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Abstract || This paper intends to carry out a description and analysis of one of the first elements in any dubbing process: the script list delivered by a film distribution company to a dubbing studio for its translation. This is done with a twofold purpose: first, to offer a close description of a document that is not normally included in audiovisual translation studies, and second, to present it as one of the symptoms of the risks involved in any translation: misinterpretation and manipulation. At the same time, this paper provides some documents that support the analysis.
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0. Introduction

It may be said that one of the symptoms related to the risk of misinterpretation during the translation process can be clearly observed in one concrete component: the “dialogue list” or verbal material sent by a film distribution company to a dubbing studio for its translation and adaptation. Given that it is not a usual subject of analysis in the field of audiovisual translation studies, this paper intends to provide an understanding of this fundamental element of any dubbing process, with the aim of making known its characteristics (using a series of previously unpublished examples), and of highlighting the mobility of the written sign which continually puts the possibility of translation at risk. This is done from the perspective of what elsewhere we have termed “genetic analysis” of the dubbing process (Richart, 2009), the objective of which is to create the documentary genealogy of all the possible steps that have led to the solutions seen by the audience at the end of the process.

This paper takes, therefore, the work carried out on the original script as a starting point, in order to prepare the work of the future translators. This mediation is in fact of interest with regards to the dubbing process, as the foreign company that owns the audiovisual text usually sends an annotated script in order to guide the translator during translation. This type of annotation is usually undertaken by a post-production company contracted to this effect, which confirms that the dubbing process is one mediation more out of the many that are carried out in order to ensure that the product reaches the maximum number of viewers possible.

In practical terms, this means that the dubbing studios and the translator receive not only the audiovisual text, but also an interpretation, a fact of great importance regarding the translation itself of the verbal text of the film.

More precisely, we can say that the dialogue list sent by the company sells the film, and provides a text with the express aim of initiating translation, at least with regards to the linguistic level. The rhetorical modality that follows this text is what was termed amplification in the old rhetoric (Lausberg, 1975: 178). In effect, it consists of a discourse, as we will soon see, riddled with comments, annotations and notes, with the intention of trying to control, as far as possible, those fragments of the linguistic universe which could be misinterpreted.

We can indisputably say that this text sent for dubbing is a different text from the literary or technical script that was used to shoot the film in question. It is a working document that is not at all intended for the public sphere, and which will never be published. Herein lies
the difficulty for investigators when it comes to getting access to the document. This refers to the problem of archiving in the dubbing studio, a problem which in our opinion has held back a full and in depth analysis of said phenomenon. In a sense, investigators into this form of “audiovisual translation” have had to content themselves with an analysis of what we could term “textual surfaces”.

1. A document from the film Shrek

Here we have an example taken from the first scene of the script exactly as received by the dubbing studio for Shrek:

BOOK READS:

wedding day

SHREK (face off)
(chuckling) Yeah, like that’s ever gonna happen.

(that: a princess rescued by her true love)
(gonna: going to)
(said sarcastically —note humor of Shrek’s mocking the reality of a fairy tale, which is clearly a fantastical story and not meant to believe— however, Shrek lives in a fairy tale world, and so the incidents related in such stories are part of his reality; even so, he finds the story he’s just read improbable [reflecting his cynical attitude])
144-14

SHREK (off)
What a load of sh--

(sh--: note that Shrek stops himself before saying the vulgar word “shit”, which would have a sardonic double meaning - [1] vulgar slang for, “nonsense”, relating to the fairy tale; and [2] vulgar slang for, “excrement”, as it is revealed that Shrek is sitting in an outhouse)

SMASH MOUTH (voice over)
(sings “All-Star” — continues under following scenes and dialogue)

SHREK
(groans) (sighs)
165-04

MAIN TITLE:

SHREK
182-10

SHREK (face off)
Oh!

This is an example of the dialogue list received by the chosen dubbing studio and the translator for Shrek. In this document it is clear to us that,
right from the start, the American production company made this film with the express intention of having it dubbed into other languages. Pommier (1988: 21) is correct when he see in dubbing a commercial solution that allows for wide diffusion among an international public, something that would otherwise be impossible. This is the reason why it is not only a literary script, but rather one that unites literary aspects (the dialogue text), technical aspects (time markers for the scenes in bold), and those comments intended to make the text more comprehensible for the translator (in italics after the dialogue).

It is considered, for example, that the relative adjective “that” in the expression “Yeah, like that’s ever gonna happen” could be ambiguous with regards to the antecedent to which it refers. After all, it is the first of Shrek’s lines in the entire film after a voice has read aloud the slowly-turning pages of a story book.

To what could Shrek be referring with “that”? In case the translator has any difficulty in reading this expression, the script text clarifies it between brackets and in italics: “(that: a princess rescued by her true love)”. It is not the story of how a witch locked up a princess in a tower guarded by a dragon that is represented by “that”, but rather the fact that the princess was rescued by her true love.

The question is: should we present this interpretation, should the translator present it, as sure, certain and definitive? Or in other words: what is it that Shrek doesn’t believe, the story as it is told in the book or only the detail that the princess was rescued by her true love? If we interpret the phrase keeping to its literal meaning, then it is the latter; if we interpret it tropologically, that is, as a synecdoche of the part for the whole, then it refers to the former.

Obviously that is not the entire picture; almost immediately, the source script introduces another clarification regarding precisely the same topic:

(said sarcastically —note humor of Shrek’s mocking the reality of a fairy tale, which is clearly a fantastical story and not meant to believed— however, Shrek lives in a fairy tale world, and so the incidents related in such stories are part of his reality; even so, he finds the story he’s just read improbable [reflecting his cynical attitude])

If the scriptwriter clarifies that this first expression of Shrek’s is said in a sarcastic manner, it is because the dubbing process should take it into account. The dubbed voice of Shrek will have to do something similar in Spanish or in whichever language into which the film is to be dubbed. However, the explanation warns that the translator must take note of Shrek’s humour in laughing at the reality of fairy tales, which obviously are fantasy stories that are not meant to be believed.
Also, it is advisable for the translator to recognise that, despite this, the events in the book that have just been read are a part of Shrek’s reality and that, the explanation adds, despite this, Shrek finds the story that has just been read unlikely. This is the reason why the note ends as it does, explaining that it reflects his cynical attitude. It is an obvious attempt to control the meaning of the words, the dialogues and the text as a whole; an attempt that raises the need for translation within the language itself. What does this demonstrate? It demonstrates that the process of adaptation from William Steig’s comic *Shrek!* (1990) to the film *Shrek* (2001) involves not only intersemiotic translation but also that form of translation that is interpretive paraphrasing within the same language, or intralinguistic translation, according to R. Jakobson.

Of course, this affects those parts that are particularly resistant to being understood or translated, for example, phraseological units. Just as Mona Baker highlighted: “As far as idioms are concerned, the first difficulty that a translator comes across is being able to recognize that s/he is dealing with an idiomatic expression. This is not always so obvious.” (Baker, 1992: 65). The scriptwriter’s awareness of this difficulty, as well as the need to control the meaning of the expressions in the text, leads to his or her comments and advice being focused intensely on phraseological units. For example, in the scene where the old woman tries to sell Donkey with the argument that he can talk and that this raises his value, she says in the face of the silence that the animal keeps in front of the soldiers:

**OLD WOMAN**

Oh! (chuckling) He’s just, he’s just a little nervous. He’s really quite a chatterbox. Talk, you bone-headed dolt!

*(chatterbox: one who engages in much idle talk)*

*(bone-headed: slang for, “idiotic”)*

Both “to be a chatterbox” and “bone-headed” run the risk of not being well-understood due to their figurative components. Neither “chatterbox” nor “one-headed” mean what they literally mean, but rather the first unit refers to someone who talks a lot on a superficial level, and the second is an insult similar to “idiot”. There is a risk, therefore, that the translator will not fully understand the meaning of such expressions. Consequently, the scriptwriter accompanies the expressions with a paraphrase of their real meaning in the context in which they are being used by the old woman: “one who engages in much idle talk” for “chatterbox”, and “idiotic” for “bone-headed”.

In reality, the hermeneutic control of the source text by the film production company is nothing more than the continuation on the textual level of what happens on a commercial level, that is, an...
attempt to control the product up to the very last detail, so that it reaches the consumer in good condition. An irrefutable piece of evidence for this is the existence, in those cases in which the film is part of a high-budget production, of a supervisor, who controls the text after its adjustment so as to ensure that the sentences and passages, considered important by the film distribution company reach the audience exactly as they were planned and designed originally. This shows that the question of hermeneutic control over the text is of utmost importance in the dubbing process. On such occasions, the translation is controlled at both the start and the end of its preparation.

However, the method followed to achieve this is paradoxical: after the translation text has been adjusted ready for studio dubbing proper, the company translator must translate certain sentences taken from the adjusted version into the target language (e.g. English) so that the supervisor may compare the English text of the adjusted version with the English text that was used for translation. Therefore, the translator translates the text from the source language into the target language, the agent in charge of adjustment alters it, and the translator translates the adjusted text from the target language into the source language. Finally, the supervisor compares the two versions in the source language.

2. Another document related to dialogue lists and hermeneutic control

In this second example of a dialogue list from the film *Anger Management* (Peter Segal, 2003) we can see the extent to which the company may try to control the interpretation of the text:

NOTES

1 | This is the so-called “script as recorded”.


There are three types of hermeneutic control focuses in this dialogue list:

— Control over untranslatable cultural allusions.
This refers to allusions that belong to the source culture that are not found in the target culture. This is the case with “fudgeicles”, the meaning of which depends, as explained by the note between brackets, on knowledge of the previously existing words “fudge” and “popsicles”. The note explains in a fair amount of detail that “fudgeicles” is a derivation and the result of combining “fudge” (soft sweet made from sugar and milk or cream) and “popsicle” (ice cream on a wooden or plastic stick). The translator must deal with the problem of finding an “equivalent” that more or less covers this allusion.
We saw that the translator proposed translating “No more fudgeicles” as “Ni un magno más”, and accompanied this translation with an explanatory note about the convenience or inconvenience of using
the brand name “Magno” (“I don’t know if we should use the brand name”, she says to the adjuster). The company adjuster changes “fudgeicles” and “Magno” to “Se acabaron los almendrados”, perhaps for reasons of synchrony or the inconvenience of mentioning the name of a commercial brand. Finally, the director of dubbing, in one final transformation, substitutes “fudgeicles”, “Magno” and “almendrados” for “cucuruchos”. The definitive line used by the character in the Spanish dub is “me he quedado sin cucuruchos”.

— Control over cataphoric particles.
The second focus refers to the presuppositions of cataphoric particles. The dialogue list considers that the “that” in Chuck’s question, the character speaking, could be difficult to interpret and later translate. So it is immediately clarified that it refers to the person that is speaking: “Who’s that?”: i.e. “Who just spoke”. Consequently, the translator translates not the expression “Who’s that”, but rather the explanation given by the script. “¿Quién habla?” is the more or less literal translation of “Who just spoke” in question form. We agree that in order to achieve a textual coherence that would be clear to the audience, what the translator has done has been to precisely translate the explanatory paraphrase that accompanies the part of the text that is thought to be ambiguous. But these morphosyntactic explanations include even which could be considered as a grammatical mistake of common spoken usage. In the case of Chuck’s question “She making fun of me?”, as it is an incorrect way of forming a question, grammatically speaking, the script analyst clears up the doubt that this syntaxis could provoke and clarifies it, within brackets as always: “(She: i.e., “Is she”)”. The translator therefore proposes “¿Se está burlando de mí?”

— Control over phraseological units.
This control is exercised over those idiomatic expressions, phraseological units, run the risk of being left unnoticed or misinterpreted by the translator. The scriptwriters feel obliged to clarify that the expression “You tell her to put a sock in it” is a colloquial way of saying “be quiet”, literally “put a sock in her mouth to quiet herself”. The translator finds that the Spanish expression “cerrar el pico” is equivalent to the English expression.

As we will see in the following sections, the metaphoric imagery that the two expressions, the English and the Spanish version, bring into play are very different. In one (the English expression) she doesn’t speak because an object, a sock, stops her from doing so; in the other, she doesn’t speak because of the voluntary act of shutting her mouth. In the English expression, the humanity of the addressee is maintained; in the Spanish version, the addressee is animalised. Whatever it is, the dialogue list intended for the translator’s use does everything possible in order to avoid misinterpretation.

---

**NOTES**

2 | In this article we have continued to use the name “Magno”, which is the term used by the translator, although we believe that it actually refers to the popular ice cream by Frigo, “Magnum”. 

---
Umberto Eco (1995), forever preoccupied by the problems that overinterpretation of texts can cause, formulated a series of strategies to avoid it, taken from a hermeneutic tradition that goes back at least to the time of St. Augustine. He states that “reconocer la intentio operis es reconocer una estrategia semiótica [consistente en] cotejar [nuestras conjeturas] con el texto como un todo coherente” (Eco, 1995: 77). Just as is recognised by Eco, this involves the rehabilitation “del viejo y aún válido “círculo hermenéutico”, the fundamental assumption of which states that “un texto es un dispositivo concebido con el fin de producir un lector modelo” (Eco, 1995: 76).

It is evident, therefore, that the scriptwriters for the film Anger Management did not clearly understand this idea, or at least they did not put much trust it. When it is more than just an academic interpretation that is involved, the “authors” prefer not to take any risks with regards to the text’s interpretation. In the same way that Dante accompanied his poems with a series of critical comments that explained their meaning, differences in circumstance aside, so the scriptwriters dispel any possible doubts that the text could provoke. They do not recognise the ability of the translator to use the hermeneutic circle when it comes to “understanding” the intentio operis.

— Control over phonic wordplays.
In the following example, the attempt to control the meaning of the text compromises its phonic dimension:
In the situation described, the characters of David and his therapist, Buddy, are going to visit a former schoolmate of David’s with the aim of settling the score with him for the way he mistreated David when they were at school together. The bully’s name is Arnie, but now he lives in a secluded Buddhist monastery and has changed his name to “Pana Kamana”. From the moment that they are introduced to each other, Arnie’s Buddhist name is the object of a constant phonic reinterpretation with a clearly humorous effect. The dialogue list had previously noted that it was necessary to avoid rhyming “Pana” and “Kamana”.

So, the first time that David repeats the name he calls him “Pana Kamanana”, and the second he used the expression “Pana Manapia”; Buddy calls him both “peanuts” and “Pena”. In the moment reflected
in the cited example, David is teasing Arnie and instead of calling him “Pana Kamana” he calls him “Pana Banana”. The absolute and almost obsessive scrutiny of the dialogue list’s explanatory notes includes, as we can see, those humorous effects that are fundamental in a phonic wordplay. In this case, the translator only has to include this phonic wordplay, given that it is identical in Spanish. Another type of problem stems from the use of the word “heinie”, the meaning of which the dialogue list also chooses to clarify, noting that it is a slang term for the buttocks.

3. The characteristics of dialogue lists

We have here an example taken from one of Woody Allen’s films, *Scoop* (2005). The script or dialogue list that was sent by the American and distribution company to the dubbing company is as follows:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMBINED CONTINUITY &amp; DIALOGUE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>START MEASURING 0.00 AT START MARK IN ACADEMY LEADER.</td>
<td>11-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCENE 1 - INT. VARIETY SHOW THEATER - NIGHT - M/S - CAMERA PANS SLIGHTLY L, AS THE MEMBERS OF THE AUDIENCE APPLAUD.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUDIENCE (cheers - continues unhr following scene and dialogue)</td>
<td>16-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCENE 2 - M/S - HIGH ANGLE - PAST THE MEMBERS OF THE AUDIENCE, SITTING FG, TO SID, WHO STANDS BG ONSTAGE WITH WENDY BEAMISH, A BEEFY ENGLISH WOMAN. A CABINET IS BG ON THE STAGE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SID: Who's, what's your name, sweetheart? Tell me your name.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENDY (overlapping)</td>
<td>I, I'm Wendy Beamish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENDY</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SID STARTS TO APPLAUD.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SID (overlapping)</td>
<td>Let's hear it for Wendy Beamish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE MEMBERS OF THE AUDIENCE APPLAUD.</td>
<td>24-09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MASTER ENGLISH SUBTITLE/SPOTTING LIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LABORATORY: 0.00 AT START MARK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.13 = 1ST SCENE END</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.9 = 2ND SCENE END</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.15 = 3RD SCENE END</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-What's your name, sweetheart? -Wendy Beamish. (that night, Sid is doing his magic show at the theater - a woman named Wendy stands on the stage with him)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Let's hear it for Wendy Beamish. (R : your applause)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
Note how, unlike the script for *Shrek*, this one is explicitly organised around the fact that it will be dubbed and subtitled. The page space in this dialogue list is therefore organised in a different way. We can see two completely different fields:

1. The one on the left (COMBINED CONTINUITY & DIALOGUE) provides us (SCENE 1, SCENE 2, etc.) with technical annotations (INT. VARIETY SHOW THEATER – NIGHT – MFS – CAMERA PANS SLIGHTLY L AS THE MEMBERS OF THE AUDIENCE APPLAUD), annotations regarding the action (WENDY (overlapping)), the dialogues themselves ("SID What's, what's your name, sweetheart? Tell me your name"), and time indicators in bold (11-15, 16-13, 24-09, etc.) It is, as we can see, a list containing descriptions of the shots and the actors within the shot, as well as the spoken dialogue within said shot.

2. The one on the right (MASTER ENGLISH SUBTITLE / SPOTTING LIST) is a list of the real subtitles and their calculated duration. This model becomes the guide for future subtitles in other languages and to help their division into “takes”, which is essential for dubbing. Furthermore, this is the section that contains the analysis of sentence meaning within the dialogues. This may include comments that refer to the identity of characters and their actions (when, for example, after Sid and Wendy’s first words, we immediately read: “that night, Sid is doing his magic show at the theatre –a woman named Wendy stands on the stage with him”); to referents (“aftershave: lotion used by men after they have finished shaving, which usually contains alcohol, a perfume to enhance scent, and a moisturizer”); or to the cultural meaning of the terms used. Note the following page in which the text explains not only the meaning of the term “narcissism”, but also the element of humour present in Sid’s line.

4. Other documents related to dialogue lists
Note on the one hand the definition of the word “narcissism” (“consuming self-absorption and self-love”) and the warning, on the other hand, regarding the humour that comes from the way Sid treats narcissism like a religion. This second item highlights how the dialogue list sent to the company and the translator works as a guide that controls the meaning and the effect that lines in the film should provoke in the audience.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCENE 55 - (CONTINUED)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SID LOOKS R AT A FRENCH HORN ON A COUNTER, THEN PICKS IT UP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SID (contd)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hey, you know the old dirty joke about how how the French horn player sleeps with his wife at night?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONDRA TURNS AND LOOKS AT SID, THEN GESTURES AT HIM.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONDRA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney, put that thing down!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh, I....</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONDRA TO SID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney, put that down! (that : that French horn) (unusual, Peter reacts to Sondra's prolonged absence)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCENE 56 - INT. PETER'S HOUSE/LIVING ROOM - NIGHT - MS - PETER LOOKS AT THE HUSBAND, WHO SITS L. ON THE SOFA BESIDE HIM. OTHER PARTY GUESTS ARE AROUND THE ROOM.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will you excuse me?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUSBAND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(low) Yeah.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETER STANDS UP AND WALKS R OUT OF FRAME.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this example we can see again how the script believes it necessary to provide a clarification for the adjective “dirty” (“obscene” / “vulgar”), but also clarifies the meaning of the term “French Horn” on which Sid bases his joke (“valved brass wind instrument that produces a mellow tone form a long narrow tube that is coiled in a circle before ending in a flaring bell”).

As we have seen just above, the explanations introduced by the dialogue list may refer - and this is of particular interest - to the phraseological units, to the different locutions whose presence may be problematic for the translator, a fact that proves our thesis on the resistance of such units to translation. If we look at the following example, we can see the type of change in perception of the phenomenal world that is produced:
In effect, “We’re on a wild goose chase” is an attributive nominal locution in which idiomy or its figurative character plays an essential role. The literal meaning of the expression is obviously not the one used by the character of Sid. Therefore, faced with the translator misinterpreting the text, the script chooses to clarify its meaning. In reality, this means that this type of expression is explained as followed: “(wild goose chase: colloquial for, “futile pursuit or search”)”, or in Spanish, “búsqueda infructuosa”.

The purpose, therefore, of this type of comment is to make clear what may at first sight be ambiguous and lead to mistranslation. This type of comment works according to the phenomenological logic that is upheld by interpretative theory:
the paraphrase is equal to a “deverbalisation”, that is, the clarification of an idea, which is reverbalised in another language by the interpreter, so that “búsqueda infructuosa” must become invariant in meaning between the text in an SL and the text in a TL.

Which was the final translation solution for this phraseological unit in the Spanish dub?: the use of the expression “estamos dando palos de ciego”. Let us take a look at the situation: Sid and Sondra are in the basement room where Peter keeps a collection of musical instruments, while Peter himself and a group of people remain in the flat above where a party is taking place. They are looking for evidence that Peter was involved in the murders committed by the Tarot murderer. For the moment, they are failing to find anything decisive, and this is when Sid says: “Th-th-there’s nothing but musical instruments in here. I’m telling you, we’re on a wild goose chase, eh, believe me”. I have here the image that corresponds to the moment in which Sid says the aforementioned line to Sondra:

Given that it is a middle distance shot, labial synchronism does not cause too many problems. The dub should focus on the temporal synchronism with regards to the moment when the linguistic sequence begins and starts. The Spanish dub says: “Aquí no hay más que instrumentos musicales. Te aseguro, estamos dando palos de ciego, créeme”. Both lines, the English version and the Spanish, have a similar number of syllables (around sixteen). The Spanish version also fits well to the beginning and end of Sid’s lip movement.
The question is: Do the expressions “we’re on a wild goose chase” and “estamos dando palos de ciego” have the same invariant meaning (i.e. “futile pursuit or search”)? No, in fact the transformation-manipulation creates a split between the idea of “wasting time” or “doing stupid things” and that of “dar palos de ciego”. The first expression centres on the metaphoric imagery of doing something unproductive, or wasting time, and suggests that although Peter could be the murderer, they will probably not find anything there (remember that at this stage of the story, Sid is insisting on Peter’s guilt and Sondra on his possible innocence). The second is constructed according to the metaphor of someone who, because of being blind, cannot manage to hit the target with a stick. It refers to the idea of causing harm through ignorance or rashness, as highlighted by Iribarren (1956: 82). The Diccionario de español actual gives three meanings: “golpe dado sin mirar a quién o dónde”, “medida o castigo que se aplica de manera arbitraria o irreflexiva” and, lastly “acción que se realiza por puro tanteo, sin una visión clara de sus consecuencias” (Seco et al, 1999: 3360).

Therefore, as well as the metaphoric imagery of the two expressions being clearly different and the different cognitive element that this implies, on the semantic level they also describe ideas that do not coincide: the Spanish expression has a semantic value of acting without taking the consequences into account, which does not exist in the English expression. Consequently, they do not say the same thing. The attempt to impose control by the English script intended for dubbing does not prevent the transformation-manipulation caused by the Spanish text.
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