Censoring Swearwords in the Translation of Ken Loach's Films

by *Mariagrazia De Meo*

Abstract

Language variation in its diamesic and diatopic dimensions represents a multi-faceted field of research in audio-visual translation, frequently generating issues of language censorship and sanitization when a film undergoes scrutiny before its public release. This is all the more so in the case of the translation of swearwords inextricably embedded in genuine interplay between actors, encouraged to perform using their own dialects and accents.

The aim of this paper is primarily to identify possible patterns of translation of strong language occurring in both the dubbed and subtitled versions of two of Ken Loach's films, *Sweet Sixteen* (2002) and *The Angels' Share* (2012), where the use of vernacular varieties featuring taboo words and expressions has been censored by the British Board of Film Classification (BBFC), and their viewing restricted. As both externally imposed and internalised systems of social control, censorial practices seem to be less concerned with images of violence than with the use of what is preventively marked as bad language. The difficulty of measuring the perceived severity of swearwords in the source culture affects the translation process in which these tend to be deleted or toned down, regardless of their social and pragmatic functions. The comparative analysis of the two modes of audio-visual translation focuses on whether the specificity of the medium may affect the translation choices and what is the relationship between them. Is there a connection between the degree of manipulation encountered in translation and the pragmatic function played by swearwords in the source text? What are the strategies used in the attempt to achieve dynamic equivalence?

1
Introduction

This paper analyses the degree of censorship and sanitization in the audio-visual translation of swearwords in two of Ken Loach's best known films, *Sweet Sixteen* (2002) and *The Angels' Share*[1] (2012), through a comparative investigation of their dubbing and subtitling in Italian. The aim is to highlight possible translation patterns in relation to existing norms that tend to choose either omission or toning down, influencing the work of the translator through forms of censorship and self-censorship. The comparative analysis of the different modes of audio-visual translation may also shed new light on the assumption that subtitling is more naturally inclined to sanitization, since swearwords tend to be perceived as more severe when read than when heard.

As one of the most provocative and representative filmmakers of the contemporary British scene, Loach's use of dialects and sociolects, close to spontaneous speech, has been commended, and translations of his films have been the object of previous studies[2]. In Britain, his films have always encountered censorial restrictions, with their viewing being limited to audiences of at least 15 years of age, due to the presence of very strong language. In spite of the 18 certificate attributed to *Sweet Sixteen* and the 15 certificate of *The Angels' Share*, the Italian DVD versions were both released with no restrictions[3]. The reasons refer not only to the fact that each country may have a different perception of what is considered a taboo, but also to the considerable number of omissions and manipulations of the source language. This was adapted to the perceived expectations of the target audience, while more or less covertly depriving the target text of an important connotative component, offering a sanitised version of the original films both in dubbing and subtitling.

The first part of the paper will build on a methodological and theoretical framework concerning the use of swearwords and their perception in a given culture[4]. It will also consider the verbal hygiene practices[5] produced as a censorial response to their use, focusing on the way these are treated in translation, referring to Venuti's model of foreignization vs. domestication[6]. Taking both a quantitative and qualitative perspective**,** the research will first consider the number of occurrences of swearwords and the strategies adopted to transfer them into dubbing and subtitling, with the main purpose of identifying recurrent patterns mainly in the translation of the 4-letter words *fuck* and *cunt*, adopting a descriptive approach[7]. As the technical constraints of lip synchronization in dubbing as well as time and space limitations in subtitling are not always liable for the choices operated at target text level[8], it is argued that the deletion and toning down of bad language raises issues of self-imposed and preventive censorship that go beyond translation matters, drawing on target culture norms that depend on political, financial and moral forces[9], overlooking their sociocultural function in conversation and characterization. On the other hand, the difficulty of measuring the perceived severity of swearwords, due to a number of different variables ranging from social class, age, education, context of utterance etc., without doubt affects the arbitrariness and lack of consistency in their translation. Moving from such sociolinguistic considerations, the research hypothesis suggests that there may be a relation between the degree of manipulation in translation and the pragmatic function played by swearwords in the source text, that is not limited to offensiveness but more often implies emphasising states of mind, socializing and marking belonging to a specific group. To what extent does the sociolinguistic value of swearwords in conversation affect the translator's decisions, or is it overlooked? What are the strategies used in the attempt to achieve dynamic equivalence in the transfer of connotative intentions[10]?

2
Swearwords as taboo

According to Andersson and Trudgill[11], three distinctive features can be identified in swearwords. First of all, they address a subject perceived as taboo in a given culture; secondly, they should not be interpreted literally; and thirdly, they are used to express strong emotions or attitudes. The main semantic areas that usually represent a taboo and touch on the field of

social acceptability refer to religion, sex, scatological functions, drugs and illnesses[12]. Allan and Burridge argue that «a taboo is a proscription of behaviour for a specifiable community of people, for a specified context, at a given place and time»[13]. Such behaviour diverges from what usually corresponds to «the middle class politeness criterion»[14]. In addition to touching on taboo subjects, the use of swearing functions pragmatically as an expression of positive or negative emotions, either as a reflexive and untargeted act or as a term of abuse uttered to be offensive as in the case of insulting or cursing[15]. In spite of the negative attitude concerning its usage, bad language is undeniably part of everyone's lives and conveys the ability to externalize pain and disagreement as well as humour and surprise, as a fundamental team bonding activity.

Little effort is made to dispel the notion that swearing is always an expression of negativity: little focus is directed in synthetizing the range of sociolinguistic variables that interact in instances of swearword usage and reception. To do so is to deny the dynamism of swearing and to promote the myth that swearwords are categorically offensive and indicative of abusive language[16].

In actual fact, the derogatory connotation represents just a minor element in the plethora of ways in which swearing is employed, as outlined by Pinker's[17] five categories of swearing: descriptive (i.e. let's fuck), idiomatic (i.e. it's fucked up), abusive (i.e. fuck you!), emphatic (i.e. this is fucking brilliant) and cathartic (i.e. Fuck!). Though offensiveness is only one of a variety of possible uses, the degree of abuse is intricately interwoven into a number of variables, such as age, gender, social group etc., that affect the perception of negativity and severity of swearwords. For the purpose of this research, swearing will be considered as an umbrella term including expletives, intensifiers, interjections and epithets aimed at cursing and insulting[18].

Censorship of bad language usually fails to take into due consideration factors such as the measurement of actual offensiveness and its sociolinguistic value in discourse, because of de-contextualization. In 2000, the Advertising Standards Authority (ASA) in cooperation with the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), the Broadcasting Standards Commission (BSC) and the Independent Television Commission (ITV), carried out a survey aimed at measuring the level of offensiveness of swearwords[19]. This showed some consistency in determining a taxonomy of perceived severity and in considering *cunt*, *motherfucker* and *fuck* as the most abusive and offensive words when used as derogatory epithets[20]. Although more than a decade has passed since the survey, and considering that, especially in conversation the level of tolerance towards the use of swearwords has risen, these remain the most offensive words when employed in audio-visual products, and are strictly monitored by the BBFC[21]. In Italy, the journalist Vito Tartamella has carried out the only official study to date on the perception of severity of swearwords[22]. The results, reported on an offensiveness meter, showed blasphemous imprecations at the highest end of the scale, followed by sexual insults referring to women (*zoccola*, *puttana*, *troia* etc.) and then epithets referring to scatological functions (*stronzo*, *pezzo di merda* etc.)[23]. For the sake of this article, reference will be made to these surveys only as general guidelines in the comparative analysis of perceived severity of the most common pragmatic equivalents used in the translation of the English words mentioned.

As Beers Fägersten argues, measuring offensiveness is often based on single item lists provided for evaluation: «this enforces the one dimensional view of swear words as categorically offensive and socially inappropriate expressions of negative force, [...] ignoring the significant aspect of swear word usage as an indicator of an intricate combination of social contexts and interlocutor variables»[24]. Once considered in context, the evaluation of offensiveness becomes less transparent and bad language starts to appear more as a sociological feature whose role can only be described case by case rather than prescriptively banned. Several studies advocate a sociolinguistic approach to swearing[25], acknowledging that such words make little or no semantic contribution in conversation, as opposed to their social connotations, and this accounts for the difficulty of arriving at a denotative definition.

A more inclusive consideration of swearing as a means of expressing emotions sheds new light on how deeply embedded it is in the human mind and language: it is by no means merely a redundant accessory used as a statement of moral and social decline. In this perspective, the recurrent question of why people swear inevitably draws on different fields such as psychology, the history of language and literature[26] etc., enhancing the conflicting views of swearwords as socially negative but at the same time widely used among the very people who reject them. As Montagu argued, there should be «no in-asterisking of them»[27].

Deborah Cameron[28] provides an insight into the natural human tendency to make value judgments on language, involving the establishment of an unquestioned compliance to prescriptive norms concerning what is linguistically acceptable, defined as verbal hygiene practices. «Verbal hygiene is not just about ordering language itself, but also exploits the powerful symbolism in which language stands for other kinds of orders – moral, social, political»[29]. This explains the tendency to treat descriptive qualities as prescriptive and fixed norms, since individuals tend to associate language usage with safeguarding the moral and social order. In fact the long-established argument that Standard English is superior to non-standard varieties is fed by people's beliefs. «Verbal hygiene and social and moral hygiene are interconnected; to argue about language is indirectly to argue about extra-linguistic values»[30]. The defence of plain, standard language, although not being novel, finds reinforcement in the postmodern, globalized era of mass migration of people and work forces, requiring people to be persuasive and intelligible on a global scale.

Moreover, the dichotomy between prescriptive and descriptive, or between what is natural and what is constructed, is misleading in explaining the human tendency to constantly evaluate and censor language use. Although it seems that only spontaneous changes are really able to affect language use, language hygienists demonstrate how often language manipulation is carefully orchestrated. When «norms become naturalised»[31] and unquestioned, individuals become self-censors as they choose to follow self-prescribed rules of what is right and wrong. The different modes of censorship that apply to language use and translation should be seen as both institutional and self-imposed acts[32]. What has been discussed so far not only explains the generalised negative attitude and preconceptions that lead people's judgement in the use of bad language, but it also shows censorial behaviour to be an internal rather than just an external force, and therefore much more difficult to delimit and bring to light, since it appears a natural and inborn practice.

3
Much ado about language

Loach's social-realist dramas usually portray the working class, minorities, immigrants, un-employed, teenagers and all those "victims of society" who get entangled in the intimidating practices of the social services and institutions. In his portrayal of post-industrial and peripheral Britain, Loach often employs the Scottish, Irish or Northern English linguistic varieties close to spontaneous speech, using non professional actors who have, had similar experiences to the fictional characters they play, giving the impression that the language is the result of spontaneous reactions and improvisation. While British audiences have often demanded intra-lingual subtitles in order to understand the idiolects and sociolects, Loach believes that language varieties constitute an integral part of the British cultural setting, arguing that criticism is caused less by unintelligibility than by mere prejudice against non-standard varieties.

This research focuses on the Italian dubbed and subtitled versions of two of his films, *Sweet Sixteen* and *The Angels' Share* (the title of the latter was translated literally as *La parte degli angeli*). In spite of the ten-year gap, they both raised issues of language censorship. The protagonists are teenagers and young people from harsh backgrounds whose lives are marked by violence and dysfunctional families. They are forced to manage alone, surrounded by a society that is not able to support them, in contrast with their determination to have a better life. Set in the small town of Greenock near Glasgow, *Sweet Sixteen* is a social drama that tells the story of the sensitive and affectionate Liam, almost 16 years old. With his ex-drug addict mother in prison he has to struggle with his violent stepfather and careless grandfather. In the hope of being able to start a new life with his mother he sells stolen cigarettes and later becomes a drug pusher with his friend Pinball, caught in a sequence of violence and tension that will lead to a tragic epilogue.

The Angels' Share, a comedy-drama with a surprisingly explicit and positive ending when compared to Loach's more usual dramatic edge, is also set in Glasgow. The main character, Robbie, an unemployed young father also from a background of violence and minor crimes, is serving a sentence with the social services. Loach's attitude towards institutions seems more tolerant in this film, as the boy and his mates find support and understanding in Harry, their social work supervisor. It is thanks to him that Robbie discovers a natural talent for recognising whisky and therefore plans a way to give himself, his friends and his family a new chance. As the director explains, the more positive tone of *The Angels' Share* does not imply a total change of attitude from his previous films. Laughing and irony are part of life and, in spite of the positive ending of this film, there are elements that make the audience aware of the dramatic circumstances.

The sociolect spoken in both films emulates the spontaneous local jargon of young people and of the non-professional actors, naturally filled with swearing which is used more with the purpose of marking social belonging than to express aggression and abuse. «Within this speech community, swearing is rather a behaviour engaged in among friends, which more often than not is either accepted or overtly supported and ratified in the form of echoic behaviour. Swearing thus takes on the pragmatic function of signalling and acknow-ledging in-group co-membership»[33]. In fact the words that topped the list for severity and

offensiveness acquire a completely different pragmatic function once contextualised. The social distance between the interlocutors becomes the most important factor capable of increasing or decreasing the perception of offensiveness[34]. «Speaker-listener variables emerge as the most reliable predictors of swear word usage. The more variables the speaker and listener(s) have in common such as age, sex, race, social status and the closer they are in social distance, the more likely swearing is to occur»[35]. Therefore, contextualization is essential in evaluating swearword usage.

In contrast with this line of thinking, *Sweet Sixteen* received an 18 certification from the BBFC, thereby precluding its viewing by the very teenagers portrayed in the film who could have identified with the protagonists. The main motivation concerned the use of the offensive epithet *cunt* about a child, namely the protagonist who only turns sixteen[36] at the end of the film. The filmmaker argued: «I wonder what message the BBFC sends to the people in the film by telling them that they are fit only to be rated with the work of pornographers»[37]. *The Angels' Share* would have fallen foul of the same censorship had the filmmaker not cut some instances of the *c-word*, making it acceptable for a 15 certificate. Loach's long-time producer Rebecca O'Brien considered it offensive that *The Angels' Share* was allowed a maximum of seven instances of the *c-word*, especially considering that the director's past productions included films with dramatic scenes of torture, violence and racism that received the same rating. Loach underlines that violence is not the real issue, explicitly addressing the hypocrisy of the British censors, who tend to make negative judgements about the realistic and natural use of a language variety common among young people, while "passing" violent images.

The British middle-class is obsessed by what they call bad language. The odd oath, like a word that goes back to Chaucer's time, they will ask you to cut, but not the manipulative and deceitful language of politics they use themselves. So I think we should re-examine what we mean by bad language and have respect for our ancient oaths and swear words which we all enjoy[38].

The parameters employed by the BBFC are not without ambiguity since, as stated in their guidelines, these are aimed at protecting the younger audience from "moral harm", although the explicitation of what may cause it remains vague, as this could be anything depending on its context of use and on intentions. On one hand, bad language is considered as totally unacceptable and audiences may get seriously offended by its reiterated use: while on the other, the BBFC fails to measure the degree of such severity stating the «impossibility to set out comprehensive lists of words, expressions or gestures which are acceptable in each category»[39], particularly if de-contextualised. While the 15 rating sets no limits on the use of strong and sexual violence, providing these are appropriately contextualised, and allows unlimited occurrences of *fuck*, the word *cunt* is subject to fuzzy restrictions. As stated in the guidelines, its acceptance depends on a subjective evaluation of its usage that in practice does not consider contextualization as relevant. It was this that determined the rejection of *Sweet Sixteen* and the forced cutting of instances of the word in *The Angels' Share*, on the basis of a mere quantitative evaluation. However, the Italian censorial system follows similar guidelines, where the presence of swearing and violence does not follow explicit regulations with reference to a rather vague criterion of acceptable behaviour in relation to contextualization and possible emulation[40].

The difficulty in presenting a coherent framework of parameters to limit the presence of taboo elements such as violence, drugs, racism, religion etc., increases when dealing with language, in line with Cameron's idea of verbal hygiene[41], and with what she sees as a form of «anxiety that lies behind the rhetoric of "communication"»[42] inspiring the long established campaign of «verbal hygienists» in defence of standard varieties as if they were not varieties themselves but rather a superior and better way of communicating compared to their inferior, sub-standard counterparts. In this sense Allan and Burridge argue: «censorship is futile. In fact, it is only ever effective when it coincides with what individuals would choose to censor for themselves»[43], shifting the focus to self-censorship and self-imposed restrictions designed to protect moral values and function as a preventive force, whose effects are much more powerful and profound than any external censorial limitation.

4
Censorship in the translation of swearwords

Similar kinds of self-imposed and preventive restrictions apply in translation as for language usage, since this is also an activity that inevitably requires making judgements and establishing censorial norms and parameters. These parameters are influenced by different forces such as censorial boards, the agent of the translation or the translator, who makes choices on what he/she considers right or wrong to convey[44]. Billiani[45] underlines how censorship in translation is not in fact a repressive act but a form of manipulation and transformation produced to comply to target culture requirements. In fact censorship, like translation, belongs to a space of negotiation and ambiguity. In this sense she underlines «the importance of looking at censorship simultaneously as a repressive and "creative" power»[46] and at translation as being normally subject to manipulation. In translation «censorship is [...] an act, often coercive and forceful, that – in various ways and under different guises – blocks, manipulates and controls the establishment of cross-cultural communication»[47].

Any translation process is controlled by target norms embedded in the local cultural tradition that determines its acceptability. If, on one hand, the nature of norms implies reference to a form of prescriptive control, these are normally based on the description of the translator's behaviour and exist «midways between laws and conventions»[48]. In audio-visual translation the technical limitations, namely lip-synchronization in dubbing and the time and space constraints in subtitling, may be considered as binding and objective norms, which are imposed by the medium as mandatory. On the other hand, there are norms that are more similar to conventions, referring to practices that are weaker and less constrictive. In this sense Toury underlines the «socio-cultural specificity of norms and their instability»[49], as their boundaries become seriously blurred in the description of the translation process. Since it is in the nature of norms to show regularities in translational behaviour, these are subject to alteration and change over time as proved by different studies[50], presenting correctness as a variable concept.

Pedersen speaks of translation strategies as possible options in the translation process, whose predominance is also to be inferred by a descriptive analysis. However, they should not be placed on the same level as norms, since «norms tell translators which strategy is appropriate, given the circumstances»[51]. Swearwords do not fully belong to what Pedersen defines

extralinguistic cultural references (ECRs)[52], if these are characterised as being immediately recognizable by the target audience as belonging to a taboo area. However, the perception of their degree of offensiveness and their pragmatic connotation is culturally embedded in the source culture and they thus require problem-solving skills on the part of the translator. In addition to the verbal hygiene practices at work in the translation of swearwords, it is useful to consider Pedersen's parameters of *transculturality* and *extratextuality*[53] as influencing the translator's decisions, where the former refers to the fact that cultures are interconnected and accessible on a global scale, and the latter that some items may exist also outside the source culture. Concerning dubbing and subtitling into Italian, several studies[54] have outlined the general convention to omit swearwords. As for the translation strategies employed, excluding the uncommon feasibility of direct translations, the main tendency is either to sanitize bad language, using strategies such as the insertion of euphemisms or less offensive words, or to add neutral interjections or phrases aimed at least at retaining some of the connotative meaning of the source text or, again, to resort to substitution with a pragmatic equivalent.

Particularly in dubbing, toning down swearwords has often determined the usage of artificial words, mere calques or clichés that are part of "dubbese", an artificial language devised for translating film language to attenuate what was perceived as socially unacceptable or to fill in the lack of semantic correspondence, determining the reiterated use of stereotypical expressions in the target language as an artificial standard[55]. This process of language sanitization, which also reflects Italian dialogue writers' preference for standard Italian, tends to undermine elements such as linguistic realism and speakability, which along with synchronization are considered of primary importance in the dubbing process[56]. As Cameron argues, the way forward «is not to deny the importance of standards and values but to focus critically on the particular standards and values being invoked and to propose alternatives»[57]. Therefore, setting standards may be perceived as problematic only when they are constructed around superficial principles and when used as instruments of social manipulation. The lack of denotative relevance for plot development reinforced this tendency to manipulate swearwords, underestimating their connotative role and the variety of functions they express. As Taylor maintains, «film language in itself can be seen to display neutralising tendencies, remaining more within the sphere of standard variety of language, and this aspect is even more accepted in translated film texts»[58].

Subtitling, in comparison to dubbing, appears to suffer even more from a generalized convention close to standardization determined by the assumption that the passage from the spoken to the written word may increase perception of the severity of swearwords. According to Díaz Cintas, «emotionally charged language such as swear words and other taboo expressions are also particularly sensitive to this media migration as there is the belief that the impact is more offensive when written than when verbalized, which in turn tends to lead to the systematic deletion and down-toning of most "effing and blinding" in subtitles»[59]. Deletion and condensation are peculiar features that are employed in particular when subtitling language that is very close to spontaneous speech. On the other hand, while dubbing hides any form of manipulation, subtitling does not, maintaining the original dialogue and creating a feedback effect[60], in particular if considering the high recognisability of words like *fuck* and *fucking* for an Italian audience. It is also interesting to mention what Pederson defines as «a contract of illusion»[61] that exists between the subtitler and the audi-

ence, referring to the silent agreement that allows what appears on screen to be considered as what people actually say, although, of course, it is clearly not. Therefore, the audience is prepared to accept that some elements characterising the spoken dialogue such as false starts, hesitations and linguistic taboos, will not be included in the written text.

In line with what has been said so far, the different rating of the two films is coherent with the higher occurrence of swearwords in *Sweet Sixteen* in comparison to those in *The Angels' Share*. The table below also shows a similar omission rate in dubbing, that increases in subtitling.

TABLE I
Number of occurrences and omissions of swearwords

Films	Original dialogue	Dubbing	Subtitling
Sweet Sixteen (SS)	385	233 (60.5%)	279 (72.4%)
The Angels' Share (AS)	249	140 (56.2%)	152 (61.0%)

However, the contrastive analysis of both audio-visual translation modes reveals a higher variance rate between dubbing and subtitling in SS than in AS. The analysis of the transcripts reveals that, while in the first film each mode of translation refers back to the original soundtrack as its source, in the second the subtitles are an almost faithful transcription of the dubbed version. As indicated by Taylor, «this should normally raise eyebrows and indicate that they come from the same script or transcription with no attention paid to the specificity of one or other of the modes»[62]. For the sake of the present analysis, this similarity affects the choices in the translation of swearwords both quantitatively and qualitatively, as the omission rate in dubbing and subtitling is much closer in AS than in SS, indicating that the close relation to the dubbed version allows for an overall higher number of occurrences of swearwords in subtitling, besides the different variables that generally contribute to their omission or toning down. When the modes of translation are independent from each other, it is possible to find instances of swearwords to achieve pragmatic equivalence, through substitution or compensation in the subtitles, even when these are omitted in the dubbed version. Extracts (1) and (2) from SS offer evidence that the subtitle refers directly to the source dialogue and is independent from dubbing as the emphatic *fucking* translated in *cazzo* is absent from the Italian dialogue. In such cases, there are two sets of considerations that can be made. On one hand, as a general norm, the subtitler still tends to omit as much swearing as possible in order to comply with market expectations. On the other, the subtitle should not be automatically considered as a milder version of the corresponding dubbed version but rather as an independent text. By contrast, extracts (3) and (4) from AS show that the subtitles are close to being a mere transcription of the dubbed version. The examples provide some evidence that the presence of swearwords in translation sometimes depends neither on pre-fabricated norms nor on subjective choices but appears to be more a consequence of arbitrariness. In (4), the last omission of *fucking* is compensated by the insertion of the sentence *Ecco che cosa sei*, that, although presenting no swearing, serves to acknowledge the intensifying function of the omitted term.

TABLE 2

	Original dialogue	Dubbing	Subtitling
1. Pinball	What are you **fucking** turning it up for?	Ma perché devi Ø alzare così il volume?	**Cazzo**. Ma perché alzi il volume?
2. Pinball	**Fucking hell**, Liam. Get out of here, man!	Ø Ma guardali, Liam.	**Cazzo,** Liam
3. Mo	Oh, for **fuck's sake.** **Fucking hell**, man	Ma che caz... Porca troia, basta. Ø Fai schifo Albert.	Ma che caz... Porca troia, basta. Ø Fai schifo Albert.
4. Leonie's dad	Have you listened to a **fucking** word I've said? You are **a stack of shite**, go on bit it! **Fucking** waste of space.	Vuol dire che fin'ora ho parlato a vuoto. Ø Sei **un gran coglione**. Scendi vattene. Ø Un fallito. Ecco che cosa sei.	Vuol dire che fin'ora ho parlato a vuoto. Ø Sei **un gran coglione**. Scendi vattene. Ø Un fallito. Ecco che cosa sei.

Returning to the quantitative analysis, table 3 presents a list of the type of swearwords and the number of occurrences found in both films. The words are grouped according to their related area of taboo and in order of perceived severity, in reference to the 2000 survey[63], in which *cunt, motherfucker*, *fuck* and *fucking* figure as the most offensive terms. As evident from the data, the most recurrent swearwords are also those perceived as the most severe with a higher percentage of omission in subtitling than in dubbing. *Fuck* is considered as a separate entry from its inflection *fucking*, as this deserves separate analysis. Through its syntactical flexibility of usage the term loses its sexual connotation and acquires a variety of pragmatic functions, employed in the majority of cases as an expletive with an emphatic and cathartic value like in "fucking hell!", and more rarely as a derogatory epithet as in "fucking arsehole". In the translation of this intensifier, that lacks equivalents in Italian, contextualization is essential in order to understand the choices operated at target text level.

TABLE 3
Omission of individual swearwords

		Swearwords in the original		Dubbing		Subtitling	
		SS	AS	SS	AS	SS	AS
Sex	*cunt*	21	11	5 23.8%	4 36.3%	7 33.3%	6 54.5%
	fuck	75	70	41 54.6%	26 37.1%	43 57.3%	31 44.2%
	fucking	**238**	**109**	**173 72.6%**	**94 86.2%**	**201 84.4%**	**96 88%**
	wanker	1	-	1	-	-	-
	bastard	15	10	2	5	5	6
	prick	9	9	-	1	2	1
	arse/arsehole	9	4	4	1	4	1

(segue)

TABLE 3 (*segue*)

		Swearwords in the original		Dubbing		Subtitling	
		SS	AS	SS	AS	SS	AS
Religion	*God's Sake*	-	1	-	1	-	1
	Jesus Christ	3	3	1	-	3	-
	damn	-	1	-	1	-	1
	hell/heaven	8	13	4	6	5	7
Bodily effluvia	*piss*	1	5	-	-	-	-
	shit/shite	5	10	2	1	1	1
	twat	-	1	-	-	-	1
	crap	-	2	-	-	-	-

For the purpose of this research, the analysis will focus on the translation strategies used for *cunt* and *fuck/fucking*. Although, according to Allan and Burridge[64], it is racial and ethnic slurs that range at the top of the list of offensiveness of insults, overtaking sexual reference, blasphemy and profanity[65], *cunt* is still considered as the strongest insult[66], in spite of claims for its de-vulgarization which stress its recurrent use as a word of endearment among young people. The dysphemic epithet may also vary in intensity depending on contextualization, but its negative connotation is perceived as taboo especially when used as a directive abuse against a minor, determining the censorial labelling of ss as an 18 film. In (5), during a visit to Liam's mother in prison, her partner Stan is verbally attacking the boy, anticipating the physical violence that is going to follow shortly after. Here Liam is refusing to pass his mother some drugs hidden in his mouth, to protect her from running into further trouble if caught taking part in Stan's business of selling drugs to the other convicts. In dubbing, the noun phrase *little cunt* is repeated twice and toned down in the less offensive diminutive *stronzetto*, whereas the subtitle retains a stronger tone with the choice of *piccolo stronzo*. As this scene does not present problems of lip-synchronization, in the Italian dialogue, the violence of the threat produces the addition of phrases of light intimidation such as: *ascoltami bene / tu vedrai quello che ti faccio* and *è chiaro stronzetto?* in order to compensate for the omission of the intensifier *fucking* and the expletive *Christ* that reinforce the intimidation. The verbal violence of this scene is essential for Stan's characterization and probably should not raise any eyebrows, any more than the disturbing act of forcing a minor to take part in drug dealing.

TABLE 4

	Original Dialogue	Dubbing	Subtitling
5. Stan	Kiss your **fucking** mother S(...) **Christ!** If you don't kiss your mother goodbye, **you little cunt**! I'm going to beat your **fucking** arse all the way home. Kiss your **fucking** mother, **you little cunt!**	Forza, dai un bacio a tua Ø madre Ø Ascoltami bene. Tu vedrai quello che ti faccio se non baci tua madre, **stronzetto!** Guarda che ti prendo a calci Ø da qui a casa, è chiaro **stronzetto?** Bacia tua Ø madre, è chiaro **stronzetto?**	Bacia tua Ø madre! Ø Senti, **piccolo stronzo**, Se non baci tua madre Ti prendo a calci in Ø culo fino a casa. Baciala! Ø Ø

While *fuck/fucking* have almost completely lost their offensive charge in everyday use, when part of audio-visual material they still represent a strong taboo, considering that their occurrence is only allowed after the 9 pm watershed on television. Table 5 offers a summary of the variety of translations in both dubbing and subtitling of *cunt* and *fuck*, proving the difficulty of finding words with a similar pragmatic value and degree of offensiveness in Italian. The term *cunt*, when used as directive abuse, is more frequently rendered as *stronzo* or its diminutive form *stronzetto*, changing the semantic field of taboo from sexual to scatological. According to Tartamella's survey[67], the Italian word still rates as one of the strongest insults, just preceded by blasphemy and sexual references, so that while in a sense the English term is toned down, it still maintains quite a high degree of offensiveness. When *cunt* is used as a word of endearment, like for instance in *smart old cunt/vecchio paraculo* or *friendly wee cunts/simpatici cazzoni*, the more positive connotation and contextualization determines the choice of lighter alternatives and a higher degree of domestication in both modes of audio-visual translation.

In the light of Pinker's categorization, *fuck* is used as an expletive (*a* and *b*), as an abusive epithet (*c*), and in idiomatic phrases (*d*). As an expletive, *fuck* is frequently substituted by *cazzo/che cazzo*, that belongs to the same semantic field of taboo and is perceived as an appropriate pragmatic equivalent that also does not raise eyebrows in everyday conversation, but is still censored as taboo in audio-visual material. From the same semantic field, there is also *vaffanculo*, while the few instances of *porca troia* and *porca puttana* represent the most severe alternatives[68]. The table shows that, as for the translation of *cunt*, there are slightly more occurrences of the Italian abusive epithet in the subtitle than in the dubbed version. In the case of *fuck*, when the word functions as an expletive and a social marker, the subtitle also presents more occurrences of the strong terms *cazzo* and *vaffanculo* than when it occurs as a derogatory epithet in *fuck off/fuck you*, often translated as *vaffanculo*. This may reveal the translator's attention to contextualization and his/her awareness of the multifaceted functions played by swearwords, as well as stronger incidence of verbal hygiene practices in the case of words that are meant to be abusive.

TABLE 5
Italian translations for *cunt* and *fuck*

Swearword	Translation	Dubbing	Subtitling
Cunt	*Stronzo*	**8**	**10**
	Stronzetto (piccolo stronzo)	4	2
	Bastardo	2	1
	Coglione	-	1
	Ciccione	1	1
	Frocetto di merda	1	-
	Merda	1	1
	Vaffanculo	1	-
	Paraculo	1	1
	Imbecille	1	1
	Cazzone	1	1

(*segue*)

TABLE 5 (*segue*)

Swearword	Translation	Dubbing	Subtitling
Fuck! (a)	*Cazzo/che cazzo*	**9**	**11**
	Vaffanculo	**5**	**18**
	Porca troia	3	3
	Porca puttana	2	1
	Chi se ne frega	2	2
	Fuori dalle palle	1	
(For) fuck's sake! (b)	*Che cazzo*	**4**	**7**
	Vaffanculo	2	-
	Porca troia	2	3
	Porca puttana	1	-
	Che stronzi	1	-
	Che coglione	1	-
Fuck off!/you! (c)	*Vaffanculo*	19	9
	Levati/fuori dalle palle	2	1
	Cazzo/chi cazzo	2	1
	Va' a cagare	1	1
	Stronzo	1	-
Don't give a fuck (d)	Chissenefrega	1	1
Get the fuck out (d)	Levati dal cazzo	1	1
Get to fuck (d)	Vai affanculo	1	1
	Fuori dalle palle	1	-
What the fuck... (d)	*Che/chi/come cazzo*	6	5
	Che cavolo	1	-
	Che stronzata	1	1
	Stronzo	-	1
Fuck up (d)	Fare cazzate	2	2

Considering that de-contextualization and absence of prosodic elements conceal the pragmatic force of the swearwords in the source text, the inflection *fucking* is not in the list, due to its flexibility of use in informal speech and because it particularly needs contextualization in order to provide a qualitative description of its translations. Its inflections cover every grammatical category in English, being used as a pre-modifying adjective, noun, verb, adverb and even as infix, adding pragmatic force to utterances. In 84.8% of the occurrences in ss and in 93.5% of the cases in as, the word is employed as an intensifier rather than reinforcing a term of abuse, confirming the line of thought that sees this word as an emphasiser of positive and negative emotions, as well as a socializing tool, rather than just a term of abuse.

The translation of *fucking* requires a number of syntactic transformations, in order to convey the pragmatic connotation of the word in the target text. Most frequently occurring as a

pre-modifying adjective, it is translated using a variety of strategies. In (6), Pinball is talking about Liam's grandfather, using an affectionate tone in contrast with the intensifier *fucking*, whose derogatory function is toned down and becomes a noun: *quel pezzentone*, a tramp or more of a scrooge, in dubbing; while it retains a stronger connotation in the subtitle with *quello stronzo*. Moreover, the syntactic structure emphasises the object through the insertion of the determiner *quel, quello*. In extract (7), the intensifier is used as an expression of joy and enthusiasm and, while omitted in dubbing, it is substituted by an expression that conveys the positive charge of the interjection in the subtitle. Still referring to Liam's grandfather, extract (8) presents the word *fucking* reinforcing an adjective. This is dubbed using an expletive that stresses the ironic tone through the addition of an adjective in *che bel cazzo*, while it is omitted in the subtitle, though the exclamation is maintained to emphasise the ironic tone. In extract (9), Liam is talking to his friend Pinball about having made an impression on the beautiful Suzanne, whom both friends fancy. *Fucking*, used in an adverbial position, is omitted in dubbing that changes the sentence structure, while the subtitle remains semantically and syntactically closer to the source dialogue, maintaining the emphatic tone of the adverb through the substitution with the noun *cazzo*. In extract (10), the adjective and creative use of the infix are omitted in both translations and normalized in *impazzito con le palpitazioni*. In (11), Roby is addressing the father and uncles of his girl-friend Leonie. They beat him up to stop the boy from seeing Leonie and his newborn baby, but in spite of the scene's violence the swearwords are mainly deleted in both translations. In extract (12), Roby is commenting on Mo's uncontrollable instinct to rob that will probably create trouble for everyone, and the rather strong Italian expletive *porca puttana* is used to translate the adjective *fucking* in both modes of translation not to insult but as a marker of disbelief. In the last extract, Roby's expletive stresses a moment of deep joy as he has just finished talking to Leonie about their newborn baby and here again the expression is substituted with a strong expletive.

TABLE 6

	Source dialogue	Dubbing	Subtitling
6. Pinball	I love your **fucking** grandpa, man.	Lo amo **quel pezzentone** di tuo nonno.	Io voglio bene a **quello stronzo** di tuo nonno.
7. Liam	**Fucking** dancer, wee man! This is our score.	Ø Per noi è una svolta.	**Meraviglioso amico!** Questa è la nostra occasione.
8. Liam	My **fucking** caring grand-father, eh?	**Che bel cazzo** di nonno amorevole	Che Ø nonno amorevole!
9. Liam	She **fucking** does man. She wants me.	No, è così, giuro Ø. Ci devi stare amico mio.	**Cazzo**, se mi vuole!
10. Albert	**Fucking** palpi-**fucking**-ta-tions in my heart.	Ho il cuore impazzito con le palpitazioni. Ø	Ho il cuore impazzito con le palpitazioni. Ø
11. Roby	I'll **fucking** kill them	Li ammazzo tutti. Ø	Li ammazzo tutti. Ø
12. Roby	**Jesus Christ**, Mo. You're a **fucking** disgrace, man.	Hai rubato qualcosa? **Dio santo**... sei una vergogna, **porca puttana.**	**Dio santo**... sei una vergogna, **porca puttana.**
13. Roby	**Fucking hell**, man	**Porca puttana**	**Porca puttana**

Before reaching some tentative conclusions, the following extract highlights the important sociolinguistic role played by swearwords as register markers. In (14), a mixture of social and aggressive swearing fills the exchange between a policeman and a van driver. Following Liam's deceitful directions, the van driver had backed into the police motorbike which was blocking his gateway. The register of the original compared to the translated dialogues reveals a substantial difference. While the tone in the original dialogue is very informal and marks the lack of a formal filter between the Scottish working class and the police, the translation presents register domestication, adding formality and mirroring the type of verbal reverence Italians would normally show the authorities. While the original dialogue is filled with swearwords used as expletives and also offensive remarks that are part of the informal street jargon, the Italian dialogue, both in dubbing and subtitling, almost completely deletes swearing, apart from the first utterance where the driver is addressing Liam, also toned down in the euphemistic rendering of *bastard* into *ma sei pazzo, sei?* and in the last broken epithet *porca p...*, uttered by the policeman. The omission in the first line of the subtitle is partly balanced by the attempt to retain an ironic connotation inserting the interjection *Meraviglioso!* The rather aggressive tone used by both interlocutors is completely toned down and in contrast with the original dialogue, as the driver's blunt interjection *It's a fucking gateway!* is translated in *Sì ma scusi questo è un passaggio!* and uttered in an apologetic tone, while less stressed in the condensed subtitle *Ma questo è un passaggio!* The use of the demonstrative for explicitation may be considered a compensation strategy for the dropping of *fucking*, as previously pointed out.

TABLE 7

	Original dialogue	Dubbing	Subtitling
14. Driver	**What the fuck**! You little **bastard**. You wee **bastard**. Oh **fuckin'** brilliant, **super fuck!**	Che **cazzo**...ma sei pazzo sei? Che pazzo **bastardo**.... Ø Ma guarda che roba, **porca puttana.**	Ø Piccolo bastardo! Meraviglioso! Ø Ø Ø
Police	**Shit!** Don't you use your **fuckin'** mirrors?	Che cavolo! Ma che hai fatto? Se ce li hai usali Ø quegli specchietti	Che cavolo! Non usi Ø gli specchietti?
Driver	How am I suppose to see a bike parked there?	Ma come facevo a vedere la moto parcheggiata così?	Come facevo a vedere la moto?
Police	**Fuckin' hell!** Look at the state of it **fuckin'...**	Ø Ma non lo vedi che hai fatto? C'è un sacco di spazio, lì. Ø	Ø Guarda cosa hai fatto! Lo spazio c'era. Ø
Driver	It's a **fucking** gateway!	Sì ma scusi questo è un Ø passaggio!	Ma questo è un Ø passaggio.
Police	What are you doing?... For **fuck's sake**. Where is my helmet?	Che ti dice il cervello? **Porca p**... ma dov'è il mio casco?	Dov'è il mio casco? Ø

As suggested earlier, the high occurrences of deletions and toning down of swearwords determine a change of register and cultural specificity of the utterances, particularly when

they are meant to represent a sociocultural variety close to spontaneous speech. The use of euphemisms and diminutives soften the emotive charge of the original utterance, affecting the colloquial style and producing a domesticating translation.

5
Concluding remarks

In spite of the degree of similarity to spontaneous speech, film dialogue is still based on carefully devised scripts and thus still «written to be spoken as if not written»[69] and affected by the rules governing written texts in which style is mainly concerned with what Milroy and Milroy have defined «the ideology of standardization»[70]. This undermines the essential nature of oral language, based on constant variation and the use of emotional marks, valuing mendacious and superimposed language features, such as uniformity and transparency, as natural and spontaneous qualities. Since language is perceived as a social practice[71], the establishment of prescriptive rules that pin it down to fixed parameters is an act of artificial manipulation that fosters censorial and self-censorial practices, which linguists, translators and individuals alike often follow.

This paper shows that both using swearwords and censoring its usage are common human phenomena, and this is what ultimately makes the analysis of the translation of swearwords particularly articulated and complex. The fact that swearing is a common activity in most cultures does not facilitate talking about it for two main reasons. Firstly, the perception of offensiveness is inextricably bound to a number of changeable and culturally embedded variables; secondly, engaging in the translation of such fluid and inconsistently connotated items, in relation to target culture norms and preventive verbal hygiene practices, is by no means straightforward. The data analysed have confirmed the existence of a high percentage of omissions and toning down of the taboo words *cunt* and *fuck/fucking*, although it has not been possible to establish any consistency in the translation patterns adopted in both dubbing and subtitling. However, comparative analysis has thrown up some interesting considerations concerning sanitization practices. Although the overall data presents a higher percentage of omissions in subtitling than in dubbing, strong Italian expletives, if present, tend to occur more frequently in the subtitles, in particular when they function as expletives, marking social and emotional intentions. This challenges the established convention that considers written swearwords as more severe than the spoken ones and therefore more prone to be censored, as often happens in a context of directive abuse. This shows, on one hand, the translator's concern to contextualize swearwords and convey their pragmatic function, but, on the other hand, the impossibility of establishing parameters, considering the limited amount of swearwords present in the target texts. Therefore, the hypothesis of a possible relation between the omission rate and the pragmatic function fulfilled by taboo words is not supported by the data, as the examples show a generally arbitrary occurrence of translations owing little to contextualization. Particularly in the translation of the intensifier *fucking*, some compensation strategies are employed involving the addition of emphasising syntactical elements that, although sanitized, are aimed at acknowledging the high pragmatic value played by this word in conversation. Presenting both modes of audio-visual translation has ultimately been useful to shed light

on the arbitrariness of conventions that are usually associated with dubbing and subtitling, showing that censorial intervention often escapes pre-defined translation practices in ways that may, at times, appear even surprising and unexpected, enabling a deeper understanding of the processes involved.

In conclusion, the research has also highlighted the fact that swearing is employed more often in a playful and social manner than as a derogatory means to be abusive. It thus plays a substantial role in the connotation of language and register, designed to reach the target audience through strategies that go beyond the use of clichés and stereotypes. Therefore, the use of swearwords deserves a thorough understanding and analysis, even though it is entangled in and manipulated by the censorial and self-censorial forces aiming at language sanitization. Moreover, when the subtitles appear to be transcriptions of the dubbed version and the occurrence of swearwords in the two modes of translation is very close, censorial norms become less binding, acting more in terms of an economic and time saving perspective. This also shows that escaping the tyranny of self-imposed rules is not impossible: it is a path worth exploring further, in order to enhance cross-cultural communication and to escape from the use of standard clichés.

Notes

1. In 2002, *Sween Sixteen* obtained the prize for Best Script at Cannes Film Festival, as well as a BAFTA for Best Actor and two British Independent Film Awards for Best British Film and Most Promising Newcomer.

2. C. Taylor, *The Translation of Regional Variety in the Films of Ken Loach*, in N. R. Armstrong, F. M. Federici (eds.), *Translating Voices, Translating Regions*, Aracne, Roma 2006.

3. The ratings considered here refer to DVD or Blue-ray distribution as this can differ from the ones given for cinema releases. The British ratings comply to the following labels: U (Universal), PG (Parental Guidance), 12A (Those under 12 can watch the film with parental guidance), 12, 15, 18. In Italy the labels are T (film per tutti), VM14, VM16, VM18. *Sweet Sixteen* received a VM14 certificate for the cinema screening, while *The Angels' Share* was a film for all (T).

4. K. Allan, K. Burridge, *Forbidden Words: Taboo and the Censoring of Language*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2006. K. Beers Fägersten, *Who's Swearing Now? The Social Aspect of Conversational Swearing*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle-upon-Tyne 2012.

5. D. Cameron, *Verbal Hygiene. The Politics of Language*, Routledge, London-New York 1995.

6. L. Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*, Routledge, London-New York 1995.

7. G. Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam-Philadelphia 1995, Id., *The nature and role of norms in translation*, in L. Venuti (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (2nd ed.), Routledge, London-New York 2004, pp. 205-17.

8. J. Díaz Cintas, G. M. Anderman (eds.), *Audiovisual Translation: Language Transfer on Screen*, Palgrave Macmillan, London 2009.

9. Y. Gambier, *Les censures dans la traduction audiovisuelle*, in "Érudit", 15, 2, 2002, pp. 203-21.

10. J. Munday, *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*, Routledge, London-New York 2012.

11. L. G. Andersson, P. Trudgill, *Swearing*, in L. Monaghan, J. Goodman (eds.), *A Cultural Approach to Interpersonal Communication*, Blackwell, Oxford 2007, pp. 195-9.

12. T. McEnery, *Swearing in English. Bad Language, Purity and Power from 1586 to the Present*, Routledge, London-New York 2005.

13. Allan, Burridge, *Forbidden Words: Taboo and the Censoring of Language*, cit., p. 27.

14. Ivi, p. 31.

15. T. Jay, *Why We Curse: A Neuro-Psycho-Social Theory of Speech*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam-Philadelphia 2000, Id., *Do offensive words harm people?*, in "Psychology, Public Policy, and Law", 15, 2009, pp. 81-101.

16. Beers Fägersten, *Who's Swearing Now? The Social Aspect of Conversational Swearing*, cit., p. 165.

17. S. Pinker, *The Stuff of Thought: Language as a Window into Human Nature*, Penguin, New York 2007.

18. M. Ljung, *Swearing. A Cross-Cultural Linguistic Study*, Palgrave MacMillan, Basingstoke-New York 2011.

19. ASA, BBC, BSC, ITV, *Delete Expletives?*, http://www.ofcom.org.uk/static/archive/itc/uploads/Delete_Expletives.pdf, 2000, (last view 18th February, 2014).

20. In addition to this, the survey includes terms used to express racial abuse and abuse of minorities. Ivi, cit., p. 9.

21. The *British Board of Film Classification* (BBFC), set up in 1912, is an independent body aimed at setting standards, which acknowledge public expectations concerning audio-visual material.

22. V. Tartamella, *Parolacce. Perché le diciamo, che cosa significano, quali effetti hanno*, Rizzoli BUR, Milano 2006.

23. The report on the outcome of the survey on offensiveness of swearwords by Tartamella: http://www.focus.it/Community/cs/photos/parolacce/images/327726/original.aspx.

24. Beers Fägersten, *Who's Swearing Now? The Social Aspect of Conversational Swearing*, cit., p. 9.

25. L. G. Andersson, P. Trudgill, *Bad Language*, Blackwell, Oxford 1990; Beers Fägersten, *Who's Swearing Now? The Social Aspect of Conversational Swearing*, cit.; J. Milroy, *Linguistic Variation and Change*, Blackwell, Oxford 1992.

26. A. Montagu, *The Anatomy of Swearing*, The MacMillan Company, New York 2001.

27. Ivi, p. 3.

28. Cameron, *Verbal Hygiene. The Politics of Language*, cit.

29. Ivi, p. 25.

30. Ivi, p. 114.

31. Ivi, p. 17.

32. F. Billiani, *Assessing Boundaries – Censorship and Translation*, in Id. (ed.), *Modes of Censorship and Translation: National Contexts and Diverse Media*, St. Jerome Publishing, Manchester-New York 2007, pp. 1-25.

33. Beers Fägersten, *Who's Swearing Now? The Social Aspect of Conversational Swearing*, cit., p. 123.

34. Ivi.

35. Ivi, p. 167.

36. In Britain, most legal rights are acquired at the age of sixteen.

37. H. Davies, *Break law to see my film, Ken Loach tells teenagers*, in "The Telegraph", 4th October, 2002, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1409087/Break-law-to-see-my-film-Ken-Loach-tells-teenagers.html. Last view, 10th March, 2014.

38. C. Higgins, *Cannes: Ken Loach brands BBFC hypocritical over cuts of the c-word*, in "The Guardian", 22nd May, 2012. http://www.theguardian.com/film/2012/may/22/ken-loach-bbfc-hypocritical. Last view 10th March, 2014.

39. BBFC Guidelines, http://www.bbfc.co.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/BBFC%20Classification%20Guidelines%202014_0.pdf, p. 6.

40. From 2007 the censorial norms have conformed to international procedures with a Film Commission evaluating an auto-certification of the films for censorial compliance to the norms in relation to language, violence, drug use, crime, discrimination etc.

41. Cameron, *Verbal Hygiene. The Politics of Language*, cit.

42. Ivi, p. 25.

43. Allan, Burridge, *Forbidden Words: Taboo and the Censoring of Language*, cit., p. 283.

44. B. Hatim, I. Mason, *Discourse and the Translator*, Routledge, London 1990.

45. Billiani, *Assessing Boundaries – Censorship and Translation*, cit.

46. Ivi, p. 10.

47. Ivi, p. 3.

48. A. Chesterman, *The Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam-Philadelphia 1997, p. 55.

49. G. Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies – and Beyond*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam-Philadelphia 1995, p. 62.

50. Chesterman, *The Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory*, cit. J. Pedersen, *Subtitling Norms for Television: An Exploration Focussing on Extralinguistic Cultural References*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, 2011.

51. Pedersen, *Subtitling Norms for Television: An Exploration Focussing on Extralinguistic Cultural References*, cit., p. 37.

52. ECRs are words or expressions whose meaning can only be fully understood by reference to extra-linguistic components that belong to the audience's encyclopaedic knowledge, as for proper names, institutions, customs and so on. They may lose their impact in translation. Pedersen, *How is Culture Rendered in Subtitles?* in

"MuTra – Challenges of Multidimensional Translation", Saarbrücken 2005. http://www.euroconferences.info/proceedings/2005_Proceedings/2005_proceedings.html.

53. The seven parameters that Pedersen identifies in the translation process are 1. Transculturality, 2. Extratextuality, 3. Centrality, 4. Polysemiotics, 5. Co-text, 6. Media-specific and 7. Subtitling situation. Pedersen, *Subtitling Norms for Television: An Exploration Focussing on Extralinguistic Cultural References*, cit., pp. 106-10.

54. J. Mattsson, *Linguistic Variation in Subtitling. The subtitling of swearwords and discourse markers in public television, commercial television and DVD*, Mutra: Audiovisual Translation Scenarios, Copenhagen 2006. http://www.euroconferences.info/proceedings/2006_Proceedings/2006_proceedings.html; D. Pujol, *The Translation and Dubbing of "Fuck" into Catalan: The Case of* From Dusk till Dawn, in "JoSTrans: The Journal of Specialized Translation", 6, 2006, pp. 121-33; C. Bucaria, *Translation and Censorship on Italian TV: An Inevitable Love Affair?* in "VIAL", 6, 2009, pp. 13-32; G. L. Scandura, *Sex, Lies and TV: Censorship and Subtitling*, in "Meta", vol. 49, n. 1, 2004, pp. 125-34; M. Pavesi, E. Perego, *Profiling Film Translation in Italy: A Preliminary Analysis*, in "JoSTrans: The Journal of Specialized Translation", 6, 2006, pp. 99-114.

55. M. Pavesi, *Analysing Audiovisual Dialogue*, CLUEB, Bologna 2005.

56. M. Pavesi, A. L. Malinverno, *Sul turpiloquio nella traduzione filmica*, in C. Taylor (a cura di), *Tradurre il cinema*, La Stea, Trieste 2000, pp. 75-90.

57. Cameron, *Verbal Hygiene. The Politics of Language*, cit., p. 115.

58. Taylor, *The Translation of Regional Variety in the Films of Ken Loach*, cit., p. 38.

59. J. Díaz Cintas, *Subtitling: Theory, Practice and Research*, in C. Millán, F. Bartrina (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies*, Routledge, London 2013, pp. 273-87, p. 278.

60. H. Gottlieb, *Subtitling. People Translating People*, in C. Dollerup, A. Loddegaard (eds.) *Teaching Translation and Interpreting 2. Insights, Aims, Visions*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam 1994, pp. 261-74, p. 268.

61. Pedersen, *Subtitling Norms for Television: An Exploration Focussing on Extralinguistic Cultural References*, cit., p. 22.

62. Taylor, *The Translation of Regional Variety in the Films of Ken Loach*, cit., p. 50.

63. ASA, BBC, BSC, ITV, *Delete Expletives?*, cit., p. 9.

64. Allan, Burridge, *Forbidden Words: Taboo and the Censoring of Language*, cit.

65. J. Ayto, *Oxford Dictionary of Slang*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2003.

66. ASA, BBC, BSC, ITV, *Delete Expletives?*, cit.

67. Tartamella, *Parolacce. Perché le diciamo, che cosa significano, quali effetti hanno*, cit.

68. The results of Tartamella's survey are indicated on a special offensiveness meter designed by the journalist. http://blog.focus.it/parolacce/2009/05/16/abbiamo-il-volgarometro/.

69. M. Gregory, S. Carroll, *Language and Situation. Language Varieties and the Social Contexts*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London 1978, p. 42.

70. J. Milroy, L. Milroy, *Authority in Language*, Blackwell, Oxford 1985, p. 26.

71. J. Milroy, *Language Variation and Change*, Blackwell, Oxford 1992.