
Relevant/Irrelevant	Relevant/Irrelevant	Relevant/Irrelevant	Relevant/Irrelevant	Relevant/Irrelevant	Relevant/Irrelevant	Relevant/Irrelevant	Relevant/Irrelevant

Conclusions

The aim of this paper was to bridge one of the numerous gaps within the study of live subtitling: a model accounting for the product of (intralingual) live subtitles in translational terms. Before starting to analyse the most influential proposals put forward by several scholars working on (interlingual pre-recorded) subtitling, it was necessary to sort out the terminology employed in this field by AVT scholars. After having opted for the goal of translation (being the form of translation used to ensure accessibility to a specific audiovisual product to a given audience), strategy (being the main criterion to be followed by the AVT translator in order to meet the goal of translation), and tactics (being the technical operations made by the AVT translator to adhere to the main strategy), the identified models of analysis were evaluated. As a result, some needs have emerged which the estimated models lacked. In particular, the necessity not to reduce the analysis of intralingual live subtitles "to a question of compatibility between words" has been the underlying principle behind the design of the proposed model, which is based on three main pillars: segmentation and consequent alignment of ST and TT into semiotically meaningful units of analysis; categorization of these units into tactics accounting for the most evident differences between the ST linguistic component and the subtitles in the TT; and a final semiotic scrutiny clearly stating whether the main translational strategy has been respected and how. As it has been conceived, the model appears to be quite satisfactory. However, it must still be applied and evaluated. Furthermore, it has to be considered as a tool limited to fully account for intralingual live subtitling. It does not seem to be useful for the analysis of interlingual live subtitling nor for any other form of AVT. In case it proves to be sufficiently acceptable to fulfil the researcher's needs and expectations, the proposed model of analysis will be a step forward in the study of live subtitling.

References

Arumí Ribas, M., & Romero Fresco, P. (2008). A practical proposal for the training of respeakers. *Journal of Specialised Translation, 10*.

Baldry, A., & Thibault, P. J. (2005). *Multimodal transcription and text analysis*. Oakville: Equinox publishing.

Chesterman, A. (1997). *Memes of translation: The spread of ideas in translation studies*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Delabastita, D. (1989). Translation and mass-communication: Film and TV translation as evidence of cultural dynamics. *Babel, 35*(4).

Delisle, J. (1993). *Reasoned translation: Handbook of professional translation from English into French (La traduction raisonnée: Manuel d'initiation à la traduction professionnelle de l'anglais vers le français)*. Ottawa: Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa.

Eugeni, C. (2005). *Access services: Re-speaking pre-recorded programmes: Interview with Alison Marsh*. Retrieved from http://subtitle.agregat.net/index.php/eng_AREA/interviews_more/bbc_access_services_part_3_re_speaking_pre_recorded/

Eugeni, C. (2008). *Live subtitling: Theoretical, professional and didactic aspects (Le sous-titrage en direct): Aspects théoriques, professionnels et didactiques)*. Macerata: CEUM.

Eugeni, C. (2009). Respeaking the BBC news—A strategic analysis of respeaking on the BBC. *SLTI, 3*(1).

Eugeni, C., & Mack, G. (Eds.). (2006). *Proceedings of the first international conference on real-time intralingual subtitling* (InTRAlinea special issue: Respeaking). Retrieved from www.intralinea.it

Gambier, Y. (2006). Subtitling: A selective translation? (Le sous-titrage: Une traduction séléctive?). In J. Tommola & Y. Gambier (Eds.), *Translation and interprerting: Training and research*. Turku: University of Turku.

Gottlieb, H. (1991). Subtitling—Synchronous audiovisual translation (Tekstning—Synkron billedmedieoversættelse). *Danish theses on translation 5 (Danske Afhandlinger om Oversættelse 5)*. University of Copenhagen: Center for Translation Studies and Lexicography.

Gottlieb, H. (2000). Texts, translation and subtitling. In H. Gottlieb (Ed.), *Screen translation*. University of Copenhagen: Center for Translation Studies and Lexicography.

Gottlieb, H. (2005). Multidimensional translation: Semantics turned semiotics. *MuTra: Challenges of multidimensional translation* (On-line conference proceedings). Retrieved from http://www.translationconcepts.org/pdf/MuTra_2005_Proceedings.pdf

Grice, H. P. (1961). The causal theory of perception. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, Supplementary, 35,* 121-152.

ITC (Indipendent Television Commission). (1999). *ITC guidance on standards for subtitling*. London: ITC. Retrieved from www.itc.org.uk

Ivarsson, J., & Carroll, M. (1998). *Subtitling*. Simrishamn: TransEdit HB.

Kovačič, I. (1996). Subtitling strategies: A flexible hierarchy of priorities. In C. Heiss & R. M. Bollettieri Bosinelli (Eds.), *Multimedia translation for cinema, television and the scene (Traduzione multimediale per il cinema, la televisione, la scena)*. Bologna: CLUEB.

Lambert, J., & Delabastita, D. (1996). Translation of audiovisual texts: Modes and cultural challenges (La traduction de textes audiovisuels: Modes en enjeux culturels). In Y. Gambier (Ed.), *Language transfers in audiovisual media (Transferts linguistiques dans les médias audiovisuels)*. Villeneuve d'Ascq: Septentrion.

Lambourne, A. (2007). Real-time subtitling: Extreme audiovisual translation. *Speech at the international conference "LSP Translation Scenarios"*. Vienna: University of Vienna.

Lomheim, S. (1995). Screen translation: Subtitling strategies at NRK (L'écriture sur l'écran: Stratégies de sous-titrage à NRK). In Y. Gambier (Ed.), *Communication audiovisuelle et transferts linguistiques: Audiovisual communication and language transfer*. *Special issue of Translatio/Nouvelles de la FIT/FIT Newsletter, 14*(3-4).

Marsh, A. (2004). Simultaneous interpreting and respeaking: A comparison (M.A. thesis, University of Westminster, London).

Molina, L., & Hurtado Albir, A. (2002), Translation techniques revisited: A dynamic and functionalist approach. *Meta: Translators' Journal, 47*(4), 498-512.

Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. London: Prentice Hall International.

Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a science of translating with special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Podeur, J. (2002). *Translation practice: From French into Italian and from Italian into French (La pratica della traduzione: Dal francese in italiano e dall'italiano in francese)*. Naples: Liguori.

Schwarz, B. (2002). Translation in a confined space. *Translation Journal, 6*(4) & *7*(1).

Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Vázquez-Ayora, G. (1977). *Introduction to translation studies (Introducción a la traductología)*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Vinay, J. P., & Darbelnet, J. (1958). *Compared stylistics of French and English (Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais: Méthode de traduction)*. Paris: Didier.

Zabalbeascoa, P. (2000). From techniques to types of solutions. In A. Beeby, D. Ensinger, & M. Presas (Eds.), *Investigating translation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.