

Federici, F. (2009). Translation as stylistic evolution. Italo Calvino Creative Translator of Raymond Queneau. Amsterdam: Rodopi. 302 p.

L'analyse de Federici concerne un aspect jusqu'à présent peu connu de l'œuvre de Calvino. Il aborde d'une manière intéressante, efficace et originale les problèmes liés au développement de sa poétique.

Dans les années 60, Italo Calvino est un auteur illustre et reconnu. Il n'a ni l'âge ni le statut des traducteurs habituels. Pourquoi s'intéresse-t-il à Queneau ? Pourquoi et comment s'attèle-t-il à la tâche, complexe sans doute, de traduire *Les Fleurs bleues* ?

Afin de répondre à ces questions, Federici considère d'abord le rôle de Calvino dans le monde de l'édition, sa pratique de traducteur, sa maîtrise des langues française et italienne. Il insiste surtout sur la vision calvinienne de la littérature et de la traduction, ainsi que sur l'intérêt de l'écrivain italien pour l'œuvre de Queneau, la poétique de l'Oulipo et la traductologie.

Qu'est-ce que la littérature pour Calvino et quel est le rapport entre celle-ci et la traduction ? Le processus de traduction joue un rôle majeur dans la pratique littéraire en se situant au cœur de ses phases essentielles : la lecture et l'écriture. La traduction — pour Calvino — est la lecture par excellence («il sistema più assoluto di lettura», p. 36), de sorte que, pour bien lire un texte, il convient de le traduire. Quant à l'écriture, elle ne fait que « traduire » le monde en un système de signes, de sorte que « translating a written text is an act of re-writing, as it translates "a translation of the world of signs" » (p. 54). La traduction est par ailleurs réécriture, la réécriture étant elle-même à la base de l'écriture littéraire. Calvino appréhende la littérature comme un «intertextual game», reprise créative de textes précédents. Les ouvrages, non centrés sur la personnalité de l'auteur, constituent un patrimoine commun (p. 37). Cette vision doit beaucoup à l'Oulipo et à Queneau: « his own ideas of translation as a transmission of other systems of signs may have influenced Calvino the translator either before or after Calvino translated Queneau's works. [...] The Oulipian idea of writing as a form of eternal and repetitive mediation, reproduction, plagiarism, self-plagiarism, anachronistic plagiarism, and translation offered many stimuli to Calvino » (p. 50). Un lien profond s'établit dès lors entre lecture, écriture et traduction. Quant au transfert d'un texte d'une langue à l'autre, le traducteur doit, selon Calvino, percevoir toutes les nuances du texte source et les rendre dans un discours qui semble «thought and written directly in Italian» (p. 33). Cela demande «not only a complete understanding of the SL, but also a creative and impeccable talent in writing his own TL» (p. 68). Ces idées se rapprochent de la «dynamic equivalence» théorisée par Eugène Nida, connue de Calvino à travers la lecture de Georges Mounin (p. 77). Elles ont des répercussions sur la traduction des *Fleurs bleues*.

Calvino qualifie *I fiori blu* «di traduzione "inventiva" (o per meglio dire "reinventiva") che è l'unico modo di essere fedeli a un testo di questo tipo» (p. 79). Le traducteur fait appel à plusieurs stratégies, telles que l'amplification, la diminution, la non traduction, la «direct translation», la

«modulation», la substitution (y compris le remplacement de l'intertextualité des *Fleurs bleues* par d'autres sous-textes littéraires). Ces stratégies ne sont pas menées au hasard, mais dépendent de contraintes imposées par le texte source, par la langue italienne, par les compétences du lecteur, par l'ambition du romancier italien à recréer le texte selon l'orientation de sa propre poétique.

Les écarts introduits par Calvino sont plus nets lorsque *Les Fleurs bleues* affichent une vision du monde et des démarches linguistiques qui s'éloignent de celles du traducteur. Calvino était, par exemple, moins pessimiste que Queneau sur la possibilité de comprendre l'histoire et d'y participer : «by compressing Queneau's ridiculousness, Calvino took the clear decision of distinguishing his TT through elements that were more congruous with his own perspective. On the other hand, Calvino adopted less invasive direct translations for elements that did not contrast with his point of view on historiography» (p. 208).

La divergence majeure entre *Les Fleurs bleues* et *I fiori blu* se situe au niveau du langage. Le texte français se caractérise par un mélange de formes écrites et orales, standards et régionales. Calvino traduit beaucoup de régionalismes par un lexique technique, spécialisé, précis et concret : «Calvino reduced the regional features of *les Fleurs bleues* in standardizing Queneau's linguistic pastiche to a more technical italian that he felt to be rather more transmissible in translation» (p. 215). Il «substituted or expanded certain regional details with more precise and technical languages» (pp. 252-253). Cette stratégie est conforme à la tâche stylistique qu'il poursuit: forger un italien épuré le plus possible des éléments dialectaux et régionaux et soumis à un processus de technicisation croissante. Cette recherche correspond à la quête d'une langue italienne transmissible, donc traduisible et internationale, par conséquent moins caractérisée par des régionalismes. «This linguistic challenge was based on Calvino's knowledge of linguistics and on his notion that a close relationship exists between transmissibility and translation» (p. 248), et sur l'idée que «the forms, and above all the written forms, of linguistic communication should belong to a common human background, which calls to mind the notion that languages share *universalis*» (p. 246). La langue des *Fleurs bleues* est à plusieurs égards le contraire de celle de Calvino, qui «tackled the translation of a novel which had a linguistic tone completely opposite to his own» (p. 255). C'est une raison supplémentaire pour l'affronter, la traduire, la «domestiquer», mettre à l'épreuve son projet linguistique et se donner les moyens de le mener à bien. *I fiori blu* sont donc pour Calvino un exercice de style, une étape cruciale dans son évolution : «The process of technicalization was applied to Queneau's novel as well, thus including the translation in the evolution of Calvino's style. [...] In 1960s [...] «his renovation of style was achieved by strengthening his confidence in his set of writer's tools by comparing his

own style with Queneau's, through the pivotal translation of a novel based on a different poetics» (p. 255).

**Rosario Gennaro – Department of Translators and Interpreters,
Artesis University College, Antwerp**

Fong, Gilbert C.F., Kenneth K.L. Au (Eds.) (2009). *Dubbing and Subtitling in a World Context*. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press. 291 p.

Dubbing and Subtitling in a World Context is a fine contribution to the growing field of translation studies and essential reading for anyone interested in the history, theory and practice of the profession. The book consists of 18 selected papers that were presented at the “International Conference on Dubbing and Subtitling in a World Context”, organized by the Department of Translation of The Chinese University of Hong Kong in October 2001. A record of the round-table discussions is also included at the end of the book, where conference participants share their professional experiences in their respective countries. All in all, there is always something for everyone in this collective volume.

In the first section ‘The Historical Perspective’, four papers look at dubbing and subtitling from a diachronic perspective. The history of this emerging academic discipline is fascinating yet easy to be overlooked by students or scholars since the subject matter is relatively applied and practicality-oriented. In his contribution “The History of Subtitles in Europe” (pp. 3-12), Jan Ivarsson provides a detailed description of subtitle evolution from a technical point of view. Qian Shaochang’s “Screen Translation in Mainland China” (pp. 13-22), on the other hand, discusses the historical dimension but focusing on political and socio-cultural factors. In the chapter entitled “Subtitling in Japan” (pp. 23-25), along with a brief history about Japanese subtitling, Karima Fumitoshi shares not only his own experience in Japan but also his observations of inadequate established rules and procedures in the industry in other Asian countries. Last but not least, in “The History of Subtitling in Korea” (pp. 27-35) Lee Young Koo emphasizes the importance of having professional translators trained to do such a demanding job as subtitling and illustrates the issues arising in the translation of film titles.

The second section ‘Theoretical Issues’ is made up of five papers centred on theoretical issues. Major translation theories are presented here and illustrated with interesting case studies. In Gilbert C. F. Fong’s “The Two Worlds of Subtitling: The Case of Vulgarisms and Sexually-oriented Language” (pp. 39-61), the choice of subtitlers among foreignisation, naturalisation and neutralisation is explained with intriguing examples. Fong’s second paper in this volume, “Let the Words Do the Talking: The

Nature and Art of Subtitling” (pp. 91-105), investigates the difficulty inherent in the cross-media transference of linguistic and stylistic features under the constraints of time and space, highlights the leaning of film subtitles towards domestication in Hong Kong, and resorts to *Skopos* theory to argue that subtitling “serves no other purpose than to help the audience understand the dialogue and enjoy the film” (pp. 103). In the chapter by Chuang Ying-ting, “Subtitling as Multi-modal Translation” (pp. 79-90), readers can explore the concept of multi-modality—equivalence relationships ranging from a one-to-one to a many-to-many relationship—in the process of subtitle translation.

Although most of the papers in this section are centred on subtitling, “A Functional Gap between Dubbing and Subtitling” (pp. 63-78), written by He Yuanjian, extends the discussion to the representational discrepancy between the two forms of audiovisual translation. In order to strengthen his analysis, he incorporates Sari Eskola’s stimuli theory into the textual processing model proposed by James S. Holmes so as to explain the contrast in question. Chapman Chen’s “A Critical Evaluation of a Chinese Subtitled Version of Hitchcock’s *Spellbound*” (pp. 107-135) can be seen as a wrap-up of this section. His comprehensive analysis of the technical, textual, intralinguistic and extralinguistic constraints that impinge on the subtitled film provides readers with an opportunity to test and verify the issues discussed in the previous papers.

The third section ‘The Profession’ takes up a large chunk of this book and consists of nine papers discussing professional practices in various countries in Asia and Europe. Contrary to the previous section, dubbing carries more weight here in four of the papers—Sergio Patou-Patucchi’s “I Translate, You Adapt, They Dub” (pp. 139-148), Zhang Chunbai’s “The Translation of Film Dialogues for Dubbing” (pp. 149-160), Lu Danjun’s “Loss of Meaning in Dubbing” (pp. 161-165), and Rupert Chan’s “Dubbing and Subtitling. Art or Craft?” (pp. 167-174)—where the focus is placed on current practice and specific difficulties encountered in this translation mode.

The final five papers of this section lay more emphasis on subtitling, while tackling different issues. In “Translation Imperative: Synchronise Discipline and Technique” (pp. 175-197), Janet Tauro laments the lack of scholarly attention when it comes to the production and consumption of Filipino audiovisual translation, and suggests “the television industry and the academic community to put their acts together to serve the needs of the coming industry of television translation” (pp. 196). Kari Jokelainen’s “Translating Understanding and Non-understanding through Subtitling” (pp. 199-212), based on the case study of a Finnish subtitled version of the film *Comme des Rois*, proposes practical solutions to a complicated yet very interesting problem: dealing with several languages and cultures, and the challenge of transmitting the extralinguistic messages they convey in the original film. A unique viewpoint of the subtitling profession from a

Hong Kong filmmaker and distributor, Shu Kei, is presented in “Translating Subtitles for the Hong Kong Audience: Limitations and Difficulties” (pp. 213-220), where the author presents a personal account of the local subtitling practice. “Surtitling for *Xiqu* (Chinese Opera) in the Theatre” (pp. 221-230), written by Jessica W. Y. Yeung, is perhaps one of the most fascinating articles in the collection, introducing the technicalities of a virtually unknown practice in the AVT field. Closing the book is Corinne Imhauser’s “The Pedagogy of Subtitling” (pp. 231-241), in which she echoes most of the practical problems mentioned earlier albeit from a didactic standpoint. The case for greater cooperation between academia and the industry is reinforced by the author as a way to design a better subtitling course for students.

In the area of dubbing and subtitling, this book covers a wide range of perspectives: from history to theory, from academic arguments to practitioners’ reflections, and from the Western experience to the Eastern practice. Despite this diversity of topics, the two editors, Gilbert C. F. Fong and Kenneth K. L. Au, successfully bring all the papers together and manage to present the information in a cogent way.

The book offers a solid overview of the profession, and is, to my knowledge, the first ever written in English to deal with the Far East, shedding light on the current status of the subtitling profession in Asian countries, including China, Japan, Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and the Philippines. In addition, the rich case studies allow readers to gain an insight into the difficulties and limitations of subtitling in different language pairs. Considering the dearth of material centred on these languages, this collection is bound to become one of the key reference books in the field of subtitling and dubbing in the Far East.

Szu-Yu Arista Kuo – Department of Humanities, Imperial College London, London

Gambier, Y. & van Doorslaer, L. (Eds). (2009) *The Metalanguage of Translation* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 192 p.

Translation Studies is a growing field and interdisciplinary by nature. Like all scientific disciplines it has its own metalanguage. Contributors to this volume address some of the essential topics of the metalanguage of translation, reflecting on the origin of key terms, inconsistencies in their definitions and the costs and benefits of a harmonized metalanguage. Several of the authors point out how important it is to learn to live with terminological discussions and with fuzzy and evolving definitions.

In recent decades the study of scholarly terminology has become descriptive rather than normative. Moreover the creative potential of terminology (the vocabulary of specialized knowledge) in a multilingual

and intercultural setting has been given more focus in the cognitive sciences of late. It was therefore a good decision to put the problematic variations of usage and conceptualisation in both theory and practice of translation at the centre of a special issue of *Target* in 2007, 19(2). This special issue has now been republished as a volume in Benjamins Current Topics.

The editors point out that through the compilation of anthologies, dictionaries and encyclopaedias Translation Studies has enhanced its visibility. However, they wonder how comprehensive and coherent all these publications are and whether the metalanguage of Translation Studies is becoming more consistent and more useful, as a consequence of the spread of the discipline, without turning into extremely technical sets of jargon. They also express their concern that the discipline may have become so fragmented (in “schools”, “turns”, or “approaches”) that it no longer shares any assumptions, frameworks, or metalanguage. In this volume 11 specialists zoom in on different aspects of the metalanguage of translation.

In his contribution entitled “Defining patterns in Translation Studies. Revisiting two classics of German Translationswissenschaft” (pp. 9-26), Gernot Hebenstreit relates metalanguage in Translation Studies, especially definitions, to metalanguage development in other scholarly disciplines. He analyzes the defining patterns used by Otto Kade (1968) *Zufall und Gesetzmäßigkeit in der Übersetzung* and by Hans J. Vermeer and Katharina Reiß (1984) *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie* and observes that most concepts referred to in both books have been defined in ways that do not meet the standards one could expect.

Luc van Doorslaer introduces parts of the conceptual map that was developed for the online *Translation Studies Bibliography* project launched by John Benjamins a few years ago in: “Risking conceptual maps. Mapping as a keywords-related tool underlying the online Translation Studies Bibliography.” (pp. 27-43) His starting point is that relatively few attempts have been made to complement or develop the so-called Holmes/Toury map, which has become a true monument in Translation Studies. The TSB maps are seen as open and descriptive in nature and they can help young or inexperienced researchers in the field by offering them a kind of a panoramic view. The existing maps are hierarchically structured to a limited extent and they complement each other. He takes it that in a field characterized by growing complexity and interdisciplinarity, such maps will become increasingly useful.

The TSB maps have explicitly taken polysemy and synonymy into consideration. This is also the topic of Leona van Vaerenbergh’s article entitled “Polysemy and synonymy. Their management in Translation Studies dictionaries and in translator training. A case study” (pp. 45-64). The author integrates didactic considerations into her discussion by showing the relevance of the use of metalanguage in the training of translators. In her article she deals with the polysemic term ‘coherence’ and some related term couples. The conclusion is that Translation Studies

should not strive for a reduction of terminological or conceptual complexity. The discipline should not shun an optimisation of existing diversity.

In “The terminology of translation. Epistemological, conceptual and intercultural problems and their social consequences” (pp. 65-79), Josep Marco combines epistemological and conceptual issues with the ‘outward’ consequences for the social and professional field, linking it with the problem of interculturality. His article focuses on three kinds of problems related to the terminology of discourse on translation: The absence of consensus among experts, the ambiguous relationship between concepts and terms, and the differences in national traditions. These interrelated sets of problems, are exemplified by the study of the very common concept of ‘strategy’, also referred to as ‘technique’, ‘procedure’ or ‘shift’. Marco believes that if there is a relationship between terminological practices and the social prestige of a profession, then the terminological “chaos” in today’s Translation Studies could explain, at least in part, the relatively low status of the discipline as a whole and its lack of appreciation on the part of members of other scholarly communities.

Anthony Pym revisits the equivalence controversy in “Natural and directional equivalence in theories of translation” (pp. 81-104). He tries to make sense of this rather confusing term by distinguishing between “directional” and “natural” equivalences, to describe the different concepts used by theories of translation since the 1950s. In both cases, either looking at one side only (the target side) or being a two-way movement, there are different strategies for reaching or maintaining equivalence. Moreover, the application of relevance theory shows equivalence to be something that operates on the level of beliefs, of fictions, etc. Equivalence has been called an illusion regardless of how lots of people still think about translation. Pym points out that the widespread use of translation memory software has rekindled the belief in equivalence.

A very different perspective is offered by Leena Laiho in her contribution “A literary work – Translation and original. A conceptual analysis within the philosophy of art and Translation Studies” (pp. 105-122). She discusses ‘original’, ‘translation’ and ‘identity’ first within the framework of philosophy of art (using Borges’ “Pierre Menard, autor del Quijote” as a case in point) and then within the framework of Translation Studies. The core question is: can the identity of a literary work of art be retained when the work is translated? This question is related to the necessity of contextual embedding and to the importance of making any theoretical framework explicit. The author argues in favour of a genuine exchange of ideas and views between and within disciplines on the basis of conceptual transparency.

In “What’s in a name? On metalinguistic confusion in Translation Studies” (pp. 123-134), Mary Snell-Hornby basically distinguishes between three ways of introducing a new technical term in Translation Studies: the

use of a general language word in a specified sense, the introduction of a completely new term, and the borrowing of a word from a classical dead language. She first extensively discusses Toury's concept of 'norm' in translation and then looks at comparable definitions, categorizations and comments on the norms from the German functional school. From this she concludes that a complete standardisation of terms is both unrealistic and undesirable. However, a field should strive for a compatible discourse that is lucid, reader-oriented, clear and unambiguous. Compatibility of discourse does not exclude a multilingual metalanguage, which would help to counteract the dangers that might be involved in using one single dominant language (English) for metadiscourse

The "desire for the univocal" and the search for axiomatic truths through clear-cut definitions is fundamentally criticised by Nike Pokorn in "In defence of fuzziness" (pp. 135-144). The examples of *mother tongue* and *native speaker* are used to show that the meaning of terms is elusive, that the signifieds playfully escape the grasp of signifiers. Although we keep trying to name, our desire for dominance and univocality inevitably fails in the last instance and, as Derrida believed, capitulates to the plurality, elusiveness, equivocality and fuzziness of language. The author warns practitioners of Translation Studies against the illusions of univocal metadiscourse of the kind that was typical of 19th century academic thinking (and of some outdated approaches nowadays) but is out of touch with scientific approaches in several disciplines that take issue with the complexity of a modern society under study.

Pokorn's plea for fuzzy definitions is in a way supported from a very different angle when Iwona Mazur in: "The metalanguage of localization. Theory and practice" (pp. 145-165) describes the dynamic nature of definitions in software localisation. In recent years, the localisation industry has developed a terminology of its own. The aim of the article is twofold: to explain the basic terms as they are used by both localisation practitioners and scholars, and to make this metalanguage more consistent. Of course, one author alone has no power to select and standardise definitions, but by raising the issue, she increases awareness and pinpoints what needs urgent solution.

The question of globalisation leaves traces in the metalingual practice itself. Jun Tang describes the development of translation metadiscourses in China and the position of Western metalanguage in that development in: "The metalanguage of translation. A Chinese perspective" (pp. 167-182). He criticises both Chinese scholars and Western metadiscourses, the former for having failed to set up local channels for knowledge dissemination and the latter for having focused too long on their own relevance. For Jun Tang global academia can only develop through a combination of open-mindedness for the existing paradigms and respect for local knowledge and traditions.

The concluding interview article by Yves Gambier “Translation terminology and its offshoots” (pp. 183-189), can be seen as a kind of test case for the findings about the metalanguage of translation. There are different versions in different languages of Terminologie de la traduction / Translation terminology / Terminología de la traducción / Terminologie der Übersetzung (originally published in 1999) today. In order to investigate how these different versions were completed or are still being drawn up, nine editors were interviewed via e-mail. What was their purpose? How did they proceed to select terms, to write their definitions, to insert examples? In a paradoxical way, the answers do not reflect a clear and thorough methodology, which—for Yves Gambier—shows that we still have a long way to go.

The editors admit that although many different aspects of the metalanguage issue are discussed in this special issue, lots of other potential perspectives still remain underexposed. Examples are: What kinds of metalanguage are used in the practices of revision and adaptation? Is the functional metadiscourse the dominant one in translation practice? How does an idiosyncratic use of terms function in different environments? Is the dynamic use of terms and definitions inextricably linked with the succession of ‘schools’ or ‘turns’ and their socio-institutional dimension? etc. They also point out that many more terms would have been worth investigating, e.g. culture, translation, causality, representation, transfer, function, system, norm, rule, text, etc.

This volume tries to contribute to a necessary and long-standing discussion central to the dynamic discipline that Translation Studies has become. James Holmes ended his seminal paper of 1972 by saying that it was time to study the subject of Translation Studies itself and launching an appeal to let the meta-discussion begin. After reading this volume compiled by Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer any reader will feel inspired to let the meta-discussion continue.

Rita Temmerman, Department of Applied Linguistics, Erasmus University College Brussels

Matamala, A. & Orero, P. (Eds.) (2010). *Listening to Subtitles: Subtitles for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing*. Peter Lang: Bern. 235 p.

Although in some countries, such as France and in the UK, subtitling for the deaf and hard of hearing (SDH) has been in use for nearly thirty years, most of the production criteria for this type of subtitling—character identification, position, length of display, etc.—have been based mainly on “common sense” rather than on research or empirical testing. *Listening to Subtitles: Subtitles for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing* is the first book of its kind to be entirely dedicated to research and experimentation in SDH. The

editors, Pilar Orero and Anna Matamala, have worked on and coordinated several European wide projects in the field of accessibility to the media over a number of years. The book is composed of various contributions from academics and professionals from different European countries and covers the methodologies, stages of research and findings of several EU-funded projects on SDH.

By way of prologue, Peter Olaf Looms, senior consultant at DR Media, assesses some of the challenges faced and solutions put forward by public service and state broadcasting to render the small screen accessible to all during the imminent switchover from analogue to digital television (pp. 19-24). Concluding optimistically, the author advocates a consortium to deal with the enhanced opportunities provided by digital television. "Spanish deaf people as recipients of closed captioning" (pp. 25-44), by Inmaculada Báez Montero and Ana Fernández Soneira, highlights the various features used to classify deaf receivers into groups in order to adapt subtitles to their respective needs: prelocutive deaf, postlocutive deaf and implanted deaf. Carmen Cabeza-Pereiro revises the concepts of grammatisation and epilinguistics to apply them to reading-writing skills developed by individuals in "The development of writing and grammatisation: The case of the deaf" (pp. 45-58). She then determines the linguistic knowledge of the deaf.

In "Maximum font size for subtitles in Standard Definition Digital Television: Test for a font magnifying application" (pp. 59-68), Francisco Utray, Belén Ruiz and José Antonio Moreiro describe the technical testing of the maximum font size attainable in subtitles for users who wish to increase character size in standard definition digital television. According to their findings, for the recommended font Arial Regular, the maximum font size is 31; for Arial Narrow, it is 39; for Verdana, 28; and for Times, 30. This is followed by an evaluation conducted by Eduard Bartoll and Anjana Martínez Tejerina through reception studies in Spain of "The positioning of subtitles for the deaf and hard of hearing" (pp. 69-86). The two favoured choices were a mixed position followed by a bottom position. These displays are customary in Catalan channels and in some Spanish channels respectively. The study seems to confirm the original hypothesis of the authors and that of other studies, i.e. that "the audience's preferences are often influenced by habit / conventions." (p. 79).

In "Criteria for elaborating subtitles for the deaf and hard of hearing adults in Spain: Description of a case study" (pp. 87-102), Ana Pereira uses a selection of technical and orthotypographical criteria for the subtitles in her experiment. In the case study some of the assertions under examination, such as the success of the use of colours for character identification, are upheld while others are refuted, such as the preferred mode of sound description, i.e. description of sound versus the use of onomatopoeic spellings. Another criterion under examination reveals that adapted subtitles can enhance understanding. Ana Pereira continues this line of research in

her next contribution, “Including Spanish Sign Language in subtitles for the deaf and hard of hearing” (pp. 103-114), which describes a methodology for integrating features of Spanish Sign Language (SSL) into subtitles. The author suggests adaption in syntax, lexis and verbal inflections to better reflect specific SSL features. Focusing on communicative efficiency of subtitles for children, Lourdes Lorenzo aims in her article “Subtitling for deaf and hard of hearing children in Spain: A case study” (pp. 115-138) to verify the functionality of the existing criteria in use in Spain for SDH, the Standard UNE 153010. In an experiment which consists of subtitling an episode of the series *Shin Chan*, Lorenzo considers the comprehension and the level of difficulty of the subtitles. She completes her contribution with the article “Criteria for elaborating subtitles for deaf and hard of hearing children in Spain: A guide of good practice” (pp. 139-148), in which she develops such guidelines based on three levels: technical, linguistic and cultural.

“Introducing icons on subtitles for the deaf and hard of hearing: Optimising reception?” (pp. 149-162), by Clara Civera and Pilar Orero, borrows iconography from mobile technology and the Internet to suggest new and innovative ways for the production of SHD using icons to represent sound context, character identification and mood. The article illustrates some of the possible applications with a range of examples. “SUBSORDIG: The need for a deep analysis of data” (pp. 163-174) by Verónica Arnáiz Uzquiza describes the possible applications of eye-tracking technology to the study of subtitling for the deaf and hard of hearing. The author exposes the first steps of the project SUBSORDIG which has led her to consider using scientific tools for achieving more objective, quantifiable research. In “D’Artagnan and the Seven Musketeers: SUBSORDIG travels to Europe” (pp. 175-190), Pablo Romero-Fresco describes the aims of the EU-funded project, D’Artagnan. He outlines the rationale, methodology and initial findings in the UK and Spain. The tests performed with eye-tracking technology consisted of showing and assessing several clips subtitled with variable parameters. The first results point towards the existence of common patterns across the two countries, such as in the choice of font, but also to discrepancies, such as in character identification methods. “Shadow speaking for real-time closed-captioning of TV broadcasts in French” (pp. 191-208), written by a team of researchers at the *Centre de recherche informatique de Montréal (CRIM)*, describes solutions to specific live subtitling problems using CRIM’s voice-recognition software on Canadian television and proposes a new method for measuring the performance of the end-result. “Subtitles for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing within a virtual avatar environment” (pp. 209-218), by Álvaro Pérez-Ugena, Ricardo Vizcaíro-Laorga and Deborah Rolph, explains particular elements of the ULISES project (*Utilización Lógica e Integrada del Sistema Europeo de Signos/Señas*). The authors describe the development and results of the research project implemented in several

international Spanish Airports, in order to demonstrate the potential usefulness of combining SDH with signing virtual avatars. The final contribution is “A comprehensive bibliography on subtitling for the deaf and hard of hearing from a multidisciplinary approach” (pp. 219-228), collated by Ana Pereira and Verónica Arnáiz Uzquiza.

The articles are well-written, clear and to the point, setting out their findings with plenty of examples of practical applications. It is worth noting, however, that the majority of the studies and their subsequent contributions are dedicated primarily to the deaf, leaving aside the hard of hearing, a group that potentially represents the widest group of subtitle users. Although mostly carried out in a Spanish context, the findings should be relevant to other countries, even those with a different subtitling tradition. This book is an essential read for anyone interested in the field of accessibility to the media. With its varied content—from technical considerations to semiotics and reception studies—and carefully constructed studies, *Listening to Subtitles: Subtitles for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing* paves the way for further research in this field.

Tia Muller – Departament de Traducció i d’Interpretació, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Espanya