

UPGRADING FILM SUBTITLING TO THE LEVEL OF LITERARY

TRANSLATION

by

ALEXANDRA PALMER

A dissertation submitted to the
School of Humanities
of the University of Birmingham
in part fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Translation Studies

This dissertation consists of approximately 12,000 words

Supervisor: Andrea Mayr

Centre for English Language Studies
Department of English
University of Birmingham
Edgbaston, Birmingham B15 2TT
United Kingdom

September 2005

ABSTRACT

The choice of topic - film subtitling - was inspired by the present status of film translation as such. The inferiority of film translation (as opposed to literary translation) is obvious. Authors like Whitman-Linsen note 'the disdain of literary intelligentsia, who seem to dismiss film translating and the degree of difficulty involved in it as not worthy of their attention' (in Cintas, 2004: 51). There is a tendency, even among film subtitling practitioners, to view film subtitling as adaptation, not translation. It will be argued that excluding film subtitling from the domain of translation is not justified; and that the current attitude to film subtitling needs to be changed, so that film subtitling is upgraded to the level of literary translation. Hence, the primary objective of this dissertation is to show that this argument is based on a solid theoretical and practical foundation.

To achieve its objective, the dissertation comprises both theoretical and practical parts. The latter features the case study: the English-subtitled version of the Russian film 'Autumn marathon'. The critical analysis of the chosen subtitling product is conducted within the framework of interpersonal pragmatics. The dissertation yields theoretical and practical findings that apply to future research in the field and support the view of film subtitling as a branch of literary translation.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Contemporary role of translation/subtitling	1
1.2	‘Autumn marathon’: reasons behind the choice of the film	2
1.3	Scope of the present study	3
1.4	Analysis: brief overview of relevant terminology	4
1.5	Dissertation outline: brief description of chapters	6
CHAPTER 2	FILM SUBTITLING VS. LITERARY TRANSLATION	8
2.1	Similarities between film subtitling and literary translation	8
2.2	Differences between film subtitling and literary translation	10
2.3	Inferiority of film subtitling: possible explanations	12
CHAPTER 3	FILM SUBTITLING AS A BRANCH OF LITERARY TRANSLATION	15
3.1	The art of film subtitling: literary challenge of subtitling constraints	15
3.2	Film subtitling as a process/product of literary translation	17
3.3	Film subtitling: approach to critical analysis	18
CHAPTER 4	FILM SUBTITLING: CRITICAL ANALYSIS WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF INTERPERSONAL PRAGMATICS	20
4.1	Case study: the English-subtitled version of the Russian film ‘Autumn marathon’	20
4.2	Linguistic features encoding interpersonal pragmatics and their treatment in the subtitling of Episode 2	22
4.2.1	Lexis and its treatment in the subtitling	22
4.2.2	Repetitions and unfinished utterances and their treatment in the subtitling	25
4.2.3	Sentence form and its treatment in the subtitling	28

4.3	Relaying aspects of explicit interpersonal pragmatics in the subtitling of Episode 26	30
4.3.1	Relaying pragmatics of title and personal names in the subtitling	30
4.3.2	Relaying pragmatics of disagreement in the subtitling	31
4.3.3	Pragmatics of one original lexical choice - <i>притащить</i> (<i>drag oneself</i>) - forming basis for politeness strategy as a whole	32
4.3.4	Pragmatics of one subtitling lexical choice - <i>came (to see you)</i> - resulting in transformation of the original politeness strategy	34
4.3.5	Relaying contextual pragmatics in the subtitling	35
4.3.6	Relaying pragmatics of emphasis in the subtitling	36
4.4	Avoidable and unavoidable losses of pragmatic information in the course of subtitling (Episode 26)	38
4.5	Subtitling accuracy - the key to faithfully relaying pragmatics of the original (Episodes 2 and 26)	41
4.6	Comments on the overall quality of the chosen subtitling product	46
CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION		48
5.1	Summary of theoretical and practical findings	48
5.2	Strengths and weaknesses of the dissertation	49
5.3	Suggestions for future research	50
APPENDIX I		51
APPENDIX II Table 4.1		61
APPENDIX III		63
APPENDIX IV Table 4.4		70
Table 4.2		25
Table 4.3		33
Table 4.5		39
Table 4.6		42
Table 4.7		44
REFERENCES		72

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Contemporary role of translation/subtitling

In the preamble to The Translator's Charter (approved by Congress at Dubrovnik in 1963, and amended in Oslo on July 9, 1994) The International Federation of Translators notes that

'translation has established itself as a permanent, universal and necessary activity in the world of today; that by making intellectual and material exchanges possible among nations it enriches their life and contributes to a better understanding amongst men'.

The world of today becomes increasingly smaller: in the era of digitalization physical borders among nations are continually erased. Recent technological developments in such fields as film industry, mass media and communication are strong factors that - by creating a world's audience - contribute to this unification process. Translation in any of the mentioned fields - for instance, film industry - becomes particularly important, for it erases linguistic borders, once physical borders are erased; and, hence, truly unifies nations.

Subtitling - a specific translation mode - represents one of the main types of film translation (the remaining types are dubbing and voice-over). Choice of a particular type depends on various reasons (including financial) and tends to accommodate to changing circumstances, both linguistic and extralinguistic. Russia, for instance, with its strong tradition of dubbing currently favors voice-over, for the latter is a lot cheaper. Only selected films are dubbed. Once film translation is properly financed, dubbing would probably be revived. However, it might not enjoy its former exclusive status. It gradually becomes common for people in Russia to be familiar with foreign languages. Hence, a new category of Russian viewers - formed by those able and eager to appreciate the original language of a foreign film - is growing. For such viewers subtitling that traditionally has never been preferred in Russia might prove an optimal choice, for them

‘subtitling – as a means of overcoming linguistic barriers between the nations – will come to play a critical role’ (Karamitroglou, 1998: 1).

1.2 ‘Autumn marathon’: reasons behind the choice of the film

Traditions, however, resist changes and it is still next to impossible to find a Russian-subtitled film on the market. The inability of finding a film in English with Russian subtitles became the primary reason for the choice of the film - ‘Autumn marathon’ - to be analyzed in this dissertation. With subtitling as the subject of the analysis, English/Russian as the language pair, but no Russian subtitles available; the only option left was to analyze English subtitles for a Russian film. The choice fell on the English-subtitled version of the Russian film ‘Autumn marathon’ for the following reasons.

The quality - of both, the film itself and the subtitles for it - was the main reason (next to the primary reason discussed above) for choosing ‘Autumn marathon’. The film comes in a DVD format, the copyrighted DVD version produced by RUSCICO (Russian Cinema Council) - a well established commercial association of Russian and foreign companies. RUSCICO’s complex task comprises restoration, remastering, replication and world distribution of the best products of the Soviet/Russian cinema. ‘Autumn marathon’ directed by Georgy Danelia and released in 1979 is a beautifully crafted film. The quality of RUSCICO’s English subtitles for ‘Autumn marathon’ tends to meet the high standards set by the quality conscious association.

Finally, the decision to conduct the analysis in the framework of interpersonal pragmatics made ‘Autumn marathon’ a perfect choice. The simple plot is very rich pragmatically, for it is the complexity of personal relationships that is being explored in the film. Although the quality of the analyzed subtitles is generally high, there seems to be scope for improvement, especially in the sphere of rendering the film’s intended politeness strategies.

1.3 Scope of the present study

Audiovisual translation may be considered a new field of academic research. Cintas marks the last decade of the twentieth century as the turning point in the history of audiovisual translation, the beginning of its 'golden age' (Cintas, 2004: 56). Ivarsson's 'Subtitling for the Media' published in 1992 is referred to as 'the first book ever to deal exclusively with subtitling' (ibid.). Since the 1990s, however, audiovisual translation in general and subtitling in particular have been systematically researched.

The relatively short stretch of time of about fifteen years has indeed proved fruitful in terms of the number of books and academic papers on the subject. In addition, most of the proceedings of the numerous conferences - with a general emphasis on subtitling - have also been published. The following topics - to mention just a few - have been explored: linguistic aspect of subtitling and linguistic awareness of professionals working in the field, subtitling skills and professional training of subtitlers, commercial dimension of subtitling and promotion of production and distribution of subtitled products. (See, for instance, Hatim and Mason (1997), Williams and Thorne (2000), Cintas (2001), correspondingly.)

The European Association for Studies in Screen Translation (ESIST) - of which Cintas is currently president - since its creation in 1995 has been supporting both researchers and practitioners in the field by providing international contacts, information and expertise. Ivarsson - the author of the pioneering 'Subtitling for the Media' (1992) - is also on ESIST's Executive Board. The European association has been extending the sphere of its influence (beyond the limitations suggested by its name) acquiring a genuine world status. For instance, subtitling companies and broadcasters from all over the world were invited to and did participate in ESIST's project on subtitling practice in the year 2000. The collected data provide insight into various subtitling approaches in different language communities.

Despite all the achievements in the study of (film) subtitling, there is still a broad scope for academic research in this field. As Cintas notes

'Approaches to translation which have made a large impact on areas such as literary translation, are still yet to be applied to subtitling' (Cintas, 2004: 63).

In this respect in-depth studies of pragmatics and politeness with reference to subtitling may prove highly profitable. They would help emphasize the crucial role pragmatics and politeness play in creating and understanding the overall meaning conveyed by a film. By focusing on concrete examples, such studies would also provide possible solutions for minimizing losses of pragmatic meaning in the course of subtitling. It is hoped that this dissertation will constitute a modest contribution to this goal.

1.4 Analysis: brief overview of relevant terminology

'Pragmatics is the study of language in use. It is the study of meaning, not as generated by the linguistic system but as conveyed and manipulated by participants in a communicative situation' (Baker, 1992: 217).

The decision to conduct the analysis within the framework of interpersonal pragmatics was inspired by the existing tendency to economize on the latter in the course of film subtitling:

'one area of meaning which appeared consistently to be sacrificed in subtitling was that of interpersonal pragmatics' (Hatim and Mason, 1997: 79).

Sacrificing the whole area of meaning is bound to jeopardize the overall comprehension of the original. Hence, the importance of preserving the intended interpersonal pragmatics in film subtitling cannot be overestimated.

The analysis is focused on politeness, for that particular area of interpersonal pragmatics *'is almost inevitably underrepresented'* in film subtitling (ibid.). The term 'politeness'

'is intended to cover all aspects of language usage which serve to establish, maintain or modify interpersonal relationships between text producer and text receiver' (Hatim and Mason, 1997: 80).

The above is a succinct description of politeness in the sense explored in detail by Brown and Levinson (1987). Central to their study of the subject is the notion of 'face':

'the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself, consisting of two related aspects:

(a) negative face: the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction - i.e. to freedom of action and freedom from imposition

(b) positive face: the positive consistent self-image or 'personality' (crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants'

(Brown and Levinson, 1987: 61).

Finally, adult language users - who as a rule tend to protect their own 'face' and that of their interactants - would, however, sometimes perform linguistic actions that may threaten 'face'. Those actions are referred to as 'face-threatening acts' or FTAs. Defined by Brown and Levinson (1987) and again summarized by Hatim and Mason (1997), the following are the strategies available to speakers who confront a possibility of an FTA:

- 1. Don't carry out the FTA at all.*
- 2. Do carry out the FTA, but off-the-record, i.e. allowing for a certain ambiguity of intention (e.g. 'I'm desperately short of money. I wonder where I could get twenty pounds from.').*
- 3. Do the FTA on-record with redressive action (negative politeness). This will involve reassuring hearers that they are being respected by expressions of deference and formality, by hedging, maintaining distance, etc. (e.g. 'I hate to ask you this, but could you possibly lend me twenty pounds?').*

4. *Do the FTA on-record with redressive action (positive politeness). This will involve paying attention to hearers' positive face by, e.g. expressing agreement, sympathy or approval (e.g. 'We're old friends and I know I can rely on you. Please lend me twenty pounds.').*
 5. *Do the FTA on-record, without redressive action, baldly (e.g. 'Lend me twenty pounds.').*
- (Hatim and Mason, 1997: 80-81).

Various FTAs and politeness strategies are analyzed in Chapter 4 in which the overviewed above terminology - the core of the analysis - finds practical application when concrete examples are explored.

1.5 Dissertation outline: brief description of chapters

The following two chapters deal with predominantly theoretical issues. In Chapter 2 similarities and differences of film subtitling and literary translation are discussed. Possible explanations for the inferior status of film subtitling are proposed. In Chapter 3 subtitling constraints are viewed as literary challenging and, hence, are given a new dimension. It is then suggested that film subtitling should be analyzed as a process/product of literary translation. A possible approach to the critical analysis of film subtitling is considered.

In Chapter 4 the discussed theoretical issues are connected to the very practice of film subtitling. The English-subtitled version of the Russian film 'Autumn marathon' is critically analyzed within the framework of interpersonal pragmatics. The analysis is focused on the realization in the subtitling of the film's intended politeness strategies. Alternative translations are provided. A conclusion is then drawn about the overall quality of the chosen subtitling product.

In Chapter 5 the findings - both, theoretical and practical - are summarized. The validity of the proposition concerning 'the upgrade' of film subtitling is assessed. Strengths and weaknesses of the dissertation are discussed and suggestions for future research are made.

CHAPTER 2 FILM SUBTITLING VS. LITERARY TRANSLATION

2.1 Similarities between film subtitling and literary translation

Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary defines the noun of *subtitle* as:

1. a secondary or explanatory title;
2. a printed statement or fragment of dialogue appearing on the screen between the scenes of a silent motion picture or appearing as a translation at the bottom of the screen during the scenes of a motion picture or television show in a foreign language (1993: 1175).

The first definition is sometimes exploited to etymologically justify the inferiority of film subtitling as opposed to literary translation. Karamitroglou (2000: 10), for instance, cites Minchinton who says the following:

'sub-title is an old literary term for a subordinate or additional title of a literary work'.

However, it is indeed an old term: the date of the earliest recorded use in English of the first sense of *subtitle* is 1825. Back then it was the only sense possible, for motion pictures (much less television shows) had not yet become a fact of life. Language may change under the influence of technical developments: new terms or new senses of old terms may appear. It does not seem reasonable to rely exclusively on etymology, for the latter might limit or even distort the understanding of a new reality.

Hence, a more flexible approach to understanding film subtitling would be to view *subtitle* in its second sense. The definition - 'a printed statement or fragment of dialogue ... appearing as a *translation* at the bottom of the screen ...' - instantly brings together film subtitling and translation in the broad sense of the latter: 'a rendering from one language into another' (Merriam Webster's, 1993: 1254). The idea that film subtitling and translation represent the same linguistic phenomenon needs to be stressed, for there is a

tendency to exclude film subtitling from the domain of translation as such. Even film subtitling practitioners sometimes refer to their work as adaptation. With reference to subtitling foreign films, the new term - adaptation - seems superfluous and confusing. Film subtitling - a process that does involve 'rendering from one language into another' - is translation.

Hence, the basic similarity that paves the way for further similarities between film subtitling and literary translation is that both operate within the broad domain of translation in general. Consequently, both film subtitling and literary translation share the same basic aim:

'to reformulate a source language message in a given target language, avoiding at all costs any misunderstandings in the process' (Cintas, 2001: 199).

It appears that means of achieving this basic aim are also broadly similar in both, film subtitling and literary translation. Strategies used by professional translators - cultural substitution, omission and compensation, to mention a few - are equally applicable to translating (subtitling) films or fiction. Finally, general translation theory naturally accommodates subtitling along with literary translation, providing the framework for the study of both.

Notwithstanding the focus on the similarities between subtitling and literary translation in the current section of this dissertation, a major distinction between them - if existent - would have unavoidably revealed itself. Hence, it may be concluded that in basic, general and broad terms subtitling and literary translation are indeed similar. It would, however, be pointless to deny the specific features that pertain to film subtitling exclusively. Those features that distinguish film subtitling from literary translation are discussed in the next section.

2.2 Differences between film subtitling and literary translation

'The subtitler has to represent in the written mode what is spoken on the soundtrack of the film' (Hatim and Mason, 1997: 78).

This specific feature of film subtitling - dealing with mixed modes - that should instantly distinguish film subtitling from literary translation, could have been in principle mentioned alongside the similarities listed above (see 2.1), for

'Most audiovisual translations nowadays are performed with a written form of the original source text in hand (cf. Remael, 1995: 128), sometimes even without any further access to the film-product itself' (Karamitroglou, 2000: 11).

The reasons for and the consequences of this practice will be discussed in the next section. What is relevant here is that this practice does unite film subtitling and literary translation, for both ultimately operate with the same - written - mode of communication.

The following parameters are compiled into a list of specific constraints on subtitling (see Karamitroglou, 2000: 10):

- *spatiotemporal constraints;*
- *the accompanying visual source-culture elements;*
- *the accompanying aural source-language elements;*
- *the cross-semiotic nature of subtitling;*
- *the inability of backtracking (with the exception of video).*

However, only the first three of these parameters appear to pertain to subtitling solely: naturally, literary translation is neither influenced by visual/aural source elements, nor governed by any

'physical constraints of available space (generally up to 33, or in some cases 40 keyboard spaces per line; no more than two lines on screen) and the pace of the sound-track dialogue (titles may remain on the screen for a minimum of two and a maximum of seven seconds) (Hatim and Mason, 1997: 78).

Semiotics, on the other hand, is, or at least should be, an integral part of translation in general, literary translation included. Any semiotics-conscious translation deals with identifying semiotic signs of the original and correlating them with semiotic systems of the target culture. Furthermore, Hatim and Mason place cross-semiotics at the core of translation process redefining the latter as *'the process which transforms one semiotic entity into another'* (1990: 105). In other words, cross-semiotics - formally referred to as a constraint on the process of subtitling - may now be considered the essence of translation process as such.

Finally, listing inability of backtracking among subtitling constraints seems outdated. So is (or will be in the near future) the reference to video subtitling or video in general, for that matter. Video subtitling will probably linger for a while, but it will be - as it has been - constantly influenced, transformed and ultimately replaced by digital technology. In 1999 Karamitroglou marveled at the effects of digitalization employed in TV and video subtitling:

'The audiovisual translator/subtitler does not have to waste precious time while searching or replaying slowly and inaccurately the starting and finishing points of a source utterance using his video buttons; this can now be done with high precision and speed offered by the arrows of his computer keyboard' (Karamitroglou, 1999: 4).

Back then he fully acknowledged the importance and the inevitability of digitalization, but he would refrain from directly labeling it a new reality. Six years later digitalization is no longer a matter of the future; digitalization is without a doubt a new reality now. Video tapes are rapidly replaced by Digital Versatile Discs (DVDs) the very name of which -

versatile - suggests multiple options for viewers, professional and non-professional alike. With DVDs widespread and numerous subtitling software systems easily available, the inability of backtracking is no longer a problem for either subtitlers or recipients of subtitling/translation products. (Viewing a subtitled film at the cinema - where the actual inability of backtracking might still occasionally impose a constraint on processing information by the audience - should, however, be noted if only as an exception to the rule.)

Interestingly, it appears that the focus on the differences between film subtitling and literary translation reveals further similarities between them. The similarities prevail, and the specific subtitling constraints do not automatically account for the inferior status of film subtitling as opposed to literary translation. Moreover, those constraints (as it will be shown in Chapter 3) may be considered a literary challenge absent from literary translation and demanding equal if not higher expertise on behalf of the subtitler/translator. And yet, the inferiority of film subtitling is obvious. In the next section an attempt to trace the origin of the present - inferior - status of film subtitling is made.

2.3 Inferiority of film subtitling: possible explanations

The inferior status of film subtitling as opposed to literary translation may be regarded as yet another similarity between them, for

'translation has never really enjoyed the kind of recognition and respect that other professions such as medicine and engineering enjoy' (Baker, 1992: 2).

This *'low status accorded to translation as a profession'* (Baker) imparts inferiority to film subtitling and literary translation alike. Though complaining about the unjust treatment, the translation community itself tends to treat film subtitling in the same disrespectful fashion. The reasons for according the lower of the low status to film subtitling are, however, equally applicable to translation in general, literary translation included.

The most important factor that is indeed capable of undermining the professional authority of translation is poor quality of the end product. Poor quality of the end product is caused by poor quality of the original and/or poor professional skills of the translator resulting from poor professional training. Poor wages and absurd deadlines should not be overlooked, either, as important factors affecting the quality of the end product. As a matter of fact, Fawcett places poor wages and absurd deadlines at the top of the list, prior to such factors as poor originals and poor training of translators (in Cintas, 2001:199).

It is true that the quality of film subtitling is generally not high. However, the bookselling industry - like film industry - is also filled with poor quality translation products. Literary translation does not comprise canonized literature exclusively. The quality of the original piece of fiction may be as poor as the quality of the film to be translated/subtitled. Poor wages and absurd deadlines - pointed out by Fawcett (ibid.) with reference to subtitling - are characteristic of literary translation as well. Finally, professional training of translators is not given deserved credit, the tendency that results in poor professional skills of subtitlers and literary translators alike:

'The translation community itself is guilty of underestimating not so much the value as the complexity of the translation process and hence the need for formal professional training in the field' (Baker, 1992: 2).

The practice of subtitling a film without the actual access to the film itself (see 2.2) unquestionably affects the quality of the end product: film subtitling may not be complete without *'the special traits of audiovisual translation (picture-sound-text)'* all present (Karamitroglou, 2000: 34). The importance of the text component should not be underestimated. *'A dialogue list ... the compilation of the dialogue exchanges that materialize in the film'* (Cintas, 2001: 200) is an indispensable asset to the subtitler. According to Cintas, *'the provision of a good dialogue list makes the difference between a high quality product and an inferior one'*. However, even an ideal dialogue list, providing the subtitler (in addition to the film dialogue itself) with all relevant linguistic and extralinguistic information, should not serve as a substitute for picture and sound.

What is to be borne in mind here is *'the commercial dimension of the film industry, a factor sometimes neglected by scholars when commenting on the quality of the product'* (Cintas, 2001: 201). Preventing the subtitler from watching the film means preventing the circulation of the film before the commercial launching. Unless subtitlers acquire exclusive rights to watching non-released films, the situation is unlikely to change. As long as film subtitlers have to rely on the text component solely, their comprehension of the message will *a priori* be jeopardized. The described condition under which film subtitlers are forced to work does not, however, in any way impart inferiority to film subtitling as such.

It appears that there are no objective reasons for treating film subtitling as inferior to literary translation. It seems that the force propelling film subtitling into the inferior is the force of habit. If the habit of viewing subtitling as subordinate or additional to literary work is indeed what deprives film subtitling of recognition and respect, then all what is needed to raise the prestige of film subtitling is an unprejudiced attitude.

CHAPTER 3 FILM SUBTITLING AS A BRANCH OF LITERARY TRANSLATION

3.1 The art of film subtitling: literary challenge of subtitling constraints

*'The study of translation has been dominated, and to a degree still is, by the debate about its status as an **art** or a **science**'* (Bell, 1991: 4; emphasis in the original).

Bell - an advocate of the scientific approach - suggests that understanding translation as an art or a craft automatically rejects any attempts at translation theory as such. It does not, however, have to be the case. The *'supposed dichotomy'* (ibid.: 5) - if accepted as a fact - presents the natural solution to the debate. Both, the science and the art of translation, may indeed coexist without mutually excluding each other. The former governs translation theory, while the latter ranges from translator training - in the course of which the craft or skill of translation is acquired - to the elusive, but undoubtedly existent, artistic element that distinguishes between skilled and talented translators.

Nabokov in 'The Art of Translation' - one of his lectures on Russian literature - claims that to have talent for a translator is compulsory. Furthermore, Nabokov then raises talent to yet a higher level - that of genius - setting an almost impossible standard for the majority of translators to achieve. It has to be borne in mind that Nabokov refers to creating *'an ideal version of a foreign masterpiece'* (1981: 319) - an ideal and idealized translation experience. The reality of literary translation may be remote from the ideal, however, the artistry of literary translation is unquestionable. Real - as opposed to ideal - translators may never meet the ideal standards, but they should aspire to do so.

The same applies to film subtitlers, for if the art of translation - literary translation in particular - is acknowledged, then so is the art of film subtitling. James notes that

'trying to create a file of perfect subtitles is a neverending challenge' (2001: 151).

Subtitling constraints - as it was suggested earlier (see 2.2) - may also be viewed as a challenge presenting itself exclusively to film subtitlers and demanding from them no less talent or expertise than translation of fiction demands from literary translators. Although ‘expansion’ (see Berman, 2000: 288) or ‘explicitation’ (see Blum-Kulka, 2000: 300) might be inherent in translation in general, film subtitlers in particular have to be aware of this tendency. Spatiotemporal constraints of subtitling do not allow for any “‘empty’ expansion’ (Berman, 290) of the original:

‘With regard to the technical considerations imposed by the medium, the subtitler has to edit the content in such a way that the original meaning will remain intact, but will allow for comfortable reading by the audience’ (Williams and Thorne, 2000: 220; emphasis in the original).

In creating a condensed but faithful version of the original the visual and aural constraints of subtitling might in fact prove to be beneficial. It is still a challenge to coherently incorporate any visual/aural source culture/language elements into subtitling, to *‘match the subtitle to what is actually visible on screen’* (Hatim and Mason, 1997: 79). However, the ability of relying on picture and sound (provided subtitlers have that ability) in addition to text undoubtedly enriches the comprehension of the latter. Hence, the visual and aural constraints may be viewed not only as a challenge, but also as a unique advantage of film subtitling as opposed to literary translation.

This is not to suggest in any shape or form the inferiority of translating fiction, but to exercise the unprejudiced attitude to film subtitling that would make the latter worthy of attention in its own right. Subtitling a film is not the same as translating a novel, but it does not make either process inferior or superior to the other. Both should be treated as equally important and operating alongside on the same level - that of translation or more precisely literary translation. In other words, film subtitling should be considered a branch of literary translation.

3.2 Film subtitling as a process/product of literary translation

'The discursive cohesion and coherence, the numerous attempts at attaining the same impact as the original, the recreation of the different linguistic registers, the implementation of the compensation strategy, the absence of deficiencies or errors...' (Cintas, 2001: 207).

The above could apply to any high quality literary translation, but it happens to be the appraisal of the subtitles for a Woody Allen film. This once again stresses that film subtitling does qualify as a branch of literary translation. Consequently, film subtitling as a process/product may be viewed and analyzed as a process/product of literary translation. Karamitroglou notes that the notion of 'product' with reference to audiovisual translation is problematic (Karamitroglou, 2000: 72). Although the text of subtitles is the ultimate product of film subtitling, the textual and audiovisual film components are inseparable. Hence, it seems justified

'to consider as translation "product" not simply the transferred text, but the totality of the semiotic elements that are interwoven with this text, i.e. the whole audiovisual product as it is released in the target system' (ibid.: 73-74).

On the surface level this would mean matching film subtitles to what is actually seen and heard, on a deeper level - integrating what is seen and heard into film subtitles, formulating the written message that would incorporate the aural and visual information carried by a film. Bearing in mind the complexity of the task, it seems unfair to reduce the process of film subtitling to merely *'providing a target language guide to what is going on in the source text'* (Hatim and Mason, 1997: 82). It might be *'impossible for all the meaning values perceived in the source language soundtrack to be relayed'* (ibid.). However, the same impossibility is questionably true of any literary translation. Still, literary translators and film subtitlers alike should aspire to - be it possible or not - relay the original meaning in all its aspects or nuances.

3.3 Film subtitling: approach to critical analysis

'It is central to any study of language that the words we use and the way we organize them carry, or more technically encode, meanings' (Butt, 2000: 6; emphasis in the original).

Here, 'the words we use' may be understood as a reference to lexis and 'the way we organize them' - grammar. The borderline between lexis and grammar is by no means distinct, for they are in fact *'two ways of describing the same phenomenon, language'* (Willis, 1993: 83). However, for the purposes of analysis the crude division of language into lexis and grammar is acceptable. Lexis and grammar may be separated and explored in parallel to refine the overall meaning they create together.

Film subtitling should accurately relay the original meaning. Or, in other words, lexis and grammar of film subtitling should convey the same meaning encoded by lexis and grammar of the original. Hence, to assess the quality of film subtitling, lexical and grammatical choices made in the course of it may be critically analyzed in terms of whether or not they ensure rendering the original meaning accurately. The analysis may be carried out from different perspectives. One of the options is to look at how lexis and grammar of film subtitling realize the original interpersonal pragmatics, especially since the latter is the *'area of meaning which appeared consistently to be sacrificed in subtitling'* (Hatim and Mason, 1997: 79).

What lies at the root of this sacrifice is the subtitling tendency observed by Hatim and Mason (ibid.: 84) to consider rendering interpersonal pragmatics of the original to be secondary. Achieving coherence for film audience appears to be the *'overriding priority'* (ibid.) in the course of subtitling. However, it is unclear how *'easy readability and connectivity'* (ibid.) that are placed in the forefront of subtitling may indeed fulfill their task as sole means of ensuring coherence. Subtitling that is done at the expense of interpersonal pragmatics is bound to be incoherent. As it was mentioned earlier (see 1.4),

sacrificing the whole area of meaning is bound to jeopardize the overall comprehension - and the overall cohesion - of the original.

The aim of the analysis conducted in Chapter 4 is to prove that interpersonal pragmatics (and in particular politeness) does not have to be sacrificed in film subtitling. The data for the analysis derives largely from a *'phrase-by-phrase comparison of source text and target text for the purposes of translation criticism'* - *'an idle exercise'* (Hatim and Mason, 1997: 82) that ceases to be one as long as it helps to find ways of preserving the original meaning.

CHAPTER 4 FILM SUBTITLING: CRITICAL ANALYSIS WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF INTERPERSONAL PRAGMATICS

4.1 Case study: the English-subtitled version of the Russian film ‘Autumn marathon’

As it was noted earlier (see 1.2), the plot of the ‘Autumn marathon’ is simple. Andrei Bouzykine is the film’s central character. He is a higher education teacher of translation and a very talented literary translator in his forties. He has been married to Nina for twenty years. They have a grown-up daughter. The other woman in Andrei’s life is Alla with whom he has had an affair for some time. Andrei is a very gentle, kind and charismatic person who attracts people and does everything to avoid hurting other people’s feelings. Unhappy both in his work and his private life, Andrei has convinced himself that things cannot be changed. At some point, however, the pressure becomes unbearable and Andrei revolts. He attempts to radically change the course of events and almost succeeds.

Episode 2 - ‘Morning’ - (see Appendix I) may be described as a stage act unfolding within the film. The lead is played by Andrei. For a brief moment at the very beginning of the episode the audience is shown the real Andrei - an extremely tired and unhappy man. He is by himself, and it is almost embarrassing to have to watch something that is not intended for anybody’s eyes. Andrei’s facial expression when he hears the doorbell, that mixture of disgust and hate; the annoyed gesture of brushing off cigarette ashes when he stands up to open the door; and finally, the fake smile he puts on to greet his guest - all these paralinguistic features speak for themselves prior to anything being actually said on the screen.

It is clear from the start that Andrei’s primary concern is maintaining personal relationships and his ‘face’ at any cost, paradoxically even at the cost of losing his ‘face’. In an attempt to maintain his positive self-image Andrei actually denies himself ‘the basic claim to freedom of action and freedom from imposition’ (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 61) and, hence, loses his ‘face’. As soon as he opens the door, he adopts a role of a cheerful companion to Bill, although going for a run before breakfast is probably the last thing

Andrei would want. Another role he carefully adheres to throughout the episode is that of a devoted husband to a jealous wife. Andrei does everything to maintain his relationship with Nina or more precisely to maintain their relationship the way he wants it to appear. Again there is no freedom, for he is constantly forced into telling lies to defend himself against Nina's 'groundless accusations'. Andrei's positive self-image is also destroyed by his dishonesty. So, the result is the same: Andrei loses his 'face' while trying desperately to keep it.

For the most part Episode 2 is a dialogue between Andrei and Nina. To use Bell's categorization (in Hatim and Mason, 1997: 83): though occasionally treated as a known to the speaker ratified participant who either is (an addressee) or is not (auditor) directly addressed, Bill is basically an overhearer known by the speaker to be present, but neither directly addressed nor ratified. However, it gradually becomes apparent that Bill is definitely a ratified participant who merely accepts the role allotted to him in Andrei's play. That this play is a fiasco is as clear to Bill as it is to Nina who nevertheless also accepts her role and, despite her provocative strategy of carrying out FTAs, never actually goes on-record baldly, without redressive action. All three - Nina, Bill and Andrei - led by the latter adhere to their roles to the end.

As is always the case with a film dialogue, paralinguistic features are of great importance. However, film subtitling - or language, for that matter - would have been altogether superfluous if communication relied on paralinguistic features exclusively. Facial expressions, mimics, gestures, body language characteristic of Episode 2 are highly informative in terms of understanding the interpersonal relationships among the film characters. However, the very wording of the film dialogue, along with other linguistic features, is without a doubt essential for making communication possible. In other words, Episode 2 illustrates how interpersonal pragmatics may (linguistic features) or may not (paralinguistic features) be made explicit in language. Linguistic realization in the subtitling of the film's explicit interpersonal pragmatics - and in particular politeness strategies - is the focus of the following analysis.

4.2 Linguistic features encoding interpersonal pragmatics and their treatment in the subtitling of Episode 2

4.2.1 Lexis and its treatment in the subtitling

Choice of lexis is a graphic example of making politeness explicit in language. It is, therefore, vital that lexis of film subtitling conveys pragmatic information faithful to the original. The lexical choices made by the subtitler of Episode 2 do not always appear to preserve the film's intended pragmatics. For instance, at the very beginning Andrei's reply *Just a moment, доложу жене* is translated as *I'll just tell my wife*. However, the Russian verb *доложить* corresponds to the English verb *report* (Contemporary Russian-English Dictionary, 2002: 152) here in a sense of 'to make known to the proper authorities' (Merriam Webster's, 1993: 993). The usage of *report* is in line with Andrei's politeness strategy of maintaining - especially among others present - his image of a devoted husband who with a slight hint of self-irony does nevertheless make known to his wife every step he takes. The implication of *I will report to my wife* is missing from the subtitling version *I'll just tell my wife* that back translates as *Я только скажу жене* and does not fully preserve the pragmatic force of the original utterance.

Another example of pragmatically inaccurate choice of lexis is the translation of the following remarks:

A. - *Нина – прекрасная кулинарка.*

N. - *Не напрягайся, дорогой.*

The subtitler opts for

A. - *Nina's a very good cook.*

B. - *Don't overdo it, darling.*

Originally the superlative degree of the adjective *красная* (*fine*) formed by means of the prefix *пре*, the adjective *прекрасная* (*the finest*) has retained its superlative quality and needs to be translated accordingly. Andrei does not stint his praises, so it would be more appropriate to render his remark as *Nina is an excellent cook*.

Nina's reply in its subtitling version *Don't overdo it, darling* may be understood as a warm request to Andrei not to exaggerate her art of cooking in front of their guest. This is clearly not Nina's intention. There is hostility, not warmth, in the way she talks through clenched teeth without looking at either Andrei or Bill. Obviously, her remark does not have anything to do with her cooking. What she refers to is Andrei's attempt at keeping up appearances that she finds offensive, for it threatens her 'face' in several ways. Firstly, being lied to by her husband in the presence of the third party and being expected to accept, if not believe, these lies is a direct threat to Nina's positive self-image. Secondly, if she chose not to accept Andrei's lying, one of the options would be to confront him by going on-record.

However, this strategy would constitute a direct threat to Nina's own 'face', for in line with it she would openly admit - and again, in front of the third party - her status of a 'deceived wife'. Apparently, at this stage Nina is not ready to go on-record baldly or with redressive action. The only option left is to carry out an FTA against Andrei off-the-record. This is yet another threat to Nina's 'face', for FTAs also affect those who initiate them; however, she resorts to the strategy that allows for a certain ambiguity of intention. Instead of saying *Stop pretending, I know you lie to me* she says *Не напрягайся, дорогой* that, to avoid any misinterpretation in the context of the dialogue, may be translated as *Do not exert yourself, darling*.

Another seemingly insignificant lexical choice of the subtitler results in a significant shift in the film's intended pragmatics. There is a phone call for Andrei. It is Varvara, his old fellow student. She has a message for Andrei from his mistress Alla. When Varvara realizes that Andrei is unable to call Alla at the moment, she says *Ладно, я сама с ней поговорю*. The subtitles read *All right. I'll call her back myself* that back translates as

Ладно. Я сама ей перезвоню. However, the Russian *поговорю (с ней)* corresponds to the English *I will talk (to her)*. Unlike the neutral *call back*, the verb *talk* - that in one of its senses means 'to give a talk : lecture' (Merriam Webster's, 1993: 1202) - accurately relays the implication conveyed by the original verb *поговорю*.

Varvara does not intend to simply return Alla's call (*call her back*); her real intention is to take initiative and *give a talk* to Alla, to *lecture*, 'to reprove formally' (see the entry for *lecture* (ibid.: 663)) or, in other words, carry out an FTA against her. Unsurprisingly, Andrei tries to stop Varvara who in turn claims she is in the right and insists on having it her way:

A. - *Вот этого не надо!*

V. - *Надо! Пока.*

The following would be an accurate translation:

A. - *That you should not do!*

V. - *I should! Bye.*

The subtitler, however, chooses to translate the above exchange as

A. - *I don't think you should do it.*

V. - *Yes, I should. Bye.*

Hence, the neutralizing effect is further ensured by the syntactic structure and punctuation the subtitler resorts to. There is, therefore, continuity in the subtitling, for the latter remains consistently neutral.

The problem that arises here is that of a mismatch between the interpersonal pragmatics of the moving image and that of the subtitles. It is confusing why a phrase, like *All right. I'll call her back myself* - a simple courtesy on behalf of an old friend - should meet such an

inexplicably emphatic reaction. It is equally confusing to see a person almost panicking on the screen when the subtitles read simply *I don't think you should do it*. The described above implication of the verb *talk* - which the verb *call back* does not have - sustained by the accurate syntax and punctuation of the subsequent dialogue would have rendered the intended pragmatics faithfully and, hence, eliminated any confusion.

4.2.2 Repetitions and unfinished utterances and their treatment in the subtitling

Apart from lexis other linguistic features also play an important role in the realization of the episode's politeness strategies. Those features, however, tend to be altogether omitted by the subtitler. For example, Andrei's speech is characterized by repetitions and unfinished utterances of which none are found in the subtitling of the episode (see Appendix II, Table 4.1). Andrei's feelings of nervousness, insecurity, guilt seem to vanish: a very different Andrei emerges from the language of the subtitles. This new Andrei is calm and confident, his speech is laconic and precise. He never repeats his wife's words or his own words and never leaves his utterances unfinished. This pattern is so strong that one time the subtitler mistakenly (or intentionally?) changes the order of the original dialogue placing Andrei's utterance in front of Nina's and actually making Nina repeat Andrei's words:

Table 4.2

Russian text	English translation	English subtitling
N. - А, это я ему.	N. - Oh, I was talking to him.	A. - She was talking to me.
А. - Это она мне.	А. - She was talking to me.	N. - I was talking to him.

It has to be noted that - unlike the lexical choices analyzed above - the treatment of repetitions and unfinished utterances is considerably influenced by the specific subtitling constraints. For instance, the requirement of '*a maximum of two lines of subtitles ... presented at a time*' (Karamitroglou, 1998: 3) may account for omitting Andrei's reply from the following exchange:

B. – *What is it called?*

N. – "*Khvorost*".

A. – "*Khvorost*".

The subtitling reads:

B. – *What do you call them?*

N. – "*Khvorost*".

Andrei's tendency to repeat Nina's words, however, needs to be retained in subtitling whenever technically possible, for it is pragmatically very important: it is yet another attempt to maintain his image of a devoted husband who is so close to his wife he even echoes the way she talks. Moreover, omitting those repetitions may not only alter the pragmatic aspect, but also disturb the cohesiveness of the original dialogue:

N. – *So, why do you say nothing and breathe over there?*

Could have at least meowed!

A. – *Bill, do judge this, why if somebody somewhere says nothing and breathes this means that the call is definitely for me?*

Although Andrei's reply does not immediately follow Nina's words, it is still a dialogue cohesively sustained by the repetition of '*says nothing and breathes*'. The further exchange is again characterized by repetition - this time Andrei repeats his own words - and features an unfinished utterance:

B. – *Sorry, what?*

A. – *Well, I am saying why if somebody somewhere...*

The following is the subtitler's version:

N. – *Can't you talk?*

Give a meow, at least.

A. – *Bill, if one doesn't say anything,
why should that call be for me?*

B. – *Pardon?*

The exchange is weakened in terms of both, pragmatics and cohesion, due to the fact that Andrei's repetition of Nina's words is not retained and Andrei's reply to Bill is altogether omitted in the subtitling. The omitting here is not dictated by spatial limitations: only one line of subtitles - *Pardon?* - appears on the screen, so technically there is space for Andrei's reply. Karamitroglou (1998: 11) argues that

'The subtitler should not attempt to transfer everything, even when this is spatio-temporally feasible'.

He refers, however, to omitting linguistic items that are not - unlike repetitions in the analyzed episode - essential for the overall comprehension of the film (for instance, tautological cumulative adjectives/adverbs like 'great big' or 'super extra').

The preference for brevity alone appears to have governed the subtitling of the above exchange. It is true that the original dialogue is too long to be fully retained. It needs to be altered to meet the specific subtitling requirements. However, the alteration does not have to affect any essential linguistic elements and, therefore, result in losses of pragmatic information. The following is an alternative subtitling version:

N. – *Why do you say nothing and breathe?* (35 characters with spaces)

Could have at least meowed! (27)

A. – *Bill, if one says nothing and breathes* (38)

why is this call for me? (24)

B. – *Sorry, what?* (12)

A. – *Well, as I say, if one...* (23)

As is seen, the pragmatically meaningful repetitions remain intact notwithstanding the reduction of the original dialogue due to the specific requirement of around 35 characters per each subtitle line (Karamitroglou, 1998: 3). Padding expressions - a category of linguistic items that in principle could be omitted (ibid.: 11) - are also preserved in the subtitling for their pragmatic value: *well, as I say* pad-in Andrei's speech not merely to maintain the desired speech flow, but mostly to build a fence of semantically empty words around the truth he is desperate to hide.

4.2.3 Sentence form and its treatment in the subtitling

Another linguistic feature of pragmatic value - sentence form - should also be treated with caution, for alteration of sentence form in subtitling may lead to distortion of the original interpersonal pragmatics. The following exchange is the subtitler's version:

A. - *I'm sorry, Bill, now I have to go to the Institute.*

B. - *Can I ask you just one more simple question?* (44 characters with spaces)

Bill's reaction has taken the form of a polite question/request, whereas in the original dialogue he actually says:

B. - *Андрей, я Вас отпускаю, да, только у меня есть ещё один маленький вопрос.* (81)

The reply literally translates as

B. - *Andrei, I let you go, yes, but I have one more simple question.*

The subtitler chooses to replace the indicative pragmatic request with the straightforward question sentence - *Can I ask you just one more simple question?* - in line with the following subtitling standard:

'Simpler syntactic structures ... tend to be both shorter and easier to understand ... and should, therefore, be preferred' (Karamitroglou, 1998: 12).

Karamitroglou, however, stresses that the preference over complex syntactic structures should be given to canonical forms on one condition:

'provided that a fine balance is achieved between a) semantic aspects ..., b) pragmatic aspects ..., and c) stylistics ...' (ibid.).

The subtitler's version (44 characters with spaces) is indeed shorter than the original (that contains 81 characters), but still exceeds 40 characters - the maximum per subtitle line. As for maintaining different aspects of the original, the semantics remains intact in the subtitling, whereas the function and the stylistic features undergo a principle change.

If still considered a request - *Andrei, I let you go, yes, but I have one more simple question.* - it is a bold request that borders on a command and comes from a person who would not take 'no' for an answer. The description does not seem to apply to Bill who has been extremely polite throughout the episode. The affirmative - rather than interrogative - sentence he resorts to and his choice of words - *I let you go* - are very important linguistic features, for they clearly show that, notwithstanding his good manners, Bill's politeness strategy is rooted in pursuing his own interests. The entirely new perception of Bill, who could be almost rude if it helps him get what he wants, is effaced in the subtitling.

It appears more appropriate here to replace the indicative pragmatic request with a straightforward imperative sentence. The following is an alternative subtitling version that is both concise and faithful to the original pragmatics:

A. - *Sorry, Bill, I have to go now.* (30 characters with spaces)

B. - *You may, but answer one question first.* (39)

4.3 Relaying aspects of explicit interpersonal pragmatics in the subtitling of Episode 26

4.3.1 Relaying pragmatics of title and personal names in the subtitling

Episode 26 - 'Faculty meeting' - (see Appendix III) has become a cinematographic event in its own right. It would often be referred to as 'Бунт Бузыкина' ('Bouzykine's revolt'), with the recurrent reference gradually acquiring idiomatic quality. 'Bouzykine's revolt' is a sudden transformation of a weak person who attempts to restate his rights as a human being. The sense of 'revolt' is strengthened by the name 'Bouzykine' that in Russian evokes connotations with low-colloquial 'буза', 'бузить', 'бузотёр' that accordingly correspond to the English 'noise, row, riot', 'to make a noise/row, to run a riot', 'troublemaker, rowdy' (back translation of the Russian definitions given in Ozhegov's Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language, 2000: 62). The 'revolt' is the climax of the film, the metamorphosis of the gentle and pliable Bouzykine whose anger makes him realize that change is indeed possible. 'Faculty meeting' (RUSCICO's choice) - although retained in this analysis as the title found on the DVD - carries no pragmatic value and clearly fails to convey the significance of the episode.

Options of relaying personal names may be discussed and analyzed as a separate translation issue that is faced by literary translators and subtitlers alike. The subtitler of Episode 26 chooses transcription that is questionably the only suitable option here. Hence, the pragmatic value of names like 'Бузыкин' or 'Шершавников' - from the adjective 'шершавый' that corresponds to 'rough' as in 'rough hands' or 'coarse-textured' (Contemporary Russian - English Dictionary, 2002: 757) - is unavoidably lost. However,

the loss does not have to be followed by effacing the pragmatics of the episode as a whole. On the contrary, it should be partially compensated for by sustaining the pragmatic information the episode is charged with. The subtitler's choices, as it will be shown in the following sections, do not seem to continually serve this purpose.

4.3.2 Relaying pragmatics of disagreement in the subtitling

The title 'Faculty meeting' is not only impersonal and pragmatically neutral, but also misleading, for it may be understood as a 'staff meeting of faculty professors and members'. What is meant, however, is Andrei's conversation with Varvara who came to see him at the Institute where he teaches. It is not surprising that the 'revolt' takes place at this very stage in the film, for right from the beginning of the episode Andrei is subjected to a series of face-threats that range from ambiguous off-the-record to bald on-record acts.

The first FTA Varvara carries out is so subtle it might even not be perceived as one. The counter-argumentative structure - I agree, but - tentatively employed by Varvara becomes apparent only on examining her words more closely:

*Слушай, ты знаешь, я понимаю, это идиотизм, но ты знаешь,
что мне сказал Виригин?*

*[Listen, you know, I understand it is ridiculous, but you know
what Virigine said to me?]*

Varvara's actual message may be traced in the following way:

I understand it is ridiculous, but

↓

I disagree with Virigine, but

↓

I agree with you, but

As is seen, Varvara's strategy of positive politeness comprises the stage of claiming common ground with Andrei that is followed by the FTA stage of implied disagreement with him. Since the disagreement is not direct, Andrei might in principle be unaware of its face-threat. However, it is unlikely, for Andrei on the verge of the 'revolt' is sharp:

V. – *you know what Virigine said to me?*

A. – *What?!*

Andrei's line - *What?!* - is altogether omitted in the subtitling. The impatient and aggressive manner is very uncharacteristic of Andrei. It is a sign of the change happening in him and as such is pragmatically valuable. Therefore, it appears important to retain the emphatic *What?!* in the subtitling of the dialogue. It signals Andrei's awareness of the FTA and his readiness to retort that is further sustained by his subsequent ironic remark:

V. – *He said that my translations are better than yours. I die with laughter!*

A. – *Congratulations.*

4.3.3 Pragmatics of one original lexical choice - *притащить* (*drag oneself*) - forming basis for politeness strategy as a whole

Varvara immediately reacts to the change in Andrei and in turn changes her strategy switching from positive to negative politeness and, hence, lessening the face-threat. She again goes on-record, but this time concentrates on showing her respect for Andrei. Varvara's opening line - *You know why I dragged myself here?* (see Table 4.3 below), the preparatory stage of the upcoming FTA - is an instance of both, maintaining distance and hedging. The effect is achieved by the verb *притащить* (*drag oneself*) that comprises several aspects of pragmatic meaning.

Since Andrei does not express willingness to talk, Varvara's primary concern is to show Andrei that she understands how busy he is, and that she does not mind his unwelcoming manner. Varvara's not being welcome is encoded in the verb *притащить*, for one of its

senses is *show up* (low-colloquial, disapproving) as in ‘He was not invited and yet dragged himself along’ (back translation of the entry for *притащиться* found in Ozhegov’s Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language, 2000: 601). Varvara maintains distance with Andrei by showing him she realizes she is taking up his precious time. She also humbles herself by implying that, in contrast with Andrei, she is not efficient, slow: the other sense of *притащиться* given in the same entry is *move slowly, with difficulty* (colloquial). At the same time, Varvara hedges herself against the possibility of Andrei’s counterattack, for the (low)colloquial verb she resorts to - *притащиться* (*drag oneself*) - imparts triviality to what she is about to say next.

Table 4.3

Russian text	English translation	English subtitling
V. - Ты знаешь, чего я притащилась?	V. - You know why I dragged myself here?	V. – You know why I came to see you?
A. – Ну?!	A. - Why?!	
V. – В плане на Скофилда ты стоял?	V. – You were scheduled to translate Scofield?	V. – You planned to do Scofield’s book?
A. – Да...	A. – Yes...	A. – Yes...
V. – Ну, передали мне, ну, я хочу знать, как ты к этому относишься.	V. – Well, it was handed over to me, well, I want to know how you feel about it.	V. – He’s given it to me, I want to know what you think about it.
A. – Я очень рад...	A. – I am very happy...	A. – I think it’s great.

4.3.4 Pragmatics of one subtitling lexical choice - *came (to see you)* - resulting in transformation of the original politeness strategy

As is seen from Table 4.3, the translation and the subtitling of the original dialogue differ considerably in terms of pragmatics. The subtitler's choice of lexis - *came to see you* - erases the pragmatic nuances discussed in the previous section. However, the chosen wording does not neutralize, but rather transforms the original pragmatics. New - absent from the original - aspects of pragmatic meaning emerge from the subtitling of the exchange. Varvara's manner of speech becomes more assertive and direct. While in the original dialogue Varvara - reluctant to state the purpose of her visit - employs hedging (*You know why I dragged myself here?*), in the subtitling she resorts to the phrase that is meant to draw - not to distract, like in the original - Andrei's attention (*You know why I came to see you?*). The phrase may still be considered hedging, for Varvara's actual message is not yet verbalized: Varvara does not tell Andrei *why* she came to see him. However, she does tell him that she came *to see him*. Hence, in contrast with the original, Varvara clearly states the purpose of her visit - seeing Andrei about some matter - and her manner of speech does neither impart triviality to the 'matter', nor humble Varvara in any way.

The directness - carefully avoided by Varvara in the original dialogue - becomes characteristic of her in the subtitling. While in the original exchange Varvara is still preparing for the upcoming FTA, Varvara of the subtitling attacks bluntly: *You planned to do Scofield's book?* She favors active structures that allow her to speak directly to the point in contrast with the original in which Varvara resorts to passive withholding the would-be-subjects of active structures and intentionally blurring her message: the subtitler's *You planned to...* instead of the original *You were scheduled to...* and *He's given it to me...* instead of *it was handed over to me*. Hence, what is underlying in the original becomes foregrounded in the subtitling. This is the case of explicitation in its negative sense in which it 'aims to render "clear" what does not wish to be clear in the original' (Berman, 2000: 289).

4.3.5. Relaying contextual pragmatics in the subtitling

Varvara does not yet wish to be direct. Her aim at this stage is to break ground for - and ultimately, to ensure the effectiveness of - the major FTA she will carry out last. What Varvara needs now is to lull Andrei's vigilance and make him lose his new - disturbing for Varvara - attitude. Judging by Andrei's replies (see Table 4.3), her strategy appears to work. The impatience - *Why?!* - vanishes replaced by the initial shock - *Yes...* - and followed by the submissiveness - *I am very happy...* - so characteristic of the prior-to-the-change Andrei. The transition of the new Andrei back to his old self is less apparent in the subtitling: the initial line - *Why?!* - is omitted, whereas the punctuation and the wording of the last one - *I think it's great.* - fail to convey the deeply emotional moment behind it.

The line follows Varvara's: *I want to know what you think about it.* However, the choice of the verb *feel* instead of *think* - *I want to know how you feel about it.* - would be the accurate choice in the pragmatic context of the film. Translating Scofield (probably an allusion to Scott Fitzgerald) is a very personal matter for Andrei. This is something he would in his own words 'get down on his knees and beg for'. Varvara is of course aware of it as she is of the fact that Andrei was scheduled to do the translation. She knows exactly how Andrei feels about losing the job that means so much to him. Varvara - whose own poor quality translations are routinely rewritten for her by her loyal friend Andrei - also knows how he must feel about her in particular getting the job. Her concern about Andrei's feelings - *I want to know how you feel about it.* - is yet another FTA against him. Varvara is forcing Andrei to either go on-record and disagree or - and that is what she is hoping for - to take the blow to his self-image and accept her triumph. Andrei's reply - *I am very happy...* - is just the reaction Varvara wants to get, for it proves that Andrei may still be manipulated, and that she may gradually proceed to her major attack.

4.3.6 Relaying pragmatics of emphasis in the subtitling

Once again Varvara changes her strategy. Now that Andrei sounds like himself, she ceases to be respectful. Instead, with a look of reproach in her eyes Varvara appeals to Andrei's conscience challenging his positive self-image and forcing him to admit she is in the right:

V. – I have anticipated this! Bouzykine, have you got conscience?!

V. – For the first time in my life I was given something serious to do!

V. – So, should I go decline to do it?!

Varvara's speech - ambiguous and hesitant before - becomes precise and assertive, with every line emphasized. Andrei's reaction, however delayed, is equally emphatic:

A. – What do you need from me?! Got the job – translate!

Varvara is halfway to achieving her goal: she has secured her right to do the translation. What she needs to do now is to win Andrei back onto her side. So, she continues with her emphatic plead:

*V. – But I do not want you to consider this to be a swinish trick on my part,
Bouzykine, please, it is very important for me!*

A. – All right, this is not a swinish trick.

Andrei's reply is the triumph of Varvara's strategy: Andrei finally admits that there is nothing wrong with her getting the job. Moreover, he does it in his usual calm and friendly manner, his voice mellowed.

It is only at this stage that Varvara goes on-record baldly, without redressive action:

V. – *Bouzykine, and have you already started, eh?*

V. – *Maybe, you have some drafts, papers left...*

V. – *...maybe, you will let me have them, eh, Bouzykine?*

Varvara's speech - once again hesitant - is by no means ambiguous. Varvara assumes that she has secured Andrei's friendship and - since 'a direct request for a favor is less face-threatening between friends' (Hatim and Mason, 1997: 81) - directly claims a favor from Andrei finally making clear the underlying purpose of her visit. However, she underestimates the forces of change transforming Andrei's personality and - so close to being granted her request - Varvara unwillingly triggers the sudden outbreak of anger that marks the beginning of the upcoming 'Bouzykine's revolt':

A. – *Do you need your floors washed?! For I will wash them! You whistle!*

The comparative analysis of the original dialogue and its subtitling version (see Appendix IV, Table 4.4) shows that perhaps the most characteristic feature of the original - emphasis - has not been retained in the subtitling. Exclamation points that should be used to indicate emphasis in subtitling just like in printed materials (see Karamitroglou, 1998: 7) appear in the analyzed subtitling twice, both times at the end of Andrei's lines: *You have it, do it!* and *I'll do it, just whistle!* The same lines, however, contain emphatic questions - *What do you need from me?!* and *Do you need your floors washed?!* - that are not emphasized in the subtitling due to the punctuation - question marks alone - the subtitler resorts to.

Varvara's speech that becomes assertive at this stage of the original dialogue and later on again acquires its hesitant quality remains continually assertive in the subtitling. (Except for the crucial line, the essence of the FTA, that becomes due to the subtitler's lexical choice (*take a look* instead of *have*) less assertive and face-threatening in the subtitling than it is in the original exchange: *How about letting me take a look at them?* instead of

...maybe, you will let me have them, eh, Bouzykine?) As for the emphasis Varvara applies to everything she says - up to the point when she receives the desired reply (*All right, this is not a swinish trick.*) - it is completely effaced in the punctuation of the subtitling, for no markers of emphasis - exclamation points - are used.

4.4 Avoidable and unavoidable losses of pragmatic information in the course of subtitling (Episode 26)

Any revolt is *a priori* emphatic and so is the next and final stage of Episode 26 - the stage of 'Bouzykine's revolt' itself - that features the new, completely transformed Andrei. Every single line of Andrei's is pronounced with emphasis. Surprisingly, however, the subtitler's version remains markedly non-emphatic: an exclamation point appears at the end of just one Andrei's line - *Nice seeing you!* (see Appendix III). The neutral punctuation of the subtitling erases the original emphasis and, hence, results in the loss of the original pragmatic information. The loss that is neither dictated by subtitling requirements, nor unavoidable - exclamation points could and should have been used instead of full stops to help relay the interpersonal pragmatics of the 'revolt' - when followed by the unavoidable losses, unnecessarily increases the damage to the original done in the subtitling.

One of the losses referred to here as unavoidable results from the already discussed (see section 4.3.1) transcription of the personal names *Бузыкин* (*Bouzykine*) and *Шершавников* (*Shershavnikov*) that effaces their pragmatic value. The other unavoidable loss concerns the dilemma of relaying pragmatically charged personal pronouns - namely pronouns of address - in the process of translation/subtitling. Russian, unlike English, belongs to those languages 'which have distinct pronouns of address to encode addresser/addressee relationship' (Hatim and Mason, 1997: 81). Russian *ты* would normally be used among peers and friends, while *Вы* (with a capital 'B') is the form of address among strangers and people whose relationship is hierarchical. *Вы* would be used by a younger person to address somebody who is older. Any switch from *ты* to *Вы* or vice versa is important pragmatically, for it signals a change in the speakers' relationship. Since both Russian pronouns - *ты* and *Вы* - correspond to the English pronoun *you*, the Russian into English

translation unavoidably effaces the pragmatic shift caused by the duality of the original form of address.

Shershavnikov is in a hierarchically superior position to Andrei and always says *ты* to the latter. At the stage of ‘revolt’ Andrei for the first time ever rebuffs Shershavnikov and actually carries out an FTA against him by initiating the change in their relationship and saying *ты* to his boss. The English pronoun *you* fails to relay either the usual patronizing manner of Shershavnikov, or the unexpected non-reciprocal use by Andrei (see Table 4.5 below in which the pragmatically charged pronouns of the Russian text are italicized).

Table 4.5

Russian text	English translation	English subtitling
A. - А вот руки-то я <i>Вам</i> не подам!	A. – A handshake I will not give you!	A. - I won’t shake hands with you.
S. - <i>Ты</i> что, с ума сошёл? Почему?	S. – What are you, crazy? Why?	S. - Are you crazy? Why not?
S. - <i>Тебе</i> это не идёт, Бузыкин, запомни! Не идёт!	S. – It does not become you, Bouzykine, mind! Does not!	S. - It’s not your style, Bouzykine.
A. - И всё-таки я прошу <i>тебя</i> , Шершавников, на будущее: не ставь себя в глупое положение!	A. – And still, I ask you, Shershavnikov, for the future: do not make a fool of yourself!	A. - I’m warning you, don’t put yourself in an awkward situation.

The critical analysis of the English subtitling (see Table 4.5) suggests that the latter has not employed the full potential of those linguistic means - namely, punctuation, lexical choices

and syntax - that partially compensate for the unavoidable information losses described above. The effacement of emphasis due to the chosen punctuation - absence of exclamation points - has already been discussed (see section 4.3.6 and first paragraph of the current section). It may be added that within an established pattern punctuation - however preconditioned - may not only follow, but also influence or, in other words, precondition lexis and grammar.

For instance, the neutral punctuation pattern favored by the subtitler appears to force the latter into using the syntactic structure that - unlike the accurate *A handshake I will not give you!* - does not necessarily require an exclamation point at the end: *I won't shake hands with you.* Apparently, the emphatic *mind!* matched by Shershavnikov's peremptory tone - *It does not become you, Bouzykine, mind!* - is omitted from the subtitling for the same reason. The subtitler's version completed with *mind!* - *It's not your style, Bouzykine, mind!* - would have been pragmatically accurate while still concise (37 characters with spaces), however, it would have definitely required emphatic punctuation that is repeatedly rejected by the established subtitling pattern.

As for the subtitling line - *I'm warning you, don't put yourself in an awkward situation.* - it is both, too long (60 characters with spaces) and pragmatically inaccurate. The original line - *And still, I ask you, Shershavnikov, for the future: do not make a fool of yourself!* (84 characters with spaces) - unquestionably needs reduction in subtitling. The pragmatically valuable ironic *I ask you* - that in the subtitler's version loses its irony and becomes the flat *I'm warning you* - would probably be sacrificed along with the bold direct address *Shershavnikov*. However, the message itself, the 'favor' asked for - *do not make a fool of yourself!* - needs to be retained. An alternative subtitling line may read: *In future don't make a fool of yourself!* (40 characters with spaces). The suggested wording - in contrast with the tentative subtitling *don't put yourself in an awkward situation* - seems to faithfully relay the challenge of Andrei's utterance and, hence, convey - if partially - the effect achieved in the original by the emphatic use of the pronoun *ты* in Andrei's addressing his boss.

4.5 Subtitling accuracy - the key to faithfully relaying pragmatics of the original (Episodes 2 and 26)

As it was shown in the previous section, even unavoidable losses of information may be less dramatic if in the course of subtitling lexical and grammatical choices are made with particular accuracy in order to minimize damage to the original pragmatics. In general, accuracy might be the key to quality translation/subtitling. Andrei Bouzykine - a gifted literary translator and a devoted advocate of perfectionism in work - certainly seems to think so. Andrei's professionalism is the one most carefully preserved part of his 'face', the part all the more pragmatically important since it is in contrast with Andrei's usual submissive politeness strategy. While indecisive and cautious in his personal life, Andrei may be firm and straightforward professionally.

In the extract from Episode 2 (see Table 4.6 below) Andrei comments on Bill's translation of Dostoevsky. As is seen, Andrei would not miss or tolerate even minor translation inaccuracies. His display of professional self-confidence at this early stage of the film is the first sign of Andrei's potential for change and acquisition of confidence in general. Such signs shape interpersonal pragmatics and need to be relayed properly in the course of translation/subtitling. Hence, the accurate translation of the word *облизьяна* - slang form of *обезьяна* (*ape, monkey*) - is as important a subtitling issue as it is a translation issue discussed in the film.

The word is, however, totally omitted from the subtitling. Instead, the latter features the overstretched line: "*You should take your medicine and learn to like it*". (It is assumed further in the current paragraph that Bill's translation, Andrei comments on, reads "*You should take your pill*". However, it is not made clear in the subtitling: according to the latter, Bill's translation could also read "*You should take your pill and learn to like it,*" - the variant that would place the words *medicine* and *pill* in obscure opposition to each other.) The opposition ("*You should take your medicine and learn to like it.*" vs. "*(You should) take your pill.*") does partially relay the implied by Andrei - and made explicit in the subtitling (*He means: Take what you've got coming and like it.*) - idea of potential

distortion of meaning due to translation inaccuracies. However, the original slang effect - resulting from the perceived contrast between *облизьяна* and the correct form *обезьяна* - is effaced in the subtitling.

Table 4.6

Russian text	English translation	English subtitling
А. - В принципе, всё правильно, но есть кое-какие неточности.	А. – On the whole everything is fine, but there are a few inaccuracies.	А. - Everything is fine, but there are a few inaccuracies.
Вот здесь, насколько я помню, у Достоевского сказано:	Right here, as far as I remember, Dostoyevsky writes:	Right here, as far as I remember, Dostoyevsky writes:
“За кого ты себя считаешь, фря ты этакая, облизьяна зелёная?”	“Who do you think you are, you green ape-lick big noise?”	“You should take your medicine and learn to like it”.
У Вас правильно: “обезьяна”.	You have it correct: “ape-like”.	You say “take your pill”. He means: Take what you’ve got
А у него же “облизьяна” – сленг!	But he has “ape-lick” – slang!	coming and like it. It’s slang.

Both, the sound and the spelling of the word *облизьяна*, are connotatively linked to the word *лизать* (*lick*). The suggested English translation *ape-like* retains the connection with *обезьяна* (*ape*), while the deliberate misspelling that changes *-like* into *-lick* relays the original connotation between *облизьяна* and *лизать*. The Russian associative ‘equation’

облизьяна = *обезьяна* + *лизать* corresponds in the translation to *ape-lick* = *ape* + *lick*. The liberty has been taken to use the non-existent word *ape-lick* or rather create that word in the course of translation. However, the liberty seems to be justified. Firstly, it is not - in contrast with the subtitling - the liberty of rewriting the words of the world-famous Russian writer. Secondly, the attempt to faithfully translate those words into English by means of creative wordplay appears to be successful. The coinage *ape-lick* does qualify as the accurate translation of *облизьяна* and as such serves the purpose of preserving the important element of the film's overall interpersonal pragmatics - Andrei's strive for maximum accuracy in his work.

As the plot of the film unfolds and Andrei's life becomes increasingly difficult, it is Andrei's professional dignity that saves his 'face' from complete destruction. His professional self-awareness ultimately urges Andrei to reclaim his personal self-esteem and self-confidence. At the stage of 'revolt' (Episode 26) the professional morale becomes Andrei's guide to change and renewal. The Translator's Charter acquires particular importance for Andrei as the moral standard one should abide by and aspire to reach. Therefore, the reference to the document needs to be relayed with maximum accuracy in the course of translation/subtitling.

However, on comparing the English translation and the English subtitling of the extract from Episode 26 (see Table 4.7 below), the subtitler's version appears to be surprisingly inaccurate. The reference to the concrete document - *The Translator's Charter* - becomes the generalized *code of our profession*. The subtitling that for no objective reason changes the original results in the distortion of the film's interpersonal pragmatics. The role of The Translator's Charter in the process of Andrei's personal growth is not relayed. The pronoun *our* (in *The code of our profession*) presupposes that Lifanov is already numbered among translators or at least viewed as a potential one. Andrei, however, does not at all consider Lifanov to be a translator, not just because Lifanov is still a student without a degree, but primarily due to the fact that Lifanov is completely unsuitable for the profession.

Table 4.7

Russian text	English translation	English subtitling
<p>А. - Хартия Переводчиков, товарищ Лифанов, гласит, что перевод в современном мире должен содействовать лучшему взаимопониманию между народами! А Вы, своим лепетом, будете только разобщать!</p>	<p>A. - The Translator's Charter, comrade Lifanov, reads... ...that translation in the world of today... ...should contribute to a better understanding amongst men! And you, with your babbling, will only estrangle!</p>	<p>A. - The code of our profession, my dear Lifanov, is this: - We aim, in this turbulent world, to make culture and language of different peoples more available. - And you, with your double talk, will just slow down the process.</p>

What follows in the original - *translation in the world of today should contribute to a better understanding amongst men* - is almost a direct citation from the preamble to The Translator's Charter:

'...translation has established itself as a permanent, universal and necessary activity in the world of today; ... by making intellectual and material exchanges possible among nations it enriches their life and contributes to a better understanding amongst men' (my emphasis).

The inaccurate subtitling - *We aim, in this turbulent world, to make culture and language of different peoples more available.* - does damage not only to the original, but also to The

Translator's Charter, the source the original derives the citation from. The subtitler's version both rephrases and alters the Charter's message: 'availability' does not equal 'a better understanding'. Such alterations of the Charter's form and content are not acceptable in the pragmatic context of the film. Andrei's professionalism, true devotion to translation, and strive for excellency would not permit him to quote The Translator's Charter inaccurately at any time, but especially not at the stage of 'revolt' when he is particularly sharp and precise.

Finally, Andrei's diagnosis of Lifanov as a translator - *And you, with your babbling, will only estrange!* - loses its finality in the subtitler's version. *Doubletalk* - unlike *babbling* - refers to Lifanov's empty promises (*And I will pass the test, as soon as I am free I will pass it.*) rather than his professional abilities and, hence, holds out a hope of him eventually becoming a translator. As for the subtitling *slow down the process (of making culture and language of different peoples more available)*, it does not only efface the categorical *estrange*, but also results in Andrei's involuntarily making a paradoxical statement. At the stage of 'revolt' Andrei does allow himself the liberty to further develop - not alter - the Charter's message by emphasizing the damaging - *estranging* - effect bad translation causes. This negative effect that might be irreversible is paradoxically transformed by the inaccurate subtitling into the ultimately positive effect: bad translation merely *slows down* - but does not altogether halt - *the process* and therefore appears to be a delayed success.

Hence, as was shown in the current section and throughout Chapter 4, maximum accuracy in the course of subtitling does help relay interpersonal pragmatics of the original faithfully. Inaccurate subtitling, on the other hand, may disturb the original pragmatics on various levels. The process may involve distortion of sources referenced in the original (the described above inaccurate citing of The Translator's Charter) as well as inadvertent distortion of logic (the paradoxical statement analyzed in the previous paragraph).

4.6 Comments on the overall quality of the chosen subtitling product

The overall assessment of the chosen subtitling product was already given at the very beginning of this dissertation, in the Introduction, when high quality - of both, the film itself and the subtitles for it - was emphasized as the main reason for choosing 'Autumn marathon' to be the subject of the analysis (see 1.2). However, as it was shown in the previous sections of Chapter 4, even good subtitles could be improved especially in the sphere of rendering interpersonal pragmatics and politeness strategies of the original.

The analysis conducted for the purpose of translation criticism focused specifically on linguistic realization in the subtitling of the film's explicit interpersonal pragmatics. Implicit pragmatics - although acknowledged as highly informative - was not explored and paralinguistic features - valuable in their own right - were dismissed as a substitute for linguistic features encoding interpersonal pragmatics. Lexical and grammatical choices of the subtitling - linguistic features solely - were analyzed in terms of whether or not they rendered the original pragmatics faithfully.

It was observed that the subtitling did allow linguistic inaccuracies that affected interpersonal pragmatics and politeness strategies of the original. For instance, the consequences of the subtitler's inaccurate lexical choices range from weakening the original pragmatic effect and creating a confusing mismatch between the moving image and the subtitling to such serious consequences as misinterpretation of the original message and transformation of the original politeness strategy. The subtitler's obvious tendency to omit repetitions and unfinished utterances results in effacement of pragmatically informative aspects and weakens the film's original cohesiveness. Sentence form is not always treated with caution by the subtitler: its alteration distorts the original pragmatics and inevitably affects the overall comprehension of the film. Finally, neutral punctuation favored by the subtitler leads to considerable pragmatic information losses that are neither governed by subtitling requirements, nor unavoidable.

Notwithstanding the critical points made in the previous paragraph, it may be repeated again that the quality of the chosen subtitling product is generally high. The conducted analysis, however, shows that quality subtitling could only benefit from giving the neglected interpersonal pragmatics its deserved attention.

CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION

5.1 Summary of theoretical and practical findings

This dissertation is based on the proposition that - contrary to popular belief - film subtitling is translation - not adaptation - and should be treated as a branch of literary translation on equal terms with translation of fiction. The validity of the proposition is confirmed by the findings - theoretical and practical - summarized below.

The simple argumentation (see 2.1) dismisses the term *adaptation* as superfluous and confusing with reference to film subtitling. The latter involves 'rendering from one language into another' (the entry for 'translation' in Merriam Webster's, 1993: 1254) and, therefore, is translation.

The close examination of similarities (2.1) and differences (2.2) between film subtitling and literary translation shows that similarities do prevail and may even be found among the supposed differences. Those differences may appear either outdated (dealing with mixed modes in the course of subtitling) or disputable (listing cross-semiotics among specific subtitling constraints).

The following theoretical finding is actually the absence of one: no objective reasons are found for treating film subtitling as inferior to literary translation (2.3). The force of habit is suggested to be the force propelling film subtitling into the inferior. The new, unprejudiced, attitude is proposed as a solution for raising the prestige of film subtitling and upgrading the latter to the level of literary translation.

The 'unprejudiced attitude' theory is put into practice when spatiotemporal constraints on subtitling are treated as literary challenging and uniquely advantageous (3.1). The new dimension given to the specific subtitling constraints strengthens the idea of film subtitling as a branch of literary translation. The idea is further developed when analyzing film subtitling as a process/product of literary translation (3.2) and the possible approach to the analysis (3.3) are suggested.

The practical part of the dissertation - Chapter 4 - is built on the theoretical grounds explored in Chapters 2 and 3. The English subtitling to the Russian film 'Autumn marathon' is analyzed as a process/product of literary translation. The analysis is conducted within the framework of interpersonal pragmatics. In addition to the comments already given above (section 4.6), it should be stressed that maximum accuracy appears to be the key to relaying the original pragmatics faithfully. Moreover, maximum accuracy may be considered the key to quality translation/subtitling in general; for pragmatics is an area of meaning, and relaying meaning in all its nuances is the eternal pursuit of translators and subtitlers alike. Subtitling (in)accuracy - and this is another practical finding - may be assessed by means of a phrase-by-phrase comparison of the original text and its subtitling version. Translation criticism with reference to subtitling does play a constructive role, for it helps find solutions to preserving the original meaning as fully as possible.

5.2 Strengths and weaknesses of the dissertation

The attempt to provide a solid theoretical and practical foundation for the author's belief appears to be successful: it appears to be well argued that film subtitling belongs to the domain of translation in general and should be upgraded to the level of literary translation in particular. A variety of theoretical sources has been used as base for the discussion (Chapters 2 and 3) and has been given practical application in the course of - while supplying theoretical background to - the critical analysis (Chapter 4). The dissertation has yielded both theoretical and practical findings applicable to future research in the field of subtitling.

The dissertation would benefit - since the author's native language is Russian - from choosing a Russian-subtitled version of a film in English as the subject of the analysis. However, Russian-subtitled foreign films are not available. Hence, this particular drawback - the analysis of the English subtitling performed from (rather than into) the author's native language - may be acknowledged as preconditioned and as such does not apply to the very nature of the dissertation.

Choice of more than one subtitling product would also be beneficial, for it would broaden and deepen the analysis allowing for subtitling patterns to be discovered. It has to be borne in mind, however, that the specific dissertation requirement - the limit of 12,000 words - does not permit the analysis to be extensive. To meet the requirement, even the analysis of just one subtitling product - the case study undertaken in this dissertation - still had to be narrowed down to the analysis of two selected episodes only. Hence, the extensive and deep analysis based on data derived from a variety of films *a priori* was not to be expected from the space-limited dissertation. The latter, however, does yield the idea of such analysis - the idea that takes the form of a suggestion for future research among other suggestions discussed in the next section.

5.3 Suggestions for future research

As it was noted earlier (see 1.3), in-depth studies of pragmatics and politeness with reference to subtitling may prove highly profitable. Even a brief analysis (like the analysis conducted in this dissertation) shows that film subtitling repeatedly features avoidable losses of the original pragmatic meaning. It appears useful to explore the problem further focusing broadly on the importance and practical ways of relaying the original pragmatics faithfully. The research may comprise various studies each highlighting a particular pragmatic aspect of film subtitling (for instance, *relaying pragmatics of personal names and titles*). Combined studies of both explicit and implicit pragmatics may also yield interesting results, for instance, with respect to paralinguistic features partially compensating for unavoidable losses of the original pragmatic meaning. Naturally, in-depth studies would rely on extensive data derived from a variety of sources. That would allow for subtitling patterns to be discovered and objective conclusions to be drawn.

With a specific reference to Russia, the following directions for future research may be suggested: public attitude to the currently dominant voice-over, preferences for a particular film translation type among different social/age groups of the population, prospects of film translation/film subtitling in Russia.

APPENDIX I Russian text	English subtitling
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Эпизод 2</i></p> <p>- Morning!</p> <p>- Morning!</p> <p>- Вы готов?</p> <p>- Just a moment, доложу жене.</p> <p>[- You ready?</p> <p>- Just a moment, I will report to my wife.]</p> <p>Нина! Мы побежали.</p> <p>[Nina, we are off and running.]</p> <p>Господи! Я бы ещё час могла спать!</p> <p>[Jesus! I could have slept another hour!]</p> <p style="text-align: center;">***</p> <p>Алë?</p> <p>Алë?</p> <p>Алë?!</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Episode 2 'Morning'</i></p> <p>A. = Andrei</p> <p>N. = Nina, Andrei's wife</p> <p>B. = Bill, a guest professor from Denmark, also a literary translator</p> <p>V. = Varvara, Andrei's old fellow student</p> <p>B. -Mornin'.</p> <p>A. -Mornin'.</p> <p>B. -You ready?</p> <p>A. -I'll just tell my wife.</p> <p>A. Nina! We're off and running.</p> <p>N. Oh great! And I could've slept another hour!</p> <p style="text-align: center;">***</p> <p><i>(Phone rings, it is Alla, Andrei's mistress.)</i></p> <p>N. Hello?</p>

Ну, что вы там молчите и дышите? Хоть бы мякнули!

[So, why do you say nothing and breathe over there? Could have at least meowed!]

В следующий раз бери трубку сам.

[Next time pick up the phone yourself.]

- Попробуйте вот это, Билл!

- Спасибо.

[- Try this, Bill!

- Thank you.]

В. - Это как называется?

N. - "Хворост".

A. - "Хворост".

[- What is it called?

- "Khvorost".

- "Khvorost."]

Очень вкусно!

[Delicious!]

- Нина прекрасная кулинарка.

- Не напрягайся, дорогой.

[- Nina is an excellent cook.

- Do not exert yourself, darling.]

N. Can't you talk? Give a meow, at least.

N. Next time answer it yourself.

N. -Have you ever tasted these, Bill?

B. -Don't think I have.

B. -What do you call them?

N. -"Khvorost".

B. It's delicious.

A. -Nina's a very good cook.

N. -Don't overdo it, darling.

Простите, очень тихо, плохо понимаю.

[Sorry, very softly, I understand badly.]

N. - А, это я ему.

A. - Это она мне.

[- Oh, I was talking to him.

- She was talking to me.]

Билл, ну рассудите, почему, если кто-то где-то молчит и дышит, то это значит, что звонят именно мне?

[Bill, do judge this, why if somebody somewhere says nothing and breathes this means that the call is definitely for me?]

B. - Простите, как?

A. - Ну, я говорю, почему, если кто-то где-то...

[B. - Sorry, what?

A. - Well, I am saying why if somebody somewhere...]

Может быть, мы без Билла разберёмся?

[Maybe we will straighten this out without Bill?]

Простите, я не понимаю.

[Sorry, I do not understand.]

B. Sorry, I couldn't understand.

A. -She was talking to me.

N. -I was talking to him.

A. Bill, if one doesn't say anything, why should that call be for me?

B. Pardon?

N. Maybe we'd better not involve Bill in this?

B. I don't understand.

- Это она мне.

- Это я ему.

[- She was talking to me.

- I was talking to him.]

Слушаю Вас?

[Hello?!]

Бузыкин, сейчас меня разбудила твоя Алла...

[Bouzykine, your Alla has just woken me up...]

...и просила тебе передать, чтоб ты ей срочно позвонил.

[...and asked me to tell you to call her up immediately.]

Ты у неё там какую-то рукопись оставил.

[You forgot some manuscript at her place.]

К сожалению, сейчас никак не смогу. Очень загружен работой.

[Unfortunately, there is no way I can do it now. I am loaded up with work.]

А, ясно, Нинка там рядом?

[Oh, get it, Nina is there?]

Ладно, я сама с ней поговорю.

[All right, I will talk to her myself.]

A. -She was talking to me.

N. -I was talking to him.

(Phone rings again.)

A. Hello?

V. Bouzykine, your Alla has just **waked** me up

and asked me to tell you to call her up immediately.

V. You forgot your manuscript at her place.

A. I can't do it right now. I'm loaded up with work.

V. I get it. Nina is with you.

V. All right. I'll call her back myself.

- Вот этого не надо!

- *Надо! Пока.*

[- That you should not do!

- *I should! Bye.*]

Виригин звонил из издательства.

Торопят, торопят...

[Virigine called from the publishing house.

Rushing me, rushing me...]

- Что, у вас, в Дании, тоже так?

- Тоже так, да.

[- Is it like this in Denmark too?

- Like this, yes.]

А, тебе не показалось, что у него женский голос?

[Did not you think he had a feminine voice?]

- У кого?

- У Виригина.

[- Who?

- Virigine.]

Так он через секретаря звонил...через секретаршу.

[He called through his secretary...female secretary.]

A. -I don't think you should do it.

V. -Yes, I should. Bye.

A. That was Virigine, my editor. Rushing me up, as usual.

A. -Is it like this in Denmark too?

B. -Oh yes.

N. Don't you think his voice was rather feminine?

A. -Who's voice?

N. -Your **Veriguine**'s. (*inconsistent spelling: Virigine/Veriguine*)

A. He was calling through his secretary.

Нравится? Нина сама варила!

[Like it? Nina made it herself!]

Очень вкусно! Это есть повидло?

[Delicious! This is called jam?]

Нет, это варенье. Извините.

[No, this is “preserves”. Excuse me.]

Андрей, она немножко сердится?

[Andrei, she is a bit angry?]

- Может быть, я лучше иду, или лучше остаюсь: будет меньше скандал?

- Нет...

[- Maybe I better go or better stay: will be less of a fight?

- Oh, no...]

Плохо себя чувствует.

[She is not feeling well.]

- До свидания, Билл!

- До свидания.

[- Goodbye, Bill!

- Goodbye.]

A. Do you like it? Nina made it herself.

B. Delicious. It is jam, yes?

N. No, it’s called “preserves”. Excuse me.

B. Andrei, she seems a little angry.

B. -I better go or I better stay?

Which would make it easier?

A. -No, it’s nothing.

A. She’s just not feeling well.

N. -Goodbye, Bill.

B. -Goodbye.

Дальше Вас будет развлекать Андрей.

Я ухожу!

[From now on Andrei will entertain you. I am leaving!]

Нина! Если что-нибудь надо купить, ты скажи, у меня после семинара будет время.

[Nina! If there is something we need at the store, you tell me, I will have time after the seminar.]

Да! Купи цветы...секретарше!

[Yes! Buy flowers...for the female secretary!]

Ушла на работу.

[Left for work.]

Андрей, может быть, у Вас тоже есть работа?

[Andrei, maybe you also have work?]

Может быть, я отнимаю время?

[Maybe I am taking up your time?]

Ну, что Вы, что Вы... Ничуть.

[Oh, no, no... Not at all.]

N. Andrei will now entertain you alone.

A. Nina, you want me to go shopping? I'll have time after my seminar.

N. Go buy flowers for that secretary.

A. She's gone off to work.

B. Andrei, perhaps you have work too?

B. Perhaps I'm taking your time?

A. No, not at all.

Билл, я прочитал.

[Bill, I have read it.]

В принципе, всё правильно, но есть кое-какие неточности.

[On the whole everything is fine, but there are a few inaccuracies.]

Вот здесь, насколько я помню, у Достоевского сказано:

[Right here, as far as I remember, Dostoyevsky writes:]

“За кого ты себя считаешь, фря ты этакая, облизьяна зелёная?”

[“Who do you think you are, you green ape-lick big noise?”]

У Вас правильно: “обезьяна”.

[You have it correct: “ape-like”.]

А у него же “облизьяна” – сленг!

[But he has “ape-lick” – slang!]

Прошу прощения.

[I beg your pardon.]

Да?

[Hello?]

A. Bill, I’ve read it.

A. Everything is fine, but there are a few inaccuracies.

A. Right here, as far as I remember, Dostoyevsky writes:

A. “You should take your medicine and learn to like it”.

A. You say “take your pill”. He means: Take what you’ve got

A. coming and like it. It’s slang.

(Phone rings.)

A. Excuse me.

A. Hello?

V. - Бузыкин! Она ненормальная!

A. - Кто?

V. – Наша машинистка!

[- Bouzykine! She is crazy!

- Who?

- Our typist!]

Я ей сейчас перезвонила, пыталась ей всё объяснить, причём очень деликатно...

[I have just called her back, tried to explain everything to her, very tactfully I mind you...]

...а она послала меня подальше.

[...and she told me to go to hell.]

И тебе велела передать, чтоб ты больше не приходил.

[And to tell you not to come anymore.]

Что делать, а? Может, мне к ней подскочить?

[What shall we do, eh? Maybe I should call on her?]

Ни в коем случае! И вообще, кто тебя просил вмешиваться?

[*By no means!* On the whole who asked you to interfere?]

V. Bouzykine, she's crazy, our typist.

V. I called her to explain what the situation was.

V. She told me to shut up.

V. and that you should get lost and never come again.

V. Maybe I'd better go there?

A. Don't you dare! Who asked you to meddle in the first place?

Ну ладно, салют.

[All right, cheerio.]

Андрей, я думаю, что “облизьяна” – это неправильная печать.

[Andrei, I think that “ape-lick” is a misprint.]

Нет, это правильная печать.

[No, it is not a misprint.]

Простите, Билл, но мне пора в институт.

[I am sorry, Bill, but it is time for me to go to the Institute.]

Андрей, я Вас отпускаю, да, только у меня есть ещё один маленький вопрос.

[Andrei, I let you go, yes, but I have one more simple question.]

- Пожалуйста.

- Сейчас найду.

[- Sure.

- I will find it in a moment.]

V. All right. Bye.

(Andrei picks up the phone again and starts dialing ...

B. Now I understand. It’s a colloquial expression.

A. Yeah, a colloquial expression.

... Andrei finishes dialing, but the number is busy.)

A. I’m sorry, Bill, now I have to go to the Institute.

B. Can I ask you just one more simple question?

A. -Sure.

B. -Just a second, I’ve got to look.

APPENDIX II

Table 4.1

Treatment of Repetitions and Unfinished Utterances		
Russian text	English translation	English subtitling
N. – Ну, что вы там молчите и дышите? Хоть бы мяукнули!	N. – So, why do you say nothing and breathe over there? Could have at least meowed!	N. – Can't you talk? Give a meow, at least.
***	***	***
B. – Это как называется?	B. – What is it called?	B. – What do you call them?
N. – “Хворост”.	N. – “Khvorost”.	N. – “Khvorost”.
A. – “Хворост”.	A. – “Khvorost”.	
***	***	***
B. – Простите, очень тихо, плохо понимаю.	B. – Sorry, very softly, I understand badly.	B. – Sorry, I couldn't understand.
N. – А, это я ему.	N. – Oh, I was talking to him.	A. – She was talking to me.
A. – Это она мне.	A. – She was talking to me.	N. – I was talking to him.
***	***	***
A. – Билл, ну рассудите, почему, если кто-то где-то молчит и дышит, то это значит, что звонят именно мне?	A. – Bill, do judge this, why if somebody somewhere says nothing and breathes this means that the call is definitely for me?	A. – Bill, if one doesn't say anything, why should that call be for me?

<p>В. – Простите, как? А. – Ну, я говорю, почему, если кто-то где-то...</p>	<p>В. – Sorry, what? А. – Well, I am saying why if somebody somewhere...</p>	<p>В. - Pardon?</p>
<p>***</p>	<p>***</p>	<p>***</p>
<p>А. – Виригин звонил из издательства. Торопят, торопят...</p>	<p>А. – Virigine called from the publishing house. Rushing me, rushing me...</p>	<p>А. – That was Virigine, my editor. Rushing me up, as usual.</p>
<p>А. – Так он через секретаря звонил...через секретаршу.</p>	<p>А. – He called through his secretary... female secretary.</p>	<p>А. – He was calling through his secretary.</p>
<p>***</p>	<p>***</p>	<p>***</p>
<p>В. – Может быть я лучше иду, или лучше остаюсь: будет меньше скандала?</p>	<p>В. – Maybe I better go or better stay: will be less of a fight?</p>	<p>В. – I better go or I better stay? Which would make it easier?</p>
<p>А. – Нет...</p>	<p>А. – Oh, no...</p>	<p>А. – No, it's nothing.</p>
<p>***</p>	<p>***</p>	<p>***</p>
<p>В. – Может быть, я отнимаю время?</p>	<p>В. – Maybe I am taking up your time?</p>	<p>В. – Perhaps, I'm taking your time?</p>
<p>А. – Ну, что Вы, что Вы... Ничуть.</p>	<p>А. – Oh, no, no... Not at all.</p>	<p>А. – No, not at all.</p>

APPENDIX III

Russian text	English subtitling
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Эпизод 26</i></p> <p>- Бузыкин, ты что хромаешь? Что случилось?</p> <p>- Да, так.</p> <p>[- Bouzykine, why are you limping? What happened?</p> <p>- Ah, nothing.]</p> <p>Слушай, ты знаешь, я понимаю, это идиотизм, но ты знаешь,</p> <p>[Listen, you know, I understand it is ridiculous, but you know...]</p> <p>- что мне сказал Виригин?</p> <p>- Ну?!</p> <p>[- ...what Virigine said to me?</p> <p>- What?!]</p> <p>Он сказал, что мои переводы лучше, чем твои. Ну, это умора!</p> <p>[He said that my translations are better than yours. I die with laughter!]</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Episode 26 'Faculty meeting'</i></p> <p>V. = Varvara A. = Andrei</p> <p>V. -Why are you limping, Bouzykine?</p> <p>A. -Ah, it's nothing.</p> <p>V. -I realize it's ridiculous, but you know</p> <p>V. -what Verigine told me?</p> <p>V. -That my translations are better than yours. Isn't it a riot?</p>

Поздравляю.

[Congratulations.]

- Ты знаешь, чего я притащилась?

- Ну?!

- В плане на Скофилда ты стоял?

[- You know why I dragged myself here?

- Why?!

- You were scheduled to translate

Scofield?]

Да...

[Yes...]

Ну, передали мне, ну, я хочу знать, как ты к этому относишься.

[Well, it was handed over to me, well, I want to know how you feel about it.]

Я очень рад...

[I am very happy...]

Я так и знала! Бузыкин, у тебя совесть есть?!

[I have anticipated this! Bouzykine, have you got conscience?!]

В первый раз в жизни мне дали сделать что-то серьезное!

[For the first time in my life I was given

A. -Congratulations.

V. -You know why I came to see you?

You planned to do Scofield's book?

A. -Yes...

V. -He's given it to me, **I want to know what do you think** about it.

A. -I think it's great.

V. -I knew it. Shame on you.

V. -It's my one big chance. Bigger than I ever had.

something serious to do!]

Ну, что мне идти отказываться?!

[So, should I go decline to do it?!]

От меня-то, что тебе надо?! Дали – переводы!

[What do you need from me?! Got the job – translate!]

Но я не хочу, чтоб ты это считал свинством с моей стороны, Бузыкин, ну, мне это очень важно!

[But I do not want you to consider this a swinish trick on my part, Bouzykine, please, it is very important for me!]

Ладно, это не свинство.

[All right, this is not a swinish trick.]

Бузыкин, а ты уже начал, а?

[Bouzykine, and you have already started, eh?]

Может, у тебя остались какие-нибудь черновики, бумаги,

[Maybe, you have some drafts, papers left...]

может, ты отдашь мне их, а, Бузыкин?

[...maybe, you will let me have them, eh, Bouzykine?]

V. -And you want me to turn it down?

A. -What do you want from me? You have it, do it!

V. -I just don't want you to think I cheated you out of it.

A. -You didn't cheat, okay?

V. -Bouzykine, you've already started on it, right?

V. -Maybe you've got some notes?

V. -How about letting me take a look at them?

А полы тебе помыть не требуется?! А
то я вымою! Ты свистни!

[Do you need your floors washed?! For I
will wash them! You whistle!]

‘Бунт Бузыкина’

- Добрый день, Андрей.

- Здрасте!

[- Good day, Andrei.

- Hello!]

- И, чтоб, понимаете, никаких
осложнений, всё должно быть идеально.

- Ясно. Ясно.

[- And, mind, no complications, everything
should be perfect.

- Understood. Understood.]

A. -How about me scrubbing your floors?

I'll do it, just whistle!

‘Bouzykine’s revolt’

*(Andrei walks at a brisk pace. A colleague
(C) who is also a good friend greets him.)*

C. -Good morning, Andrei.

A. -Morning.

*(Muffled voices are heard. Andrei who is
about to enter the classroom turns around
and walks in the direction of the two people
talking. The two are Shershavnikov (S)
and an elderly professor (P), World War II
veteran.)*

S. -And, please, no complications.

P. -I know.

*(The two notice Andrei who stands next to
them staring at Shershavnikov. The latter
greets Andrei.)*

- Здорово, Бузыкин!

[Hi, Bouzykine!]

А вот руки-то я Вам не подам!

[A handshake I will not give you!]

- Здравствуйте!

- Здравствуйте!

- Здравствуйте!

[- Hello!

- How are you?

- Hello!]

- Ты что, с ума сошёл? Почему?

- А, потому!

[- What are you, crazy? Why?

- Just because!]

Тебе это не идёт, Бузыкин, запомни! Не идёт!

[It does not become you, Bouzykine, mind!

Does not!]

И всё-таки я прошу тебя, Шершавников, на будущее: не ставь себя в глупое положение!

[And still, I ask you, Shershavnikov, for the future: do not make a fool of yourself!]

S. -Hello, Bouzykine.

A. -I won't shake hands with you.

(Andrei turns to the veteran and greets him.)

A.-Good morning.

P. -How are you?

S. -Are you crazy? Why not?

A. -Because I won't.

S. -It's not your style, Bouzykine.

A. -I'm warning you, don't put yourself in an awkward situation.

- Всего доброго!

- Всего доброго!

[- Take care!

- Take care!]

- Что с ним?

- Не понимаю...

[- What is wrong with him?

- I do not understand...]

Андрей Палыч, Андрей Палыч,
напишите мне зачёт, пожалуйста, а то
мне стипендию не дают.

[Andrei Palych, Andrei Palych, pass me
please: they would not give me my
monthly allowance.]

А я сдам, вот освобожусь немного и
сдам.

[And I will pass the test, as soon as I am
free I will pass it.]

Хартия Переводчиков, товарищ
Лифанов, гласит,
[The Translator's Charter, comrade
Lifanov, reads...]

что перевод в современном мире
[...that translation in the world of today...]

A. -Nice seeing you!

P. -Goodbye!

P. -What's the matter with him?

S. -I don't get it.

*(Andrei enters the classroom. One of the
students, Lifanov (L) approaches him.)*

L. -Would you help me with my final
paper? Or I'll lose my scholarship.

L. -I'll do make-up work later on.

A. -The code of our profession, my dear
Lifanov, is this:

-We aim, in this turbulent world,

должен содействовать лучшему
взаимопониманию между народами!

[...should contribute to a better
understanding amongst men!]

А Вы, своим лепетом, будете только
разобщать!

[And you, with your babbling, will only
estrangle!]

И вообще, учтите все!

[On the whole, bear in mind, all of you!]

Больше никому никаких побряжек не
будет!

[No more indulgence towards anybody!]

to make culture and language of different
peoples more available.

-And you, with your double talk, will just
slow down the process.

-The same goes for all of you.

-In future, I do no more favors for anyone.

APPENDIX IV

Table 4.4

Russian text	English translation	English subtitling
V. - Я так и знала! Бузыкин, у тебя совесть есть?!	V. – I have anticipated this! Bouzykine, have you got conscience?!	V. -I knew it. Shame on you.
V. - В первый раз в жизни мне дали сделать что-то серьёзное!	V. – For the first time in my life I was given something serious to do!	V. -It’s my one big chance. Bigger than I ever had.
V. - Ну, что мне идти отказываться?!	V. – So, should I go decline to do it?!	V. -And you want me to turn it down?
A. - От меня-то, что тебе надо?! Дали – переводи!	A. – What do you need from me?! Got the job – translate!	A. -What do you want from me? You have it, do it!
V. - Но я не хочу, чтоб ты это считал свинством с моей стороны, Бузыкин, ну, мне это очень важно!	V. – But I do not want you to consider this to be a swinish trick on my part, Bouzykine, please, it is very important for me!	V. -I just don’t want you to think I cheated you out of it.
A. - Ладно, это не свинство.	A. – All right, this is not a swinish trick.	A. -You didn’t cheat, okay?

<p>V. - Бузыкин, а ты уже начал, а?</p>	<p>V. – Bouzykine, and have you already started, eh?</p>	<p>V. -Bouzykine, you've already started on it, right?</p>
<p>V. - Может, у тебя остались какие-нибудь черновики, бумаги...</p>	<p>V. – Maybe, you have some drafts, papers left...</p>	<p>V. -Maybe you've got some notes?</p>
<p>V. - ...может, ты отдашь мне их, а, Бузыкин?</p>	<p>V. - ...maybe, you will let me have them, eh, Bouzykine?</p>	<p>V. -How about letting me take a look at them?</p>
<p>A. - А полы тебе помыть не требуется?! А то я вымою! Ты свистни!</p>	<p>A. – Do you need your floors washed?! For I will wash them! You whistle!</p>	<p>A. -How about me scrubbing your floors? I'll do it, just whistle!</p>

REFERENCES

- Baker, M. 1992. *In Other Words. A Coursebook on Translation*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Bell, R. 1991. *Translation and Translating. Theory and Practice*, London and New York: Longman.
- Berman, A. 2000. 'Translation and the Trials of the Foreign'. In Venuti, L. and Baker, M. (eds) *The Translation Studies Reader*, London and New York: Routledge, 284-297.
- Blum-Kulka, S. 2000. 'Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation'. In Venuti, L. and Baker, M. (eds) *The Translation Studies Reader*, London and New York: Routledge, 298-313.
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. 1987. *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage*, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Butt, D., Fahey, R., Feez, S., Spinks, S., Yallop, C. 2000. *Using Functional Grammar, An Explorer's Guide, Second Edition*, Sydney: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research Macquarie University.
- Cintas, J. 2001. 'Striving for Quality in Subtitling: the Role of a Good Dialogue List'. In Gambier, Y. and Gottlieb, H. (eds) *(Multi) Media Translation*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 199-211.
- Cintas, J. 2004. 'Subtitling: the Long Journey to Academic Acknowledgement'. In *Journal of Specialised Translation*. Issue 01: 50-68.
- FIT (1994) *The Translator's Charter* [Online] Available at <http://www.fit-ift.org/en/charter.php> (accessed 01 August 2005)

- Hatim, B. and Mason, I. 1990. *Discourse and the Translator*, London and New York: Longman.
- Hatim, B. and Mason, I. 1997. *The Translator as Communicator*, London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- James, H. 2001. 'Quality Control of Subtitles: Review or Preview?' In Gambier, Y. and Gottlieb, H. (eds) *(Multi) Media Translation*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 151-160.
- Karamitroglou, F. (1998) A Proposed Set of Subtitling Standards in Europe. *Translation Journal* Volume 2, No. 2, April [Online] Available at <http://www accurapid.com/journal/04stndrd.htm> (accessed 22December 2004)
- Karamitroglou, F. (1999) Audiovisual Translation at the Dawn of the Digital Age: Prospects and Potentials. *Translation Journal* Volume 3, No. 3, July [Online] Available at <http://www accurapid.com/journal/09av.htm> (accessed 29 November 2004)
- Karamitroglou, F. 2000. *Towards a Methodology for the Investigation of Norms in Audiovisual Translation*, Amsterdam - Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.
- Mish, F. (editor in chief) 1993. *Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. Tenth Edition*, Springfield, Massachusetts, U.S.A.: Merriam-Webster, Incorporated.
- Nabokov, V. 1981. *Lectures on Russian Literature*, San Diego New York London: A Harvest Book Harcourt Brace & Company Bruccoli Clark Layman.
- Ozhegov, S. and Shvedova, N. (eds) 2000. *Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language*, Moscow: 'Azbukovnik'.

Taube, A. and Darglish, R. (eds) 2002. *Contemporary Russian-English Dictionary*, Moscow: Russky Yazyk Publishers.

Williams, H. and Thorne, D. 2000. 'The Value of Teletext Subtitling as a Medium for Language Learning'. In *System*. 28: 217-228.

Willis, D. 1993. 'Grammar and Lexis: Some Pedagogical Implications'. In Sinclair, J., Fox, G. and Hoey, M. (eds) *Techniques of Description*, London: Routledge, 83-93.