# On Translational "Lacunas" in the English Translation of *The History of Armenia* by Movses Khorenatsi*

**Seda Gasparyan**

*Yerevan State University*

**Luiza Gasparyan**

*Institute of Literature, NAS RA*

The paper deals with the study of the English translation of *The History of Armenia* by Movses Khorenatsi and aims at revealing the inadequate cases of translation which are, as a rule described as translational "lacunas". The investigation shows that translational "lacunas" can be observed on different levels of the target text: lexical-phrasiological, morphological, syntactic and stylistic. Some inadequate transformations may also result in the violation of toponymic elements. Some of these violations can be accounted for not by possibly objective reasons but by the translator's intent.

**Key words:** *Movses Khorenatsi, The History of Armenia, English translation, R. Thomson, translational lacuna, subjective attitude, intent.*

## Introduction

Language is the mirror of culture. This figurative expression can demonstrate the relationship between language and culture. It is beyond doubt that translation is far from being a linguistic process only. It is rightly regarded as a cultural phenomenon, an indispensible part of the national culture which plays a crucial role in the development of national identity. Currently translation theory is concerned not only about the problem of choosing the

---

* The question of translational "lacunas" in R. Thomson's translation of Khorenatsi's work has been initially viewed in: Seda Gasparyan, Luiza Gasparyan (2008) *Targmanakan "bats", anpututyun, te mitum.*//Otar lezuner Hayastanum. Yerevan: krtutyan azgayin institute, pp. 76-92.

adequate option for the source text in the target language, but also about ways of creating a "natural" atmosphere of inter-cultural communication between the source and target texts. Research suggests that the absence of the above-mentioned preconditions can lead to lexical, stylistic or functional inaccuracies and result in the so-called translational lacunas, which, certainly, are an indicator of incomplete, inadequate and, therefore, unacceptable translation. It is worth mentioning that according to Russian theoreticians, translational lacunas are the incomprehensible, unacceptable, ineffective parts in a translated text, which can be discovered and assessed by considering the text through contrasting pairs: comprehensible/incomprehensible; true/false, efficient/ inefficient (Sorokina, Markovina 1988).

### Translation of Historiographical Works

The researchers have arrived at the conclusion that the relevance of translational lacunas in the target text can be conditioned by various factors and by the differences between mechanisms of national language thinking, mentality and temperament in the first place. Meanwhile, it is no secret that the specificities of phonetics, punctuation and many other language phenomena are shaped and developed on the basis of underlying national characteristic features. Moreover, it is also evident that the specific historical process of the formation and development of each nation presupposes the emergence of certain original traditions and customs which in time, get rooted in the culture of the given nation and become its integral part. They are, first of all, expressed in the phraseological units, place names and proper names, as well as in realias reflecting the national peculiarities of the given people.

The question of a certain amount of resemblance of the life experience of the author and the translator which, at times plays a significant role in the proper perception and interpretation of the original work and hence, in its adequate reproduction in the target language, is of no less importance, either.

If we are to consider the subject matter from a slightly different perspective, we probably can claim that all the factors mentioned above constitute a part of the national culture in a wide sense, especially if one is to

admit that the original text gets its national coloring and national-cultural atmosphere due to their collective influence.

It should be acknowledged that in general the differences observed in cognitive, cultural, stylistic and literary traditions of different languages produce certain challenges for their equivalent reproduction. This is especially true for the contrastive examination of Grabar (Old Armenian) and Modern Armenian. To achieve success the translator needs to have a comprehensive knowledge of the linguistic and extra-linguistic phenomena. It is no news that overall cognition, emotions and feelings are reflected through most diverse means of expression, various grammatical and stylistic overtones conditioned by the characteristics peculiar to the given nation, by psychological factors and cultural environment. Hence, V. Humboldt's note on the ability of different languages to serve nations as a unique means of thinking and perceiving is not accidental (Humboldt 1984).

Thus, equivalence is conditioned not only by the translator's world vision, but also by the in-depth and comprehensive knowledge of the source language, the target language and the cultural awareness, since translation is a process where two cultures, two ways of national thinking either combine or contrast.

In this regard, we should try to examine the English translation of certain extracts from *The History of Armenia* by Movses Khorenatsi, particularly that this work occupies a special place among the Armenian historical reflections of the 5th century. We should hasten to add that the validity of the ample and reliable evidence and facts included in the work was long undebatable. However, it is evident that since the 18th century and notably since the first decades of the 19th century the historical account of Khorenatsi has been in the focus of attention among western scholars (Gutschmidt A. 1876/1892, Carriere A. 1895, Toumanoff C. 1963, Thomson R.1978/2006) who believe that the knowledge of the Armenian history and cultural "awareness" can provide the necessary conditions for the realization of the political goals of certain countries[1.] Otherwise stated, such a development of Armenological studies in the west not only ensured global recognition of the fact of the ancient and

medieval Armenian manuscript writing, but also produced serious mysteries for Armenian historians and philologists (Musheghyan 2007).

*'История Армении' Мовсеса Хоренаци ('The History of Armenia' by Movses Khorenatsi)* by academician G. Sargsyan is worth mentioning with this regard. The author harshly criticizes the biased and anti-scientific approach adopted by R. Thomson towards Khorenatsi. The former accuses Khorenatsi of falsification of the time period of his own life, deliberate distortion of historical sources and of invention of certain episodes *(he willfully distorts his sources and invents episodes)* (Thomson 2006:34, 58). He accuses the great historian of even borrowing certain phrases, full sentences, etc. from the works of his favorite authors to heighten the expressiveness and impressiveness of his own biography, etc. (Thomson 2006:1-60) [2].

Nevertheless, many researchers make a reference to historiographical views of M. Khorenatsi as the founder of the Armenian national historiographical tradition qualifying them as quite unique, and relate them to the peculiarities of the time period he lived in. In the 5th century Armenia was a remarkable center of the world historiographic thought. While the West was more popular with World and Christian historiography, Armenia mostly produced works depicting its national history. Hence, *the History of Armenia*, with its solid and ambitious structure, with carefully elaborated and refined details and certain principles of creativity could not be accidental.

The history of Khorenatsi, as a matter of fact, was the first to present the Armenian national ideology systematically, which provides a solid ground for many scholars even to consider him the first Armenian nationalist (Sargsyan 1991, Ayvazyan 1998, Topchyan 2001, Musheghyan 2007, et al.). Nevertheless, the wave of literary criticism which started back in the 70s of the 19th century attempts to cast doubt upon the validity of the chronology of Khorenatsi's work as well as the sources he has used. The brightest expression of this tendency is the translation of *The History of Armenia* from Grabar by R. Thomson which was published in 1978 and republished in 2006.

Thus, albeit much has been written about *The History of Armenia* by Movses Khorenatsi – one of the brilliant expressions of the development of

human intellect, the existing research is far from being satisfactory in terms of the revelation of the historical-scientific and linguostylistic value of the work. The vast majority of the research and investigations, with few exceptions, are of historical-philological nature and usually do not examine the work by Khorenatsi in its entirety. Rather, they address predominantly source study issues and tackle disputes related to its chronology which usually lack serious grounds and are artificially created (Sargsyan 1991)[2] We should note that the translation of historiographical material is one of the spheres that has not been duly investigated and since there is practically no research studying the translational value of *The History of Armenia*, our choice fell on this work.

### Intentional Lacunas in R. Thomson's Translation of *The History of Armenia* by Khorenatsi

The current research aims to study and reveal the translational lacunas in the target text through the analysis of R. Thomson's English translation of *The History of Armenia* by Movses Khorenatsi.

The analysis of the translation of this historical work shows quite clearly that the target text abounds in translational calques at lexical, morphological, syntactic, as well as phraseological levels. Evidently, being closely connected with the culture, phraseological units serve as important stylistic means in speech, and as often they do not undergo relevant transformation in the target text, the language and style of the text suffer significant losses. Now, let us demonstrate this on some extracts taken from the book.

> *Similarly his foster-daughter Khosrovidukht was a modest maiden, like a nun, and did not at all **have an open mouth** like other women. (R. Thomson, History of the Armenians, 228)*

> *Նոյնպէս էր և սան նորա Խոսրովիդուխտ, կուսան համեստ որպէս զօրինաւոր ոք, և ոչ ամենևին **ունել**

*անդունն բերան, նման այլոց կանանց: (Մովսես Խորենացի «Հայոց պատմություն», 272)*

*Նրա պես էր և նրա սանր, Խոսրովիդուխտը, մի օրինավոր համեստ կույս, և չուներ բոլորովին ան-դունն բերան, ուրիշ կանանց նման: (Ըստ Ստ. Մալխասյանի թարգմանության)*

In this context using the phraseological unit *անդունն բերան*, the historian, evidently, sought to present and generalize the image of a woman of the time (or maybe the image of a woman, as such in general) who is characterized as a chatterbox. The figurative use of the phraseological unit allows the writer not only to introduce his optimistic attitude into the context but also, based on that, to further enhance the dignity and aristocratic breed of Khosrovidukht.

Considering the target text we can see that in this context we deal with the phenomenon of a calque of a phraseological unit *(անդունն բերան –an open mouth*). It is easy to understand that the English linguomentality does not make it possible to perceive the emotive-expressive overtones, let alone the humorous coloring of the neutral *have an open mouth.* The English version of the phraseological unit clearly lacks the culture-biased stylistic charge. The detailed analysis of English phraseological units and set expressions reveals the phraseological unit *loose tongue* which has long been established as անդունն բերան[3].

The color-rich expressiveness of Khorenatsi's phraseological units, figurative colorings present in their various meanings and their linguistic-historical value must be considered properly and reproduced appropriately by the translator. However, the "word for word" translation of phraseological units evidently weakens the integrity of the literary work leading to impermissible translational lacunas.

Here is another extract.

*When the Armenian princes **became aware of this and reflected on it**, they gathered together in the presence of Vrt'anes the Great and sent two of the honorable lords – Mar, lord of Tsop'k', and Gag, lord of Hashteank. (R. Thomson, History of the Armenians, 254)*

***Ուստի ուշ ի կուրծս անկեալ** և ի միտս եկեալ նախարարացն Հայոց՝ ժողովեցան առ մեծն Վրթա-նէս, և առաքեցին երկուս ի պատուական իշխա-նացն, զՄար իշխանն Ծոփաց, և զԴատ իշխանն Հաշտենից: (Մովսէս Խորենացի «Հայոց պատմու-թյուն», 310)*

*Ապա Հայոց նախարարները **ուշքի և խելքի գալով**՝ ժողովեցին մեծ Վրթանեսի մոտ և պատվավոր իշխաններից երկու անձ, Ծոփքի Մար իշխանին և Հաշտյանքի Գագ իշխանին, ուղարկեցին նախա-գահ քաղաք գնալու Կոստանդիանոսի որդու՝ Կոս-տանդ կայսրի մոտ: (Ըստ Ստ. Մալխասյանի թարգմանության)*

In this example the historian describes the union of the Armenian ministers with Vrtanes. This decision was arrived at after long considerations and speculations. In Grabar (Old Armenian) it is emphasized with the combination of the synonymic set expressions *ուշ ի կուրծս անկեալ* and *ի միտս եկեալ*. The dictionary *Nor Bargirq Haykazean Lezvi* (1979) defines the set expressions as *ուշ ի կուրծս անկանիլ կամ առնիլ – բաց խորհել ի սրտի, խելամուտ լինել, զգաստ մտոք բնել*, and *ի միտս եկեալ (ի միտս գալ) – զգաստանալ, խորհել և զօրանալ*. The combination of synonymic phraseological expressions often emphasizes the importance of the semantic nuances of the context. It is obvious that in the target text the above-mentioned phraseological units have been replaced with the neutral units *became aware of*

*this and reflected on it*. Though the translator has been faithful to the principles of synonymic combination  with the lexical units of  *became aware – իրազեկ, տեղյակ լինել,* and *reflect – խորհել, մտածել, մտորել,* however, we are deeply convinced that, in order to preserve the expressiveness of the original work it would have been more appropriate to use the phraseological unit *on sober reflection.*

Phraseological units are mostly the result of poetic expressive thinking and usually emerge out of the necessity to present the idea with some poetic expressiveness rather than for nominative purposes only. This standard, of course, is neglected in the examples above. The phraseological units in the source text are replaced with neutral, free expressions *have an open mouth, became aware of this* and *reflected on it* that are deprived of any expressiveness, while the target language possesses more appropriate phraseological units, namely – *loose tongue, on sober reflection.*

Our examination makes it possible to detect valuable cognitive and culture-bound elements in the original text whose transformed versions are far from being equivalent. The following translated version bears evidence of the "polarity" of the author's and the translator's worldviews. Thus, for instance,

> *Semiramis freely paraded her passion and sent messengers to **the handsome Ara** with gifts and offerings. (R. Thomson, History of the Armenian, 93)*

> *Համարձակ պատուելով Շամիրամայ զախտն՝ ա-ռաքէ հրեշտակս առ **Արայն Գեղեցիկ**՝ ընծայիւք և պատարագօք: (Մովսես Խորենացի «Հայոց պատ-մություն», 60)*

> *Շամիրամը իր ախտը համարձակ պատվելով՝ **Արա Գեղեցիկի** մոտ պատգամավորներ է ուղար-կում ընծաներով ու նվերներով: (Ըստ Ստ. Մալ-խասյանի թարգմանության)*

The attributive phrase *the handsome Ara* which is the translated version of the original *Արա Գեղեցիկ* attracts much attention. We are convinced that the choice supposes a careful examination on the part of the translator. The use of the postpositional attribute in the given context displays evident tendency for epithetization and comes to emphasize the perfect, moderate features of Ara which have come to be known in history as beauty that was able to attract the voluptuous Shamiram. Though in Grabar the attribute is predominantly prepositional as in English, its postpositional use is in no way excluded. Of course, the postpositional attribute renders certain emotional and expressive coloring to the utterance. Historiographical literature is no exception in this regard. It should be stated that by placing the attribute *handsome* before the noun the translator mentions the good looks of Ara only slightly. In doing so he also deprives the expression from its stylistic colouring ignoring the fact that the adjective *գեղեցիկ* has merged with the name, has become its integral part and has long been sealed in the memory of the Armenian history and in the language as an integrity of the form and content embodying the given historical figure.

As to the choice of the equivalent *handsome* of the adjective *գեղեցիկ,* this, too, can lead to certain confusion at first sight, since the Armenian word *գեղեցիկ* has the English equivalent beautiful. However, the connotational meaning of the adjective *beautiful* (it describes only female beauty) forces us to agree with the translator.

The examination of the grammatical categories and patterns of the source text demonstrates their irrefutable importance despite the sufficient number of translational lacunau observed in the target text. Thus,

> *Let no one be surprised at this, that although, as is clear*
> *to all, many nations have* **histories***, especially the*
> *Persians and Chaldeans, in which particularly are*
> *found many references to the affairs of our nation, yet*
> *we have mentioned only the Greek historians from*

*whom we have promised to present the account of our genealogy. (R. Thomson, History of the Armenians, 65)*

*Եւ ընդ այս մի՛ որ զարմասցի, եթէ բազում ազգաց լեալ* **մատենագիրք**, *որպէս ամենեցուն է յայտնի, մանաւանդ Պարսից և Քաղդէացւոց, յորս առաւել ազգիս մերոյ գտանին բազում ինչ իրաց յիշատակք, մեք զՀունաց միայն յիշեցաք զպատմագիրս, և անտի զյայտարարութիւն մերոյ ազգաբանութեանս խոստացաք յանդիման կացուցանել: (Մովսես Խորենացի «Հայոց պատմություն», 8)*

*Եվ այս բանի վրա թող ոչ ոք չզարմանա, որ թեպետ շատ ազգեր մատենագիրներ են ունեցել, ինչպես ամենքին հայտնի է, մանավանդ պարսիկներն ու քաղդեացիները, որոնց մոտ ավելի շատ են գտնվում մեր ազգին վերաբերյալ բազմաթիվ գոր-ծերի հիշատակարաններ` մենք սակայն միայն հունաց պատմագիրները հիշեցինք և այնտեղից խոստացանք առաջ բերել մեր ազգաբանության հույների շարքը: (Ըստ Ստ. Մալխասյանի թարգմա-նության)*

In this context making a reference to the sources used, M. Khorenatsi mentions that though Persian and Chaldean manuscript writers also played a significant role in historiography, he mostly refers to Greek sources. The translational lacunas in the target text, most probably, are the result of a wrong interpretation of the word *մատենագիրք* in Grabar. The point is that the lexical unit *մատենագիրք* should be understood as a combination of the roots of the lexical units *մատյան* and *գիր(ք)*, the *(ք)* being a plural suffix, hence, the meaning of *մատենագիրներ* (manuscript writers). The translated text uses the word *histories – պատմություններ*, which may be explained by the lack of understanding the lexical unit and its word forming peculiarities. Both the

given extracts in Grabar and in modern Armenian support the claim that the historian here meant *manuscript writers.*

Obviously, *The History of Armenia* by M. Khorenatsi is a combination of history, science and literary expression that appear as one. The target text could have achieved maximum adequacy only through the reproduction of this strong bond. In the three-tier process of perceiving, interpreting and translating historiographical literature a translator faces the need to transform terms, phraseological units and various grammatical patters, but also expressive notions, phenomena, unusual combinations of language units whose equivalent translation is an important precondition for the preservation of the national and cultural integrity of the original text.

The rich individual style of Khorenatsi – full of various metaphors and other units with emotive-expressive overtones constitute an inseparable part of the Armenian historiography, and the expressive reproduction of these units in the target text is of utmost importance for preserving the national and cultural coloring of the original text. Some theoreticians (Lakoff, Johnson 1980: 3; Sadock 1979: 40; Black 1979: 28-29) emphasize the necessity of the accurate perception of the use of metaphor in the context since the integrity of form and content can best be communicated into the target text due to the adequate transformation of the figurative speech only. It is common knowledge, that metaphor possesses cognitive and creative power and is based on the keen sight to distinguish the similarity or resemblance of various phenomena. This description of metaphor and metaphorization can be traced in Grabar, as well. Thus:

> *Those who pursue the philosophers and investigate*
> *astronomical studies say that stars receive (their light)*
> *from the moon, and the moon waxes because of the*
> *sun, and the orb of the sun (derives its light) from the*
> *ethereal heaven. Thus the ether pours its rays into both*
> *zones, and each zone shines through the sun according*
> *to its order, revolution, and time.* **In such fashion so**

*too did we, reflecting the grace that continually flows from the intelligible rays of the spiritual fathers, circle through the southern regions, and reach the city of Edessa. Sailing gently over the deeps of the archives, we went on to worship at the holy places and to remain for a while studying in Palestine. (R. Thomson, History of the Armenians, 332)*

*Հարահետնլոդք իմաստասիրացն և վերահայեցողդ չափաբերապէս մակագրութեանց՝ զասստեղս ի լուսնոյ ասեն ընծուիլ, և զլուսին արեգականմբ ուռ-ճացեալ, և զբոլոր արեգակն յարփայինն երկնէ. հիկէն արփիոյն հեղեալ զծագումն յերկաբանչիր զոտիսն, և ի ձեռն արեգական ընծուիլ ըստ դասի, ըստ բերման, ըստ ժամանակի։ **Օրինակ իմն, այսպէս և մեք յաւետախադաց շնորհիւ ցոլացեալ յիմանալի ճառագայթից հոգլոր հարց, ըստ հարաւային մասանցն պարայաձեալք՝ յԵղեսա-ցիոց հասանէաք քաղաք.** թեթնակի ընդ խորս դիւանին նաւեալ՝ անցանք ի սուրբ տեղիսն երկր-պագել, և մնալ վայրկեան ի Պաղեստինացոց հրա-հանգս։ (Մովսէս Խորենացի «Հայոց պատմու-թյուն», 428)*

*Նրանք, որ շարունակ հետևում են իմաստասիրու-թյան և քնում են մաթեմատիկական գիտություն-ները, ասում են, թե աստղերը լույս են ստանում լուսնից, լուսինը լցվում է արեգակի լույսով, իսկ արեգակն արփային երկնքից. այսպես որ արփին լույսը սփռում է երկու գոտիներում և այս երկու գոտիները լույս են ստանում արեգակից ըստ դա-սի, ըստ շարժման և ըստ ժամանակի։ **Սրա նման**

*մենք էլ մեր հոգևոր հայրերի իմանալի ճառագայթ-*
*ներից մշտապես ցոլանալով, հարավային կողմերը*
*շրջագայելով   հասանք   Եդեսացոց   քաղաքը,*
*թեքնակի նավեցինք դիվանի խորքերի վրայով,*
*այնտեղից անցանք սուրբ տեղերին երկրպագելու և*
*կարճ ժամանակ պաղեստինացոց ուսմամբ պա-*
*րապելու: (Ըստ Ստ. Մալխասյանի թարգմանու-*
*թյան)*

The micro-context is of autobiographical nature. The extract recounts Khorenatsi's trip to Yedesia and Palestine. The extract is full of imagery and abounds in different metaphors like *յաւետախաղաց շնորհիւ ցոլացեալ լիմանալի ճառագայթից հոգևոր հարց, հարահետնոդք իմաստասիրացն և վերահայեցողք չափաբերապէս մակագրութեանց՝ զաստեղս ի լուսնոյ ասեն ընծուիլ, և զլուսին արեգակամբ ուռճացեալ, և զբոլոր արեգակն յարփայինն երկնէ,* which have not been translated with their adequate versions in the target text in terms of the form and the content. The dictionary *Nor Bargirq Haykazean Lezvi* (1979) defines the word *յետախաղաց* with the following lexical units - *մշտախաղաց, յաղթժագնաց, մշընջենախոս, մշտա-բուխ, մշտաշարժ* all of which display positive connotational meanings. In the target text the translator has chosen the expression *continually flows* for the Armenian *յետախաղաց*. The careful investigation of the language units of the target text leads to the conclusion that it is necessary to do the following transformation in the passage: *In such fashion so too did we, reflecting the grace from **the everlasting** intelligible rays of the spiritual fathers,* where the positive coloring of the lexical unit *everlasting* could have preserved the emotive-expressive atmosphere of the original.

The irrelevant and illogical presentation of certain expressions that perform the function of the object in brackets in the target text (*their light),* (*derives its light)* is of certain interest too, since it evidently violates the integrity of the perception of the context, for it is known that brackets usually

contain secondary, additional explanations while such a tendency is not observed in the original.

R. Thomson highly appreciates M. Khorenatsi's interest in examining and interpreting the etymology of the Armenian noble families. However, for unknown reasons, he considers the etymological facts provided by Khorenatsi imaginary. In this regard, A. Musheghyan (Musheghyan 2007: 329) writes: "It should be stated that previously too Khorenatsi's attempts to interpret and explain the origin of proper names were often treated with much skepticism since based on current linguistic and semantic evidence they cannot be proven accurate and are primarily based on assonance. Nevertheless, we should not forget that old Greek and Roman authors also treated assonance as a most reliable means for etymological examination of names".

For instance,

> *And the Artsruni I know are not Artsruni but **artsui-**
> **uni**; they carried the eagles before him. (R. Thomson,
> History of the Armenians, 135)*

> *Եւ qԱրծրունիսդ գիտեմ՝ ոչ Արծրունիս, այլ **ար-**
> **ծուի ունիս**, որք արծուիս առաջի նորա կրէին:
> (Մովսես Խորենացի «Հայոց պատմություն», 124)*
> *Իսկ Արծրունիներն իմ գիտցածովս ոչ թե Արծրունի
> են, այլ **արծիվունի,** որոնք թագավորի առջև արծիվ-
> ներ էին կրում: (Ըստ Ստ.Մալխասյանի թարգմա-
> նության)*

> *I know that the Gnuni are – **gini-uni;** - they prepared
> drink worthy of the king. (R. Thomson, History of the
> Armenians, 135)*

> *Գիտեմ և qԳնունիսդ **գինի ունիս**, որ qարժանի
> թագաւորին պատրաստէր qըմպելիսն: (Մովսես
> Խորենացի «Հայոց պատմություն», 24)*

*Գնունիներն էլ իմ զիտացծով **գինիունի** են, որ*
*թագավորին արժանի ընկելիքներ էր պատրաս-*
*տում: (Ըստ Ստ. Մալխասյանի թարգմանության.*

According to R. Thomson, M. Khorenatsi's etymological interpretation of the Armenian noble families is fanciful and whimsical in nature (*Moses' etymology is fanciful* -Thomson 2006:135). From the semantic perspective, the etymology of the families of Artsruni and Gnuni is based on the characteristic features of these families. Thus, for instance, M. Khorenatsi states that the name Artsruni came from the action of *bearing eagles before kings* and the name Gnuni originated from the expression *having wine* since the Gnunis were the suppliers of wine to the Armenian court. Hence, the etymology of the proper names is based on the natural perception when one classifies items, sometimes proper names and place names of the objective reality on the basis of their characteristic features. As is known, figurative thinking rests on features, rather than objects and phenomena. In the target text artsui-uni, gini-uni transliteration does not provide the reader with information about the family characteristics as the original does. Therefore, it would have been more appropriate to provide some clarification or explanation of the above-mentioned names in the brackets.

Translational lacunas can also be observed in the translation of place names. It is known that proper names, as well as place names are usually based on the nominative function of linguistic units. The latter reflect the national and geographical relevance of the "object named", hence their proper transference requires special care. This is especially true for historiographical literature to avoid historiographical misunderstandings. The translated versions of the proper names in the Armenian History, especially those of Persian, Greek, Assyrian origin are sometimes translator-biased.

Thus, for instance,

> *He gave him Nisibis as his capital and established as his*
> *frontiers part of western Syria, Palestine, Asia, and all*

of Anatolia and T'etalia, from the Sea of Pontus to the place where the Caucasus runs into the Western Sea, and **Azerbaijan**. (R. Thomson, History of the Armenians, 79)

Եւ քաղաք թագաւորութեան տայ նմա զՄծբին, և սահմանս հատանէ նմա զմասն ինչ յարևմտեայ Ասորւոց և զՊաղեստին և զԱսիա և զամենայն Միջերկրեայս և զԹետալիս, ի ծովէն Պոնտոսի մին-չև ի տեղին` ուր  Կալկաս յարևմտեանն յանգի ի ծով, և **զԱտրպատական**: (Մովսէս Խորենացի «Հա-յոց պատմութիւն», 34)

Նրան թագավորության քաղաք է նշանակում Մծբինը և նրան սահմաններ է որոշում` Ասորիքի արևմտյան կողմից մի մասը, Պաղեստինը, Ասիան, ամբողջ Միջերկրայրը և Թետալիան, Պոնտոս ծովից մինչև այնտեղ, ուր Կովկասը վերջանում է արևմտյան ծովի մոտ, նաև **Ատրպատականը:** (Ըստ Ստ. Մալխասյանի թարգմանության)

The extract above recounts the period of the reign of Vagharshak in Armenia, the brother of Arshak the Great – the king of the Persians and Partevs and the cities under his control. The translated text makes it clear that the translator chose the proper name *Azerbaijan* for *Ատրպատական* mistakenly believing that Atrpatakan is the present-day Azerbaijan, or he did it intentionally aiming to mislead the rerader.

To support our suspicions it is necessary to make a reference to certain historiographical sources. First, it should be mentioned that the dictionary *The Place Names of Armenia and Adjacent Areas* by T. Hakobyan, St. Melik-Bakhshyan and H. Barseghyan, explains the place name of Atrpatakan as the name of an ancient country in Persia between the Caspian Sea and Lake Urmia which were predominated with Median tribes or Mars. It is also stated that

Mihrdat, the King of Atrpatakan received the dominance of the Armenian King Tigran the Great after which the Arshakuni kings made Atrpatakan a hereditary property and named it Armenian Atrpatakan.

According to ancient and Islamic sources, as well as various others containing geographical evidence, the territory lying north to the River Araks, currently called Azerbaijan, was previously known as Albania. Classical authors like Strabo presents this region with names Albania, Armenia, Aghvanq. Persians called this territory Arran (Arran, the real name of the Republic of Azerbaijan according to an interview with Dr. Enayatollah Reza). Barthold writes that in Arabic sources one can come across the names Al-ran or Arran which, most probably derive from the name Ardan. Enayatollah Reza thinks there is every reason to believe that Arran and Azerbaijan are the same territories (Reza, Sunday, July 21, 2019).

The sources of the Tsarist Russia (Russian Encyclopedia, St. Petersburg, 1890:212-213) recognize only one Az**a**rbaijan (the territory of the historical Atrpatakan) -*phl. (Pahlavi = āturpātakān, New Persian = Āδarbāδān, zd. Avestan = ātarǝpāta)* which was once a wealthy industrial state in Northern Iran, whereas the territory lying to the north of the River Araks (present-day Azerbaijan) is mentioned in the Encyclopedia as Russian Azerbaijan. Moreover, Enayatollah Reza is convinced that this area had never historically borne this name until 1918. Following the Bolshevik Revolution due to the active involvement of Turkish politicians a marionette country was established in the Caucasus (present Azerbaijan) with the aim to consolidate Turkic speaking nations under the auspices of Turkey. Therefore, the Mossavat Party established a special government in the territory of the present day Azerbaijan on May 27, 1918 thereby founding the Republic of Azerbaijan we know today. Barthold believes (Barthold 1971) that the use of the place name Azerbaijan in that territory had one aim – to create an artificial link with the Iranian Az**a**rbaijan (Iranian state) and today's Az**e**rbaijan. Apparently, the translator by the magic change of the sounds a>e Az**a**rbaijan (an Iranian state) – Az**e**rbaijan (present-day Azerbaijan) tried to connect Atrpatakan with today's Azerbaijan. It should be added that according to the translation ethics of historiographical texts the

translator must have preserved the historical names of the region or at least used the version Atropatene making a reference to Strabo[4].

The parallel examination of the original text and the translated version comes to confirm W. Humboldt's idea that if translation is to endow the language and spirit of a nation with something they do not have or possesses it in a different form, then the first requirement a translator should meet is fidelity.

To sum up, we should note that translational lacuna in historiographical genre can often be traced at various levels from sounds to paragraph. However, the research reveals inadequate cases of translation the presence of which can be accounted for by the translators intention to violate and misinterpret historical facts, cultural values and characteristic features of Armenian linguomentality.

### Notes:

1. *The History of Armenia* by Movses Khorenatsi has become an object of interest for the world science and has been translated into different languages. It was translated into Latin by the brothers Wilhelm and Gevorg Wiston and was published in London in 1736. The Italian translation was initiated by the Mekhitarist Congregation in Venice (Venice 1841). The book was translated into French by V. Langlua (Paris, 1869) into Russian by S. Eminin (Moscow, 1893), into German (partial) by A. Lauer (Regensburg, 1869). The first and the only English translation was done by R. Thomson (published in 1978 and republished in 2006) who aimed at disclosing the source data and discovering the motives of their creation. The current article is an attempt to reveal to what extent R. Thomson has managed to come up with comprehensive evaluation of the work and represent its linguostyistic peculiarities.

2. The time span covered in the History of Armenia has caused numerous controversies. Some researchers, including R. Thomson, place M.

Khorenatsi among the historians of the 9th century. Here are the brief explanations suggested by R. Thomson himself:

- Khorenatsi was the first historian to identify Syunik and Sisakan. The information about the latter dates back to the 6th century (Book 1, part 12);

- Khorenatsi knew about 4 Armenias /Hayq/ since these four Byzantine provinces were set up by Hustianos in 536A.D. (Book 1, part 14);

- Khorenatsi mentions the province of Vaspurakan which lies to the East of Laka Van which existed only in 591 A.D (Book 2, part 162);

- He knew about Butania which was ruled by Persia and which joined Armenia after the war with Persia in 604-629 A.D. (Book 3, Part 18);

In this regard, A. Musheghyan points out that his historical-philological research in the 1980s is aimed to reject the anachronisms in the History of Armenia by Khorenatsi. He is convinced that attempts to consider M. Khorenatsi an author of a later period are anti-scientific, in fact, the result of:

- the introduction of a new list of names which appeared in new global-political realities in later centuries;

- the unawareness of the medieval editors and writers;

- separate data unknown to historical studies and philology;

- intentional distortion of historical facts and their misconceptions by critics. (Musheghyan 2007:18)

3. Cf. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English, 2006, Oxford: Oxford University Press; Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1978, London: Longman Group Limited; Webster's New World Dictionary. Third Edition. New York, 1988; English-Armenian, Armenian-English Proverbs and Phrases, Yerevan: Ankyunakar: 2005:

4. According to Strabo, this area was named *Atropatene* (which is obviously closer to the version of Atrpatakan) after a Median general called Atropat, who bravely defended his homeland back in the times of Alexander the Great. ( in: R. Galichyan 2007)

## References:

1. Ayvazyan, A. (1998) *Hayastani patmutyan lusabanumy amerikyan patmagrutyan mej: qnnakan tesutyun.* Yerevan: Lusakn.

2. Arakelyan, V. (1984) *Hingerord dari targmanakan grakanutjan lezun yev vochy.* Yerevan: HSSH GA hrat.

3. Barthold, M. (1971) *Collected Works.* Vol. 7, Moscow.

4. Black, M. (1979) More about Metaphor. // Metaphor and Thought. / Ed. by A. Ortony. Cambridge: CUP.

5. Carriere, A. (1895) *La légende d'Abgar dans l'Historie d'Armenie de Moïse de Khoren.* Paris: Impr. Nationale.

6. Gabrielyan, S. (2007) *The Translation Studies Reader.* Yerevan: Sahak Partev.

7. Galichian, R. (2007) *Countries South of the Caucasus in medievel maps. Armenia, Georgia and Azerbaijan.* Yerevan: Printinfo Art Books and London, Gomidas Institute joint publication.

8. Gutschmidt, A. (1876/1892) *Uber die Glaub-Wurdigkeit der armenishen Geschichte des Moses von Khoren.* Leipzig, Phil.-Hist. Classe, XXIII BD.

9. Hakobyan, T., Melik-Bakhshyan, S., Barseghyan, H. (1986) *Hayastani yev harakits shrjanneri teghanunneri bararan.* Yerevan: YSU Press.

10. Humboldt, W. (1984) *Izbrannye trudy po yazykoznaniyu.* M.: Progres.

11. Lakoff, G.; Johnson, M. (1980) *Metaphor We Live by.* Chicago, London: University of Chicago.

12. Musheghyan, A. (2007) *Movses Khorenatsu dary.* Yerevan: YSU Press.

13. (1979) *Nor Bargirq Haykazean Lezvi.* Yerevan: YSU Press.

14. Petrosyan, H. (1987) *Hajerenagitakan bararan.* Yerevan: Hayastan Press.

15. Reza, E. *Arran, the Real nName of the Republic of Azerbaijan* Cf. Available at:<http://www.iranchamber.com/geography/articles/arran_real_azerbaijan .php> [Accessed January 2017]

16. Sadock, J. M. (1979) *Figurative Speech and Linguistics.* // Metaphor and Thought. / Ed. by A. Ortony. Cambridge-London-New York: CUP.

17. Sargsyan, G. (1991) *Movses Khorenatsu Hajots patmutyuny.* Yerevan: Yerevan University Press.

18. Sorokin, A.; Markovina, B. (1988) *Tekst i perevod.* M.: Nauka.
19. Thomson, R. (2006) *History of the Armenians*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
20. Topchyan, A. (2001) *Movses Khorenatsu hunakan aghbyurneri khndiry.* Yerevan: Sargis Khachents Press.
21. Toumanoff, C. (1963) *Studies in Christian Caucasian History.* Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

## Թարգմանական «բաց»-ի խնդիրը Մովսես Խորենացու «Հայոց պատմության» անգլերեն թարգմանության մեջ

Հոդվածում քննության է առնվում Մովսես Խորենացու «Հայոց պատմության» անգլերեն թարգմանությունը: Հետազոտության նպատակն է վեր հանել թարգմանության անհամապատասխանության դեպքերը, որոնք սովորաբար ընդունված է կոչել թարգմանական բացեր: Ուսումնասիրությունը ցույց է տալիս, որ թարգմանական տեքստում այսպիսի անհամապատասխանություններ կարելի է գտնել բառաղարձվածճային մակարդակում, մասնավորապես՝ տեղանունների և դարձվածաբանական միավորների վերարտադրության դեպքերում, նաև ձևաբանական, շարահյուսական և ոճական մակարդակներում: Անհամարժեքության այսպիսի դեպքերը հաճախ թարգմանչի սուբյեկտիվ վերաբերմունքի և մտադրվածության արդյունք են: