

## THE INTERSECTION OF INTERPRETIVE AND COGNITIVE-LINGUISTIC ANALYSES IN TRANSLATION OF LITERARY TEXTS

Nelli Sargsyan\*

<https://orcid.org/0009-0005-7381-8369>

Yerevan State University

**Abstract:** *The present paper explores the intricate intersection of cognitive stylistics and hermeneutics within the framework of literary translation. Specifically, it examines the challenges of rendering metaphorical structures from English into Armenian, using selected excerpts from Jack London's prominent novels: *Martin Eden*, *The Star Rover* and *White Fang*. Drawing upon G. Fauconnier's "mental spaces," P. Stockwell's "figure and ground" concepts, and U. Eco's "model reader," the study investigates how translators navigate the cognitive and social schemata inherent in the source text. The research highlights the transition from literal translation to interpretive rendering, particularly in the case of "occasional" or novel metaphors that demand a deep hermeneutic analysis. By analyzing specific translational choices, such as the application of conceptual blending and the identification of universal versus context-specific metaphors, this paper demonstrates that successful translation is not merely a linguistic transfer but a dynamic reconstruction of the author's original intention and the reader's cognitive perception.*

**Keywords:** *interpretation, translation, hermeneutics, cognitive stylistics, interpretative analysis, metaphor, concept, reader, writer*

### Introduction

A primary focal point in literary scholarship involves investigating the reader's contribution to perceiving and decoding the fundamental essence of a creative work. Debates regarding the authentic standards for textual analysis – particularly within the realm of artistic prose – persistently occupy the scholarly inquiries of prominent theorists like U. Eco, R. Poole, S. Fish, N. Holland, and D. Bleich.

---

\* nelly.sargsyan@ysu.am



Throughout the evolution of textual hermeneutics, reader-response theory holds a significant position as an analytical framework established in the early 1930s. This school of thought identifies the audience as the central element in the ultimate construction of a literary work's meaning. The reader is granted priority because the text essentially exists for an audience; consequently, the definitive goal of literary criticism is to examine how readers perceive and decode the core message of a narrative (Iser, 1978, pp. 20–21).

U. Eco (1992, p. 64) asserts that “the initiative of the reader basically consists in making a conjecture about the text's intention.” His research emphasizes the tripartite relationship between the model author, the model reader, and the textual intention, thereby endorsing a hermeneutic perspective on interpretation. A rigorous analysis of fiction presumes that an ideal or “model reader” consists in the identification of critical textual markers established by the author. When readers successfully navigate these pre-defined indicators, they grasp the author's objective, which ultimately aligns with the inherent purpose of the text itself. In the construction of a text particular importance should be given to the consideration of the background knowledge of the intended group of readers. In order to shape the text in the manner that will lead the reader to the successful understanding of the authorial intention, the writer should feel the needs, the main interests and concerns of his/her contemporaries.

U. Eco explores the concept of a reader accurately perceiving the author's intention, suggesting that a sophisticated interpretation relies on the reader possessing proper background knowledge of the subjects presented by the writer. Consequently, U. Eco (1992, pp. 67–68) classifies an interpretation that remains grounded and accurate as “economical”, whereas an analysis that deviates into unfounded or excessive territory is labeled as “uneconomical”.

Emerging in the 1930s and reaching its academic maturity in the 1970s, reader-response theory branched into several distinct analytical perspectives:

- **Transactional reader-response criticism** focusing on depicting the dynamic bond between the text and the reader as a reciprocal exchange, ultimately fulfilling the reader's specific goals.
- **Affective stylistics** concentrating on the immediate emotional and cognitive impact a written work exerts on its audience.
- **Psychological reader-response theory** proposing that a reader's decoding of a literary work serves as a vehicle for personal self-discovery and internal revelation.
- **Social reader-response theory** emphasizing how shared interpretive communities collectively shape and determine the final understanding of a text.

The final two methodologies, i.e., psychological and social reader-response theories constitute the primary frameworks defining the analytical boundaries of this thesis. N. Holland's psychological reader-response theory focuses specifically on examining the reader's personality. Within this literary study, the reader's role is framed through their unique "character", which encompasses every nuance of an individual's textual engagement. This distinctive mode of interpreting fiction fosters the development of a reader's personal style, which essentially represents his/her unique aesthetic preference and subjective taste (Holland, 2009, pp. 40–47).

The formation of the individual taste of a reader is carried out under the influence of cultural and historical factors persistent in the society. However, the genuineness of a reader's interpretation consists in the specific functioning of the identity of a reader. In the process of getting acquainted with the text, the reader works out the ability to cognize the individual style of a writer and later on to represent the writer's intention in accordance with his or her peculiar judgments.

The idea of understanding a writer's individual style is framed by N. Holland as a form of stylistic imitation, leading to a state where the reader's identity effectively vanishes in the effort to internalize and decode the writer's original intention (Holland, 2009, pp. 211–228). Evaluating the text from the reader's standpoint remains critically significant. This internal evaluative process operates along three primary axes: the author's creative "genius," the resulting aesthetic impact of that creativity, and the reader's reaction, which serves as the definitive stage of textual assessment. By integrating these three facets of appreciation, the reader's unique character or personal taste becomes paramount, as it fundamentally dictates the final form of their engagement with the author's artistic creation (*ibid.*, pp. 304–321).

The investigation of a literary text concentrates upon the problem of delimitation of the subjective and objective approaches towards the cognition and appreciation of a text. The issue of subjectivity and objectivity has been discussed by such scientists as R. Poole and D. Bleich. R. Poole (1972, pp. 95–96) rejects the possibility of pure objective perception of reality, emphasizing the fact that a person cannot be absolutely delimited of feelings and emotions in the process of making judgments. Conversely, D. Bleich (1985) proposes an alternative framework regarding the cognition of reality and the development of a personal worldview. He emphasizes that language serves as the fundamental instrument facilitating the interaction between human consciousness and the external environment. Acting as a metaphorical "tunnel" for the exchange of data between objective reality and the mind, language characterizes the perception and assessment of existence through expressions unique to each person. This linguistic

mediation of sensory experience and reaction ultimately results in the construction of an individual's subjective perspective (Pinchukova, 2015).

In the exploration of textual meaning, S. Fish's methodology warrants specific consideration for its emphasis on the reader's engagement with literary art. S. Fish (1980) proposes that the reader's response should not be viewed merely as an external reaction to an inherent textual meaning; rather, the actual essence of the work is constituted by the reader's personal response and subsequent interpretation. Considering U. Eco's approach mentioned earlier in this subchapter we can say that S. Fish gives counter proof to U. Eco's claim that the true meaning of a text is in the text itself, a text that is regarded as a separate organism that has its own unique genius. The facts stating that the ultimate objective perception of reality is impossible (Poole, 1972) and the omnipresent nature of language subjectivizing a person's cognition of reality (Bleich, 1985) is unavoidable, prove that S. Fish's claim focusing the reader's interpretation of literary texts in literary analysis is true.

### **A Cognitive-Stylistic Analysis of the Relationship between Author's Intention and Reader Reception**

The evolution of research regarding the interaction between language and consciousness has reached a new frontier through the integration of cognitive science into the linguistic domain. This interdisciplinary synthesis, established during the late 20<sup>th</sup> century and currently expanding rapidly, has fostered a groundbreaking perspective on linguistic structures, their holistic manifestations, and their practical implementation within discourse. As an established field, cognitive science encompasses linguistics, psychology, philosophy, anthropology, neuroscience, and artificial intelligence, seeking to analyze how information is constructed and processed within the human intellect. The profound link discovered between verbal expression and mental processes (a central focus of cognitive inquiry) has culminated in the birth of a specialized discipline termed *cognitive linguistics*. Originally conceived as a framework for exploring the synergy between cognitive processes and linguistic operations within the human intellect, cognitive linguistics has successfully evolved to prioritize the historical transformations of language alongside the shifting cultural development of human mentality. This progressive integration of cognitive science with linguistic study has facilitated the rise of an innovative domain focusing on language in practice, namely cognitive linguistics. This discipline effectively synthesizes the systematic analysis of literary works with the overarching cognitive mechanisms developed within human consciousness. The resulting field allows researchers to bridge the gap between creative expression and the fundamental psychological structures that

govern how people perceive, organize, and ultimately articulate their experiences of the world.

Given that the exploration of literary works necessitates a rigorous examination of the author's intention, cognitive stylistics emphasizes the structural and functional dimensions of a writer's personal style. This cognitive-stylistic approach highlights the analysis of specific textual markers that reflect the unique mental framework of the creator, thereby facilitating a genuine comprehension of the underlying purpose within the narrative. Through such detailed textual inquiry, the distinctive characteristics of an author's individual style are successfully identified. While the linguistic features may not appear extraordinary when viewed in isolation, their collective arrangement prescribed by the writer within a specific piece of fiction – constitutes the unique authorship that distinguishes that particular literary work. The main means of cognitive-stylistic analysis of texts includes the comprisal of concordances and frequency lists of such linguostylistic units as repeated words and phrases, collocations, etc., found within a text under investigation. The interaction indicates the shaping of the associational memories in the writer's mind. Such cognitive phenomena found in an utterance show a person's particular way of generating language (Lancashire, 2004, p. 27).

According to the studies of M. Johnson (1987, p. 117), the genuine meaning is not found within language, but is rather revealed with the help of language: language that is the result not of the separate structural system of human consciousness but of general cognitive processes, enabling the human mind to conceptualize experience. These are processes that are called *embodied understanding* in cognitive linguistics.

The theory of categorization as one of the major components of the cognitive-stylistic analysis of literary texts has been developed by P. Stockwell (2002, p. 28) who claims that in order to shape a better understanding of the authorship of a particular text the readers turn to differentiating the genre of the text, as well as the specificities of the writer's style of writing, the epoch to which a literary text belongs and other details. Correspondingly, texts can be categorized under various genres in accordance with such criteria as social, political and historical context, authorial specificities of text creation, idiosyncratic manifestations and functional peculiarities of verbal expression found within a text. The process of creation of categories, that enable the differentiation of various concepts collected in a person's consciousness, is elaborated by means of various prototypes accumulated in a person's memory (Word Meaning, 2024). The cognitive system of categories is constructed of different types of associative elements of central, secondary and peripheral characters arranged in radial order. These elements in their turn shape up

prototypes. Prototypicality serves as the fundament for categorization and the central associative elements within the radial structure of a prototype – function as cognitive reference points (Stockwell, 2002, p. 29). Thus, prototypes serve as the main means activating the cognition of different phenomena in human mind. The essential feature of the prototype consists in the representation of a category in a generalized manner, i.e., its ability to encapsulate all the dimensions of the concept for which it stands. However, for the achievement of the eventual cognition of a phenomenon the ability to discern all the possible componential elements of the general notion represented by the prototype is nonetheless of primary importance.

Of particular importance is the concept of idealized cognitive models, with the help of which knowledge is arranged in human mind. A cognitive model represents a construct of categories interrelated with each other. The connection between those categories is conditioned by social and cultural factors and individual experience. By means of cognitive models a person can identify a prototype and hence demarcate distinct categories. One of the essential features of a cognitive model lies not only in its uniqueness but also in its ability to represent common knowledge shared by a group of individuals. In this case, as P. Stockwell (2002, p. 33) claims, “Cognitive models which are shared become cultural models”.

In the cognitive-stylistic investigation of literary texts of particular importance is the concept of metaphor. In the field of cognitive stylistics metaphor is studied from the perspective of conceptual metaphor theory (CMT) that is concerned with the representation of metaphorical coherences as a system that integrates closely related ideas (Grady, 2007, p. 190.) The interrelation between the components of conceptual metaphorical links is of hierarchical character, representing the source-target interrelation, the target domain of which is represented as the specified component that inherits its differentiated traits from the general component, the so-called source domain. In the basis of metaphors in terms of cognitive stylistics lies the invariance principle introduced by G. Lakoff and M. Johnson (1980) that consists in the following requirement: the components of the morphological links must not transgress the topological structure of the target domain.

Metaphors are not merely decorative extensions of rational thought, but rather the core components of a conceptual framework that maps physical interaction with reality onto abstract experiences, such as sentiments and feelings. This mechanism allows individuals to denote, assess, and distinguish non-physical states by grounding them in tangible, sensory experiences. By utilizing metaphorical structures, the human mind translates the concrete into the symbolic, creating a bridge between external observation and internal emotional interpretation. This perspective emphasizes that our primary way of organizing the world is

fundamentally rooted in the bodily experience of the environment, which subsequently informs the linguistic expression of our most complex psychological and emotional perceptions (Ghazala, 2011, pp. 69–71). The mechanism of preserving and producing information within the human intellect constitutes the core of cognitive linguistic inquiry. To establish a comprehensive framework for how knowledge is organized in human consciousness, G. Fauconnier developed the concept of “mental spaces”. These spaces are comprised of internal components and are defined by specific frames and cognitive schemas. Functionally integrated with both long-term and working memory, mental spaces activate as thought or communication unfolds and are interconnected through various mappings, such as identity and analogy (Fauconnier, 2007, p. 351).

In cognitive linguistics particular attention is drawn to schema theory, that was initiated by Plato (1991) and found its further development in works by E. Kant (1929), J. Piaget (1952) and many others. As already mentioned, all human knowledge is conducted and accumulated by means of special units called schemata. A constituent of schemata, schema is to be understood as a summarized representation or a system of notions necessary for interpretation of knowledge. J. Culpeper (2009, pp. 125–161) emphasizes the significance of social schemata for analyzing literary works, particularly regarding the development of fictional characters. He claims that because a schema represents generalized understanding sourced from long-term memory, it inherently possesses a “stereotypical quality,” leading to the designation of the “cognitive stereotype”. In literature, figures are constructed using these cognitive templates; consequently, fictional characters often exhibit actions that do not fully align with the contextually-driven behaviors typically observed in real-world individuals. In the schema theory E. Semino (2009, pp. 33-47) gave rise to the concept of “text worlds”. He highlights the fact that text worlds depicted in works of fiction are genuinely of cognitive nature as opposed to possible logical worlds that can be distinguished in order to speculate upon certain logical implementations. Accordingly, the main exclusive feature of possible text worlds consists in their being embellished and composed of a group of other sub-worlds that can be either apparent or veiled.

To achieve a comprehensive cognitive-stylistic evaluation of a literary work, the concepts of figure, ground, and attention (established by P. Stockwell) act as the fundamental pillars directing the interpretive processes. Distinguishing between figure and ground requires a comparative analysis of their inherent characteristics. Specifically, the figure is identified as a vivid, dynamic, autonomous, and foregrounded entity, which stands in stark contrast to the muted, neutral, stationary, and secondary quality of the ground. Furthermore, the element of attention serves

as a crucial factor in this analytical framework, functioning primarily as the cognitive mechanism that separates the focal figure from the ground, the latter being defined as the peripheral component lacking intensive mental focus.

Thus, the fundamental challenge of reconciling authorial intention with the reader's subjective interpretation composes the core of cognitive-stylistic inquiry. Essentially, the reader as the central figure in cognitive-stylistic research, is reflected through cognitive transformations occurring within human consciousness. However, the notion of entirely unique textual decoding, ensured by individual mental frameworks, is contested, given that every written work is embedded with social, political, and historical norms of a shared nature or ideologies. These collective conventions inevitably function as the essential foundation upon which all textual interpretation is built. To sum up, the cognitive-stylistic framework for textual decoding functions as a primary instrument for defining the authentic standards required to grasp authorial intention, the internal dynamics of the reader's mental processes during analysis, and the recognition of literary art as a sublime expression of human aesthetic and intellectual capabilities.

### **The Role of Interpretation in the Translation Process**

Both the text and its constituent lexical units are characterized by semantic multi-layeredness, requiring a specific communicative environment or context for their full disclosure. Before its specific application, a linguistic unit represents a totality of co-existing meanings destined for realization across various contexts. In artistic discourse, this simultaneous realization and the potential for diverse application are defined as the "polyphony of the word," a crucial category for establishing a work's aesthetic value and exerting a unique influence on the reader's perception (Gasparyan, 2008).

Based on these premises, the process of understanding becomes a vital factor in uncovering the essence of both the overall textual meaning and its inherent metaphors. Proper semantic analysis of the text and its components is of primary importance for both the philologist and the translator. In this regard, the hermeneutic method of interpretation gains decisive significance, allowing the text to be viewed as a unity of linguistic, structural, and authorial-psychological components. The researcher's work is completed by accounting for the author's style and intention which is a key requirement in textual studies. Furthermore, one cannot overlook the reader's cognitive and emotional capacities, which explains U. Eco's introduction of the "model reader" concept (Eco, 1992).

Thus, the hermeneutic method serves as a reliable tool for textual interpretation, integrating the undeniable importance of authorial intention, the

deep investigation of the message across all semantic levels (Gasparian, 2003) and especially the reader's interpretation, which plays a decisive role in the dynamic evolution of textual meaning. In the process of perception and interpretation, it is essential to account for the conditions of text creation, namely its structure, the prerequisites of its distinct features, cultural traditions, and the specific nature of the author's creative method. In this regard, it is also vital to consider the cognitive-hermeneutic perspective of interpretation, according to which the prerequisites of textual form and structure are rooted in the author's intention, the textual concept, literary orientation, and system of beliefs (Tepe, 2011, p. 603). Hence, the interpretive analysis reveals the unity between the text's structure and the premises of its creation; thus, the researcher should not aim to extract the text's significance for the reader/interpreter, but rather focus on its inherent meaning, independent of the reader's subjective perception or individual imagination (Bühler and Tepe, 2008, pp. 317–318).

Considering that the study of literary texts necessitates a proper analysis of the author's intention, cognitive stylistics emphasizes the examination of the structural-functional aspects of a writer's individual style. This includes the investigation of marked elements within the text that express the specificities of the author's cognition and mental framework.

As an example of the expression of author's uniquely figurative mindset, metaphor demands specialized translational methods to be transferred from one language to another. The translation of a metaphor implies a multi-level investigation of its conceptual essence, a hermeneutic analysis of its contextual significance, and an evaluation of the most precise equivalents within the target text. At the heart of this process lies the challenge of how a metaphor conveys the interaction between its content, experience, and mode of semantic association, an issue central to developing a methodology for metaphor "translatability" (Dagut and Menachem, 1976, pp. 22–31). Translating metaphors signifies understanding the structure of source-language concepts and reproducing them appropriately in the target language. Considering this, the translator's adequate perception of source-text elements and the subsequent identification of equivalents in the target text become vital. The search for a precise equivalent requires the translator's comprehensive knowledge of both the source and target languages, including their national and socio-cultural components. This requirement is paramount when translating literary texts, as the translator's ingenuity and skill in transferring source elements become primary. Thus, translation is often viewed as the recreation of the source text within the target language (Gasparian, 2021, pp. 37–40).

The complexities of the translation of literary works are further explored in this study through a comparative analysis of selected excerpts from Jack London's *Martin Eden*, *The Star Rover*, and *White Fang*, alongside their respective Armenian translations. Let us analyze the metaphor and its translation in passages from *Martin Eden*:

*Then he remembered the underwriters and the owners, the two masters a captain must serve, either of which could and would **break** him and whose interests were diametrically opposed.* (1916, p. 44)

*Հետո նա հիշեց ապահովագրողին և նավատերերին՝ նավապետի այդ երկու տնօրեններին, որոնցից յուրաքանչյուրը կարող է և կուզենա **խորտակել** իրեն, և որոնց շահերը տրամագծորեն հակառակ են իրար:* (2018, p. 58)

In the above example it is evident that the verb *break* is employed metaphorically, representing a common metaphor within this specific context. Its Armenian equivalent, the verb *խորտակել*, also serves as an instance of a common metaphor. This example confirms that common metaphors can successfully find corresponding metaphorical equivalents within the target language.

*And he, in turn, knew again the **swimming sensation of bliss** when he felt the contact of her hand in greeting* (1916, p. 58).

*Իսկ տղան իր հերթին նորից զգաց **վի երանավետ սարսուռ**, երբ սեղմեց աղջկա ձեռքը:* (2018, p. 76)

In the English passage, *swimming*, which carries a metaphorical meaning within the phrase *swimming sensation of bliss*, is translated indirectly in the Armenian version. In this instance, the translator replaces the aforementioned English phrase with the Armenian equivalent *երանավետ սարսուռ* (literally, *blissful shiver*). Here, the translator has employed the conceptual blending methodology, merging the conceptual domains of *sensation* and *սարսուռ*.

The following example, taken from J. London's *The Star Rover*, illustrates the importance of the reader's (translator's) interpretation in the translation process:

*As they told me, news did occasionally **dribble** into solitary by way of the guards, but they had had nothing for a couple of months. The present guards on duty in solitary were a particularly bad and vindictive set.* (1913, p. 38)

Նրանք ինձ ասացին, որ երբեմն վերակացուների միջոցով ինչ-ինչ լուրեր են թափանցում մեկուսարան, բայց վերջին երկու ամիսներին ոչ մի տեղեկություն չի հասել իրենց: Այդ ժամանակամիջոցում մեկուսարանները հսկող վերակացուները պատկանում էին ամենարուք և ամենակատաղիների թվին: (1965, p. 50)

As is evident, in this passage, the metaphor *dribble*, which possesses an occasional or novel character (context-specific and uniquely created by the author) is rendered in the Armenian version through the metaphor *թափանցել* (*to penetrate/permeate*). It is clear that the translator was guided by specific semantic and stylistic features of the Armenian language. Nevertheless, within the translator's conceptual system, the mapping of the conceptual metaphor follows this trajectory: *dribble* – *to reach gradually* – *to penetrate*. In this instance, we observe two distinct reflections of the same concept, *to reach gradually* within the original and translated texts.

The following extract taken from J. London's *White Fang*, demonstrates the inevitability of integration of both cognitive-stylistic and interpretative methods of analysis in the process of translation of a literary text:

*The months passed by. Still continued the journey of Grey Beaver. White Fang's strength was developed by the long hours on trail and the steady toil at the sled; and it would have seemed that his mental development was well-nigh complete. He had come to know quite thoroughly the world in which he lived. His outlook was bleak and materialistic. The world as he saw it was a fierce and brutal world, a world without warmth, a world in which caresses and affection and the bright sweetnesses of the spirit did not exist.* (1906, p. 82)

Անցավ մի քանի ամիս, իսկ Գորշ Ջրշունի ուղևորությունը դեռ շարունակվում էր: Երկար ճանապարհը և սահնակ քաշելիս բարեխղճորեն աշխատելը ամրապնդեցին Սպիտակ Ժանիքի ուժերը, և ըստ երևույթին նրա մտավոր զարգացումն ավարտվեց: Շրջապատող աշխարհը նա ճանաչեց ամբողջովին: **Եվ նայում էր նա դրան մտայլ՝ ոչ մի պատրանք չունենալով դրա հանդեպ:** Խստաշունչ ու դաժան էր այդ աշխարհը, ոչ ջերմություն կար այդտեղ, ոչ քնքշանք, ոչ էլ բարեկամական կապ (2017, p. 126):

In this passage, the occasional metaphor *outlook was bleak*, which denotes the sense of *viewing with a somber state of mind*, is translated interpretively in the

Armenian version. It is evident that, in this instance, the translator conducted a hermeneutic study of the text and performed an appropriate selection of the components for the aforementioned phrase.

Another linguistic unit worthy of interest in this example is the adjective *materialistic*, which also possesses an occasional character. In the Armenian version, it has also been translated interpretively through the use of the phrase *նչ սխառութիւն չունենալով* (literally, *having no illusions*). In this case as well, before finalizing this decision, the translator resorted to a hermeneutic analysis of the text.

Building upon these cognitive-stylistic and hermeneutic foundations, it is evident that the translation of metaphor in literary works is of vital importance. It is through these metaphors that a translator succeeds in conveying the entire emotional, ethno-cultural, and socio-linguistic richness inherent in the source text, particularly in the case of occasional and novel metaphors which serve as the primary axes upon which the cognitive bridge between author and reader is built.

## Conclusion

The cognitive-stylistic analysis of metaphors in J. London's works and their Armenian translations reveal that the essence of textual interpretation lies in the dominance of mental representations over mere linguistic surfaces. The findings indicate that:

- Universal metaphors often find direct equivalents in the target language due to shared human cognition, whereas occasional metaphors necessitate an interpretive and hermeneutic approach to preserve the author's unique cognitive stereotypes.
- The translator acts as a "model reader" who must conduct a deep-level hermeneutic study to balance the author's original intention with the linguistic and socio-cultural constraints of the target language.
- Strategies such as conceptual blending and the restructuring of mental spaces allow the translator to recreate the emotional and aesthetic impact of the original text, effectively transforming translation into an act of literary recreation.
- Ultimately, the hermeneutic method proves to be a reliable and vital tool for the philologist and translator alike, ensuring that the polyphony of the word remains vibrant and meaningful across linguacultural boundaries.

## References

- Gasparyan, S. (2008). Lingvopoetika obraznogo sravneniya [Linguopoetics of figurative comparison]. Lusakn.
- Bleich, D. (1985). *Subjective Criticism*. The John Hopkins University Press.
- Bühler, A. & Tepe, P. (2008). Kognitive und aneignende Interpretation in der Hermeneutik [Cognitive and Appropriative Interpretation in Hermeneutics]. In *Jahrbuch der Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf 2007/2008* (pp. 315–328). Düsseldorf University Press.
- Culpeper, J. (2009). Reflections on a Cognitive Stylistic Approach to Characterization. In G. Brône & J. Vandaele (Eds.), *Cognitive Poetics, Goals, Gains and Gaps* (pp.125–159). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dagut, M., & Menachem, B. (1976). Can “Metaphor” be translated? *Babel*, 22(1), 21–33. <https://doi.org/10.1025/babel.22.1.05dag>
- Eco, U. (1992). Overinterpreting Texts. In S. Collini (Ed.), *Interpretation and Overinterpretation* (pp. 45–66). Cambridge University Press.
- Fauconnier, G. (2007). Mental Spaces. In D. Geeraerts & R. Cuyckens (Eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics* (pp. 351–376). Oxford University Press.
- Fish, S. (1980). *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities*. Harvard University Press.
- Gasparyan, S. (2003). Concerning the Problem of Understanding Verbal Art. *Gitelik*, 10, 28–34.
- Gasparyan, S. (2021). Translation as interpretation. *Cultural and Religious Studies*, 9(1), 32–46.
- Grady, J. (2007). Metaphor. In D. Geeraerts & R. Cuyckens (Eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics* (pp. 188–213). Oxford University Press.
- Ghazala, H. (2011). *Cognitive Stylistics and the Translator*. Sayab Books.
- Holland, N. (2009). *Literature and the Brain*. The PsyArt Foundation.
- Iser, W. (1978). *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Johnson, M. (1987). *The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reason*. University of Chicago Press.
- Kant, E. (1929). *Critique of Pure Reason*. MacMillan.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press.
- Lancashire, I. (2004). Cognitive Stylistics and Literary Imagination. In S. Schreibman, R. Siemens & J. Unsworth (Eds.), *Digital Humanities* (pp. 397–414). University of Toronto Press.

- Piaget, J. (1952). *The origins of intelligence in children*. International Universities Press.
- Pinchukova, T. (2015). The Subjective Paradigm in David Bleich's Investigation. *Acta Germano-Slavica*, 6, 146–153.
- Plato. (1991). *The Republic*. Basic Books.
- Poole, R. (1972). *Towards Deep Subjectivity*. McGraw-Hill.
- Semino, E. (2009). Text worlds. In G. Brône & J. Vandaele (Eds.), *Cognitive Poetics: Goals, Gains and Gaps*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Stockwell, P. (2002). *Cognitive Poetics: An Introduction*. Routledge.
- Tepe, P. (2011). Cognitive hermeneutics: The better alternative. *Discourse Studies*, 13(5), 601–608.
- Word Meaning. (2024). Stanford Encyclopedia of Linguistics, Part V. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/word-meaning/#CogLin>

### Sources of Data

1. London J. (1906). *White Fang*. New York, Macmillan & Co. Ltd.
2. London, J. (1913). *The Star Rover*. London, Macmillan & Co. Ltd.
3. London, J. (1916). *Martin Eden*. London, Macmillan & Co. Ltd.
4. Լոնդոն, Ջ. (1970). *Ջսպաշապիկ. միջաստղային թափառականը*: Երկերի ժողովածու, հատոր 10: Երևան, Հայաստան:
5. Լոնդոն Ջ. (2017). *Սպիտակ ժանիք*: Երևան, Էդիթ-պրինտ:
6. Լոնդոն, Ջ. (2018). *Մարտին Բդեն*: Երևան, Անտառես:

**Ն. Սարգսյան – Մեկնողական և ճանաչողական-լեզվաբանական վերլուծությունների փոխազդեցությունը գեղարվեստական տեքստերի թարգմանության մեջ.** – Սույն հոդվածում ներկայացված են ճանաչողական լեզվաառճաբանության և հերմենևտիկայի բարդ փոխազդեցության խնդիրները գեղարվեստական թարգմանության շրջանակներում: Մասնավորապես, քննության են առնվում անգլերենից հայերեն փոխաբերական կառույցների փոխադրման մարտահրավերները՝ Ջ. Լոնդոնի հայտնի «Մարտին Բդեն», «Ջսպաշապիկ. աստղային թափառականը» և «Սպիտակ ժանիք» վեպերից քաղված հատվածների օրինակով: Հիմնվելով Ժ. Ֆոկոնյեի «մտածական տիրույթների» (mental spaces), Պ. Ստոքվելի «ֆիգուրայի և հիմքի» (figure and ground) հայեցակարգերի և Ու. Էկոյի «նմուշային ընթերցողի» (model reader) տեսության վրա՝ հետազոտության մեջ քննության է առնվում աղբյուր-տեքստի նշութավորված տարրերի թիրախ-տեքստ փոխանցման հիմնա-

հարցը: Հաշվի առնելով ճանաչողական-լեզվաբանական և թարգմանական գործընթացների, մասնավորապես՝ հասկացութային խառնուրդի (conceptual blending) և գեղարվեստական տեքստում լայնորեն կիրառվող համատեքստային փոխաբերությունների հետազոտության արդյունքները՝ հանգում ենք այն եզրակացության, որ հաջողված թարգմանությունը ոչ միայն լեզվական փոխադրում է, այլև հեղինակի սկզբնական մտադրության և ընթերցողի ճանաչողական ընկալման դինամիկ վերակառուցում:

*Բանալի բառեր՝ մեկնաբանություն, թարգմանություն, հերմենևտիկա, ճանաչողական լեզվաոճաբանություն, մեկնողական վերլուծություն, փոխաբերություն, հասկացութ, ընթերցող, հեղինակ*

**Н. Саргсян – Пересечение интерпретативного и когнитивно-лингвистического анализа в переводе художественных текстов.** – В данной статье представлены проблемы комплексного взаимодействия элементов когнитивной стилистики и герменевтики, применяемых в рамках перевода художественных текстов. В частности, рассматриваются проблемы передачи метафорических структур с английского языка на армянский на материале отобранных отрывков из известных романов Дж. Лондона «Мартин Иден», «Звездный скиталец» и «Белый клык». Опираясь на концепции «ментальных пространств» Ж. Фоконье, «фигуры и фона» П. Стоквелла и «образцового читателя» У. Эко, в работе исследуется, каким образом переводчики ориентируются в когнитивных и социальных схемах, заложенных в исходном тексте. В результате изучения конкретных переводческих решений, таких как применение концептуальной интеграции (блендинга) и выявление конвенциональных и контекстуально-специфических метафор, было установлено, что успешный перевод – это не просто лингвистический перенос, а динамическая реконструкция первоначального замысла автора и когнитивного восприятия читателя.

*Ключевые слова: интерпретация, перевод, герменевтика, когнитивная стилистика, интерпретативный анализ, метафора, концепция, читатель, писатель*