

YEREVAN STATE
UNIVERSITY

TRANSLATION STUDIES: THEORY AND PRACTICE

International Scientific Journal

volume 1 | issue 1

YEREVAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Department of Translation Studies

**TRANSLATION STUDIES: THEORY AND
PRACTICE**

International Scientific Journal

volume 1 | issue 1

YEREVAN–2021

PRAGMATIC COHERENCE AND EQUIVALENCE IN LITERARY TRANSLATION

SHUSHANIK PARONYAN

YEREVAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Abstract: The topic of the present paper concerns cultural translation and focuses on the cross-cultural aspect of pragmatic equivalence. It is based on the hypothesis that the pragmatic framework of the literary work, i.e. the deliberate choice of tied verbal actions and the interpretations of these actions, forms an important slot in the overall structure of cultural context and displays the artistic literary idea of the writer. Hence, the research work clearly shows that literary translation should adequately transmit the intentions and ideas encoded in the original text to the readers from the respective culture. The cross-cultural pragmatic analysis of the speech act sequences and reporting words carried out on the material of a literary work in English and its Armenian translation has enabled us to determine that the violation of pragmatic coherence of the source text distorts the cultural context planned by the author.

Key words: cross-cultural pragmatics, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts, cultural translation, cultural context, equivalence

1. Introduction

The present paper studies the display of pragmatic incoherence that may arise in the process of literary translation. Proceeding from the assumption that the pragmatic framework of the literary work, i.e. the purposeful choice of tied verbal actions and the interpretations of these actions, forms an important slot in the overall structure of cultural context and displays the artistic literary idea of the writer, the paper aims to reveal cases of inadequate conversion of the writer's intent from one language to another and to show that they impair the quality of the translation. Having the conception that translation and culture are intimately entangled, the cross-cultural pragmatic study of the literary translation comes to prove that its success may to a certain extent depend on the adequate translation of the illocutionary acts and their sequential ties. This kind of pragmatic coherence acquires a cross-cultural value and recreates equivalent cultural context in the target language.

The research carried out within the field of linguistic anthropology revealed a new aspect of transferring meaning - cultural translation, which means showing cultural differences and respecting them in the practice of translation (Bingqian 1995; Goodenough 1981; Darnell 2001; Maitland 2017). This factor has undoubtedly become more significant recently as many linguists who adopt cultural translation highlight the importance of how the translated text is comprehended, interpreted in the target culture. Hence the knowledge of the cultural background of the target language becomes important and translation studies are not only based on language issues, but also on

cultural contexts between people (Yunxing 1998; Ahearn 2012; Shaw 2012; Borkowski 2014).

The theoretical framework of the present research is based on the foundations of pragmatics and cross-cultural studies where the contextual study of language data is carried out from pragmatic perspective by applying qualitative methodology (Goddard and Wierzbicka 2007; Barker and Galasinski 2001; Wierzbicka 2003; Paronyan 2011; Paronyan and Bekaryan 2013) (Verschueren 1999). The process of translation is viewed from the standpoint of pragmatic equivalence, examining how the coherent flow of the illocutionary acts in the source text was reconstructed and a similar cultural context was recreated in the target text (Paronyan 2014).

The analysis is carried out on the material of the novel “Fahrenheit 451” by Ray Bradbury (Bradbury 1983) and its Armenian translation “Ֆարենհայթ 451”, done by L. Haroyan (Bradbury 2016). For the purpose of the cross-cultural pragmatic analysis certain exchanges - sequences of tied speech acts from the source (English) and target (Armenian) texts have been picked out. The criterion of pragmatic coherence viewed from the point of view of translation equivalence determines the success of the literary translation under question.

2. On the Cultural Framework of Literary Translation

The art of translation is as old as the strife of human beings to achieve perfection in life through knowledge and cognition. The necessity to create a collective storage of facts about different phenomena and life events motivated people speaking different languages and representing various cultures to collaborate. The creation of cumulative, shared informative material became possible only via changing the codification system of the information, i.e. by converting it from one language code to another. Being a social behavior, language is one of the most important ingredients of culture which reflects particular forms of the cultural blueprint of a group of people speaking one and the same language (Riley 2007; Samovar, Porter and McDaniel 2009; Paronyan 2018). If we agree that each language presents a specific linguaculture, we cannot but admit that translation is a purposefully recodified and equivalent reverberation of a certain informative content in a displaced cultural context. Translation of literary works is a specific area of connecting cultures which imposes certain difficulties on the translator.

First of all, fiction is creation of a fictional, imaginative scenario of life events on the background of certain historical, social, ideological and cultural contexts. Therefore, ideally, the converted, translated text should reflect not only the explicit and superficial layer of the encoded informative material, i.e. the exact communicative structure of the original texture, but also its implicit, profound layers of contextualization.

In translation theory the value of the translation is often determined by semantic equivalence which can be achieved via successful choice of adequate words, expressions, stylistic expressive means and devices (Newmark 1988; Newmark 1991; Larson 1998, Waard and Nida 1986; Venuti 1995; Bassnet 2002). Anyhow, the research carried out within the field of linguistic anthropology revealed a new aspect of

transferring meaning - cultural translation, which means showing cultural differences and respecting them in the practice of translation. It became obvious that a good knowledge of the target language does not create conditions for successful translation. Since the knowledge of the cultural background of the target language becomes important, translation studies are not only based on language issues, but also on cultural contexts between people. (Geng 2013; Wenhua 2000; Wilson 2009). Studying different aspects of language and communication, B. Bharati states that “Culture gives language different contexts,” and concludes that “The relationship between language, translation and culture is a key aspect of communication” (Bharati 2018).

In general, the context of a literary work is a manifold communicative framework which consists of different meaningful domains - historical, social, ideological and cultural. They form the overall contextual meaning that helps the message of a literary text make sense (Borkowski 2014). As we have already stated, the present paper focuses on one of the contextual factors - cultural context. This factor becomes important as many linguists, who adopt the idea of cultural translation, try to examine how the translated text is comprehended, interpreted in the target culture. Cultural context presents a vast field of informative slots. It refers to various symbolic expression systems that affect aesthetic communication, to the cultural background related to verbal communication such as cultural customs, lifestyle of the people and a collective habit of the social masses in language, behavior, and psychology (Cultural Context. in Quora.com).

The present paper focuses on one particular aspect of cultural context in literary translation. As we have already stated, we assume that the pragmatic framework of the literary work, i.e. the purposeful choice of tied verbal actions and the interpretations of these actions, forms an important slot in the overall structure of cultural context and displays the artistic literary idea of the writer. Cross-cultural pragmatics has revealed specific ways of expressing illocutionary forces in different cultures (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989; Wierzbicka 2003; Paronyan and Tamoyan 2016). The equivalent translation of the speech acts from one language to another acquires cross-cultural value and becomes extremely important for the success of the translation as it creates an adequate cultural context in the target language.

The literary work under question, the novel “Fahrenheit 451” by Ray Bradbury, refers to a specific literary genre, science fiction. The uniqueness of science fiction as a literary genre is apparent first of all by the context of situation in which the narrative evolves. The latter presents 'linguistic animation' of a plot which is not only fictional, imaginative but also conceptually unrealistic and fictitious, the result of the boundless human fantasy. Truly, science fiction writers are considered as great foreseers as many phenomena, devices and objects fantasied by them and unreal, non-existent at the real time of writing were invented by people many years later (e.g. airplanes, submarines, robots, cell phones, different weapons and many other realia). Thus we can say that the text of the novel presents a narrative which is based on fictive contextual model and, naturally, it makes the translator's task even more difficult. Truly, it is easier to 'reconstruct' the situational context of real past than that of unrealistic and artificially fabricated, created life events.

We strongly believe that recreation of the cultural context during literary translation is crucial for successful recodifying. People see the same things but they interpret them differently, depending on their cultural background – mindset, moral code, core values, and traditions. Furthermore, their interpretation is expressed via language – the expression of thought, which, as we said, is also a cultural variable. Hence many realia, phenomena that exist in one culture may be absent in another culture and present certain difficulties for the translator. If we study verbal communication from pragmatic perspective, we will observe that each language establishes its customary scenarios of verbal interactions, interchanges of specific speech acts, which may prove to be challenging for the translator.

3. Pragmatic Equivalence in “Fahrenheit 451” as a Key to Successful Translation

Speech acts are verbal actions that express the speaker's intent, the communicative purpose of speech. It is not only important what and how the speakers say something but also why they communicate: to get information by performing a questive speech act, to make somebody do something by performing a request or order, to state a fact by performing a statement, or to undertake an obligation by performing a promise. These verbal actions are abundant in fiction where different fictive communicative situations are verbalized in dialogs. Furthermore, the samples of direct speech that present 'authentic' speech acts performed by the literary heroes are often accompanied by reporting verbs that comment on the situation, make some additional remarks or disclose the inner thoughts of the hero, as intended by the writer. Hence our cross-cultural pragmatic analysis will focus on the adequate transfer of the speech acts and the interpretive formulations from the source language to the target language as an important aspect of pragmatic equivalence.

The cross-cultural pragmatic analysis of the novel “Fahrenheit 451” and its Armenian translation shows that in most cases the target text matches the illocutionary mapping of the original text, creating the communicative effect of pragmatic coherence. We will call this type of pragmatic equivalence 'coordinated matching of speech acts.' However, the analysis has also revealed samples of exchanges where the ‘original’ illocutionary mapping is violated and there is pragmatic incoherence between the source and the target texts. We will call this type of pragmatic equivalence ‘uncoordinated matching of illocutionary acts.’

In order to show that in the process of translation the translator can recreate the cultural context of the original texture differently - by preserving the pragmatic equivalence or violating it, let us study how the illocutionary forces in the English text and their Armenian translations match.

Coordinated Matching of Illocutionary Acts in “Fahrenheit 451”

Coordinated matching of illocutionary acts presupposes that the speech acts in the English and Armenian text samples are identical. The sameness of the communicative intent creates pragmatic coherence which, in its turn, recreates adequate cultural context in the target language.

In the following exchange the speaker asks a question which is followed by an act of supposing:

“Of course,” he said, “you’re our new neighbour, aren’t you?”
 “And you must be” – she raised her eyes from his professional symbols – “the fireman.”
 Her voice trailed off. (p. 31)

The translation of this sample displays the same illocutionary mapping:

-Ղէ իհարկէ, Դուք մեր նոր հարևանուհին էք, այնպէս չէ՞:
 -Դուք պէտք է որ, - նա հայացքը բարձրացրեց նրա մասնագիտական խորհրդանշաններին,- հրկիզողը լինէք: - Աղջկա ձայնը նվաղեց: (p. 10)

The questive speech act ‘*you’re our new neighbour, aren’t you?*’ is a disjunctive question which states a certain fact and tends to confirm its truth. The modal verb ‘*must*’ in the replying act of supposing expresses deduction - certainty. In the Armenian translation the questive speech act ‘Դուք մեր նոր հարևանուհին էք, այնպէս չէ՞’ is used which matches the communicative meaning of the disjunctive question. In Armenian grammar this communicative type is called ‘urging question,’ i.e. a question which strongly requires a response. The expression ‘պէտք է որ’ in the act of supposing matches the communicative meaning of the modal ‘must’ and expresses possibility which is close to reality, which is likely to be true. Thus we can see that the Armenian translation of the exchange echos the English communicative structure exactly, creating pragmatic coherence.

Let us analyse another exchange where coordinated sequence of speech acts can be observed:

“Do you mind if I ask? How long have you worked at being a fireman?” “Since I was twenty, ten years ago.”
 “Do you ever read any of the books you burn?”
 He laughed. “That’s against the law.” (p. 32)

-Կարելի է մի հարց տալ: Որքա՞ն ժամանակ է, ինչ աշխատում եք որպէս հրկիզող:
 -Քսան տարեկանից: Տասը տարի է արդեն:
 -Դուք երբևէ կարդո՞ւ մ եք այն գրքերը, որոնք այրում եք:
 Սոնթագը ծիծաղեց:
 -Ո՛չ, քրեորեն պատժելի է: (p. 12)

The illocutionary mapping in the English text and its Armenian translation is the same, it presents the sequence of the following speech acts: ‘*request for permission – question – stating – question – stating – denial.*’

The sameness of the illocutionary forces creates the effect of pragmatic coherence by which the communicative purport of the interaction, as intended by the author, is preserved and the cultural context in the source and target texts are harmonious.

Let us proceed to the analysis of cases where the illocutionary forces in the original and target texts are uncoordinated.

Uncoordinated Matching of Illocutionary Acts in “Fahrenheit 451”

Uncoordinated matching of illocutionary acts presupposes that the speech acts in the English text samples and their Armenian translations differ. The divergence of the communicative intent creates pragmatic incoherence which means that cultural context recreated in the target language may prove to be inadequate.

The analysis shows that in certain cases uncoordinated illocutionary acts are due to the communicative-semantic peculiarities of the target language, i.e. the choice of translating the idea with a different illocutionary force is conditioned by the mentality of the particular language culture, Armenian linguaculture. In such cases, interestingly enough, by issuing a different illocutionary act, similar communicative intent and perlocutionary effect are created - pragmatic incoherence proceeds without distorting the cultural context. The following exchange illustrates such an example of uncoordinated matching of illocutionary acts in the Armenian translation of “Fahrenheit 451”:

“I’ve meant to talk to you about her. **Strange.**”

“Oh, I know the one you mean.”

“I thought you would.” (p. 66)

-Քեզ հետ նրա մասին էի ուզում խոսել: **Տարօրինակ է, չէ՞:**

-Ճանաչում եմ նրան:

-Գիտեի, որ կճանաչես: (p. 61)

In the initiating remark of the English variant the speaker, Montag, issues two speech acts – stating and supposing. Montag makes it clear that he wants to talk to his wife about their neighbour Clarisse, whom he believes his wife should know: ‘*I’ve meant to talk to you about her.*’ Furthermore, he expresses his hypothetical opinion about Clarisse with the intention to discuss it further: ‘*Strange.*’ The reacting remark issued by Mildred is an assertion by which she acknowledges the fact she knows Clarisse: ‘*Oh, I know the one you mean.*’ In the Armenian translation the translator has replaced the act of supposing by the act of a question, urging question, in particular, which strongly expresses the need for feedback: ‘**Տարօրինակ է, չէ՞.**’ This reformulation of the illocutionary force can be explained by the fact that in Armenian culture questions usually boost further interaction, and the use of the illocutionary act of supposing, no matter how coherent pragmatically, might not stimulate Mildred to discuss the topic suggested by Montag. So in the Armenian variant the urging question, which is a direct way of appeal for the interlocutor’s viewpoint, moving her to react is used. This pragmatic incoherence does not create any pragmatic inadequacy and does not distort the cultural context in the Armenian translation.

In the following exchange the violence in the illocutionary mapping is subtle – if ever noticeable by the ordinary reader, and at first sight the speech acts in the Armenian translation seems to be coordinated:

...“But I think she's dead.”
 “**You're not sure of it!**”
 “No, not sure. Pretty sure.” (p. 66)

...Նա կարծեմ մահացել է:
 -**Սակայն համոզված չեմ:**
 -Ո՛չ, համոզված չեմ: Չէ, լիովին համոզված եմ: (p. 61)

If we look more closely at these samples and compare the communicative structure of the English variant with the Armenian translation, we will notice that the reacting remark of the speaker, that of Montag, contains an exclamation mark, which speaks of his emotional state, agitation. Montag shouts and expresses his disbelief, trying to get confirmation of the truth of the proposition of the previous speech act: the fact that Clarisse is dead makes him frustrated and he wants to make certain of that: ‘*You're not sure of it!*’ In fact, this is an indirect question, which can be paraphrased as a general question aimed at confirming the truth of some proposition: ‘*Are you sure of it?*’ In the Armenian translation the emotional colouring of the indirect question and the excitement of the speaker are lost as the translator has not marked it with an exclamation mark. Anyhow, the semanteme ‘disbelief’ is replaced by that of contrast, which is expressed with the help of the conjunction ‘*սակայն*.’ The expression of opposing attitude is an emotional trigger in Armenian that stimulates the interlocutor to confirm the truth of the proposition of the previous speech act and the reacting remark is pragmatically coherent with the English variant. We can conclude that the above mentioned communicative replacement in the target text is adequate for Armenian linguaculture and does not distort the cultural context in the Armenian translation.

Let us analyse translation samples where the purposeful displacement of the illocutionary mapping violates the pragmatic coherence of the illocutionary acts and, therefore, changes the communicative objective of the situational context as intended by the writer:

They walked on again in silence and finally she said, thoughtfully, “You know, I'm not afraid of you at all.”
 He was surprised. “Why should you be?”
 “So many people are. Afraid of firemen, I mean. **But you're just a man afte all...**” (p. 32)

-Գիտե՞ք, ես ամենին չեմ վախենում Ձեզնից:
 -Իսկ ինչու՞ պիտի վախենայիք: - Մոնթագի դեմքին ակնհայտ զարմանք կար:
 -Այդպիսի մարդիկ շատ կան: Նկատի ունեմ մարդիկ, ովքեր վախենում են հրկիզողներից: **Բայց Դուք, ի վերջո, բոլորիս նման մարդ եք, չէ՞ ...** (p. 11)

The exchange is taken from the first meeting between Montag and Clarisse late at night. The young girl talks to Montag but at the same time she tries to overcome some inner barriers, superstitions she has – firemen are said to be cruel so she has to avoid meeting them. Speaking about her fears of firemen, she makes her own deduction: ‘*But you're just a man after all...*’ This is a representative speech act – concluding, which

finalizes the speaker's inner thoughts. Performing this speech act, Clarisse addresses herself and convinces of the fact that Montag, who is a fireman, is not different from other human beings, there is no need to fear him. Anyhow, in the Armenian translation the representative speech act is replaced by a questive speech act – urging question ‘*Բայց Դուք, ի վերջո, բոլորիս նման մարդ եք, չէ...*’ As we have already stated, in Armenian this communicative question type is directed towards the interlocutor and aims at getting feedback, at least confirmation of the truth of proposition. In the English text the speaker's concluding speech act ‘*But you're just a man after all...*’ did not provoke any answer from the interlocutor, which means it was not aimed at getting any information. Hence the urgent need for getting information, which is present in the Armenian translation, violates the illocutionary mapping as well as the communicative intent of the writer - to display the deep contemplation of the speaker and create an artistic image of a profound person who has a penetrating mind. Hence it would have been better to use a negative question in Armenian, which is less addressed to the interlocutor and can be used indirectly as a concluding speech act: ‘*Բայց չէ՞ որ Դուք, ի վերջո, բոլորիս նման մարդ եք...*’ As we can conclude, in this example uncoordinated matching of the illocutionary acts in the source and target texts results in pragmatic incoherence and distorts the cultural context in the Armenian translation.

In the following exchange uncoordinated matching of the illocutionary acts in the Armenian translation is present:

“Let's talk about something else. // Have you ever smelled old leaves? **Don't they smell like cinnamon?** Here. Smell.”

“**Why, yes, it is like cinnamon in a way.**”

She looked at him with her clear dark eyes. “You always seem shocked.” (p.49)

-Եկեք ուրիշ բանից խոսենք: // Երբևէ հին տերևների բույրը զգացե՞լ եք: **Չար- չինի բույր ունեն:** Հասա փորձե՛ք զգալ:

-**Ինչու: Այո, դարչին են բուրում:**

Աղջիկն իր մուգ աչքերով նրան նայեց:

-Դուք միշտ անակնկալի եք գալիս: (p. 38)

In the first remark the speaker, Clarisse, addresses the interlocutor by performing interrogative and directive speech acts. At first she makes two interrogative speech acts. She wants to get information: ‘*Have you ever smelled old leaves?*’ (general question), to confirm the interlocutor's knowledge about some information which is subjective and expresses surprise, something unexpected: ‘*Don't they smell like cinnamon?*’ (negative general question). Furthermore, she makes two directive speech acts, encouraging the interlocutor to some action: ‘*Here. Smell*’ (recommending). In the Armenian translation the negative general question is replaced by a representative speech act – claiming, which, besides the fact that does not seek confirmation, lacks the semantic element of unexpectedness: ‘*Չարչինի բույր ունեն.*’ Judging from the overall image created by R. Bradbury, Clarisse is pictured as an unusual and eccentric personality who is not conformable in the fictive and imaginative plot of the novel. So the lack of surprise and unexpectedness in the Armenian translation, which are

necessary emotive elements in this cultural context, results in pragmatic incoherence. The responding remark contains a representative speech act – agreement, by which Montag agrees with the hypothetical truth of the disjunctive question and confirms its probability with a certain extent of doubt: *‘Why, yes, it is like cinnamon in a way.’* The remark begins with the exclamatory word *‘why,’* which is used to express surprise and echoes with Clarisse’s feeling of uncertainty and unexpectedness. Meanwhile, in the Armenian translation the exclamatory word *‘why’* is translated as an elliptical question, *‘Բնչու՞’*, which proves to be incoherent in this context since the speaker’s utterance is not aimed at clarifying the reason or purpose of anything or any action. Furthermore, the agreement expressed by the speaker in the second utterance does not contain the emotive element of surprise which is present in the English variant: *‘Այո, դարչին էն բուրուս.’* It simply confirms the truth with a great extent of certainty, without doubting, as it was in the English text. Hence in this example uncoordinated matching of the illocutionary acts in the source and target texts results in pragmatic incoherence and distorts the cultural context in the Armenian translation. Let us analyse another case of uncoordinated matching of illocutionary acts:

“Good night, Professor.”

“Not good night. // I’ll be with you the rest of the night, a vinegar gnat tickling your ear when you need me...” (p. 101)

-Բարի՛ գիշեր, պրոֆեսոր՛:

-Բարի գիշեր կարող եք չասել: // Չե՞ որ ողջ գիշեր Ձեզ հետ եմ լինելու. մոծակի պես խուտուտ եմ տալու Ձեր ականջը, երբ Դուք իմ կարիքն ունենաք: (p. 116)

The reacting remark contains direct promise: the professor undertakes an obligation to do some action in favour of the speaker. In the previous scenes of the novel the interlocutors agreed to keep in touch the whole night via a small device - ear-phone, so here the professor confirms that he is going to keep his word: *‘I’ll be with you the rest of the night, a vinegar gnat tickling your ear when you need me...’* In the Armenian translation another commissive speech act - guaranteeing/assurance is used, which is performed indirectly, with the help of a rhetorical question, *‘Չե՞ որ ողջ գիշեր Ձեզ հետ եմ լինելու. մոծակի պես խուտուտ եմ տալու Ձեր ականջը, երբ Դուք իմ կարիքն ունենաք.’* The speaker as if simulates a quest, knowing the answer beforehand. In fact, the act of guaranteeing, issued indirectly in the Armenian translation, does not imply any previous consent, moreover, it does not contain one of the most important felicity conditions for the act of promising to take place – the fact that the interlocutor will benefit from the future action. Hence in this case we can also state that the uncoordinated matching of the illocutionary acts in the source and target texts results in pragmatic incoherence and distorts the cultural context in the Armenian translation.

To finish this part of analysis, I would also like to highlight another pragmatic aspect of recreating the cultural context in this exchange, which concerns deictic markers, namely, person deixis. Since the category of number in Modern English second person personal pronouns is absent, the pronouns ‘you,’ ‘your’ are used to

address people both in singular and plural. Unlike this, the Armenian second person pronouns show number and, moreover, they also display the category of politeness in which case the pronoun is capitalized: ‘Ձեզ,’ ‘Ձեր,’ ‘Դուք.’ Thus in the Armenian translation the second person pronoun is used in its polite form, showing Montag’s respect for the old professor. The use of positive politeness strategy in the Armenian translation is in accordance with Armenian core values - respect for the social status and age of the interlocutor. Hence the polite form of address recreates the Armenian cultural context adequately and does not create pragmatic incoherence.

The cross-cultural pragmatic analysis of the pragmatic equivalence between the source text and its translation has revealed another aspect of incoherence which is important for recreating the cultural context. These are examples when the Armenian translation implies or expresses certain communicative interpretations that were not intended by the author for the heroes’ speech. We will call this type ‘inadequacy of reporting.’

Pragmatic Equivalence and the Act of Speaking

Speaking about pragmatic equivalence, it is worth mentioning that our analysis has also revealed certain changes in the Armenian translation where the reporting words follow the direct speech of the heroes. As usual the reporting words are locutionary verbs which name the communicative type of speech that is performed, describe the process of speaking – say, speak and so on (Dixon 2005). Our analysis shows that R. Bradbury uses mainly the locutionary verb ‘say’ as a reporting word in this novel. Meanwhile, in the Armenian translation different verbs (not only locutionary) can be found, which often specify or clarify the speaker’s communicative intent or attitude. Admittedly, in some cases this kind of reformulation is adequate as it is done for stylistic purposes – to avoid redundancy, unnecessary repetition of the same locutionary verb in the Armenian text. Anyhow, in certain cases this change violates the cultural context as intended by the writer.

In the following examples the locutionary verb ‘said’ is reformulated and this change recreates a specific cultural context in the Armenian translation:

“No, you don’t,” she **said**, in awe. (p.31)

-Այո՛, չի անցնում, - վախով **հաստատեց** աղջիկը: (p. 10)

And then Clarisse McClellan **said**: (p. 32)

Քլարիսն **անակնկալ միջամտեց**. (p.12)

In the first example the use of the verb ‘*հաստատեց*’ (confirmed), expressing logical action, instead of the locutionary verb ‘said’ can be approved as it is used to report the illocutionary act of agreeing. In the second example the verb ‘said’ that is translated ‘*անակնկալ միջամտեց*’ (interfered unexpectedly) contains the implicature ‘unnecessary interruption.’ This hidden meaning it distorts the cultural context of the source text, adding certain communicative elements to the portrait of the hero that were not intended by the author.

In the following example the reporting verb in the Armenian translation is reformulated to avoid redundancy:

“I didn't do that,” she **said** (1). “Never in a billion years.”
 “All right if you **say** (2) so,” he **said** (3). (p. 42)

-Այդպիսի բան չէի անի,- **կրկնեց** (1) նա,- միլիարդ տարի մնար՝ չէի անի:
 -Լավ, եթե **սկսում ես** (2), չեմ վիճում, - **եզրափակեց** (3) Մոնթագը: (p. 27)

In the English text the verb ‘*to say*’ is used three times. In the Armenian version the translator has replaced this verb with different verbs that express not only the act of speaking, i.e. the locutionary act, but also logical thinking. Thus in example (1) the verb ‘*said*’ is replaced by another locutionary verb, ‘*կրկնեց*’ (repeated) which denotes repetition of speaking. If we look at the text, we will see that in the previous part of the dialogue between Montag and Mildred, the latter denied having drunk sleeping pills several times. Hence we can conclude that the locutionary verb nominating repetition of verbal action, used by the translator, can be considered quite adequate. In example (2) the verb ‘*say*’ is replaced by the verb ‘*սկսում ես*’ (insist) which denotes demand that somebody agrees to something. Since in this situation Mildred performs the act of denial repeatedly, the locutionary act of speaking is reformulated as an illocutionary act – insisting. Being stylistically adequate in the Armenian version, anyhow, this replacement presents the translator’s subjective deduction which affects the cultural context of the corresponding communicative situation. In example (3) the verb ‘*said*’ is replaced by the verb ‘*եզրափակեց*’ (concluded) which denotes logical thinking. Even if we agree that this is the conclusive part of the dialogue where, after a lengthy discussion, Montag resigns and agrees to Mildred's point of view, we have to admit that this mental action was not designed to be expressed by the author. Hence in this case this replacement can also be considered subjective interpretation of the translator which affects the cultural context of the communicative situation.

4. Conclusion

The cross-cultural pragmatic analysis of the problem of pragmatic equivalence in literary translation on the material of the novel “Fahrenheit 451” by Ray Bradbury and its Armenian translation has enabled us to arrive at the following conclusions.

The pragmatic framework of the literary work, i.e. the deliberate choice of the sequential verbal actions and the interpretations of these actions is part of the fictional plot which forms the cultural context of the literary work and realizes the communicative and artistic goals of the writer. The literary translation should adequately transmit the intentions and ideas that are encoded in the original text. Therefore, inadequate conversion of the writer's intent from one language to another distorts the cultural context planned by the author and impairs the quality of the translation.

The cross-cultural pragmatic study of pragmatic incoherence between the source and target texts shows that the success of the literary translation may to a certain extent depend on pragmatic coherence since the latter acquires a cross-cultural value and recreates equivalent cultural context in the target language.

Lastly, the present paper presents a specific study of pragmatic incoherence that may arise in the process of literary translation. It does not aim to give an overall evaluation of the quality of the present literary translation.

References

- Ahearn, Laura M. 2012. *Living language: An Introduction to Linguistic Anthropology*. USA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Barker Chris, and Dariuzs Galasinski. 2001. *Cultural Studies and Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.
- Bassnett, Susan. 2002. *Translation studies*. London: Routledge.
- Bharati, Bhasha. 2018. "Understanding the Relationship between Translation and Culture." In *Translation Agency*: <https://bhashabharati.medium.com/understanding-the-relationship-between-translation-and-culture-92e58803bffb> (Accessed: Feb. 8, 2021).
- Bingqian, Wang. 1995. *The Science of Cultural Translation*. Tianjin: The Press of Nankai University.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana, House, Juliane, and Kasper Gabriele. 1989. *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.
- Borkowski, Jan. 2014. "What is the Cultural Context of a Literary Text?" in *Journal of Literary Theory Online*: <http://www.jltonline.de/index.php/reviews/-article/view/631/1540> (Accessed: February 25, 2021).
- Bradbury, Ray. 1983. *Fahrenheit 451 and Short Stories*. Moscow: Raduga Publishers.
- Cultural Context. at *Quora.com*: <https://www.quora.com/What-is-the-meaning-of-cultural-context> (Accessed: February 25, 2021).
- Darnell, Regna. 2001. "Translation." In *Key Terms in Language and Culture*. (ed.) A. Duranti, 248-251. USA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Dixon, Robert. 2005. *A Semantic Approach to English Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Geng, Xiao. 2013. "Techniques of the Translation of Culture." In *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. 3:6, 977-981. Academy Publisher. DOI:10.4304/tpls.3.6.977-981.
- Goddard Cliff, and Anna Wierzbicka. 2007. "Discourse and Culture." In *Discourse as Social Interaction*. (ed.) T.A. van Dijk, 231-258. Los Angeles, London: Sage Publications.
- Goodenough, Ward H. 1981. *Culture, Language, and Society*. Menlo Park, CA.: Cummings.
- Larson, Mildred. 1998. *Meaning-Based Translation: A Guide to Cross-language Equivalence*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Maitland, Sarah. 2017. *What is Cultural Translation?* London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Newmark, Peter. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Newmark, Peter. 1991. *About Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Paronyan, Shushanik, and Bekaryan, Lilit. 2013. "Verbalization of Interpersonal Conflict in Fiction." In *Studia Filologica: Filologichni Studiya Zborniknaukovikh prats.* 2, 60-66. Kiev: Kievskiy Universitet Imeni B. Grichenka.
- Paronyan, Shushanik. 2018. "Language Elements of Foreign Culture in the Narrative: A Pragmatic Approach." In: "Հայագիտության հարցեր» հանդես 1:13." 153-165. Երևան: ԵՊՀ հրատ.
- Riley, Philip. 2007. *Language, Culture and Identity*. London: Continuum.
- Samovar, Larry A., Richard E. Porter, and Edwin R. McDaniel. 2009. *Communication between Cultures*. Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Shaw, Daniel R. 2012. "The Translation Context: Cultural Factors in Translation." In *Translation Review*, 23(1), 25-29: <https://doi.org/10.1080/073748-36.1987.10523398> (Accessed: February 24, 2021).
- Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Verschueren, Jef. 1999. *Understanding Pragmatics*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Waard, Jan de, and Eugene A Nida. 1986. *From One Language to Another: Functional Equivalence in Bible Translation*. Tennessee: Thomas Nelson Publishers.
- Wenhua, Wang. 2000. *Differences and Translation*. Changsha: The Press of Zhongnan University.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 2003. *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Social Interaction*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wilson Andrew. 2009. *Translators on Translating: Inside the Invisible Art*. Vancouver: CCSP Press.
- Yunxing, Li. 1998. *Cultural Factors in Translation. Perspectives*, 6:2:175-182: DOI: 10.1080/0907676X.1998.9961334 (Accessed: February 25, 2021).
- Բրեդբերի, Ռեյ. 2016. *Ֆարենհայթ 451*. (թարգմ.) Լ. Հարոյան. Երևան: Զանգակ.
- Պարոնյան, Շուշանիկ. 2011. *Լեզվաճանաչողություն և դիսկուրս*. Երևան, ԵՊՀ հրատ.
- Պարոնյան, Շուշանիկ. 2014. «Արտալեզվական լեզվամշակութային գործոնների դերը բանավոր թարգմանության գործընթացում». *Թարգմանությունը՝ որպես գիտական ուսումնասիրության առարկա և միջմշակութային փոխներթափանցման միջոց* գիտ. հոդվ. ժող., 45-52. Երևան, ԵՊՀ հրատ.
- Պարոնյան, Շուշանիկ, Նարե Թամոյան. 2016. «Քաղաքավարության կարգը և ներողություն հայցելը». *Բանբեր Երևանի համալսարանի* 1, 68-81. Երևան: ԵՊՀ հրատ.

Received: 01/03/2021

Revised: 22/03/2021

Accepted: 29/03/2021



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

© The Author(s) 2021