ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИЙ ВЕСТНИК

Межвузовский сборник научных трудов

Выпуск 11

«**Лингвистический Вестник**» предлагает рассмотрение широкого спектра проблем языковых и функциональных аспектов на уровнях лексики, грамматики и текста. На материале разных языков, типов языковых единиц и текстовых жанров авторы выделяют и описывают закономерности и своеобразие речевых построений. Общий прагматический ракурс обеспечивает единую методологическую базу всем представленным исследованиям.

«**Лингвистический Вестник**» предназначен для специалистов-филологов, студентов-лингвистов и всех, кого интересуют проблемы прагматики текста.

СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

ON STYLISTIC VARIATION

ABSTRACT

The article considers the manifestation of the category of stylistic variability as a prerequisite for genre transformation within English publicistic texts.

KEY WORDS: stylistic variability, functional style, publicistic style, functional stylistic and genre differentiation/ integration.

Elena Y. Petrova

Candidate of Science (Psycholinguistics), associate professor,
National Research University – Higher School of Economics
Moscow, Russian Federation

ANALYSING THE WAYS TO TRANSLATE INTERTEXTUAL ELEMENTS IN FILMS: CASE STUDY OF SERIES "SUITS"

ABSTRACT

The paper looks at the way intertextual elements in films are translated. First, the paper looks at the way the concept *intertext* is interpreted in linguistics, dwells on the reasons why intertextual elements are used and elaborates on two approaches to their translation. Second, the paper describes the research which involves scripts for the series *Suits* (seasons 1 and 2). The author singles out intertextual elements in scripts, analyses their translations, identifies the translation strategy and discusses possible reasons for choosing the strategy and offers recommendations how to improve the translation.

KEY WORDS: intertext, intertextual element, translation strategy, source culture, culture-bound, target culture.

The paper looks at the way intertextual elements in films are translated. The significance of the research is explained by the fact that despite intertextuality being a popular topic, there is still no common strategy how to handle intertextual fragments when it comes to translating them into another language. This task becomes even more difficult when movie scripts are analyzed due to the challenge of dubbing the original with the translation within the same length of time. Also, ever globalizing world calls for a dialogue of cultures which would be impossible without the awareness and understanding of other cultures and, in particular, identifying intertextual elements that originated in other cultures.

Intertext and Intertextuality

The concept of *intertextuality* is a multi-faceted one and that is why there are multiple interpretations of this phenomenon as it is challenging to define something of the kind. So far, a scholar usually chooses the definition that suits his/her scientific purposes and which is within his/her scientific framework.

The wide interpretation suggests that intertextuality is a universal feature of any text and the text in its turn encompasses all semantic systems and socio-cultural codes and appears to be a limitless intertext (M. Bakhtin, J. Kristeva, R. Barthes, etc.).

The term itself was introduced in 1967 by the scholar Julia Kristeva but the origins of the concept can be traced back to Mikhail Bakhtin's theory on the dialogue of texts: all texts are *communicating* not only with the fictional and actual reality but also with the author, the reader and the past and today's process of writing [Бахтин 1975]. J. Kristeva summarized the ideas of understanding the global literature (and culture) as a universal intertext, the parts of which are constantly interacting with each other: "The word (text) is a crossword of words (texts) where one reads at least one other word (text). Any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations, the whole text is absorption and transformation of another text" [Kristeva 1969:84-85].

Intertextuality is a concept promoted mostly by foreign scientists. In Russia a similar scientific framework refers to precedential texts, images, people and events. Y.N. Karaulov was the first to define a precedential text as "essential culturewise and cognitionwise that has a suprapersonal character and can be reproduced and re-interpreted" [Karaulov 2010: 216].

A precedential text is related to a *strong* text (V.N.Toporov) that is culturally relevant for native speakers and to a *text of influence* (N.A.Kuz'mina) that resonates with the reader and creates new metatexts [Kazak, Makhova 2011:178].

There are two main sources of *strong* texts: 1) a *classical* well-known fund of myths and legends, fairy tales, the Bible, folklore, fiction and 2) media discourse that includes quotes from various TV shows, movies and series, advertising slogans, jokes, names of famous people, high-profile events. These ones have a short life and would fall out of use unless they are reproduced in the media, thus, acquiring the status of a precedential text.

Reasons for Integrating Intertextual Elements

The reasons why authors introduce intertextual elements in their work depend on the types of intertextuality.

Intertextuality can be divided into three types: obligatory, optional and accidental [Fitzsimmons 2013].

Obligatory intertextuality assumes that the author intentionally suggests a link between two or more texts. Intertextual elements incorporate the whole text into a certain

cultural domain and usually lead to a more complicated meaning structure of the text. The ability to see intertextual elements and to interpret them in the right way can be regarded as an indicator of this reader's belonging to a certain group, a tool to distinguish 'us' from 'them'. And, as the name suggests, the ability described above is essential: without grasping the link the reader cannot understand the text fully.

Then, by analyzing the types of intertextual elements in movie's/book's characters' sayings, one can work out this character's lingual profile and reconstruct his/her image. Thus, intertextual elements are clues to the character's personality.

The author may assist the reader with the task of recognizing the source text by providing references. This is especially vital in academic discourse. If the reference is not given, this is called plagiarism. But it should not be confused with intertextuality. Plagiarism means borrowing somebody else's ideas and presenting them as your own (commonly referred to as *stealing*) while intertextuality is a more complex phenomenon: it suggests using small portions of somebody else's works to create new ideas of your own. Sometimes the meaning of the part borrowed can be changed because it is placed in a different context [Jabri 2004].

Optional intertextuality puts a less crucial emphasis on the importance of the source text. The reason why the author introduces optional intertextuality is either to pay homage to the writer of the source text or to reward those who have *grasped the link*. It is possible that if intertextual relationship is recognized it may slightly alter the comprehension of the text [Fitzsimmons 2013] but it is not essential and identifying the source text is not necessary for the understanding of the target text.

Accidental intertextuality can be defined by paraphrasing the saying: "Intertextuality is in the eyes of the beholder". It happens when readers connect the target text with other texts without there being any tangible evidence for that in the text [Fitzsimmons 2013]. The author did not intend to connect the two (or more) texts and it is entirely due to the reader's speculations that these two (or more) texts are linked.

Types of Intertextual Elements

Due to various interpretations of the term *intertext*, there is no unified classification of intertextual elements. But the existing classifications show considerable overlap among themselves, thus, there is a possibility to create a classification that features those intertextual elements which are singled out by all or most researchers.

A *quotation* is a word-for-word citation of the original text. The author or the source of the quotation is usually indicated and the quotation itself is used with inverted commas. Sometimes these elements can be omitted (the author/source and inverted commas) as it is believed that the recipient knows its author/source. Word-for-word quotations are used to support and to strengthen the point of view promoted in the written piece of work.

An *allusion* is a stylistic device that points or hints at a certain fact/event/person/character from books, myths, history or politics. Allusion not only refers to the original text but also triggers certain emotions, associations and memories. Periphrasis is also included into this category. In this case periphrasis does not mean substituting words with their descriptions or synonyms. It means replacing some elements of the saying with your own but keeping its structure recognizable.

An *aphorism* is a said or written laconic statement. Then people repeat it many times in various situations to convey the meaning it implies. It usually contains five-six words. It comes into being in academic, fiction or philosophical discourse as well as in everyday situations. This category may also include popular phrases from the same sources – books, movies, art – as they have the same origin and functions.

A *reminiscence* is an element that refers to a certain work. It suggests using the same structure, parts or motives of works of art on the same topic that are known to the recipient. It makes the recipient remember the work of art with the same theme and organization that triggered associations. For example, in the "Three Days of the Condor" movie, when explaining the CIA's stance, Higgins talks about consumers' interests who want to have oil at any cost regardless of international agreements. This speech can be considered to be a reminiscence of Dostoevsky's Grand Inquisitor's monologue.

A *parody* is a work mocking another one. The comic effect is created due to replication of the work's unique features in an exaggerated way that may eventually look absurd. Another way of interpreting this term is to treat it as a poor imitation of something or somebody. Some researchers include periphrasis in this category because after paraphrasing the original message is modified intentionally or unintentionally that results in a parody though without any design to mock the original.

Two Theories on How to Translate Intertextual Elements in Movies

Many scholars look at a movie in terms of culture. For example, A.A.Castañeda Díaz defines a movie as a cultural element that is perceived through senses and it is a system of

meanings that reflect specific ways of perceiving and defining the reality [Castañeda Díaz 2008]. And that is why a movie is always a cultural phenomenon that defines, enhances and transforms the viewer's outlook. We share the author's idea that films contain a secret meaning that is understandable only to the people of the country where the film was made. It complicates the interpreter's job. There are two ways how to handle the translation of foreign movies: 1) foreignization – to keep the national character, not to adapt it to the target culture and keep the translation close to the original (Source Language oriented, in Jan Pedersen's terms), or 2) quite the opposite, domestication – to adapt it to the target culture, lose the connection with the original for the sake of making it comprehensible for the target culture (Target Language oriented) but in this case the movie may turn out to look artificial and synthetic.

A movie can be dubbed, it can be provided with off-screen translation or subtitles. We will be discussing the challenges of creating a dubbed version of a movie. Translation for dubbing is most demanding as the primary function of the translation is to be synchronized with the video and sound sequence and at the same time it must be true to the original. There is little or no space and time for cultural adaptation. Thus, translation for dubbing aims at conveying the meaning of a phrase and transforming it in such a way that it matches the actor's articulation and lasts the same amount of time as the original phrase.

Some scholars [Snetkova 2008; Shveitser 2009; Schreiber 2007] believe that intertextual elements are often culture-bound and in movies they are usually of peripheral character while the interpreter's goal is to convey the whole rather than particular parts of the movie. Besides, introducing explanation of or commentary on culture-bound elements is almost impossible because of the reasons described above. Therefore, a translator is limited in his/her choice of translation strategies. These scholars suggest that a culture-bound element must be substituted with a similar element that is well-known in the target culture as culture-bound elements are usually beyond the scope of background knowledge of target culture individuals and, thus, can be perceived as alien. A viewer/reader relies on his/her background knowledge when watching a movie / reading a book. Without recognizing culture-bound elements, there will be no complete comprehension. Thus, adapting culture-bound elements is crucial. Hence, domestication. It may come in two forms: 1) uniformization and 2) hybridization. Uniformization constitutes substituting culture-bound elements with neutral, universal and generally comprehensible ones, sometimes with those

that have a rather broad meaning while hybridization suggests using elements specific to other cultures [Fedorova 2009].

But at the same time any text exists within the framework of the reality, time and culture it was created in, it is not isolated on its own. Besides, we do not have a complete image of the viewer: he/she is characterized as belonging to various social strata and nationality because cinema products are distributed all over the world. And that begs the question that their background knowledge can also be different. Due to globalization it is easier to communicate across cultures, cultural exchange is our present which leads to cultural awareness growing. And success of cultural exchange increasingly depends on conveying cultural differences shown in movies rather than neutralizing them through adaptation. Thus, foreignization is preferred.

Foreignization or Source Language oriented strategies come in two forms.

The first is transcribing. Transcribing means reproducing the word in the target language in the form as it is pronounced. It is a common strategy for proper nouns, especially names, and neologisms.

The second is replication or direct translation: word-for-word translation of a collocation or a phrase. "The semantic load (of the collocation or the phrase) is unchanged: nothing is added or subtracted. There is no effort to transfer connotations or guide the target culture audience in any way" [Pedersen 2005:5].

As for domestication or Target Language oriented strategies, there are four of them.

The first one is transliteration which suggests reproducing the spelling of the word in the target language.

The second one is adaptation or substitution. A culture-bound intertextual element is rendered either with the help of another Source Language culture-bound element but which is a better-known one in the target culture or with the help of a target language culture-bound intertextual element that should create similar associations to those that the original culture-bound element may generate. For example, in *The Big Bang Theory* Sheldon's phrase *I would need Green Lantern and the ring* can be translated in the following ways (the English versions of the translation are given – back translation): 1) *I would need the help of Gandalf* or 2) *I would need to call Ilya Murometz and Alesha Popovich for help*. In the first translation *Green Lantern and the ring* (a superhero with the ring that gives him power) is substituted with a fictional character which is widely known – Gandalf (a powerful wizard

from *The Lord of the Rings*) while in the second translation it is replaced by two heroes from Russian folk legends.

The next one is description or paraphrase. The intertextual element is removed and is changed for something that keeps the relevant connotations in place. This strategy is rarely used when translating films for dubbing as descriptions or paraphrase can be very cumbersome and differ in length with the original text.

The last one is omission. It can be a justifiable option or it can be chosen only because of laziness. In R.Leppihalme's words, "a translator may choose omission responsibly, after rejecting all alternative strategies, or irresponsibly, to save him/herself the trouble of looking up something s/he does not know" [Leppihalme 1994:93].

There is one more way of translating intertextual elements that does not fit this classification as it can be any of them. That is using the official equivalent. It means that the word or phrase you are about to translate has already been translated by a professional translator and this translation is accepted in the target culture.

Intertextual Elements in Series Suits (Seasons 1 and 2) and Ways to Translate Them

In Seasons 1 and 2 of the series *Suits* there were found 248 intertextual elements.

Intertext that is used most often in the first two seasons of the series is allusion. It accounts for 78% of all the examples that were found in the two seasons (194 cases). Then come quotations. The share of examples is 13.7% (34 cases). The least frequently used types that were singled out are parodies (7.7% / 19 cases) and an aphorism (0.6% / 1 case).

The difference between quotations and parodies in this case is that quotations are directly taken from the original source (a movie, a book, etc.) and parodies resemble the original quotations but with some deviations. Parodies mean imitations of the original text in any way, not necessarily to produce an ironic effect. For example, in Season 1 Episode 4 one of the main protagonists introduces himself in the following way:

– *What did you say your name was?*

– *Specter. Harvey Specter.*

This reminds us of James Bond's way of introducing himself, thus, creating certain associations (portraying Harvey Specter as a brilliant and charming professional).

Most intertextual elements in the series, as it was mentioned above, are allusions. In this case they are mostly names of characters from movies/books or actors who played them and titles of movies/books/TV-shows. That's why the ways in which allusions are translated

are transcribing/transliteration, replication, using equivalents, omission, description and adaptation.

Transcribing or transliteration was used for names (of characters or actors). For example, in Season 2 Episode 1 Mike Ross talks about and quotes *Goodfellas*:

– *Really? Why would she ask you to dinner just to fire you?*

– *I don't know. A little movie called Goodfellas. Did you see it?* **Joe Pesci** *thought he was getting made, he got dead.*

– *That's your idea of a legitimate reason?*

– *"Karen! Where's the money, Karen? "Karen?"* Hey, wait a minute. Do you think I might get an office out of this dinner?

When rendering the names into Russian, *Joe Pesci* is transcribed (the way it is pronounced: Джо Пеши [dʒɔ peʃɪ]) and *Karen* is transliterated (the way it is written: Карен [karen]).

For titles of movies/books/TV-shows, replication and using equivalents were applied. Transliteration and transcribing are also included into replication as these two ways replicate the form of a foreign word but in this study we look at them separately and by replication we understand a narrower concept: word-for-word translation of a certain phrase or word combination.

The difference between the replication and using the equivalent is that replication suggests word-for-word translation when an equivalent exists that may slightly differ from the original. For example, *Goodfellas* was translated word for word as *good fellows* (replication: *Хорошие парни / Khoroshie parni*), whereas there exists the official translation of this title as *nice fellows* (equivalent: *Славные парни / Slavnye parni*).

An example of using the equivalent when translating would be the way *Hail Mary* was rendered: the translators used the Latin version of *Hail Mary* – *Ave Maria* – transliterated into Russian (*Аве Мария / Ave Maria*).

Omission and adaptation are usually applied if the intertextual element is not known or not well-known to the receiving culture. If the intertextual element remains, then it may not produce the same associations as it would in the source country. Omission is the least preferable way of translation. But in this case, it is justifiable. For example, in Season 2 Episode 11:

– Let's get one thing clear. I'm not **Charlie Brown**, you're not **Lucy**, and that's not a **football**.

– *Давай-ка проясним кое-что. Мы с тобой не школьники. А это не переменка. / Davai-ka proyasnim koe-chto. My s toboi ne shkolniki. A etj ne peremenka.*

Charlie Brown and *Lucy* are cartoon characters that are not known in Russia. Omission is a reasonable choice. The translator opted for conveying the meaning: *Мы с тобой не школьники (My s toboi ne shkolniki)* means *We are not schoolchildren (that are here to play with a football)*.

Adaptation is the most challenging way of translating. It suggests that the translator finds a realia/character/person/book/movie in the target culture that generates similar associations as the intertextual element. For example, in Season 2 Episode 2:

– *Everything became clear tonight. Okay? I was out with Rachel, and, uh…*

– *Oh, gosh. Here it comes. The Days of Our Lives.*

– *Сегодня мне стало все понятно. Я был на свидании с Рейчел… / Segodnya mne stalo vse ponyatno. Ya byl na svidanii s Reichel…*

– *Ну вот, началось. Санта-Барбара. / Nu vot, nachalos'. Santa-Barbara.*

The TV-show *The Days of Our Lives* is less well-known in Russia than *Santa Barbara* which is similar to *The Days of Our Lives* genrewise, that's why the translator chose to substitute one with the other.

But one should be careful as adaptations should not look strange (these cases will be looked at when recommendations how to change the translations are discussed).

We found one example of description: explaining the intertextual element. This way of translation is rarely used when dubbing movies as the translator is constrained by the time the original excerpts last. For example, in Season 2 Episode 4:

– *Yes, Harvey. I saw the smoking gun in a multimillion-dollar liability claim and I hid it from you. I also know where Amelia Earhart's living and I have **the missing from the Watergate tapes**.*

– *Да, Харви. Я увидела явную улику в мультимиллионном иске и скрыла ее от тебя. А еще я знаю, где живет Амелия Эрхарт, и **пропавшие 18 минут из уотергейтских кассет** тоже у меня. / Da, Harvi. Ya uvidela yavnuyu uliku v multimillionnom iske i skryla eye ot tebya. A etshe ya znayu, gde zhivet Amelia Eckhart, i **propavshie 18 minut is uotergeitskikh kasset** tozhe u menya.*

The translator explains what is meant by 'the missing from the Watergate tapes': the 18 minutes that are missing from the Watergate tapes.

Statistically, the ways of translation of allusions are ranked as follows: 1) using the equivalent (76 out of 194 cases: 39.2%); 2) transcribing (54 out of 194 cases; 27.8%); 3) transliteration (46 out of 194 cases: 23.7%) and 4) adaptation (8 out of 194 cases: 4.1%); 5) omission (6 out of 194 cases; 3.1%); 6) replication (3 out of 194 cases: 1.6%) and 7) description (1 out of 194 cases; 0.5%).

The second ranked intertextual elements are quotations (34 cases). When translating them, three ways were used: using the equivalent, replication and omission. Omission occurred only once (a quote from *Philadelphia* in Season 1 Episode 12). The sentence in bold is missing in the translation.

– *What is that Denzel movie? **"Tell it to me like I'm a five-year-old"**.*
Sometimes, the good guys gotta do bad things to make the bad guys pay.

– *Как там говорится в том фильме с Дензелом? Иногда хорошие парни делают плохие вещи, чтобы плохие парни получили по заслугам. / Kak tam govotitsya v tom filme s Denzelom? Inogda khoroshie parni delayut plokhie vetshi, chtoby plokhie parni poluchili po zaslugam.*

Replication happened when the translators did not know or did not look for the already existing official translation of the quote. These cases account for 38%. Replication cases were found mostly in Season 1 (7 out of 8). For example, a quote from *Mississippi Burning* in Season 1 Episode 12:

– *Looks like the rattlesnakes are starting to commit suicide.*

– *Похоже, гремучие змеи уже готовы покончить с собой.*

The existing translation of this phrase is

– *Видимо, змеи на юге уже готовы себя покусать. / Vidimo, zmeii na yuge gotovy sebya pokusat'.*

Using the equivalent was the predominant feature in Season 2. Sometimes translators even took the context into consideration. For example, a quote from *Star Trek* in Season 1 Episode 7:

– *Hey, Captain Kirk is the man, okay? I don't wanna hear another word about it. Now, enough with your fake law problem. Let's deal with my real one.*

– *Ауе, ауе, Captain.*

and in Season 2 Episode 5:

– Ms. Paulsen, I understand that your time is valuable. But I'm here to prepare you. And to a jury, sarcasm plays as obstructive. Obviously, any further mention of Star Trek, may just compound the problem, okay?

*– **Aye, Captain**.*

In both cases the characters used the same phrase but it can be translated in two ways into Russian. In the first case, it is a response to the order, thus, it is rendered as *Есть, капитан / Est' kapitan* (roughly meaning *Yes, captain*). In the second case, it is an acknowledgement of having understood what has been said. Hence, the translation *Так точно, капитан / Tak tochno, kapitan* (roughly meaning *Understood, captain*).

The next intertextual elements that were used in the series are parodies. The only way of translating them was using equivalents (19 cases). We treat them as equivalents as the deviation from the original was minor and translation featured the official version with the changes included. For example, in Season 2 Episode 4:

*– **Looking good, Louis**. You're supposed to say, **"Feeling good, Billy Ray."***

You know, Trading Places. Movie quotes. It's what we do.

*– **Хорошо выглядишь, Луис**. А вы должны сказать «**И чувствую себя хорошо, Билли Рей**». Фильм «Поменяться местами». Цитаты. Так мы делаем. / **Khorosho vyglyadesh', Luis**. A vy dolzhny skazat' "**I chusctvuyu sebya khorosho, Billi Rey**". Film "Pomenyat'sya mestami". Tsytaty. Tak my delaem.*

(In the original: *Looking good, Billy Ray. – Feeling good, Louis* (the location of the names was changed)).

One example of a parody could fall into the category of aphorisms but for the changed structure. The popular expression in Season 1 Episode 12 was rendered with its equivalent:

– It's time to start painting outside the lines.

– How?

*– **If Mohammed won't come to the mountain, we need to bring the mountain to Mohammed**.*

*– Really? **The mountain to Mohammed**…*

– Пора слегка выйти за рамки. / Pora slegka vyiti za ramki.

– Как? / Kak?

*– **Если Магомед не идет к горе, то нужно привести гору к Магомеду. / Esli Magomed ne idet k gore, to nuzhno privesti goru k Magomedu**.*

– Правда? Гору к Магомеду… / Pravda? Goru k Magomedu…

There was only one aphorism found: a set-expression. The set-expression *sticks and carrots* in Season 2 Episode 2 was translated with the Russian version of it – *кнут и пряник / knut i pryanik* (*whip* and *gingerbread*). Thus, adaptation was used.

After analyzing the translations of intertextual elements in the series *Suits* (seasons 1 and 2), we have developed a set of recommendations for interpreters. The numbers in brackets indicate in how many cases analyzed this recommendation could be applied.

1. Apply adaptation when the realia are not known in the receiving culture (9 cases; 4%).

For example, in Season 1 Episode 11:

– You are working together.

*– Like **Captain & Tennille**? Well, if so, he's **Tennille**.*

– Вы работаете вместе. / Vy rabotaete vmeste.

*– Как **Капитан и Тэннил**? Если так, то он, чур, **Тэннил**. / Kak **Kapitan i Tennil**? Esli tak, to on, chur, **Tennil**.*

The translators used the original intertext. But the musical duo of Daryl Dragon and Toni Tennille is not known in Russia, thus, the meaning the authors wanted to convey is lost. One may try to find a similar duo in the source culture that will be familiar to the target culture. For example, the duo of John Lennon and Yoko Ono:

– Вы будете работать сообща. / Vy budete tabotat' soobtsha.

*– Как **Джон Леннон и Йоко Оно**? Ну, если так, то он, чур, **Йоко**. / Kak **John Lennon i Yoko Ono**? Nu, esli tak, to on, chur, **Yoko**.*

The challenge with adaptation is that one must not overdo it. If translators use names and realia of the target culture, it looks strange as it creates cognitive dissonance. For example, in Season 1 Episode 5:

– What do you get to say about that, counselor?

*– I say **Atticus Finch** makes a good speech here, but this is a fender-bender, not a multimillion-dollar lawsuit.*

– Что скажете, советник? / Chto skazhete sovetnik?

– *Несомненно, трогательная речь, но какая связь между мелким происшествием на дороге и мультимиллионным иском? / Nesomnenno, trogatel'naya rech', no kakaya svyaz' mezhdu melkim proisshestviem na doroge i multimillionnym iskom?*

The translators dropped the intertext and substituted it with an adjective that conveys the meaning intended by the authors: *трогательная (речь)* (stirring speech). The name of the lawyer from *To Kill The Mocking Bird* was used to create associations with someone who pronounces long and solemn speeches. Thus, a recommendation was made to change his name for a character that would be known for the same reasons: Bazarov from Turgenev's *Fathers and Children*. But in this case a question arises: How did a character from the Russian literature find his way into the American series?

– *Что вы можете сказать по этому поводу, советник? / Chto vy mozhete skazhet' po etomu povodu, sovetnik?*

– *Я могу сказать, что эта была воистину **Базаровская** речь, однако это лишь мелкое ДТП, а не дело, достойное многомиллионной компенсации. / Ya mogu skazat', chto eta byla voistinu **Bazarovskaya** tech', odnako eto lish' melkoye DTP, a ne delo, dostoynoye mnogomillionnoi kompensatsii.*

2. Be more accurate with realia (1 case; 0.4%).

For example, in Season 1 Episode 2:

– *Wow, they're like **stormtroopers**.*

– ***Stormtroopers** don't write checks.*

– *Они похожи на **штурмовиков**. / Oni pokhozhy na **shturmovikov**.*

– ***Штурмовики** не выписывают чеков. / **Shturmoviki** ne vypisyvayut chekov.*

The translators used replication of the intertext: *штурмовики / shturmoviki*. If left, as it is in Russian, it may mislead the viewer as *штурмовики / shturmoviki* means either a soldier from a quick-strike unit or an attack plane. In this example, the reference is made to *Star Wars'* storm troopers and they are known in Russia as *имперские штурмовики / imperskiye shturmoviki* (Empire's storm troopers). Thus, an adjustment should be made in the translation:

– *Вау, они похожи на **имперских штурмовиков**. / Vau, oni pokhozhy na **imperskikh shturmovikov**.*

– ***Имперские штурмовики** не выписывают чеков. / **Imperskiye shturmoviki** ne vypisyvayut chekov.*

3. Use the existing translation of the quote (12 cases; 5.4%).

For example, in Season 1 Episode 6:

– *And unlike some people I know, Louis's references don't begin and end with **Top Gun**.*

– *Hey, I love Louis, and I don't care what you say, **I am not leaving my wingman**. See, that's funny, because that's from Top Gun.*

– *He's a **wild card**. Flies by the seat of his pants. Think I can't quote Top gun. **Get the hell out of here**.*

– *Oh, that was good.*

– *И в отличие от некоторых цитаты Луиса не сводятся к **Топ Ган**. / I v otlichie ot nekotorykh tsytaty Luisa ne svodyatsya k **Top Gun**.*

– *Я нежно люблю Луиса, и мне всё равно, что ты говоришь, **я не брошу своего ведомого**. Это смешно, потому что это тоже из Топ Гана. / Ya nezhno lyublyu Luisa, i mne vse ravno, chto ty govorish', **ya ne broshu svoego vedomogo**. Eto smeshno, potomu chto eto tozhe iz Top Gun.*

– ***Он летает, как ему подсказывает его задница.** Думаешь, я не могу цитировать Топ Ган? **Иди отсюда.** / **On letayet. Kak emu podskazyvaet ego zadnitsa.** Dumaesh', ya ne mogu tsitirovat' Top Gun? **Idi otsyuda.***

– *Это было здорово. / Eto bylo zdorovo.*

The translators replicated the sentences. It is advised to consult the official translation of this movie (*Top Gun*). Then, the translation of this excerpt would look like this:

– *И в отличие от некоторых моих знакомых, отсылки Луиса не начинаются и не заканчиваются цитатами из **«Лучшего стрелка»**. / I v otlichiye ot nekotorykh moikh znakomykh, otsylki Luisa ne nachinayutsya i ne zakanchivayutsya tsytatami iz "**L'uchshego strelka**".*

– *Эй, я обожаю Луиса. Что бы ты ни говорила, **я не брошу своего напарника**. Видишь? Забавно. А всё потому, что это тоже из «Лучшего стрелка». / Ei, ya obozhayu Luisa. Chto by ty ni govorila, **ya ne broshu svoego naparnika**. Vidish'? Zabavno. A vse potomu, chto eto tozhe iz "L'uchshego strelka".*

– ***Он дикая лошадка. Действует по наитию.** Думает, я не могу цитировать «Лучшего стрелка». **Давай, проваливай отсюда.** / **On dikaya loshadka. Deistvuyet po naitiyu.** Dumaet, ya ne mogu tsitirovat' "L'uchshego strelka". **Davai probalivai otsyuda.***

– А вот это было неплохо. / A vot eto bylo neplokho.

Conclusion

Intertextuality is more than just inserting another author's text into your own. The intertext produces a synergetic effect as, if properly deciphered, it helps to understand the author's message and adds new meanings to the original one as well as evokes certain images and associations that enrich the meaning structure of the whole text.

When rendering intertextual elements into another language, an interpreter faces a dilemma: to preserve the cultural uniqueness of the text (foreignization) or to adapt it to the target culture (domestication). The decision may depend on the degree of familiarity of the culture-bound elements: the less known they are outside the source culture, the more likely the interpreter will opt for domestication as the target reader / viewer will not understand the reference if the culture-bound element is kept unchanged. The choice of translation strategies may also depend on the type of intertextual element. For examples, foreign names are most often transcribed or transliterated unless they are 'speaking' names (then, other translation strategies can be applied). Adaptation as one of domestication strategies should be used cautiously as its result may be perceived as artificial and alien and may be resisted despite the fact that the meaning has been made clearer because of it.

Analyzing the ways intertextual elements in the first two seasons of the series *Suits* were translated exemplified these conclusions.

References

1. Bakhtin M. Voprosy literatury i estetiki / M. Bakhtin. – M.: Khudozhestvennaya literature, 1975.
2. Kazak M.Yu., Makhova A.A. Mediatexty v aspect teorii intertextual'nosti I pretsedentnosti / M.Yu. Kazak, A.A. Makhova // Nauchnye vedomosti BelGU. Seria: Gumanitarnye nauki, 24.95, 2011. – S. 175-182.
3. Karaulov Yu.N. Russkiyi yazyk i yazykovaya lichnost' [Text] / Yu.N. Karaulov. – M.: Komkniga, 2011.
4. Snetkova M.S. Lingvostilisticheskiye aspekty perevoda ispanskikh kinotextov (na materiale russkikh perevodov khudozhestvennykh filmov L. Bunyuelya "Viridiana" i P. Al'modovora "Zhentchiny nag rani nervnogo sryva"). Avtoref. dis…. kand. filol. nauk. M., 2009. Dissertatsyonnyi sovet MGU im. M.V. Lomonosova. URL: http://www.philol.msu.ru/~ref/snetkova (access date 09.04.2018)
5. Fedotova I.K. Perevod kinotexta v svete kontseptsii kul'turnogo perenosa: problema perevodcheskoy adaptatsii / I.K. Fedorova // Vestnik ChelGU, 2009. - №43 – S. 142-149.
6. Shveitser A.D. Teoriya perevoda: Status, problem, aspekty / A.D. Shveitser. – V.: Librokom, 2009.
7. Castañeda Díaz A.A. Le temps comme dimension de l'univers cinématographique (A propos du temps et de l'espace créatifs dans le cinégramme) / A.A.Castañeda Díaz //

Langage, Temps et Temporalité : Actes du 29-e Colloque d'Albi Langages et Signification, 2008. – P. 117-129.
8. Fitzsimmons, J. Romantic and contemporary poetry. Retrieved from CQUniversity e-courses, LITR 19049 – Romantic and Contemporary Poetry, 2013. URL: http://moodle.cqu.edu.au (access date 09.04.2018)
9. Jabri M. Change as Shifting Identities: A Dialogic Perspective / M.Jabri // Journal of Organizational Change Management, Vol. 17. Iss: 6. 2004.
10. Kristeva J. Semeiotike: recherches pour une sémanalyse / J.Kristeva. – Paris: Seuil, 1969.
11. Leppihalme R. Culture Bumps: On the Translation of Allusions. / R.Leppihalme. – Helsinki: University of Helsinki, English Department Studies 2, 1994.
12. Pedersen J. How is Culture Rendered in Subtitles?/ J.Pedersen // In Nauert, S (ed.) Challenges of Multidimensional Translation. Proceedings of the Marie Curie Euroconferences MuTra: Challenges of Multidimensional Translation – Saarbrücken 2–6 May, 2005. URL: http://www.euroconferences.info/proceedings/2005_Proceedings/ 2005_proceedings.html (access date 09.04.2018)
13. Schreiber M. Transfert culturel et procédés de traduction: l'exemple des réalia. / M. Schreiber // De la traduction et des transferts culturels, 2007. – P. 185-194.

Романченко Юлия Валентиновна
старший преподаватель, кандидат филологических наук
кафедра немецкого языка
Научно-исследовательский университет «Высшая школа экономики»
Москва, Российская Федерация

О ЖАНРОВОМ РАЗНООБРАЗИИ РЕЛИГИОЗНОГО ДИСКУРСА

Аннотация. Статья посвящена проблеме многожанровости религиозного дискурса. В ней раскрываются трудности, связанные с классификацией религиозных текстов, а также рассматривается традиционное понятие "Erbauung" и его место в религиозном дискурсе.
Ключевые слова: религиозный дискурс, религиозное чтение, календарь верующих.

Как известно, язык религии один из стилей и ранее привлекал внимание лингвистов, но становление когнитивно - дикурсивной парадигмы в лингвистике на рубеже XX - XXI века открыло новые перспективы для развития теории дискурса, его интерпретации, комплексного изучения различных типов дискурса. Это в свою очередь обусловило бурный интерес и к религиозному дискурсу, репрезентирующему религиозную картину мира человека, систему христианских ценностей, а также к его разновидностям. Язык религии в общетеоретическом аспекте изучали (Н.Мечковская, В.Адмони), в стилистическом аспекте как особый функциональный стиль (В.Аврорин, М.Крылова, Л.Крысин). Исследовались отдельные жанры, такие как: духовное послание (И.Ярмульская), молитва (И.Беленко, О.Прохватилова,