Application of Ellipsis and Lexical Cohesion in Subtitling and Dubbing: The Case of Prison Break TV Series

Laya Mogadam
Isfahan University
layaaamogadam@yahoo.com

Mustafa Shabanipoor
Isfahan University
mustafa.shabanipoor@gmail.com

Abstract

This study is a descriptive piece of research attempting to compare and contrast the use of two types of cohesive devices (i.e., lexical cohesion and ellipsis) in the original dialogues of a television series with the Persian subtitled and dubbed versions of the same dialogues. The data used in the study comprises the dialogues of 10 scenes randomly selected by the researcher from the television series *Prison Break* as well as the dubbed and subtitled counterparts of the dialogues of the same scenes. The study seeks two objectives: First, it attempts to investigate the original dialogues of the film in terms of the frequency of the use of the two mentioned types of cohesive devices and to compare them with the dubbed and subtitled versions; second, it aims to compare the two types of audio-visual translations (i.e., dubbing and subtitling) to find out how they have dealt with these cohesive devices and what difference exist between these two types of translation in terms of their handling lexical cohesion and ellipsis. For this purpose, the study employs the model proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976). Also, in order to determine the inter-rater reliability of the analyses, Chi Square test is conducted. The findings reveal that repetition has the greatest frequency of use among lexical cohesion elements and clausal ellipsis has the greatest frequency among ellipsis types in the original dialogues. The findings also demonstrate that the two translated versions are relatively similar in their handling lexical cohesion but the dubbed version contains a substantially greater number of cases of ellipsis than the subtitled version does. The findings of this paper could provide audiovisual translators with information as to how the cohesive elements are differently used in the English dialogues and their Persian translations (subtitled and dubbed dialogues).

Key words: Audio-visual translation, dubbing, subtitling, cohesion, lexical cohesion, ellipsis

Introduction

The media play an important role in this age of globalization and global communications. The introduction and subsequent boom in satellite television, plus the Internet, has made the world a much smaller place, allowing different peoples, cultures and languages to interact more frequently. The "screen" is a primary vehicle for this interaction, and, as a result, the audio-visual or film translator has an increasingly important role to play. Since the audio-visual text is a complex medium comprising both verbal and non-verbal signs, the translator must strive to transfer the true meaning and value of all the signs and to refrain from too many deletions. Although translation is a matter of approximation, one cannot underestimate the value of the chunks of language and the logical relationship existing among them.

Cohesive devices, and the ways in which they are used, vary from language to language and thus, if they are translated one for one from the source to the receptor language, the intended meaning of the original author will certainly be distorted. Therefore, translators should be fully aware of the cohesive devices of the source language and look for the appropriate devices of the receptor language for use in the translation (Larson, 1984). Baker (1992, p.206) refers to different networks of lexical cohesion in different languages. She maintains:

> As with the thematic structure, it is in many ways the density and progression of cohesive ties throughout a text that are important. This web of relationships may have to differ between ST and TT, since the networks of lexical relationships will not be identical across languages.

Literature Review

Audiovisual Translation

Audiovisual translation is one of the several overlapping umbrella terms that include 'media translation', 'multimedia translation', 'multimodal translation' and 'screen translation'. These different terms all set out to cover the interlingual transfer of verbal language when it is transmitted and accessed both visually and acoustically, usually, but not necessarily, through some kind of electronic device. Remael, De Houwer, and Vandekerckhove (2008, pp. 1-2) defined audiovisual translation as follows:

Audiovisual translation (AVT) constitutes a sub-discipline of Translation Studies (TS) that is now in full swing, as witnessed by the numerous recent publications dealing with this extremely volatile translation form. Having started out as a discipline focusing on the traditional forms of interlingual subtitling and dubbing, studies in AVT now embrace such diverse forms of text production as partial dubbing, consecutive and simultaneous interpretation (for television), off-screen narration, voice over, subtitling for opera and theatre, intra lingual and interlingual subtitling for the deaf and hard-of hearing (SDH), and audio description for the blind and visually impaired (AD). Many researchers in the field are treating AVT as a form of 'accessibility', i.e., a form of text production that does not merely overcome linguistic and language-specific cultural boundaries, but also sensorial boundaries, boundaries of a quite different kind.

It is also assumed that AVT is a translation form with a strong technical component which is very susceptible to influence from technological developments that necessarily exert influence on how AVT is produced, and hence on its form. In many ways, they argue, AVT acts as a microcosm of current text production, especially mixing spoken, written, visual and aural modes. They state that this type of translation undermines traditional notions such as the linearity of verbal texts and reliance on multiple forms of intertextuality (Remael et al. 2008).

As mentioned above, this new area has strong relationships with translation, literary studies, and cultural communication. It is also associated with the subtitling or dubbing process. These two methods of film translation are, according to Diaz Cintas (2008, p. 7):

The most popular in the profession and the best known by audiences, but there are some others such as voice-over, narration and interpreting. The translation of live performances was added to this taxonomy at a later stage and that is how subtitling for the opera and the theatre has also come to be included. The change of language that takes place in all these cases has been a key factor when labeling these practices as translation.

Dubbing and subtitling are the means to rendering voice tracks, whether in the oral or written forms. Subtitles are regarded as the abbreviated version of the dialogue which is projected onto the screen;

and dubbing is a synchronized soundtrack of the complete dialogue. House (1977, p. 188-89) states that "subtitles are overt translations whereas dubbing which purports to be a second original is covert."

Cohesion

Baker (1992, p. 24) defines cohesion as "the network of lexical, grammatical and other relationships, which provides links between various parts of a text. These relationships or ties organize and to some extent create a text". She adds, "cohesion is a surface relationship; it connects together the actual words and expressions that we can see or hear". In fact, cohesion refers to the linguistic unity of a text comparable with coherence which refers to its conceptual unity. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976, p. 4):

> The concept of cohesion is a semantic one; it refers to relations of meaning that exist within the text, and that define it as a text. Cohesion occurs where the INTERPRETATION of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another. The one PRESOPPOSES the other, in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it. When this happens, a relation of cohesion is set up, and the two elements, the presupposing and the presupposed, are thereby at least potentially integrated into a text.

In other words, as stated by Carter and Mc Carthy (1998, p. 80), cohesion can be described as "the means by which texts are linguistically connected". However it is necessary to recognize that "Cohesion is a manifestation of certain aspects of coherence, and a pointer towards it, rather than its cause or necessary result" (Cook, 1994, p. 34).

Each text intended to be read needs to be as clear as possible so that the reader can easily follow sentences, ideas, and details. One of the most important aspects is to show the connections and relationships among ideas. In fact, cohesion can be defined as "manifestation of how we are making sense of the message in the text" (Carter & McCarthy, 1988, p. 204).

Cohesion is achieved by a set of linguistic devices which connect ideas, making explicit the semantic relationships underlying them. The most commonly used typology of cohesive devices is provided by Halliday and Hassan (1976). This typology contains the following five cohesive devices: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion.

Use of these particular types of words and phrases, known as 'cohesive ties', to link individual sentences and parts of sentences, helps the reader to follow the movement of ideas without any difficulty. They help the text to flow naturally, without any unnecessary repetition. Such ties serve as sign posts, which signal readers how texts are organized and how parts of texts are functionally interconnected, and in turn help them comprehend the entire text.

Cohesive Devices

Halliday and Hasan (1976) divide cohesive ties into five types: conjunction, reference, substitution, ellipsis, and lexical cohesion. These are referred to as resources used in the surface structures of texts. This model of cohesion as used by Halliday and Hasan is applied between sentences as those within the sentences can also function as structural elements.

Grammatical devices

Halliday and Hasan (1976) offer taxonomy of the types of cohesive relationship which can be formally established within a text. Therefore, the main cohesive devices which bind a text together are of two main categories: grammatical and lexical devices. The kinds of grammatical cohesive ties discussed by Halliday and Hasan (1976) are reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction. The following is an explanation of different types of ellipses which is one of the focuses of the present study.

Ellipsis

Ellipsis occurs when "something which is present in the selection of underlying (systematic) options is omitted in the structure- whether or not the resulting structure is in itself 'incomplete' " (Halliday and Hasan, 1976, p. 144). In crude terms, we can take as a general guide the notion that ellipsis occurs when something that is structurally necessary is left unsaid. Ellipsis, like substitution, is believed to embody the same fundamental relationship between parts of a text (a relationship between words or groups or clauses, as distinct from reference, which is a relation between meanings). There are three types of ellipsis, depending on the structural unit within which ellipsis occurs: nominal ellipsis, verbal ellipsis, and clausal ellipsis.

- **Nominal Ellipsis**

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976, p.147), nominal ellipsis refers to ellipsis within the nominal group. On the logical dimension, "the

structure is that of Head with optional modification; the modifying elements include some which precede the Head and some which follow it, referred to as pre-modifier and post-modifier respectively". On the other hand, "the modifier is combined with another structure, on the experimental direction, which consists of the elements Deictic, Numerative, Epithet, Classifier, and Qualifier" (Halliday and Hasan, 1976, p.147). In general, any nominal group having the function of Head filled by a word that normally functions within the Modifier is an elliptical one. Therefore, as pointed out by Halliday and Hasan (1976), nominal ellipsis involves the upgrading of a word functioning as Deictic, Numerative, Epithet or Classifier from the status of Modifier to that of Head. The following example can illustrate the point.

Four students passed the course. The other *four* failed it.

In the second line 'four', which is a Numerative and therefore normally acts as Modifier is upgraded to function as Head.

- **Verbal Ellipsis**

Verbal ellipsis is defined as ellipsis within the verbal group. In other words, it is technically defined as a verbal group, of which the structure does not fully express its syntactic features- all the choices being made within the verbal group system. As implied in the definition put forth by Halliday and Hasan (1976), verbal ellipsis undoubtedly differs from nominal ellipsis. In the verbal group, unlike nominal ellipsis, there is only one lexical element, and that is the verb itself. And the whole of the rest of the verbal group expresses systematic selections, a choice of an either-or type. The following example can illustrate the point:

A: what have you been doing?

B: *Swimming.*

'Swimming' in the above example adopted from Halliday and Hasan (1976) is considered to be a case of verbal ellipsis. There are two basic kinds of verbal ellipsis: lexical ellipsis and operator ellipsis.

- **Lexical Ellipsis**

"It is the type of ellipsis in which the lexical verb is missing from the verbal group" (Halliday and Hasan, 1976, p. 170). Heed should be taken of the fact that lexical ellipsis is ellipsis 'from the right': it always involves omission of the last word, which is the lexical verb, and only

may extend 'leftward', to leave only the first word intact (Halliday and Hasan, 1976).

A: Is he going to come?

B: He might.

In the above example, the response part is a case of lexical ellipsis.

- **Operator Ellipsis**

Operator ellipsis is ellipsis 'from the left'. In fact, in most instances of operator ellipsis, everything is presupposed but the lexical verb. It should be emphasized that operator ellipsis, unlike lexical ellipsis, involves only the omission operators; the lexical verb always remains intact. The following example would illustrate the difference between lexical and operator ellipsis.

A: Have you been running?

B: Yes, I have.

A: What have you been doing?

B: Running.

A case of lexical ellipsis is self-evident in the first dialogical exchange, with the lexical verb *'swimming'* being omitted, while a case of operator ellipsis is quite obvious in the second dialogue, with the lexical verb '*swimming'* present, and all operators to its left.

- **Clausal Ellipsis**

As the title suggests, clausal ellipsis is a kind of ellipsis in which the omission occurs within a clause. The clause in English, as Halliday and Hasan (1976) put it, has a two-part structure consisting of 'a modal element' plus 'propositional element'. The modal element consists of the subject plus the final element in the verbal group. The propositional element, on the other hand, consists of the residue: the remainder of the verbal group, and any complements or adjuncts that may be present. Consider the example that follows:

The Duke was going to plant a row of poplars in the park.

In the above example, 'the Duke was' is the modal element of the clause and the rest constitutes its propositional element. The clausal ellipsis occurs where one of these elements is missing. The following example is worth noting:

A: What was the Duke going to do?

B: Plant a row of poplars in the park.

In the above example, the modal element of the clause '*the Duke was going to*' is omitted in the answer, so we have a case of clausal ellipsis.

Lexical cohesion

Lexical cohesion is the cohesive effect achieved through the selection of vocabulary. It involves using the characteristics and features of words as well as the group relationship among them to achieve cohesion. Lexical cohesion is classified into two types: reiteration and collocation. Halliday and Hasan (1976) classify reiteration into four types: the same word, a synonym/near-synonym, a super ordinate, and a general word. For example, '*a boy*' can be replaced in the following sentences with '*the boy*' (the same word), '*the lad*' (a synonym/near-synonym), '*the child*' (a superordinate), and '*the idiot*' (a general word).

There is *a boy* climbing that tree.

The boy is going to fall off if he doesn't take care (Halliday and Hasan, 1976, pp. 279-80).

Halliday and Hasan (1976) regard collocation as an important part of creating cohesion in a connected text. Collocation refers to the semantic and structural relationship among words, which native speakers can use subconsciously for comprehension or production of a text. They argue the case of collocation as follows:

> The cohesive effect of such pairs depends not so much on any systematic relationship as on their tendency to share the same lexical environment, to occur in *collocation* with one another. In general, any two lexical items having similar patterns of collocation – that is, tending to appear in similar contexts – will generate a cohesive force if they occur in adjacent sentences. (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 286)

A 'cohesive force' will produce a 'cohesive tie,' which is the relationship between a cohesive item and the item it presupposes in a

text. In other words, collocational links between lexical items create cohesion. It is significant to recognize that lexical cohesion cannot exist without sentences. That is, cohesive words should be discussed not only as the meaning relationships which hold between items, but also as the explicit expression of those meaning relationships within a text. Collocation is achieved through the association of lexical items that regularly occur. It also involves pairs of words drawn from the same order series. Examples are north/south, car/brake, father/mother, doctors/patient, etc.

Previous Related Researches

In his doctoral dissertation, Schroter (2005) investigated the translation of language play including puns, and also form-based manipulations such as rhymes and alliteration in multimedia products. According to him, due to its unusual nature, and especially its frequently strong dependence on the idiosyncrasies of a particular language, language play can generally be assumed to constitute a significant challenge in a translation context and the translator is not free to simply ignore the language-play without having taken an active stance on its treatment. He mentioned the difficulties in the translation of language-play in complex multimedia products such as films in the forms of dubbing or subtitling. His aimed to analyze and measure how language-play in film had actually been treated in authentic dubbing and subtitle versions. For his analysis, he compiled a corpus comprising 18 drama movies and 99 of their various target versions, most on DVD, and yielding nearly 800 source-text instances of language-play and thousands of translation solutions. The results of his study indicated that among the many factors that are likely to influence a translation, two sets of factors play a prominent role: the type of the language-play, and the identity and working conditions of the translator. Finally he concluded that the mode of translation (dubbing vs. subtitling), the target language, or the general properties of the films, could not be shown to have a sizeable impact in this regard.

In his article, Chaume (2004) focused on the audiovisual translation of discourse markers. Knowing the fact that there is no one-to-one correspondence between two languages in the field of discourse markers, he investigated the translation from English into Spanish of the particles now, oh, you know, (you) see, look, and I mean, which appear in the cult movie Pulp Fiction, and examined how the omission of these elements in the translation affects the balance between interpersonal meaning and semantic meaning.

In his article entitled "patterns of intersemiotic cohesion in the moving image text", Ngamsa (2013) investigated intersemiotic cohesion in the moving image text popularly known as film discourse. He aimed at identifying the interaction pattern of visual verbal strands in an unfolding text of selected video films and chose a corpus consisting of six movies and the corresponding excerpts of conversation(s) from selected film scripts. Baumgarten's (2008) theory of visual verbal cohesion and Ngamsa's (2012) methodological consideration were adopted for the annotation and matching of deictic devices. The findings showed that interaction of visual and verbal semiotic strands is always achieved at the point of convergence and at the instance of reference items, pronouns, adjectives and other extra linguistic features—signs and existents. His study finally recommended that film directors, screenplay writers and text linguists should explore the use of intersemiotic cohesive devices for explication of the moving image text.

Among Iranian researchers, Jazini (2011) made attempts to investigate the extent of translatability of off-camera speech and sounds in the Persian subtitles of five English films. He investigated the procedures that translators use in order to render and clarify unseen and off-camera speech and sounds in subtitles. To carry out his study, he randomly selected five English films with Persian subtitles and compared those elements with their Persian equivalents using a set of guidelines suggested by Captioned Media Program (CMP, 2004). The result of his study revealed that the unseen and off-camera sounds were totally ignored and the cases of unseen and off-camera speech were translated the same as any ordinary part of the films, i.e. on screen parts.

In his paper, Morady Gohareh (2012) focused on a subcategory of audiovisual translation, namely dubbing, in the case of genre films. He attempted to provide a set of tentative guidelines for audiovisual translators in order to attend to genres effectively in dubbing. For this purpose, focusing on the extracted dialogues from 24 American movies representing different genres, together with their dubbed versions, he arrived at significant relationships between the genres of the movies and the linguistic elements of the script dialogues. By making descriptive comparisons between the selected samples and the dubbed versions, he consequently identified the effective methods and strategies for attending to genres effectively in the case of translation for dubbing. The findings of his study led to a tentative film genre model which could assist

audiovisual translators in establishing basic assumptions prior to translating any given movie.

Research Questions

This study poses the following three research questions:

1. To what extent is lexical cohesion considered as a cohesive device of the film dialogues by the translators in their two methods of film translation?

2. To what extent is ellipsis considered as a cohesive device of the film dialogues by the translators in their two methods of film translation?

3. What similarities and differences exist in the two methods of film translation (subtitling and dubbing) in terms of applying ellipsis and lexical cohesion?

Methodology

In conducting this research, in the first step, 10 scenes of the television series *Prison Break* were randomly selected by the researcher. The scenes selected were of a medium length of about 200 to 500 words. Afterwards, the original dialogues of the film as well as their subtitled and dubbed counterparts were extracted from the three versions (original, dubbed, and subtitled versions) of the series. In the next step, the original dialogues as well as their translations were investigated sentence-by-sentence and the cases of the use of lexical cohesion and ellipsis in the sentences were identified. For this purpose, the study employed the framework developed by Halliday and Hasan (1976). After identification of the cases of occurrence of the two types of cohesive devices, the density and percentage of their use in all the three versions were calculated. Afterwards, the same procedure was done for the subtitled and the dubbed versions, too. Also, another rater who had been trained by the researcher did the same procedure to find the cohesive devices. Inter rater reliability was calculated to measure the reliability of the data. Chi square was employed to find whether the data obtained from dubbing and subtitling were significantly different.

Since analyzing all the discourse elements of the film was almost impossible and required analyzing lots of elements in multiple categorizations, this study only concentrated on ellipsis, lexical cohesion and their sub-categorizations in the original dialogues of the film and

measured their density in order to highlight the similarities and differences of the texts by using tables and charts.

Findings and Discussion

Analysis of Original Dialogues
According to the findings illustrated in Table 1, as regards lexical cohesion, repetition – with a percentage of 72.36 – has the greatest density in the original dialogues. The findings also demonstrate that collocation (13.15%), synonymy (8.77%), the use of superordinates (4.82%) and the use of general terms (0.87%) occupy the second to fifth ranks, respectively.

Table 1

Density of the use of different types of lexical cohesion in the original dialogues of the film

	Frequency of use	Percentage
Repetition	165	72.36
Collocation	30	13.15
Synonymy	20	8.77
Superordinate	11	4.82
General term	2	0.87
Total frequency	228	100

With respect to ellipsis, the findings revealed that clausal ellipsis (62.31%) is the first, nominal ellipsis (36.23%) is the second, and clausal ellipsis (1.44%) is the last type of ellipsis in terms of frequency of use in the original dialogues of the film (Table 2).

Table 2

Density of the use of different types of ellipsis in the original dialogues of the film

	Frequency of use	Percentage
Nominal	25	36.23
Verbal	1	1.44
Clausal	43	62.31
Total	69	100

Analysis of Persian Subtitles
According to the findings, with regard to lexical cohesion, repetition – with a percentage of 83.90 – has the greatest density in the original dialogues of the film. It is also revealed that collocation (11.49%) holds the second rank; synonymy (1.91%) and the use of superordinates (1.91%) together occupy the third rank; and the use of general terms (0.76%) holds the fourth rank (Table 3).

Table 3

Density of the use of different types of lexical cohesion in the Persian subtitles of the film

	Frequency of use	Percentage
Repetition	219	83.90
Collocation	30	11.49
Synonymy	5	1.91
Superordinate	5	1.91
General term	2	0.76
Total frequency	261	100

With respect to ellipsis, the findings reveal that nominal ellipsis (65.71%) is the first, and verbal ellipsis (17.14%) and clausal ellipsis (17.14%) together hold the second rank in terms of frequency of use in the original dialogues of the film (Table 4).

Table 4

Density of the use of different types of ellipsis in the Persian subtitles of the film

	Frequency of use	Percentage
Nominal	46	65.71
Verbal	12	17.14
Clausal	12	17.14
Total frequency	70	100

Analysis of Dubbed Version
According to the findings illustrated in Table 5, as regards lexical cohesion, repetition – with a percentage of 81.37 – has the greatest density in the original dialogues of the film. The findings also demonstrate that collocation (11.74%), use of superordinates (4.85%), synonymy (1.21%) and the use of general terms (0.80%) occupy the second to fifth ranks, respectively.

Table 5

Density of the use of different types of lexical cohesion in the dialogues of the dubbed version of the film

	Frequency of use	Percentage
Repetition	201	81.37
Collocation	29	11.74
Synonymy	3	1.21
Superordinate	12	4.85
General term	2	0.8
Total frequency	247	100

With respect to ellipsis, all illustrated in Table 6, the findings reveal that nominal ellipsis (77.98%) is the first, clausal ellipsis (11.92%) is the second, and verbal ellipsis (10.09%) is the last type of ellipsis in terms of frequency of use in the original dialogues of the film.

Table 6

Density of the use of different types of ellipsis in the dialogues of the dubbed version of the film

	Frequency of use	Percentage
Nominal	85	77.98
Verbal	11	10.09
Clausal	13	11.92
Total frequency	109	100

Concluding Remarks

Overall, as illustrated in Table 7, the findings demonstrate that 228 cases of lexical cohesion elements have been used in the sample original dialogues of the TV series whereas the Persian subtitles contain 261 cases of lexical cohesion elements and the dubbed version contains 247 elements. Therefore, it appears that there are more lexical cohesion elements in the subtitled and dubbed versions than there are in the original dialogues. That is because of the greater number of repetitions in the Persian versions. Among the subcategories of lexical cohesion, repetition was the most frequently used in all the three versions. After repetition, collocations were the second most frequently used lexical elements. Synonymy and superordinates occupied the third and fourth ranks, and general words had the lowest frequency of use.

Table 7

Frequency of the use of different types of lexical cohesion in the three versions

	Original version	Subtitled version	Dubbed version
Repetition	165	219	201
Collocation	30	30	29
Synonymy	20	5	3
Superordinate	11	5	12
General term	2	2	2
Total	228	261	247

The findings also demonstrate that 69 cases of ellipsis have been used in the original dialogues whereas 70 cases have been used in the Persian subtitles, and 109 cases have occurred in the dubbed version. Therefore, it appears that there are more cases of ellipsis in the two translated version than in the original dialogues, especially in the dubbed version where there are 40 more cases of ellipsis than in the original dialogues (Table 8). This could be due to the restrictions imposed on dubbing and subtitling. Due to the fact that in dubbing, the dubbed speech must be synchronized with the lip-movements of the characters, the translators at times have to reduce some elements so that the dubbed words match appropriately with the lip-movements of the character. In extreme close-ups, this needs to be quite rigorous to meet standards of quality, especially when it comes to open vowels and labial consonants. Kinetic synchrony (which matches the voices with characters' body movements) and isochrony (which matches the length of the dubbed utterance to the length of the original utterance) are two other forms of synchrony in dubbing. Ivarsson and Caroll (1998) assert that often not only the text but also the content of the script is altered for the sake of better lip-synchronization, and some changes are made which not only affect details but even the main point of a scene. Among the subcategories of ellipsis, clausal ellipsis is the most frequently used in the original dialogues whereas nominal ellipsis has the greatest frequency of use in the Persian subtitles and the dubbed version.

Table 8

Frequency of the use of different types of ellipsis in the three versions

	Original version	Subtitled version	Dubbed version
Nominal	25	46	85
Verbal	1	12	11
Clausal	43	12	13
Total	69	70	109

Comparison of the results of the two translation types (subtitles and dubbing) shows that, in terms of the use of lexical cohesion, the subtitled version contains 9 more cases of lexical cohesion elements than the dubbed version. In both versions, repetition is the dominant type and general words have the lowest density of use. With regard to ellipsis, the dubbed version contains 51 more cases of ellipsis than the Persian subtitles. In both of the versions nominal ellipsis is the dominant type of ellipsis. Therefore, in general, the findings demonstrate that whereas the two translated versions are somewhat similar in terms of the frequency of their use of lexical cohesion, the dubbed version has shown a much greater interest in the use of ellipsis, which could be because of the limitations imposed on dubbing in terms of the necessity of the synchronization and matching of the characters' lip-movements and body language with the dubbed words, which forces the translators to omit some elements.

However, despite the differences between the three versions, all the three texts are somewhat coherent in terms of meaning. Although some meaning changes are detected especially in the dubbed version – which is because of the nature of dubbing and subtitling and the constraints imposed upon them – the texts are appropriately smooth and cohesive and the readers would not have any difficulty comprehending them. This suggests that different languages could have different ways of obtaining cohesion, and variation in the use of cohesive devices is not necessarily equivalent to variation is the cohesiveness of texts in different languages. That is to say if a text contains more cohesive devices – e.g., lexical cohesion- than its translation, it does not necessarily enjoy greater cohesiveness than its translation.

The comparison between the original dialogues and the two types of translation reveals that there is a significant relationship between the original dialogues and the two types of translation in the use of repetition and verbal ellipsis; there is a highly significant relationship in the use of collocation, synonymy, nominal ellipsis and clausal ellipsis; and there is no significant relationship in the use of superordinates (See Appendix I).

Also, the comparison between the two types of translation reveal that there is a highly significant relationship between the subtitled version and the dubbed version in the use of nominal ellipsis; and no significant deference in the use of repetition, collocation, synonymy, superordinates, verbal ellipsis, and clausal ellipsis (See Appendix II).

References

Baker, M. (1992). *In other words*. London & New York: Routledge.

Carter, R., & Mc Carthy, T. (1988). *Vocabulary and language teaching*. New York: Longman.

Chaume, F. (2004). Discourse markers in audiovisual translating. Meta: Translators' Journal, *49* (4), 843-855.

Cook, G. (1994*). Discourse and literature: The interplay of form and mind*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Diaz Cintas, J. (2008). *The didactics of audiovisual translation.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Haliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London and New York: Longman.

House, J. (1977). *A model for translation quality assessment*. Tubingen: Gunter Narr.

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

Jazini, A. (2011). *Translation of unseen and off-camera speech and sounds in subtitling: A descriptive study of five English films with Persian subtitles* (Unpublished master thesis). Isfahan University, Isfahan, Iran.

Larson, M. L. (1984). *Meaning-Based translation: A guide to cross-language equivalence*. Lanham, New York and London: University Press of America.

Morady Gohareh, M. (2012). *Strategies for harmonizing translation and genre in dubbing* (Unpublished master thesis). Isfahan University, Isfahan, Iran.

Ngamsa, J. (2013). Patterns of Intersemiotic Cohesion in the Moving Image Text. *New Media and Mass Communication*, *9*,11-17.

Remael, A., De Houwer, A., & Vandekerckhove, R. (2008). Intralingual open subtitling in Flanders; audiovisual translation, Linguistic variation and audience needs. *Journal of Specialized Translation*, *10*, 76-105

Schroter, T. (2005). Shun the pun, rescue the rhyme? The dubbing and subtitling of language-play in film. *The Linguist List*. Retrieved from http://linguist list.Org /issues/ 16/16-1570. Html

Appendix (1)

Comparison of the data relating to cohesive elements and their subcategories in the original dialogues and the two translation types

	Cohesive device	Chi Square	Significance	Result
1	L-Repetition	7.754[a]	0.021	There is a significant relation between the original dialogues of the two types of translation.
2	L-Collocation	10.798[a]	0.001	There is a highly significant relation between the original dialogues of the two types of translation.
3	L-Synonymy	18.500[a]	0	There is a highly significant relation between the original dialogues of the two types of translation.
4	L-Superordinates	3.071[a]	0.215	There is no significant relation between the original dialogues of the two types of translation.
5	L-General word	……….	……….	Chi-Square Test cannot be performed. (There is absolutely no difference between the original dialogues and the two types of translation.)
6	E-Nominal	35.654[a]	0	There is a highly significant relation between the original dialogues of the two types of translation.
7	E-Verbal	9.250[a]	0.1	There is a significant relation between the original dialogues of the two types of translation.
8	E-Clausal	27.382[a]	0	There is a highly significant relation between the original dialogues of the two types of translation.

Appendix (2)

Comparison of the data relating to cohesive elements and their subcategories in the two types of translation (subtitling and dubbing)

	Cohesive device	Chi Square	Significance	Result
1	L-Repetition	.771[a]	0.38	There is no significant difference between the two types of translation.
2	L-Collocation	.017[a]	0.896	There is no significant difference between the two types of translation.
3	L-Synonymy	.500[a]	0.48	There is no significant difference between the two types of translation.
4	L-Superordinates	2.882[a]	0.09	There is no significant difference between the two types of translation.
5	L-General word	……….	……….	Chi-Square Test cannot be performed. (There is absolutely no difference between the original dialogues and the two types of translation)
6	E-Nominal	11.611[a]	0.001	There is a highly significant relation between the two types of translation.
7	E-Verbal	.043[a]	0.835	There is no significant difference between the two types of translation.
8	E-Clausal	.040[a]	0.841	There is no significant difference between the two types of translation.