# "Crime is disease": Contamination of Media in BBC *Sherlock*

Eleonora Sasso

"G. d'Annunzio" University of Chieti-Pescara
(eleonora.sassso@unich.it)

**Abstract**

This paper takes as its starting point the conceptual metaphor "crime is disease" as suggested by George Lakoff in order to advance a new reading of the BBC crime drama television series *Sherlock* (2010-2017) based on Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's Sherlock Holmes detective stories. Among over 200 film versions of Sherlock Holmes, the 2010 Masterpiece version, created by Steven Moffat and Mark Gatiss, remediated the Victorian detective stories visualising Sherlock's deductive reasoning on screen. Defined as "flagrantly unfaithful to the original in some respects" and "wonderfully loyal to [the original]" (Sutcliffe 2010), *Sherlock* appears to be the perfect depiction of Holmes for our times. I intend to track through these references and look at the issues – the remediation of Victorian crime from page to screen, the metamorphosis of Holmes's character, adapting techniques in crime scenes, etc – which they raise. But my central purpose will be to re-read *Sherlock* from a subtitling perspective. I will analyse the linguistics of subtitling and text-reduction shifts from a cognitive perspective in order to demonstrate that crime may be conceptualised in subtitling and that Doyle's detective stories are reproduced faithfully by audio-visual media. Through dialogues, I suggest, subtitling may be considered as a form of deduction in audio-visual crime fiction.

## 1. Introduction

"[A] man's brain originally is like a little empty attic, and you have to stock it with such furniture as you choose" (Doyle 2011: 11). By projecting the conceptual metaphor THE BRAIN IS AN ATTIC[1], Sir Arthur Conan Doyle tries to explain how to be a master of deduction and to select information from the knowledge stored in our brains. The difference between ordinary people and extraordinary people lies in the stuff with which they fill their own brains. Unnecessary furniture/data tend to pile up and make it impossible to get at the stuff that matters.

---

[1] Conceptual metaphors are always written in small capitals.

Sherlock Holmes, the fictional private detective created by Arthur Conan Doyle, the most famous of all detectives holding the record for the most-portrayed fictional character in movies, does incarnate the pioneer of forensic science and criminal investigation. Not only is he able to analyse physical evidence to link a suspect to a crime but he is also able to make brilliant deductions in order to solve the most bewildering cases by paying attention to all the details because you can't connect the dots if you don't collect the dots. Deductive reasoning can be summarised with this notorious quote from "A Scandal in Bohemia" (1891): "'You see, but you do not observe. The distinction is clear" (Doyle 2011: 54). The more information you can gather, the more accurate your deductions are going to be. From this perspective, you have to pay attention to anything, you have to tune to the surrounding reality and ask to yourself "What do you see? Smell? Hear? Now think a little deeper". If you embrace your senses your awareness will increase and, in time, you will know who people really are, what they feel and even what they are thinking.

Deduction and translation[2] are driven by similar cognitive processes influencing judgment and decision-making. Following Douglas Robinson's theory (1991) according to which translation is a largely intuitive process, and postulates that we have somatic responses to words on an unconscious level, it is possible to argue that adaptation and subtitling strategies applied in BBC *Sherlock* do take into account the psychological construct of intuition.

Among over 200 film versions of Sherlock Holmes, the 2010 Masterpiece version, created by Steven Moffat and Mark Gatiss, remediated Doyle's Victorian detective stories "without ever undercutting the flair and dazzle of the original" (Sutcliffe 2010). Defined as "flagrantly unfaithful to the original in some respects" and "wonderfully loyal to [the original]" (Sutcliffe 2010), *Sherlock* appears to be the perfect depiction of Holmes for our times. I intend to track through these references and look at the issues – the remediation of Victorian crime from page to screen, the metamorphosis of Holmes's character, adapting techniques in crime scenes, etc. – which they raise.

But my central purpose will be to re-read *Sherlock* from a subtitling perspective. I will analyse the linguistics of subtitling and text-reduction shifts from a cognitive perspective in order to demonstrate that crime may be conceptualised in subtitling and that Doyle's detective stories are reproduced faithfully by audio-visual media. Through dialogues, I suggest, subtitling may be considered as a form of deduction in audio-visual crime fiction.

---

[2] On cognitive psychology and translation see Dane and Pratt (2009), Evans (2010), Hammond (2010), and Myers (2010).

## 2. From *A Study in Scarlet* to "A Study in Pink": Contamination of Media

John Harrington, in his book *Film And/As Literature* (1977: 117) estimated that a third of all films ever made have been adapted from novels, and, if you include other literary forms, such as drama or short stories, that estimate might well be 65 percent or more. For example, there are over 200 film versions of Sherlock Holmes, from a silent film made in 1916 by William Gillette to the reimagined 2010 version starring Benedict Cumberbatch which boasted 7.3 million viewers in the United Kingdom. According to Alan Burton and Steve Chibnall "Doyle's enduring creation now coexists in period and contemporary form and perhaps is more popular than any time since the day of his first appearances in the *Strand Magazine*" (Burton and Chibnall 2013: 221). More recently, Benjamin Poore claimed that the fictional character of Sherlock Holmes has been widely adapted across media because it "was present and popular on the cultural landscape at the birth of many of the key elements of modern mass media" (Poore 2017: 2). In the battle of remediation between media in order to achieve immediacy, the audio-visual medium best represents the dynamism of Sherlock's deductive reasoning by involving the viewer into crime analysis.

As a form of remediation from page to screen, The TV series *Sherlock* appears to be more a *commentary* than *analogy*[3] according to Geoffrey Wagner's categories of adaptation (*transposition*[4]; *commentary* and *analogy*) since there are more similarities than differences from the murder mystery genre perspective. As Wagner explains a *commentary* is: "when an original is taken and either purposely or inadvertently altered in some respect. . . when there has been a different intention on the part of the film-maker, rather than infidelity or outright violation" (Wagner 1975: 29). A paramount example of this kind of adaptation is the first episode of series one entitled "A Study in Pink" which is based on the novel *A Study in Scarlet* (1887) along with allusions to other Doyle's tales. The title of the television episode is called "A Study in Pink" because the story focuses on the mysterious death of a woman dressed entirely in pink. In addition to this, Sherlock deduced the victim's past through the patterning of her pink outfit and the information obtained from her pink luggage, which lead him to further discover important clues of the mystery. The word "Scarlet" in the title of the book represents the colour red, which in this case refers to the mysterious presence of blood found in the criminal scenes as aptly summarised by Doyle himself in *A Study in Scarlet*:

> "[…] a study in scarlet, eh? Why shouldn't we use a little art jargon. There's the scarlet thread of murder running through the colorless skein of life, and our duty is to unravel it, and isolate it, and expose every inch of it" (Doyle 2011: 18).

---

[3] "[*analogy*] represents a fairly considerable departure for the sake of making another work of art" (Wagner 1975: 226).

[4] "in [*transposition*] a novel is given directly on the screen with a minimum of interference" (Wagner 1975: 224).

Significant variances between the stories concern the crime itself. The murderer in the book, Jefferson Hope, an aged cabby who is dying of aneurism, seeks for revenge by murdering. The killer targeted the ex-Mormon man who twenty years ago forced the killer's fiancée to become one of his wives in Utah. Whereas, the cabbie in the television, Jeff Hope, kills people for monetary reasons. He is paid by an unseen master mind called Moriarty to carry out these murders. He has a unique way of killing people: he holds them up by gunpoint (actually a lighter not a real gun) and has two pills (one poisonous and the other benign), forcing the person to choose one to swallow as it occurs in *Princess Bride*. This perverted way in which the murderer approaches his victims seems to project the conceptual metaphor "crime is disease" affecting the criminals' minds and the only way of addressing epidemics of violence is to put or hold people in isolation (in jail) to prevent the spread of disease.

Cardinal functions, as Roland Barthes calls them (1977), referring to the functionality of doing (i.e., to actions and events) are preserved in the remediation from page to screen in order to avoid critical outrage and popular disaffection. Such cardinal functions as Watson's military background, Sherlock's intelligence in solving mysterious crimes, how they meet each other, the conversations they have, the killer, and so forth are faithfully adapted from the novel. However, cardinal functions are deformed by varying the catalysers which denote small actions, enriching the texture of the cardinal functions.

The most interesting metamorphoses concern integrational functions, also called functionality of being, that is to say those operations embracing psychological information, data regarding the identity, notations of atmosphere, and representations of place. Such informants are data with immediate signification, ready-made knowledge such as names, ages, professions and details of the physical setting.

It is not by chance that the kill list is much longer in the television series: there are 4 victims in the television episode but only 2 in the original book. There were small changes to the mystery and the reasons why Jefferson Hope was murdering. Instead of a dead man it is a woman's body they find. And kids discovered the body instead of a police sergeant. In the book, they carved "Rache" ("revenge" in German), not "Rachel"; while in the television adaptation it is the word "Rachel" that the victim is carving because it is the password to her phone. Instead of the clue to solving the case revolving around a missing ring (the engagement ring Jefferson gave to Lucy) it revolves around the woman in pink's missing suitcase. And the BBC ending recalls the scene from Doyle's *Princess Bride* where Sherlock Holmes has to choose the pill not poisoned rather than Jefferson just explaining why he did it and accepting his fate.

On the micro-level, the major opposition through alterations is between literary and cinematic spaces of London and the crime-ridden streets of the West End. Notoriously, the city and the views of key London landmarks such as Buckingham Palace, Piccadilly Circus, Big Ben and others contribute to the narrative space for Sherlock's world. As Ann K. McClellan explains, "The city becomes part of a larger framework that shapes the cultural values and overall milieu of the show and its characters, and it seeps into every aspect of the world and its extensions" (McClellan 2018: 40). From this perspective, the stories do not take place anymore in Victorian London but in a modern-day city with arial shots of the skyline and multimodal visual representations of London's map. A case in point is the chasing taxi scene in which Sherlock accesses his mental map while pursuing a taxi across the rooftops together with Watson who is unexpectedly jumping and running despite his psychosomatic limp.

Thanks to his exact knowledge of streets and houses, Sherlock is able to trace the fastest route in his mind map in the same way as Google Maps plans the shortest way to reach a destination. Digital map iconography is used to visualise Sherlock's cognitive map along with dynamic writing indicating the street names appearing on screen as the main directions of the entire chase. From a cognitive perspective, Sherlock and Watson are trajectors following a path in order to reach their landmark (the taxi transporting the murderer). We build up the ACROSS[5] image schema in our mind projected by Sherlock and Watson moving across the roofs and streets of London. On the basis of their local bodily interactions with the onscreen space of the city, they share particular image schemas with the community of their audience: chase, map, across, through, up/down, along and others.

Despite this contemporary technological mode of representation which is updated for today's audience, BBC adaptation of London to modern times keeps true to the original Arthur Conan Doyle stories. As Steven Moffat explains: "Conan Doyle's stories were never about frock coats and gas light; they're about brilliant detection, dreadful villains and blood-curdling crimes – and frankly, to hell with the crinoline. Other detectives have cases, Sherlock Holmes has adventures, and that's what matters" (Qt. in Tribes 2014: 30). In the remediation from page to screen, digitalized technology has replaced Victorian technology without losing the adventurous flavour of Doyle's stories. Multimodality is the trademark of "A Study in Pink" and in more general terms of the world of BBC *Sherlock* in which viewers fully immerse themselves thanks to the emphasis on sensory experiences which becomes essential in order to pursue realism and verisimilitude.

## 3. Subtitling "A Study in Pink": Contacts Between Language and Image

From an intralingual subtitling perspective, "A Study in Pink" applies interesting multimodal strategies as well as the so-called text reduction shifts, a term coined by John Catford (1965) to designate any such departures from formal correspondence in the process of going from source language to target language. If it is true that subtitles should never anticipate, or be ahead of visual narration on screen, then it is equally true that *Sherlock* is characterised by an approximate synchrony between image and subtitle.

---

[5] Image schemas are conventionally written in small capitals. According to Peter Stockwell's definition image schemas are: "mental pictures that we use as basic templates for understanding situations that occur commonly. […] Locative expressions, […], are expressed with prepositions that can be understood as image schemas" (2002: 16).

This is mainly due to the characterisation of tv Sherlock as a serious, logical, constantly thinking consulting detective who exhibits at times a strange behaviour as he is rambunctious, more active, moving so fast he fails to finish his thought. Sherlock's tv genius is altered in the way it is portrayed (instead of smoking a pipe and doing opium, he is now on nicotine patches and smokes pot). Unlike Doyle's Sherlock, a calm character showing no particularly reaction to the new criminal case that was yet to be unravelled, tv Sherlock has a completely opposite approach towards the cases: he was overjoyed with the situation and he couldn't wait to solve them. The following excerpts clarify the totally different reactions of Doyle's Sherlock and BBC Sherlock when a new crime is announced:

> I was amazed at the calm way in which he rippled on. "Surely there is not a moment to be lost," I cried, "shall I go and order you a cab?" "I'm not sure about whether I shall go. I am the most incurably lazy devil that ever stood in shoe leather—that is, when the fit is on me, for I can be spry enough at times" (Doyle, *A Study in Scarlet*, 2011: 22)

> "Brilliant! Yes! Ah, four serial suicides, and now a note! Oh, it's Christmas!" – (Sherlock Holmes, BBC "A Study in Pink", Timecode 00: 15: 20)

By comparing the original script of this particular scene from "A Study in Pink" with its subtitles, it is all the more evident how Sherlock's fast speaking is conveyed in subtitles with accurate text-reduction strategies.

| **Script** | **Subtitles (Timecode 00: 15: 20)** |
|---|---|
| And I thought it was going to be a boring evening. Serial suicides, and now a note - oh, it's Christmas! | Four serial suicides and now a note. |
| Mrs. Hudson, I'll be late - might need some food. | Oh, it's Christmas. Mrs Hudson,<br>I'll be late. Might need some food. |

In this subtitled text, there is an omission at sentence level since the first sentence is completely omitted and replaced with number "four". According to Irena Kovačič (1996), there is a three-level hierarchy of discourse elements in subtitling: the indispensable elements (that must be translated, all the plot-carrying elements of a film; they carry experiential meaning without which the viewers would not be able to follow the action); the partly dispensable elements (that can be condensed) and the dispensable elements (that can be omitted); they are linguistic elements that many subtitlers would omit even if the spatial-temporal constraints of subtitling such as repetitions, names in appellative constructions, false starts and ungrammatical constructions, internationally known words, such as 'yes,' 'no,' 'ok,' exclamations, such as 'oh,' 'ah,' 'wow,' which are commonly deleted because they can be recovered from the soundtrack. Furthermore, the subtitler merges two sentences into one two-line subtitle changing punctuation since the job of the subtitler is to facilitate this reading exercise for the viewers, and in so doing he/she has to revisit some of the standard punctuation rules and give them a new twist. In attempt to rationalise the space, the subtitler eliminates dashes which, though having more specific function than in standard written language and being used to indicate that the text appearing in one subtitle belongs to two different people, distract the viewer's attention. As explained by Clara Cerón "Whenever movie and TV viewers are watching a subtitled film, they are deciphering a whole set of codes. They may be unaware of it, but they will react immediately to a departure from the norm" (Cerón 2001: 173).

BBC Sherlock speaks so fast in deduction scenes that synchronous delivery is obtained through two-line subtitles (two liners) violating the aesthetic rules of subtitling according to which one-line subtitles are easier to read since they "elicit proportionally less viewing time" (Díaz Cintas and Remael 2007: 87). The use of 43 two-liners out of 54 subtitles in the cab dialogue with John Watson while reaching the crime scene confirms Brondeel's conviction that two-line subtitles are preferable to two successive one-liners since the overall reading time in two-liners seems to offer the viewer more reading comfort.

However, 28 two-liners out of 54 subtitles seem to follow the aesthetic recommendation to keep the top line shorter in order not to pollute the image. Not only are they aesthetically more pleasing but this means the eye has to cover less of a distance. Sense blocks and readability ought to be the most influential aspects in subtitles positioning. In the remaining two-liners, the first line is longer than the second, which could not be avoided due to the way the utterance is structured syntactically.

But more often than not, segmentation in BBC *Sherlock* renders speech in writing by taking some of the meaningful features of spoken language into account (hesitations and pauses). Examples of good rhetorical segmentation help convey surprise, suspense, irony, hesitation, and reflect some of the dialogue's dynamics in Sherlock and Watson's conversation.

| Script | Subtitles | Timecode |
|---|---|---|
| Your haircut and the way you hold yourself says military - but your conversation […] | *Your haircut, the way you hold yourself*<br>*says military. But your conversation...* | (00: 18: 34) |
| Your limp is really bad when you walk, but you don't ask for a chair when you stand, […] | *Your limp's bad when you walk, but you*<br>*don't ask for a chair when you stand* | (00: 18: 50) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| That says the circumstances of the original injury were traumatising - wounded in action then. | *That says the original circumstances*<br>*of the injury were traumatic.* | (00: 18: 57) |
| Wounded in action, a suntan.<br>Afghanistan or Iraq? […] | Wounded in action, then. Wounded<br>in action, suntan - Afghanistan or Iraq. | (00: 18: 59) |
| The man in front of me wouldn't treat his one luxury item like this, […] | You wouldn't treat<br>your one luxury item like this, | (00: 19: 22) |
| could be a cousin, but you're a war hero who can't find a place to live – […] | Could be a cousin, but you're a war hero<br>who can't find a place to live. | (00: 19: 36) |
| Now Clara, who's Clara – three kisses says it's a romantic attachment. […] | Now, who's Clara? Three kisses<br>says it's a romantic attachment. | (00: 19: 45) |
| How can you possibly know about the drinking? […] | How can you possibly know<br>about drinking? | (00: 20: 12) |
| He plugs it in every night to recharge, but his hands are shaking. | Every night he plugs it in<br>to charge, but his hands are shaking. | (00: 20: 21) |

See, for example, two-line subtitles at timecodes 00: 18: 34; 00: 18:50 and 00: 19:45, each one consisting of a sentence breaking grammatical rules since noun phrases and verb phrases are split (*the way you hold yourself / says military*; *but you / don't ask for a chair*) and distributed into two different lines. Likewise, the subtitler, who applies rhetorical segmentation, seems to segment sentences trying to force the brain to pause its linguistic processes for a while, until the eyes trace the next piece of linguistic information. This strategy is particularly evident in subtitles at timecodes 00: 18: 57; 00: 18: 59; 00: 20: 12; 00: 20: 21 whose segmentation is arranged to separate noun phrases and prepositional phrases (*the original circumstances / of the injury*; "Wounded / in action,"; "you possibly know / about drinking?") as if to create a suspension bridge and keep the viewer's attention. The same occurs at timecodes 00: 19: 22 and 00: 19: 36 in which the subtitler tends to secure line-breaks violating the logic of the sentence (verb phrase and noun phrase are split; the relative clause is segmented ungrammatically) giving priority to rhetorical segmentation. From this view, subtitling in BBC Sherlock seems not to respect grammatical cohesion but at the same is able to reproduce the genius' speech flow and the rhythm of his thoughts.

The stressful experience of following Sherlock's deductions by listening to his super-fast voice is relieved by the presence of subtitles – for those viewers who set up them − which condense information keeping a certain degree of suspense thereby stimulating the viewers' intuition by rhetorical segmentation. Following Robinson (1991), our bodies send us signals regarding what we know and how we should react. Convinced that "we are guided much more powerfully […] by those autonomic responses called 'intuition' or 'gut reactions'" (Robinson 1991: x), he defines translation as a largely intuitive process and that we have somatic responses to words on an unconscious level. The same happens to the viewers of Sherlock's deductive scenes whose understanding is fostered by the use of such subtitling strategies as rhetorical segmentation and italics whose aim is to prioritize information and facilitate reading and comprehension. The idea that subtitling strategies will provoke a reaction in the viewers, a feeling that a suspended word at the end of the first subtitle may activate intuition before they are consciously aware of what Sherlock is saying, hints at the powerful influence of intuition in reading subtitles.

But the most intriguing subtitling strategy is what Hartmut Stöckl refers to as "the language-image-link" (2004: 9) that is to say that in audio-visual texts, visual and verbal elements are bound together, they contaminate each other activating intuition resulting in gut-feelings and implicit, spontaneous thoughts. Once at the crime scene, a dark room, with peeling wallpaper and in the centre a slash of pink, Sherlock silences everyone and starts inspecting the corpse with his unique mode of investigation. From timecode 00: 24: 36 to timecode 00: 25: 46, there is a dynamic use of the language mode: words pulse across the screen - just appear, float and fade in order to visualise Sherlock's deductive reasoning. For example, the words MARRIED, LEFT-HANDED, RACHE, WET, CLEAN, DIRTY, UNHAPPILY MARRIED, 10 + YEARS, DIRTY/CLEAN, REGURALRY REMOVED, SERIAL ADULTURER pulse across the screen and disappear very fast like a glancing thought. Verbal and visual elements cohere by building inter-modal sense relations and add to a common mental image that facilitates the viewer's comprehension of the multimodal artefact. Particularly significant is the word RACHE superimposed on the word "RACHE, German (n.), revenge" carved on the floor with the victim's fingernails beside her corpse. Far from being a form of redundancy or what is commonly known as *function de redondance*, i.e., words and images communicate more or less the same information, the use of dynamic writing does no more than expand on Sherlock's deductive reasoning, rendering it more explicit. From this perspective, animated writing can influence the audience's engagement with and immersion in the multimodal text breaking down the willing suspension of disbelief that occurs when watching a film and become a living part of it.

Among the ways of showing Sherlock's mind working there are labels flashing onto people's clothing to reveal the methods by which he deduces history and character. Likewise pin patterns are painted on the screen as he tried to break into a phone and numbers float across his face as he cracks a code. It is all the more evident that *Sherlock* 's creators have opted to transgress the conventions of narrative framing through "narrative metalepsis" (Genette 1983 [1980], quoted in O'Sullivan 2011: 161).

In other words, information that would have normally remained confined to the diegetic (Sherlock's reflections while inspecting the body) is made available to the audience through the use of what Pérez-González calls "authorial titling" (2013: 15-16). In order to represent Sherlock's intuitions, "double layeredness" of filmic communication (Vanoye 1985: 99) is employed by prioritizing the vertical level of interpersonal communication, that is to say between the filmmakers and the audience, at the expense of its horizontal counterpart (i.e., communication between the film characters). Ironically, Watson remains oblivious to the working of Sherlock's logic, while viewers have been provided with the information required to appreciate Holmes' brilliance.

The use of authorial titling and diegetic silence are aimed at making audiences more aware that they are watching a fiction. The viewers' attention is inevitably attracted by the superimposed titles on screen which are offered as cues that may help uncover solutions to problems. Much in the same way as translators are involved in finding translation strategies, viewers are trained to become more in tune to the outcomes of their intuition. As a specific task to be accomplished, authorial titling enables intuition processing to be activated in a shared space of affinity between Sherlock and the viewers who are able to understand the detective's deductive reasoning with the help of subtitles projecting his actions and mental processes. From this perspective, experimental and authorial titling promote what Grillo and Kawin call "parataxic reading experiences" (1981). Viewers appear to be experiencing the whole film in an "additive way, by combining the various elements consciously" (Naficy 2004: 147). Images, dialogues, titles and subtitles do interact sending us signals regarding Sherlock's mind and how we should read it.

This contact between visual and verbal signs can also be explained with the term "mindscreen" first used by Bruce Kawin who defined it as "belong[ing] to, or manifest[ing] the workings of specific minds" (1978: 12). When Sherlock experiences his moments of deduction, the viewer is presented with mental images of his cogitating mind. Such a cinematic way of rendering the character's thoughts is a paramount example of how media can interact in order to train the viewer's mind to activate intuition. The multimodality of BBC *Sherlock* appears to be the sole solution to follow Sherlock's intuition which is extremely quick and works in parallel with conscious analysis.

To conclude, Sherlock Holmes and Dr John Watson's adventures in 21st Century London is a thrilling, funny, fast-paced contemporary reimagining of the Arthur Conan Doyle classic. The universal and timeless appeal of Sherlock Holmes is mainly due to its sexy logic. It is only Holmes who ravishes our minds and remains a great marketing commodity and a timeless archetype, adaptable to any era. Despite his admission to be a "high-functioning sociopath" (Timecode 00: 57: 37), we are all "Sherlocked" by such a bewildering character whose genius challenges our way of interacting with the audio-visual medium. As attested to by Betsch and Glockner (2010: 290) intuition can be improved in multimodal situations stimulating our minds in decision-making as a vital component of individuals' effectiveness for resolving problems.

In BBC *Sherlock* both criminals and detectives are characterised by mental disorders which are often considered to be connected to creativity and genius. Their cognitive processes and their unusual behaviours are portrayed in such a multimodal way that the viewer is completely overwhelmed by Sherlock's unusual capacities trying hard to compete with the brilliance of his deductions. Cognition, multimodality and intuition are mixed together into an audio-visual product employing all the potentialities of visual, verbal, and acoustic media who appear to be cooperating in order to achieve immediacy of representation.

**Bibliography**

Barthes, R., "Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narratives", *Image-Music-Text*, trans. Stephen Heath, Glasgow, Fontana/Collins, 1977, pp. 79-124.

Betsch, T., and Glöckner, A., "Intuition in Judgment and Decision Making: Extensive Thinking Without Effort", *Psychological Inquiry: An International Journal for the Advancement of Psychological Theory*, 21, 2010, pp. 279-294.

Brondeel, H., "Teaching Subtitles Routines", *Meta*, 34, 1, pp. 26-33.

Burton, A. and Chibnall, S., *Historical Dictionary of British Cinema*, Plymouth, The Scarecrow Press, 2013.

Busse, K., and Stein, L. E., *Sherlock and Transmedia Fandom. Essays on the BBC Series*, McFarland, 2014.

Catford, J., *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1965.

Cerón, C., "Punctuating Subtitles: Typographical Conventions and Their Evolution", in Yves Gambier and Henrick Gottlied (eds), *(Multi)Media Translation: Concepts, Practices, and Research*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2001, pp. 173-177.

Dane, E., and Pratt, M., "Conceptualizing and Measuring Intuition: A Review of Recent Trends", *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 24, 2009, pp. 1-40.

Díaz Cintas J. and Remael, A., *Audiovisual Translation: Subtitling*, Abingdon, Routledge, 2007.

Doyle, A. C., *A Study in Scarlet & Other Sherlock Holmes Adventures*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2011.

Evans, J. St. B.T., "Intuition and Reasoning: A Dual-Process Perspective", *Psychological Inquiry: An International Journal for the Advancement of Psychological Theory*, 21, 2010, pp. 313-326.

Hammond, K. R., "Intuition, No!… Quasirationality, Yes!", Psychological Inquiry: An International Journal for the Advancement of Psychological Theory, 21, 2010, pp. 327-337.

Harrington, J. (a cura di), *Film And/As Literature*, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall Inc., 1977.

Kawin, B., *Mindscreen: Bergman, Godard, and First-Person Film*, Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 1978.

Kovačič, I., "Subtitling Strategies: A Flexible Hierarchy of Priorities", in C. Heiss and R. M. Bollettieri-Bosinelli (a cura di), *Traduzione Multimediale per il Cinema, la Televisione, e la Scena*, Forlí, Biblioteca della Scuola Superiore di Lingue Moderne per Interpreti e Traduttori, 1996, pp. 297-305.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M., *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2008.

McClellan, A. K., *Sherlock's World. Fan Fiction and the Reimagining of BBC's* Sherlock, Iowa City, University of Iowa Press, 2018.

Moffat, S., and Gatiss, M., "A Study in Pink", BBC *Sherlock*, 2010.

Myers, D. G., "Intuition's Powers and Perils", Psychological Inquiry: An International Journal for the Advancement of Psychological Theory, 21, 2010, pp. 371-377.

Naficy, H., "Epistolarity and Textuality in Accented Films", in Atom Egouan and Ian Balfours (eds), *Subtitles. On the Foreignness of Film*, Cambridge, MA and London, The MIT Press, 2004, pp. 131-151.

O'Sullivan, C., *Translating Popular Film*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Pérez-González, L., "Co-Creational Subtitling in the Digital Media: Transformative and Authorial Practices", *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 16, 2013, pp. 3-21.

Poore, B., Sherlock Holmes from Screen to Stage. Post-Millennial Adaptations in British Theatre, London, Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.

Robinson, D., *Becoming a Translator*, London, Routledge, 1997.

Robinson, D., *The Translator's Turn*, Baltimore, John Hopkins University Press, 1991.

Stöckl, H., "In Between Modes: Language and Image in Printed Media", in Eija Ventola, Cassily Charles and Martin Kaltenbacher (eds), *Perspectives on Multimodality*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2004, pp. 9-30.

Stockwell, P., *Cognitive Poetics. An Introduction*, London and New York, Routledge, 2002.

Sutcliffe, Th., "The Weekend's TV: Sherlock, Sun, BBC1 Amish: World's Squarest Teenagers, Sun, Channel 4" (http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/tv/reviews/the-weekends-tv-sherlock-sun-bbc1amish-worlds-squarest-teenagers-sun-channel-4-2035302.html), in *The Independent* (July 25, 2010).

Tribes, S., "The Adventures of a Legendary Detective", *Sherlock Chronicles*, London, Penguin, 2014, pp. 8-37.

Vanoye, F., "Conversations publiques", *Iris*, 31, 1985, pp. 99-118.

Wagner, G., *The Novel and the Cinema*, Rutherford (NJ), Farleigh Dickinson University Press, 1975.