

Prioritizing the most challenging pragmatic principles in Persian dubbing

Zahra Salari

University of Mazandaran
Iran

Ali Khazae Farid

Ferdowsi University of Mashhad
Iran

Shahla Sharifi

Ferdowsi University of Mashhad
Iran

ONOMÁZEIN 66 (December 2024): 162-181
DOI: 10.7764/onomazein.66.09
ISSN: 0718-5758



Zahra Salari: Department of English Language Translation, Faculty of Cultural Heritage, Handicrafts and Tourism, University of Mazandaran, Babolsar, Iran. | E-mail: z.salari@umz.ac.ir

Ali Khazae Farid: Department of English Language, Faculty of Letters and Humanities, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran. | E-mail: khazaefarid@um.ac.ir

Shahla Sharifi: Department of English Language, Faculty of Letters and Humanities, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran. | E-mail: sh-sharifi@um.ac.ir

Received: November, 2020
Accepted: April, 2021

Abstract

In the process of transferring source language elements to the target ones, the translator faces many challenges, one of which is the pragmatic aspect of the text. Some translators take only the vocabularies and grammatical structure of the texts into account, and neglect this hidden aspect of meaning. This is also the case in audiovisual translation. In fact, sometimes disregarding the hidden aspects of meaning in audiovisual translation leads to misunderstanding film's content and also losing its pleasure. Therefore, the current study aims to prioritize the most challenging pragmatic principles in Persian dubbing. To this end, four American films (*Notting hill*, *The bucket list*, *The ultimate gift* and *Still Alice*) were chosen, all of which had been dubbed into Persian. First, the most challenging pragmatic principles in Persian dubbing are identified. Then, the present study examines the frequencies and types of mismatches between the original and dubbed films in terms of these pragmatic principles. The kinds and frequencies of translation strategies which the translators applied to deal with these principles will be illustrated too. Finally, it sets a hierarchy in the most challenging pragmatic principles in Persian dubbing. It is concluded that there are mismatches between the original and dubbed versions in terms of these pragmatic principles, and the most challenging of them are implicatures, presuppositions and speech acts, respectively.

Keywords: pragmatics; translation; dubbing; translation challenges; translation strategies.

1. Introduction

Despite all developments in the area of audiovisual translation, not much has been done about the pragmatic aspects (Desilla, 2014: 194). In fact, some research has been done on the pragmatic aspects of written translations, but, in the field of dubbing, the vacancy of such research is strongly felt. Since films are dialogue-based, and pragmatic dimensions are mainly hidden in dialogues, it is very essential to consider them in this area. Whether translators observe these hidden dimensions of meaning in their translations, whether all pragmatic principles are of equal importance and challenge the translators equally, whether their degree of difficulty is different and how the translators usually act while facing these dimensions are all subjects that feel like a vacancy in pragmatic research.

Nida is among the first linguists who emphasize the importance of understanding the pragmatic principles in translation (Triki, 2013: 39). Other scholars like Malmkjar (1998) and Ho (1971) stress the relationship between pragmatics and translation. They believe that the pragmatic differences between source and target texts lead to translation problems. Jung (2002) also supposes that it is essential to have both linguistic and pragmatic competencies to establish an effective intercultural communication. In fact, it's essential to be fully aware of the pragmatic differences between two languages to have adequate translations (Bernardo, 2010: 107), because ignoring the pragmatic principles leads to ambiguity and misunderstanding in the text (Sultan, 2007: 37). Thus, the present study tries to answer four questions: (1) What are the most challenging pragmatic principles in Persian dubbing? (2) Is there any mismatch between original films and their dubbed versions in terms of these pragmatic principles? If yes, what kinds of mismatches are they? And what are their frequencies? (3) What kinds of translation strategies did the translators use to deal with these pragmatic principles? And what are the frequencies of them? And (4) What priority can be considered for these pragmatic principles in terms of the most challenging of them in Persian dubbing?

2. Literature review

Abulhassan (2011) is among the scholars who investigate the translation of pragmatic aspects. He examines the translation of some pragmatic aspects like speech acts, implicatures, presuppositions, politeness and deictic expressions in Naguib Mahfouz's Trilogy and concludes that there are mismatches between the original and translated version in terms of these pragmatic aspects and in some instances these kinds of aspects were not conveyed properly in the target text.

Zandi and Azizinezhad (2011) also examine the importance of deictic expressions in the translation of Hafiz poems. To this end, they compare deictic expressions of the original version with its two English translations. Then, they determine the translation strategies which have been applied by the translators, and finally point out their errors in terms of this pragmatic aspect.

In an attempt to investigate the translation of cultural presuppositions, Samimi and Abbasi (2014) study these kinds of presuppositions in translations of *The school Principal* and *The Blind Owl* from Persian into English. They try to describe the translation strategies and determine the best of them which result in a similar impact on the target text readers. They conclude that most of these presuppositions were rendered literally. However, substitution was the best strategy which was applied to translate these presuppositions. Finally, addition, definition, omission, borrowing and lexical creation were other strategies which were applied.

In another research, Cui and Zhao (2014) also investigate the notion of presupposition in translation studies. They elaborate the importance of presupposition by studying the case study of a Japanese text. They believe that the translators can consciously use this pragmatic principle to produce a translation which meets the expectations of the target audiences.

3. Theoretical framework

The current study is based on a theoretical framework which consists of different parts and will be elaborated in the following sections.

3.1. Pragmatic principles

Researchers have suggested different pragmatic principles which include speech acts (Yule¹, 1996; Hatim and Mason, 1997; Mey, 2001; Bublitz and Norrick, 2011), cooperative principles (Hatim and Mason, 1997), implicatures (Yule, 1996; Hatim and Mason, 1997; Mey, 2001; Bublitz and Norrick, 2011), presuppositions (Yule, 1996; Hatim and Mason, 1997; Bublitz and Norrick, 2011), entailment (Yule, 1996; Hatim and Mason, 1997; Bublitz and Norrick, 2011), deixis (Yule, 1996; Hatim and Mason, 1997; Mey, 2001; Bublitz and Norrick, 2011), references (Yule, 1996; Bublitz and Norrick, 2011), politeness (Yule, 1996), definiteness and indefiniteness (Horn and Ward, 2004), conversation (Yule, 1996), and discourse (Yule, 1996; Mey, 2001). In the current study, three kinds of these pragmatic principles are investigated, the reason of which will be clarified in the following parts.

3.1.1. Presupposition

El Gamal (2001: 51-55) believes that presuppositions result from different sources: (1) existential presuppositions, these kinds of presuppositions include definite expressions like: proper names, personal pronouns and phrases introduced by a definite determiner; (2) presuppositions resulted from factive predicates like: realize, regret, aware, know, etc.; (3)

1 It should be mentioned that Yule has not suggested any classification. He has just mentioned the areas related to pragmatics in his book which is entitled as *Pragmatics*.

presuppositions caused by change-of-state verbs like: stop, begin, start, finish, leave, etc.; (4) presuppositions resulted from iterative predicates like: again, repeat, another time, call back, etc.; (5) presuppositions caused by verbs of judging like: accuse, blame, criticize, etc.; (6) structural presuppositions, these kinds of presuppositions can be induced by temporal clauses including before, since, while, etc., another type of these presuppositions are caused by cleft and pseudo-cleft constructions; (7) presuppositions induced by comparisons including words like: too, back, in return, etc.; (8) presuppositions triggered by nonrestrictive relative clauses; (9) counterfactual presuppositions including conditional clauses and verbs like: pretend, wish, etc., and (10) presuppositions carried by questions.

3.1.2. Implicature

Violating the cooperative principles by language users leads to the implicit meaning of the utterance and audiences understand what they mean by the inferences they make. Different kinds of implicatures include: (1) conversational implicatures (these are formed by violating the cooperative principles), (2) scalar implicatures (these kinds of implicatures show one value from a scale of values like: all, many, always, often, etc.), and (3) conventional implicatures (some specific words lead to these kinds of implicatures like: yet, even, but, etc.) (Yule, 1996: 40-46).

3.1.3. Speech act

Searle's classification (Searle, 1969: 10-16) of different speech acts has been considered influential by most researchers. This classification includes: (1) representatives (speech acts which show the speaker's beliefs involving verbs like: believe, state, etc.), (2) directives (speech acts which reflect the speaker's intention to convince the hearer to do something involving verbs like: order, invite, etc.), (3) commissives (speech acts which reflect the speaker's commitment to do something in the future including verbs like: promise, pledge, etc.), (4) expressives (the speech acts which indicate the mental states of the speaker involving verbs like: apologize, thank, etc.), (5) declaratives (the speech acts which indicate sudden changes in the course of events including verbs like: fire, resign, etc.).

On the other hand, Yule (1996: 55) assumes that speech acts can also be differentiated based on their structures. In fact, "whenever there is a direct relationship between a structure and a function, we have a direct speech act. Whenever there is an indirect relationship between a structure and a function, we have an indirect speech act" (Yule, 1996: 54-55).

So, the first sentence below is a direct kind of speech act, because it has an interrogative form and its communicative function is question. On the other hand, the second one has an interrogative form but functions as a kind of request, so this is an indirect kind of speech act.

- (1) Did you open the window?
- (2) Can you give me some food?

3.2. Translation strategies

Chesterman (2016) is one of the scholars who has suggested different translation strategies. His classification of pragmatic translation strategies is as follows:

- (1) Cultural filtering: In this strategy, the cultural elements of the SL² are conveyed to the functional or cultural equivalents of the TL³. It's also called naturalization, domestication, and adaptation (Chesterman, 2016: 104).
- (2) Explicitness change: It includes the two strategies of implicitation and explicitation. Sometimes the translator conveys the implicit ST information in an explicit way in the TT (explicitation), and sometimes he/she acts the opposite way and translates the explicit information of the ST implicitly in the target one (implicitation) (Chesterman, 2016: 105).
- (3) Information change: It includes addition of relevant information to the TT or deletion of irrelevant one of the ST (Chesterman, 2016: 106).
- (4) Interpersonal change: This involves changes in the overall style like the ST level of formality or its technical lexis (Chesterman, 2016: 106).
- (5) Illocutionary change: It includes altering the speech acts (Chesterman, 2016: 107).
- (6) Coherence change: This strategy includes logical arrangement of information at the ideational level in the text (Chesterman, 2016: 107).
- (7) Partial translation: It encompasses partial translations such as: summary translation, transcription, and the like (Chesterman, 2016: 108).
- (8) Visibility change: This includes methods in which the translator's presence is evident like using footnotes (Chesterman, 2016: 108).
- (9) Transediting: It includes methods of re-ordering and rewriting the original texts which are badly written (Chesterman, 2016: 108).
- (10) Other pragmatic changes: These kinds of changes cover cases like altering the dialect or text layout (Chesterman, 2016: 109).

2 Source language.

3 Target language.

4. Research method

To prioritize the most challenging pragmatic principles in dubbing, four American films were selected, all of which were dubbed into Persian. All parts of these films were analyzed in full. The general pieces of information about these films have been illustrated in table 1.

TABLE 1

General information about the selected films

ORIGINAL TITLES	TITLES OF THE DUBBED VERSIONS	RELEASE YEAR	GENRES	RUN TIME
Notting Hill	ناتینگ هیل	1999	romance, comedy	124min
The ultimate gift	هدیه نهایی	2006	drama	117min
The bucket list	فهرست آرزوها	2007	drama, comedy	97min
Still Alice	من هنوز آلیس هستم	2014	drama	101min

To limit the research scope to the most challenging pragmatic principles in Persian dubbing, a pilot study (Dörnyei, 2007) was done. To this purpose, the original and dubbed versions of *The bucket list* was investigated in terms of all the pragmatic principles⁴ (presuppositions, implicatures, speech acts, definiteness/indefiniteness, references, entailment, deixis, and politeness) which were mentioned in the previous part, and the mismatches between the two versions were determined. The data obtained from this pilot study will be presented in the next part.

To analyze the data, both qualitative and quantitative methods of content analysis were applied. In fact, qualitative content analysis was used to determine the different types of pragmatic principles and the mismatches between original and dubbed versions in terms of each of these principles. The kinds of translation strategies which were applied were also determined by this kind of content analysis. On the other hand, the frequencies of these pragmatic principles in the original films, the frequencies of mismatches between the original and dubbed versions, and the frequencies of translation strategies were determined by the quantitative kind of content analysis.

4 It should be noted that concepts such as conversation and discourse, although related to pragmatics, are broad topics that cannot be considered as subdisciplines of pragmatics. So, they are not considered in the present study.

5. Data analysis

As it was mentioned, to limit the research scope to the most challenging pragmatic principles in Persian dubbing, a pilot study was done. According to the data obtained from this study, the research scope was confined to the three areas of presuppositions, speech acts and implicatures which had the highest frequency of mismatches, respectively. The data obtained by analyzing the aforementioned film are clear in table 2.

TABLE 2

The frequencies of mismatches between the original and dubbed versions in terms of each pragmatic principle in *The bucket list*

presuppositions	speech acts	implicatures	references	definiteness/ indefiniteness	deixis	entailment	politeness
140	67	31	4	2	2	-	1

5.1. Presuppositions

Here are some examples of the aforementioned films which elaborate the mismatches between original and dubbed versions in terms of presupposition.

Example (1)

Film title: *Notting Hill*, **scene time:** 8th minute (Someone is trying to steal a book from William's bookstore)

ST

Thief: I haven't got a book down my trousers.

William: Right - well, then we have something of an impasse. I tell you what - I'll call the police -- and, what can I say? -- If I'm wrong about the whole book-down-the-trousers scenario, I really apologize.

TT

Thief: I didn't put a book in my trousers (*man ketabi tu shalvaram nazashtam*).

William: All right, look what I'm saying. I'm calling police now, If I had made a mistake, and you wouldn't have put a book in your trousers, I apologize you. (*Kheili khub, bebin chi migam. Man alan be police telefon mizanam. Age man eshtebah karde budamo to ketabi tu shalvaret qayem nakerde budi, man azat ozr khahi mikonam*).

In example (1), the underlined question (what can I say?) includes existential presupposition of the pronoun (I). It also carries another presupposition which resulted from the question form. This question has been deleted in the dubbed version. On the other hand, (the whole book-down-the-trousers scenario) consists of an existential presupposition which has been changed in the dubbed version and conveyed by explicitation. So, information change (deletion) and explicitness change (explicitation) are the translation strategies which have been applied in this part.

Example (2)

Film title: *The ultimate gift*, **scene time:** 41st minute (Red is talking to Jason)

ST

Red: Now, you have to take that money and- as much as you need it yourself- spend it on someone experiencing a real problem.

TT

Red: Well, pick up that money and take it with you, but do your best to spend it in a good act (*Khob un pulo bardar va ba khodet bebar, vali nahayate sayeto bokon ke tuye ye kare khub kharjesh koni*).

In example (2), the first underlined clause (as much as you need it yourself) includes a presupposition triggered by a nonrestrictive relative clause, and the clause (someone experiencing a real problem) encompasses a structural kind of presupposition. Both have been deleted from the dubbed version and the meaning also has been changed. Therefore, in this case, a total change⁵ has taken place.

Example (3)

Film title: *Still Alice*, **scene time:** 20th minute (Alice is in the psychiatrist's office and talking to him)

ST

Dr. Benjamin: Now last time you came I asked you to bring a close relative.

Alice: I really didn't think that would be necessary.

TT

Dr. Benjamin: Well, last time I asked you to bring one of your relatives (*Khob daf- eye pish khastam yeki az basteganetun ro biyarin*).

Alice: I thought it's not necessary (*Fek kardam zarurati nadare*).

5 In some parts not only the meaning but also the pragmatic principles have been altered. As these cases can't be put under any of Chesterman's translation strategies, they're entitled as total change by the researchers of the current study.

In example (3), the underlined clause (you came) follows the time adverbial phrase of (last time) and includes a structural kind of presupposition. On the other hand, the verb (came) encompasses a presupposition caused by change-of-state verbs, but it has been deleted in the dubbed version.

Example (4)

Film title: *The bucket list*, **scene time:** 59th minute (Karter is talking to Edward in Egypt)

ST

Carter: You know the ancient Egyptians had a beautiful believe about that.

TT

Carter: Do you know what ancient Egyptians believe? (*Miduni mesriyaye bastan che aqidei dashtan?*).

In example (4), the original sentence has a declarative form but it has been translated as a question. So, it includes a presupposition triggered by question which is not seen in the original version. In the original version, there is just a factive presupposition of the verb (know). Therefore, the illocutionary change has been applied as the translation strategy.

5.2. Speech acts

As it was mentioned, there are also mismatches between the original and dubbed versions in terms of speech acts. So, in this part, some examples have been provided which clarify this issue.

Example (5)

Film title: *Notting Hill*, **scene time:** 12th minute (William and Anna suddenly collided, and William's coffee poured on Anna's clothes)

ST

William: Here, let me help.

Anna: What are you doing?!

TT

William: What a chance! I'm really sorry. You should forgive me. Let me ... (*Che shansi! vaqean moteasefam, bayad mano bebakhshid, ejaze bedid*).

Anna: Please don't touch me (*Lotfan be man dast nazan*).

In example (5), the original underlined sentence is a directive kind of speech act. On the other hand, it's indirect because it has a question form but functions as a kind of objection. In the dubbed version, it has been conveyed in an explicit way to a directive speech act which is direct. So, explicitation is the translation strategy which has been applied here.

Example (6)

Film title: *The bucket list*, **scene time:** 30th minute (Tom, Edward's assistant, is asking Edward how to hold a funeral for him)

ST

Edward: Treat it, as if it were your own.

Tom: So... leave all the money to my as-
sistant.

TT

Edward: Think as if it's your own funeral
(*Fek kon maraseme marge khodete*).

Tom: So I give all my money to my as-
sistant? (*Pas hameye pulamo baraye dast-*
yaram bezaram?).

In example (6), the original underlined sentence is a representative speech act which is direct, and it has a declarative form, while it has been conveyed to a question which is a directive speech act. On the other hand, it's indirect because it has a question form but functions as a kind of humor. So, illocutionary change is the translation strategy which has been applied here.

Example (7)

Film title: *Still Alice*, **scene time:** 18th minute (The family members have gathered to celebrate Christmas. The children are standing in the kitchen, and Alice asks them to go out so she can cook)

ST

Alice: Okay now, all get outta here. I have
to concentrate or there'll be no food.

Lydia: Where's dad?

Alice: He's upstairs.

ST

Alice: Guys, why don't you go out so I can
focus on making this? (*Bacheha migam*
chera shoma nemirin birun ta betunam
ru dorost kardane in tamarkoz konam?).

Lydia: Where's dad? (*Pedar kojast?*).

Alice: Upstairs (*Tabaqeye bala*).

In example (7), the underlined sentence is a directive speech act in the original version. It's direct because it has an imperative form and functions as a kind of command, but it has been rendered to a question which is indirect. Thus, illocutionary change has been also applied here as the translation strategy.

Example (8)

Film title: *The ultimate gift*, **scene time:** 44th minute (Jason is talking to Emily's mother in the hospital)

ST

Jason: Uh, well, you gotta need money, right?

Alexia: Oh, so that's it. You won your bet with your rich grandfather.

TT

Jason: You need money, don't you? (*Shoma be pool ehtiyaj darin, na?*)

Alexia: What happened? You won the bet you had with your dead grandfather (*Mage chi shode? To qarari ro ke ba pe-darbozorge mordat dashti bordi*).

In example (8), the underlined sentence in the original version is a representative speech act which has a declarative form. On the other hand, it has been rendered to a question form which is a directive kind of speech act. Its meaning is also different from the original version. So, a total change has been occurred here.

5.3. Implicatures

Here are some examples which illustrate the mismatches between the original and dubbed versions in terms of implicatures.

Example (9)

Film title: *Still Alice*, **scene time:** 2nd minute (Alice and her family are at the restaurant to celebrate her birthday. Alice is saying that Lydia has to take an exam so she couldn't be with them)

ST

Charlie: Maybe this will be her big break.

Alice: Yeah maybe.

Anna: Don't hold your breath.

TT

Charlie: Maybe it's a great opportunity in her life (*Shayad forsate bozorge zendegish bashe*).

Alice: Yeah, maybe (*Are shayad*).

Anna: Don't rely on yourself (*Be khodetunomid nadin*).

In example (9), the underlined sentence in the original version is an idiomatic expression. So, it's a conversational implicature triggered by flouting the quality maxim, but it has been rendered to an explicit sentence. So, explicitation is the translation strategy which has been applied here.

Example (10)

Film title: *The bucket list*, **scene time:** 9th minute (Edward has been hospitalised in a shared ward and he is angry about it. Now, he is asking Tom to have his own single room)

ST

Tom: You can't have your own room; it'll create an enormous PR. problem.

Edward: I don't give a shit after all; I still want my own room.

TT

Tom: You can't have a private room. You know that the press is waiting for things like this (*Nemitunin otaqe khosusi dashte bashin, midunin ke matbuat montazere hamin chizan*).

Edward: It doesn't matter to me at all. I want to be hospitalised in my own room (*In aslan baram mohem nist, man mikham tu otaqe khodam bastari besham*).

In example (10), the word *still* in the underlined sentence of the original version results in a conventional kind of implicature which has been deleted in dubbing. So, information change (deletion) is the translation strategy which has been used here.

Example (11)

Film title: *Notting Hill*, **scene time:** 7th minute (Spike is going to meet Jenny, and now William is trying to help him choose the right clothes for this meeting)

ST

William: What are the choices?

Spike: Well... wait for it...
First there's this one...

William: Yes -- might make it hard to strike a really romantic note.

TT

William: What t-shirts do you have? (*Che t-shertae dari?*).

Spike: So wait a minute (*Khob chand lahze sabr kon*).

This is the first one. Good or not? (*In avvalishe, khube ya na?*).

William: Yes, but unfortunately, the design is not romantic at all (*Are, amma mote-asefane tarhesh aslan romantik nist*).

In example (11), the word *might* in the underlined sentence of the original version induces a scalar implicature which indicates a degree of probability but has been omitted in the dubbed version and the sentence has been expressed with certainty.

Example (12)

Film title: *The ultimate gift*, **scene time:** 44th minute (Alexia is talking to Jason in the hospital)

ST

Alexia: I bet you're gonna get to the end of your game, collect your cash... and just ride off into the sunset.

TT

Alexia: I thought the game was over; you would get your money and go about your life (*Fekr mikardam bazi tamum shode, pooleto migirio miri soraqe zendegit*).

In example (12), the underlined sentence in the original version is an idiomatic expression and results in a conversational implicature caused by flouting the quality maxim. It has been translated to an explicit sentence in the dubbed version. Thus, explicitation is applied here as the translation strategy.

Table 3 illustrates the frequencies of total presuppositions of the original versions and also the mismatches between the original and dubbed versions in terms of different kinds of presuppositions. According to this table, existential presuppositions have the highest frequency of occurrence. Comparative, change of state verbs, structural, question and iterative presuppositions are also in the next levels, respectively. Counterfactual, non-restrictive relative clauses and factive presuppositions also have the lowest frequency, respectively. Moreover, there is no mismatch in terms of the presuppositions caused by verbs of judging.

TABLE 3

The frequencies of mismatches between the original and dubbed versions in terms of different kinds of presuppositions

Films' titles	Total presuppositions of the original versions	Mismatches	Existential	Structural	Factive	Change of state verbs	Iterative	Comparative	Question	Counterfactual	Nonrestrictive relative clauses	Verbs of judging
Notting Hill	1907	226	137	11	1	17	8	32	15	2	3	-
The bucket list	1411	140	84	17	3	9	1	15	8	1	2	-
The ultimate gift	1701	186	131	10	4	17	4	9	9	2	-	-
Still Alice	1989	134	95	10	1	10	3	11	4	-	-	-

According to table 4, translation strategies such as deletion, addition, explicitness change, illocutionary change, cultural filtering and total change have been applied to render dif-

ferent kinds of presuppositions, among which deletion has the highest frequency of occurrence and addition follows it. Moreover, there are cases in which total change has been taken place, the frequency of which is noticeable. Strategies like illocutionary change and cultural filtering also have lower levels of frequency.

TABLE 4

The frequencies of different translation strategies applied

Films' titles	Deletion	Addition	Explicitness change	Illocutionary change	Cultural filtering	Total change
Notting Hill	86	55	21	2	8	54
The bucket list	99	27	-	4	-	10
The ultimate gift	93	34	10	4	6	39
Still Alice	74	34	-	2	-	24

Table 5 shows the frequencies of different kinds of speech acts in the original films. As it's evident, representative speech acts have the highest frequency of occurrence. Directive, expressive, commissive and declarative ones are also in the next levels, respectively. On the other hand, most of the speech acts are direct and just some of them have been expressed in an indirect way.

TABLE 5

The frequencies of different kinds of speech acts in the original films

Films' titles	Representative	Directive	Expressive	Commissive	Declarative	Direct	Indirect
Notting Hill	690	327	185	70	2	1247	27
The bucket list	609	258	30	17	-	898	16
The ultimate gift	741	274	61	11	3	1059	31
Still Alice	902	235	65	16	-	1180	38

Table 6 also demonstrates the frequencies of mismatches between the original and dubbed versions in terms of different kinds of speech acts. As it is obvious in this table, the most frequent mismatches belong to representative kinds of speech acts. Directive, expressive and commissive ones are in the next levels, respectively. Declarative speech acts also have the lowest frequency of mismatches.

TABLE 6

The frequencies of mismatches between the original and dubbed versions in terms of different kinds of speech acts

Films' titles	Mismatches	Representative	Directive	Expressive	Commissive	Declarative
Notting Hill	108	43	47	14	4	-
The bucket list	67	43	22	1	1	-
The ultimate gift	72	29	36	5	1	1
Still Alice	75	51	19	5	-	-

As it's clear in table 7, the translation strategies which have been used to render different kinds of speech acts are deletion, addition, explicitness change, illocutionary change and total change. Moreover, deletion has the highest frequency of occurrence and addition, illocutionary change, total change and explicitness change follow it, respectively.

TABLE 7

The frequencies of different translation strategies applied

Films' titles	Deletion	Addition	Explicitness change	Illocutionary change	Total change
Notting Hill	40	34	6	13	15
The bucket list	19	17	4	15	12
The ultimate gift	28	14	-	23	7
Still Alice	36	14	3	12	10

Table 8 illustrates the frequencies of different kinds of speech acts in the original films. As it's apparent, conventional implicatures have the highest frequency of occurrence. Scalar, conversational, and numeral implicatures are also in the next levels, respectively.

TABLE 8

The frequencies of different kinds of implicatures in the original films

Films' titles	Total implicatures	Conversational	Scalar	Conventional	Numeral
Notting Hill	602	147	188	237	30
The bucket list	295	156	77	62	-
The ultimate gift	446	121	125	165	35
Still Alice	458	79	159	211	9

Table 9 shows the frequencies of mismatches between the original and dubbed versions in terms of different kinds of implicatures. According to this table, the most frequent number of mismatches belongs to scalar implicatures. Conventional, conversational and numeral ones are also in the next levels, respectively.

TABLE 9

The frequencies of mismatches between the original and dubbed versions in terms of different kinds of implicatures

Films' titles	Total mismatches	Conversational	Scalar	Conventional	Numeral
Notting Hill	69	21	28	17	3
The bucket list	31	14	7	10	-
The ultimate gift	63	14	24	24	1
Still Alice	50	16	15	19	-

Table 10 shows the frequencies of different translation strategies applied to render various kinds of implicatures. According to this table, deletion has the highest frequency of occurrence. Moreover, explicitness change, total change, addition and illocutionary change also follow it, respectively.

TABLE 10

The frequencies of different translation strategies applied

Films' titles	Deletion	Addition	Explicitness change	Illocutionary change	Total change
Notting Hill	40	6	8	-	15
The bucket list	20	2	6	-	3
The ultimate gift	40	2	12	1	8
Still Alice	32	8	7	-	3

Therefore, to prioritize the most challenging pragmatic principles in Persian dubbing, if we consider the data achieved from the current study, implicature is at the top of this hierarchy. Moreover, presupposition and speech acts are at the next levels, respectively.

It's necessary to take into account that we deal with some constraints in dubbing. One of these limitations which is essential to be considered is lip synchronicity (Díaz-Cintas, 1999: 33). As a matter of fact, the dubbing sound and the actors' lip movements must be in harmony and it imposes some limitations on translation. Another constraint which imposes on

this kind of audiovisual translation is that in dubbing there is a group of different persons including dubbing actors, dubbing assistant, dubbing director, translator and editor. So, the translator is not the only person who decides in this process (Pérez-González, 2014), and the final product must eventually be affirmed by the dubbing director.

6. Conclusion

Considering the data achieved from the pilot study, the most challenging pragmatic principles are presupposition, implicature and speech acts. To answer the next research question, the study revealed that there were mismatches between the original and dubbed versions in terms of all of these three pragmatic principles. In some instances, the original pragmatic principles had been deleted in the dubbed versions. In other words, deletion was the most frequent translation strategy which had been applied in all the aforementioned films. Sometimes new pragmatic principles were added to the dubbed versions which were not present in the original films. In fact, addition followed deletion strategy in terms of frequency. Other strategies like illocutionary change, explicitness change, cultural filtering and total change had also been applied in other instances. In some cases, the different grammatical structures of the languages may cause mismatches between the original and dubbed films. Sometimes, the limitations imposed on dubbing results in such kinds of mismatches. Apart from these two sources, translators' inadequacy may also result in mismatches. Hence, translators must acquire the essential skills and competencies related to pragmatic aspects of translation.

In fact, maybe the dubbing director changes the translation to make it native, but the translator is the one who can make such changes because he/she is competent in both source and target languages and should translate the text in a way that doesn't need many changes (Chaume, 2004: 37). So, based on the data achieved from the current study, implicature is the most challenging pragmatic principle in Persian dubbing and presupposition, and speech acts follow it, respectively. As a matter of fact, setting such a hierarchy for the most challenging pragmatic principles may help in translator training and let the syllabus designers prioritize the necessary skills translators must acquire. The present study is limited to the four aforementioned films and cannot be generalised to all cases.

7. References

ABULHASSAN, Bahaa, 2011: *Literary translation: Aspects of pragmatic meaning*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

BERNARDO, Ana Maria, 2010: "Translation as Text Transfer – Pragmatic Implications", *Linguistic Studies* 5, 107-115.

BUBLITZ, Wolfram, and Neal R. NORRICK (eds.), 2011: *Foundations of pragmatics*, vol. 1, Walter de Gruyter.

CHAUME, F., 2004: "Synchronization in dubbing" in P. ORERO (ed.): *Topics in audiovisual translation*, Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing, 35-52.

CHESTERMAN, Andrew, 2016: *Memes of translation: The spread of ideas in translation theory*, vol. 123, John Benjamins Publishing Company.

CUI, Ying, and Yanli ZHAO, 2014: "A contextual perspective on presupposition, with reference to translation studies", *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus* 43, 31-42.

DESILLA, Louisa, 2014: "Reading between the lines, seeing beyond the images: An empirical study on the comprehension of implicit film dialogue meaning across cultures", *The Translator* 20 (2), 194-214.

DÍAZ-CINTAS, Jorge, 1999: "Dubbing or subtitling: The eternal dilemma", *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 7 (1), 31-40.

DÖRNYEI, Zoltan, 2007: *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

EL-GAMAL, Ayman, 2001: "Presupposition, perceptual relativity and translation theory", *Revista alicantina de estudios ingleses* 14 (nov.), 37-62.

HATIM, Basil, and Ian MASON, 1997: *The Translator as Communicator*, London: Routledge.

HO, Hsiu-hwang, 1971: "A Pragmatic Concept of Translation", *Philosophical Review* 1, National Taiwan University: Taiwan.

HORN, Laurence R., and Gregory L. WARD (eds.), 2004: *The handbook of pragmatics*, Oxford: Blackwell.

JUNG, Ji Young, 2002: "Issues in Acquisitional Pragmatics", *Studies in Applied Linguistics & TESOL* 2 (3), Teacher's College, Columbia University.

MALMKJAR, K., 1998: "Cooperation and Literally Translation" in L. HICKEY (ed): *The Pragmatics of Translation*, British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data: GB.

MEY, Jacob L., 2001: *Pragmatics: An introduction*, 2nd ed., Oxford, England: Blackwell.

PÉREZ-GONZÁLEZ, Luis, 2014: *Audiovisual translation: Theories, methods and issues*, London: Routledge.

SAMIMI, Muhammad Reza, and Pyeaam ABBASI, 2014: "Cultural Presuppositions in Translation from Persian into English: A Case Study of Two Persian Novels: The Blind Owl and The School Principal", *The Criterion An International Journal in English* 5, 467-480.

SEARLE, John R., 1969: *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*, Cambridge: Cambridge university Press.

SULTAN, Kadhim M., 2007: "The semantics, pragmatics and translation of speech acts", *Journal of the college of basic education* 10 (50), 23-41.

TRIKI, Manel, 2013: "A Pragmatic Approach to the Study of English/Arabic Translation Errors", *Journal Academica* 3 (1), 39-51.

YULE, George, 1996: *Pragmatics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

ZANDI, Mehdi, and Masoud AZIZINEZHAD, 2011: "A pragmatic approach to translation: a case study of deictic expressions in translations of hafiz", *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 28, 928-931.