

## ON SOME SYNTACTIC PECULIARITIES OF THE ARMENIAN TRANSLATION OF FAULKNER'S *ABSALOM, ABSALOM!*

RUZANNA KARAPETYAN\*  
<https://orcid.org/0009-0007-8465-8852>  
YEREVAN STATE UNIVERSITY

**Abstract:** the grandiose novel of William Faulkner “Absalom, Absalom!” is a majestic example of a piece of writing which encompasses diverse layers of plots, social layers, and dramatic collisions, revealed through intricate linguistic apparatus, particularly a very specific syntactic organization. The paper is an attempt to make a close comparison of the original and the Armenian texts of the novel, translated by Samvel Mkrtchyan. The analysis of the syntactic complexity of the novel and its appropriate rendering into the Armenian language have been conducted within the framework of three sets of translation methods, elaborated by J. P. Vinay’s and J. Darbelnet and M. Baker. The results of the investigation manifest a striking deviation from the original text on the syntactic and textual levels. Scrupulous quantitative and qualitative data and interpretation are provided in the conclusion.

**Keywords:** translation techniques, textual equivalence, lexical expansion, textual and syntactic levels

### 1. Introduction

In the course of its history humanity has always taken recourse and tried to find a refuge in the topics of eternal truth and divine revelation. The most dreadful and formidable pages of life seem much lighter and less insurmountable provided there is a mighty hope and consolation of a higher power. There are numerous examples when Holy Scriptures and texts saved lives and lit the way out of darkness for people at the bottom. And, definitely, the whole spectrum of human emotions, be it extreme delight or desperate grief, experienced throughout life, finds its output and is expressed in the genuine works of literary art. The grandiose novel of William Faulkner *Absalom, Absalom!* is a majestic example of a piece of writing which encompasses diverse and multipolar layers of plots, stories, social layers, dramatic collisions and the tragedy of lost dreams, fragility and tragic fallacy of our yearning, transiency of life and stability. The story of the Sutpens family, its height and disastrous descent closely resonates with the Biblical plot of King David and two of his sons, Absalom and Amnon.

---

\* rkarapetyan@ysu.am



The author has no conflicts of interest to declare  
This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

Received: 06/04/2023

Revised: 25/05/2023

Accepted: 29/05/2023

© The Author(s) 2023

However, strange it may seem, fundamental plots and life-stories are quite limited and reoccur regularly and with permanent stability in our life. Nonetheless, centuries and several millennia of experience have not prevented people from making the same mistakes and they are constantly being trapped into the tenacious web of the fate. Thus it is quite natural and justifiable to seek all these plots in the Holy books. Certainly Faulkner accomplished the task of revealing the truth which according to his own words “is one. It never changes and covers all things which touch heart” (Faulkner 1940) in his seminal novel *Absalom, Absalom!* He transposed the biblical plot into the American South and demonstrated that the transition and border situation recur in our life regardless of circumstances and time period almost identically and require insight into the core in order to overcome the difficulties with dignity and fewer losses. It would be no exaggeration to say that at the moment most of the world societies, irrespective of economic and political advances, technological development and high-quality life, are going through the transition period. This is particularly true for the Armenian society and definitely careful reading of this kind of books can prove very useful. The language of *Absalom, Absalom!* is distinguished by a high level of complexity. It involves extremely long sentences, which often violate the syntactic rules of the language. Evidently, this is a stylistic device employed by the author to create and construct chaotic atmosphere on the verbal level to reproduce the extralinguistic reality more vividly and realistically. The dialogues and monologues of the heroes are also loaded with numerous linguistic nuances to uncover the deep meaning and the message that the author means to convey. For example, Rosa Coldfield’s speech is rife with the personal pronoun *I* and negative forms of the verb. This incessant parallelism of language units is a deliberate choice to demonstrate the tragedy of Rosa and her self-negation, her feeling of deep mortification as a rejected and unhappy woman.

There are many sentences starting with *because* and *as* conjunctions, which suggests the fact that both the narrators and the reader are actively seeking to establish the cause-effect relationship between the events; however, this kind of sentences develop into longer strings of an uninterrupted sentence, which in its turn points to the entanglement of this process. Mythological characters from the Bible also constitute a significant portion in the narration, thereby subconsciously referring the reader to the significance of the myth in the story of the Sutpens family.

In the text we consider, the reader and the author are in the so-called implicit, reflective relations, for not everything meant is conveyed explicitly via the language means. Thus, adequate understanding of the text requires intellectual and emotional effort; the reader is supposed to perceive the emotional background of the novel based on his/her intellectual background of the Bible, the history of the American South, feeling of the language nuances. As for the translator, this task becomes twice more difficult – ability for the explicit and implicit decipherment of the text is required in two dimensions simultaneously, namely in the source and target languages.

The antique tragedy of ravaged lives, unfulfilled prophecies and desperate search for the lost dreams is expressed through the appropriate literary form and tradition to match the chaos of external events with the chaos in the language and thought. So Faulkner opted for writing in the traditions of the popular literary trend of the 20<sup>th</sup>

century, namely *stream of consciousness narration*. In this kind of narration authors choose to go into the mind of the characters directly and present the story enveloped in the train of thoughts of the characters. Definitely this internal speech cannot be as polished and clearly-cut as an external narration, and presents whole fragments of disconnected random desultory thoughts evoked by external stimuli, deep and remote associations and some other subjective factors underpinning the attitude of the characters to what they utter, how they think and how they formulate their thoughts. In other words, the narration of stream of consciousness is heavily based on sensory, mystic and often analytically inexplicable impressions. Thus the language of this trend, as a direct indicator of the style, has some distinct features. First of all it stands out by the very specific use of syntax, and in the case of the novel described the most conspicuous techniques are as follows:

- lengthy entangled and ragged sentences,
- non-linear depiction of events,
- word order rules violation,
- use of numerous infinite sentences,
- interruption of the thought and insertion of a completely different thought within the framework of the same sentence,
- omission of conjunctions,
- blurred connection between sentences

The style of stream of consciousness is also singled out by an abundant use of associations, allusions to the past, both personal and historical, in case of the novel discussed, involvement of many not very reliable narrators whose memories can not only supplement but also deviate from the plotline, different perspectives and attitudes on the same event.

It should be stated that Samvel Mkrtychyan, whose translation of Faulkner is subject to investigation in the following chapters, has mostly preserved the style of Faulkner on all levels. The idioms and allusions are mostly foreignized, words and phrases are translated literally, culture-specific collocations are transferred as accurately as possible, i.e. on the word level the reader has an accurate and quite felicitous translation. The main difficulties arise on the syntactic level, which is preconditioned by the form-content-intent interrelationship. The ragged and random syntax, chosen for the realization of the stream of consciousness narration sounds very natural and organic in the English language to its syntactic and morphological peculiarities, while Armenian is a stiffer and less flexible syntax which does not permit so many variations and violations. Thus the study will come to reveal how the translator took up the complicated task of transferring the stream of consciousness narration into Armenian which does not so much favour the specificity of syntax of the given trend.

The subject of the investigation is the translation of Faulkner's *Absalom, Absalom!* into the Armenian language by Samvel Mkrtychyan. For the purpose of operationalization and quantification of the data obtained three sets of translation methods will be employed. Namely A. Berman's twelve tendencies of the analytic of translation, J. P. Vinay's and J. Darbelnet's seven procedures of direct and oblique translation, as well as M. Baker's principles of word, collocational, grammatical and textual equivalence serve as a categorical apparatus for the comparative investigation

of translation. Presented below is the brief summary of each of these approaches with the appropriate classification of translation means and techniques.

## 2. Close Comparison of the English and Armenian Texts

The passage selected for the close comparison deals with the description of one of the main characters, specifically Rosa Coldfield's, search and inconstancy, quest for consolation, effortless attempts to struggle loneliness and find some affection. The passage represents a somewhat desperate, abrupt flow of her feelings and thoughts, in line with the principles of "stream of consciousness" where pure thought is given priority over the linguistic formulation and perfection of speech. In other words, in this kind of writing the focus is to liberate thought from the language limits and present it in its full spectrum of insanity, despair, impetuous delight and divine inspiration. It is the distinctive feature of Faulkner's writing to step beyond the impossible which is often accompanied by entangled speech, hard for perception and, moreover, for translation. The translation into Armenian was done by Samvel Mkrtychyan. Let's take a look at pages 67-73 of the book and try to reveal some of the linguistic features:

*Now the period began which ended in the catastrophe which caused a reversal so complete in Miss Rosa as to permit her to agree to marry the man whom she had grown up to look upon as an ogre. It was not a volte-face of character: that did not change. Even her behavior did not change to any extent. Even if Charles Bon had not died, she would in all probability have gone out to Sutpen's Hundred to live after her father's death sooner or later, and once she had done so she would have probably passed the remainder of her life there. (Faulkner 2005: 67)*

*Հետո սկսվեց այն շրջանը, որն ավարտվեց աղետով, որն էլ իր հերթին այնպիսի հեղաշջջում առաջացրեց Օրիորդ Ռոզայի մեջ, որ նա համաձայնեղ ամուսնանալ այն մարդու հետ, որին մանկուց մարդակեր էր համարել: Սա բնավորության կտրուկ շրջադարձ չէր. այդ մեկը չփոխվեց, նույնիսկ նրա վարքն ամենին չփոխվեց: Եթե նույնիսկ Չարլզ Բոնը չմեռներ, այդ կինն ամենայն հավանականությամբ կգնար Մաթփենի Հարյուր վաղ թե ուշ այնտեղ ապրելու իր հոր մահից հետո, և գնալիս՝ անենայն հավանականությամբ կյանքի մնացած տարիներն այնտեղ էր ապրելու: (Faulkner 2001: 81)*

As is seen in the Armenian translation some deformations have been introduced which, according to Antoine Berman's classification, can be attributed to the so-called *destruction of linguistic patterning*. These deformations are all discerned on the level of textual analysis, which reveals the inner structure of the text, cohesion and literary intent of the author. Specifically the *which* conjunction, which in the English version indicates the abruptness of thought, short and wild intervals between the decisions made by Rosa and unexpectedness of events, is softened in the Armenian by adding *իր հերթին*. Here the translator applies the method of clarification/expansion to explicate the logical relationship in the events, which is intentionally omitted in the original to

provide the atmosphere for the imminent catastrophe. The adverb *now* is replaced by *հիւն*, which alienates the reader, by pushing him/her out of the flow of events disrupting the stream of consciousness effect and the involvement with the flux of thoughts of Rosa: the reader does not feel and think in parallel with Rosa guaranteed by the adverb *now* in the original. In terms of translation methods here we deal with the *break of adequate reference (deictic)* translation. The translator goes on with the textual deformations, and translates the next two sentences as one sentence providing much more flexible and viscous flow of speech than in the original which is much more rugged. Thus in this case the technique of *rationalization* (or in the terms of Vinay and Darbelnet *syntactic transposition*) is used at the expense of destruction of underlying networks of signification. The next sentence is translated quite accurately, where the subjunctive mood is presented adequately and the rhythm of the speech is completely preserved. On the word level there are a number of interesting points to mention. In the original there is an inversion in the collocation *a reversal so complete* while in the Armenian this phrase is translated as an unmarked phrase; the prepositional verbal phrase *grow up* is translated as *մասնկուց*, hence word class shift is evident. Also the translation of *ogre*, which is a culturally marked phenomenon evoking strong feeling of fear and disgust via the allusion, as a neutral *մարդակեր* can be considered a case of qualitative impoverishment.

*But if Bon had lived and he and Judith had married and Henry had remained in the known world, she would have moved out there only when she was ready to, and she would have lived in her dead sister's family only as the aunt which she actually was. It was not her character that changed: despite the six years or so since she had actually seen him and certainly the four years which she had spent feeding her father secretly at night while he hid from the Confederate provost marshals in the attic.* (Faulkner 2005: 67-68)

Բայց եթե Բոնը ողջ մնար, ինքն ու Ջուդիթը՝ ամուսնանային, իսկ Հենրիին չփախչեր, այդժամ Օրիորդ Ռոզան կտեղափոխվեր միայն այն դեպքում, երբ պատրաստ լիներ և մեռած քրոջ ընտանիքում կապրեր միայն որպես հորաքույր (որն այդպես էլ կար): Բնավորությունը չփոխվեց, ուրեմն, թեպետ վեց տարի արդեն չէր տեսել Սաթյեյնին ու չորս տարի շարունակ ամեն գիշեր գաղտուկ կերակրել էր հորը, մինչ վերջինս ձեռնահարկում թաքնվում էր համադաշնակիցների զինվորական ստիկանությունից: (Faulkner 2001: 83-84)

The first sentence in the passage is translated literally, with the only exception: the relative subordinate clause is translated into the Armenian as a *clarification* in brackets. In the second part the Armenian translation there is a violation of the *functional perspective of the sentence*, namely a *shift in the theme/rheme distribution* of the information. In the English version the *character* is a marked rheme/unknown, while in the Armenian version it is quite neutral. The concession conjunction *թեպետ*, and the conjunction word *ուրեմն* are added. So the translator uses *conjunctions as formal markers* to provide the cohesion of the sentences on the superficial level, at the same time disrupting the *deep network* of the original, which is expressed via very concise

and voluminous colon. On the phraseological level the translation of *Confederate provost marshals* as *համադաշնակիցների զինվորական ոստիկանություն* is an example of translation by cultural substitution. Another example of the collocation translation is *չփախչեք* to express the English *remained in the known world*, which is a case of *translation by omission*.

*At the same time she was writing heroic poetry about the very men from whom her father was hiding and who would have shot him or hung him without trial if they had found him – and incidentally the ogre of her childhood was one of them and (he brought home with him a citation for valor in Lee’s own hand) a good one. The face which Miss Rosa carried out there to live for the rest of her life was the same face which had watched him across the dinner table and which he likewise could not have said how many times he had seen, nor when and where, not for the reason that he was unable to forget it but because he could probably not have remembered it enough to have described it ten minutes after looking away, and from behind the face the same woman who had been that child now watched him with that same grim and cold intensity. (Faulkner 2005: 68)*

*Միևնույն ժամանակ նա հերոսական բանաստեղծություններ էր գրում այն նույն մարդկանց մասին, որոնցից հայրը թաքնվում էր և որոնք, եթե գտնեին հորը, առանց դատարանի կգնդակահարեին կամ կկախեին նրան. իսկ բախտի քմահաճույքով իր՝ Օրիորդ Ռոզայի մանկության մարդակերը, նրանցից մեկն էր, այն էլ (նա տուն էր բերել Լիի ձեռքով գրած քաջության վկայականը)՝ խիզախ մեկը: Այն դեմքը, որ Օրիորդ Ռոզան տարավ իր հետ ցմահ ապրելու այնտեղ, նույն դեմքն էր, որը նայել էր Սաթփենին ճաշասեղանի վրայով և որը Սաթփենը նմանապես չէր կարողանա ասել, թե քանի անգամ է տեսել, երբ կամ որտեղ, ոչ այն պատճառով, որ անգոր էր մոռանալու, այլ որովհետև չէր կարողանա հիշել դեմքը՝ նրան տեսնելուց ու հայացքը շրջելուց տասը րոպե հետո, իսկ դեմքի ետևից նույն կինը՝ այդ նախկին երեխան, հիմա նայում էր նույն սառն ու մռայլ լարվածությամբ: (Faulkner 2001: 85)*

The first sentence in the passage is a literate translation of the original, which is quite felicitous, since the rhythm and melody of the English text are fully preserved in the complicated sequence of subordinate clauses, with the precise translation of conjunctions and the grammatical mood of verbs. The only deviation from the original is on the word level: the Armenian possessive pronoun is further explicated by the addition of *Օրիորդ Ռոզա*. Thus here the translator uses the technique of lexical inflation or expansion. In the second sentence there is an atypical collocation which is *calqued* in the translation, so that *the equivalence* is preserved - *carry a face* as *տանել դեմքը*. There are also two cases of lexical cohesion when the pronoun *he* is *substituted* by the *proper noun-reference* *Սաթփեն* in the translation.

*Although she was not to see Sutpen again for years, she now saw her sister and niece more often than ever. Ellen was now at the full peak of what the aunt would have called her renegadery. She seemed not only to acquiesce, to be reconciled to her life and marriage, but to be actually proud of it. (Faulkner 2005: 68)*

Թեպետ Օրհորդ Ռոզան Սաթփենին նորից տարինրով չէր տեսնելու, փոխարենն ավելի հաճախ էր տեսնում իր քրոջն ու քրոջ աղջկան: Էլենն այժմ գտնվում էր իր, ինչպես հորաքույրը կասեր, ուխտադրժության գազաթնակետին: Կարծես թե նա ոչ միայն ընդունել էր հաշտվել էր իր կյանքի և ամուսնության հետ, այլև հպարտ էր վերջինով: (Faulkner 2001: 85)

In the above passage, the translation is completely literate, conveying the equivalence both on the word and above word levels, at the same time keeping the textual cohesion intact and holistic.

*She had bloomed, as if Fate were crowding the normal Indian summer which should have bloomed gradually and faded gracefully through six or eight years, into three or four, either for compensation for what was to come or to clear the books, pay the check to which Fate's wife, Nature, had signed his name. Ellen was in her late thirties, plump, her face unblemished still. It was as though whatever marks being in the world had left upon it up to the time the aunt vanished had been removed from between the skeleton and the skin, between the sum of experience and the envelope in which it resides, by the intervening years of annealing and untroubled flesh. (Faulkner 2005: 68)*

Նա փթթել էր, ասես բախտը ժողովելիս լիներ սովորական տաք աշնանամուտը, որը երեք-չորս տարում պիտի աստիճանաբար ծաղկեր ու նազանքով խամրեր յոթ-ութ տարվա փոխարեն, որպեսզի կամ հատուցի գալիքի համար, կամ մաքրի գրքերը, վճարելով պարտատոմսը, որի տակ բախտի կինը՝ բնությունն իր անունն էր գրել: Էլենը մոտենում էր քառասունին, թմբլիկ էր, դեմքը՝ տակավին անարատ: Կարծես այդ դեմքի բծերը, որոնք կային մինչև հորաքրոջ անհետանալը, այժմ չքվել էին կմախքի և մաշկի արանքից, փորձի հանրագումարի և նրա կեղևի արանքից՝ կոփվող ու անվրդով մարմնի խառնված տարիների օգնությամբ: (Faulkner 2001: 86)

In the sentences above there are a number of cultural elements reproduced in the Armenian translation not very accurately. The first is an element of the above-word level of analysis, namely the culture-specific collocation *Indian summer* the translation of which requires also conveyance of the presupposed meaning. *Indian summer* refers to unusually warm and dry periods in autumn in the Northern hemisphere, with clear sky and serene weather. However, in the late 1830s it acquired a figurative meaning and has the connotation of any late flowering following a period of decline. In the original it strikes the eye that the description of late blossoming, expressed by the collocation *Indian summer*, refers to Ellen's beauty in her late thirties after the fading of youth years. The comparison with *Nature* clearly resonates with Ellen's age, her tranquil and placid fascination, so natural and harmonic; in the Armenian *սովորական տաք աշնանամուտ* is completely deprived of the emotional and expressive loading presupposed. And the networking continues in Faulkner's text when the nouns *Nature* and *Fate* are written with the capital letter. The spelling is not preserved in the Armenian translation, thus the specific role of *Nature* and *Fate* as animate and very active characters in most of Faulkner's plots, is disrupted, which in

its turn leads to the destruction of underlying networks of signification. The collocation *whatever marks being in the world had left upon it* is translated into Armenian as *դեմքի բծերը*, presenting the combinatory technique of *quantitative/qualitative impoverishment*. On the level of syntax the translator applied *rationalization*: in the English version again there is extremely sophisticated syntactic patterning with the relative subordinate clause (*which should have bloomed gradually and faded gracefully through six or eight years*) and the indirect prepositional object (*into three or four*) immediately following each other, however the reference of the indirect prepositional object to the word supplemented (*crowd*) is complicated, thereby creating the feeling of chaos and instability, compression of natural flow of events into a shorter period and the subsequent confusion of Ellen and the events to follow. In the Armenian version the syntax is reconstructed, but the feeling of confusion is lost.

*Often twice and sometimes three times a week the two of them came to town and into the house- the foolish unreal voluble preserved woman now six years absent from the world – the woman who had quitted home and kin on a flood of tears and in a shadowy miasmic region something like the bitter purlieus of Styx had produced two children and then rose like the swamp-hatched butterfly, unimpeded by weight of stomach and all the heavy organs of suffering and experience, into a perennial bright vacuum of arrested sun – and Judith, the young girl dreaming, not living, in her complete detachment and imperviousness to actuality almost like physical deafness.* (Faulkner 2005: 69)

Շաբաթը երկու, երբեմն էլ երեք անգամ երկուսը քաղաք էին գալիս. հետո տուն վերադառնում. անխելք անհրական զրուցասեր ու լավ պահպանված կինը, որն առդեն վեց տարի բացակա էր աշխարհից. կին, որն արցունքի հեղեղի մեջ թողել էր հայրական տունն ու հեռավոր ժանտահոտ մի շրջանում, որը Ստիքսի սգալից փերեր էր հիշեցնում, երկու երեխա էր ծնել, հետո բարձրացել ճահճում ձվադրած թիթեռի պես, առանց զգալու որովայնի և տառապանքի ու անփորձության բոլոր օրգանների ծանրությունը, թռել էր դեպի հավիտենական պայծառ դատարկությունը խափանված ահի, - և Ջուդիթը՝ այդ աղջիկը, որը ոչ թե սպրոտ էր, այլ անբջու՜մ իրականության հանդեպ համարյա մարմնական խլության հասած կատարյալ առանձնության և անթափանցելիության մեջ: (Faulkner 2001: 93)

In the passage, the translator has made an *omission* not translating the adverb *often*, which disrupts the symmetry of the original. There are also two cases of lexical inflation, or expansion; the adverbial modifier of place *and into the house* is unfolded and translated into Armenian as *հետո տուն վերադառնում*, which corresponds to the grammatical requirements of the Armenian, otherwise the meaning of going back home would be lost; the verbal phrase *rose.....into the perennial bright vacuum* is reproduced in the Armenian as *բարձրացել.....թռել էր դեպի հավիտենական պայծառ դատարկությունը* – the verb *rose* in the original is further explicated in the Armenian to provide the stability of chain of thought, which in the original is disrupted by the insertion of the adverbial phrase of comparison *like the swamp-hatched butterfly, unimpeded by weight of stomach and all the heavy organs of suffering and*



*experience*. In other words, in the given sentence the specific form of desultory and random speech where formal linguistic links between the fragments of thought are blurred is softened in the Armenian translation. There is an atypical collocation *absent from the world* meaning living in an imaginary world which is translated literally in the Armenian. The idiom *the bitter purlieus of Styx* is translated similarly and evokes almost the same meaning and gloomy atmosphere in the Armenian. The same kind of linguistic technique, namely incomplete grammatical sentence is used by Faulkner for the description of Judith as an etheric feature cut off from the mundane life - the young girl dreaming, not living - is completely restructured in the translation in terms of all the formal grammatical elements as *այդ աղջիկը, որը ոչ թե ապրում էր, այլ անըջում* adding the indicative pronoun *այդ*, concession conjunction *այլ*, opting for the use of finite subordinate relative clause to translate the participial adverbial construction *the young girl dreaming* in the English where all the formal grammatical elements to express tense, mood and person are omitted as if producing the pictorial image of isolation from the earth. Definitely in terms of conveying the atmosphere and literary intent of the author, this kind of translation cannot be considered optimal. And finally the case of qualitative impoverishment is evident when the adjective *shadowy*, which has the connotation of gloomy, frightening, is translated neutrally as *հեռավոր* in the Armenian version.

*To them, Miss Rosa must not have been anything at all now: not the child who had been the object and victim of the vanished aunt's vindictive unflagging care and attention, and not even the woman which her office as housekeeper would indicate, and certainly not the actual aunt herself. And it would be hard to say which of the two, sister or niece, was the most unreal to Miss Rosa in turn – the adult who had escaped reality into a bland region peopled by dolls, or the young girl who slept walking in some suspension so completely physical as to resemble the state before birth and so far removed from reality's other extreme as Ellen was from hers, driving up to the house twice and three times a week, and one time, in the summer when Judith was seventeen, stopping in on their way overland to Memphis to buy Judith clothes; yes: a trousseau. (Faulkner 2005: 70)*

Նրանց համար Օրիորդ Ռոզան հիմա ոչինչ չէր լինի՝ ոչ այն երեխան, որն անհետացած հորաքրոջ քինախինդ ու անխափան հոգածության և ուշադրության զոհն էր եղել, ոչ այն կինը, որն ինքն իրեն ի պաշտոնն է կառավարչուհի էր կարգել, ոչ էլ իրական մորաքույրը: Եվ դժվար էր ասել, թե այդ երկուսից՝ քրոջից ու քրոջ աղջկանից որն էր ավելի անիրական Օրիորդ Ռոզայի համար, - մայրը, որն իրականությունից փախել էր դեպի տիկնիկներով լցված մի քնքուշ աշխարհ, թե աղջիկը, որը քնում էր մի այնպիսի արթմնի սպասման մեջ (կատարելապես մարմնական), որ նմանվում էր նախածննդյան վիճակին՝ նույնքան հեռու իրականության սյուս ծայրից, որքան էլենը՝ իր իրականությունից, - երբ նա՝ Օրիորդ Ռոզան, շաբաթական երկու թե երեք անգամ կառքով գնում էր նրանց տուն, իսկ մի անգամ, ամռանը, երբ Ջուդիթը տասնյոթ տարեկան էր, գնացին մինչև Մեմֆիս՝ Ջուդիթի համարզգեստներ գնելու. այդ, բաժինը: (Faulkner 2001: 94)

In the given passage the translator has to a certain degree violated the functional sentence perspective, for in the original *To them* is a marked element separated by a comma, whereas in the Armenian *Նրանց համար* is naturally embedded in the sentence structure and speech flow. There is also a case of quantitative/qualitative impoverishment when the phrase *object* and *victim* is merely translated as *գոհ*. There is also the case of lexical reference when *adult* is translated into Armenian as *մայրը* to provide better clarification. And again evident is the tendency to translate the infinite clauses so specific of Faulkner's style and extensively used for the vivid reproduction of the real stream of consciousness as finite clauses in the Armenian: *stopping in on their way overland to Memphis as մինչև Մեմֆիս*.

*That was the summer following Henry's first year at the University, after he had brought Charles Bon home with him for Christmas and then again to spend a week or so of the summer vacation before Bon rode on to the River to take the steamboat home to New Orleans; the summer in which Sutpen himself went away, on business, Ellen said, doubtless unaware, such was her existence then, that she did not know where her husband had gone and not even conscious that she was not curious. No one but your grandfather and perhaps Clytie was ever to know that Sutpen had gone to Orleans too.* (Faulkner 2005: 70)

*Հենրիի համալսարանում ուսանելու առաջին տարվա ամառն էր, երբ Չարլզ Բոնին իր հետ տուն էր բերել Սուրբ Ծննդի համար, հետո մի անգամ էլ՝ ամառային արձակուրդի ժամանակ (մի երկու շաբաթով) նախքան Բոնը գնաց մինչև Միսիսիպիի, այնտեղից էլ շոգենավով՝ Նյու Օրլինս. այն ամառը, երբ Սաթփենն ինքը գործով տեղ էր մեկնել – ինչ-որ տեղ, Էլենն ասաց, որովհետև այդպիսին էր այդ ժամանակ նրա գոյությունը. չգիտեր, թե որտեղ է անուսինը և անգիտակցորեն չէր էլ ուզում իմանալ: Ոչ ոք, բացի քո պապից ու գուցե Քլիթիից, այդպես էլ չիմացավ, որ Սաթփենը նույնպես Նյու Օրլինս է գնացել:* (Faulkner 2001: 94)

In the first part the rhythm and melody of the English text is reproduced quite accurately in the Armenian translation by stressing the temporal adverbial modifier *summer*, separating terse and concise sentences by commas, thereby reflecting very melodically the chronology of successive events. There is cultural substitution when the proper noun *River* is translated as *Միսիսիպիի*, for in the Armenian the literal translation could have association with other rivers. However, the second sentence in the original is again a very specific case, when thoughts are permeated into each, rather unfinished and vague. In terms of language techniques, the author uses ellipsis, omission of conjunctions, infinite clauses, commas. All this is justified by the need to show the unconscious state of Ellen and her being absent from the world. However, the translator restructured the sentence and added *որովհետև*, the entangled clause *and not even conscious that she was not curious* (which echoes so well with the state described) rewritten and rationalized in the Armenian translation as *և անգիտակցորեն չէր էլ ուզում իմանալ*. It is interesting to mention that while reading the Armenian translation the reader, at times, feels as an external observer

following the events from aside, while the English text involves the reader into the flux of events.

*They would enter Miss Rosa's house, that dim grim tight light little house where even yet, four years after she had left the aunt still seemed to be just beyond any door with her hand already on the knob, and which Ellen would fill with ten or fifteen minutes of shrill uproar and then depart, taking with her the dreamy and volitionless daughter who had not spoken one word; and Miss Rosa who in actual fact was the girl's aunt and who by actual years should have been her sister ignoring the mother to follow the departing and inaccessible daughter with myopic and inarticulate yearning and not one whit of jealousy, projecting upon Judith the only gift (it was Ellen who told this, with shrieks of amusement, more than once) in her power: she offered to teach Judith how to keep house and plan meals and count laundry, receiving for the offer the blank fathomless stare, the unhearing "What? What did you say?" while even now Ellen was shrieking with astonished appreciation. Then they were gone – carriage, bundles, Ellen's peacock amusement, the niece's impenetrable dreaming. When they came to town next and the carriage stopped before Mr. Coldfield's house, one of the negresses came out and said that Miss Rosa was not at home. (Faulkner 2005: 70)*

Նրանք, ուրեմն, մտնում էին Օրիորդ Ռոզայի տունը՝ այդ մռայլ ու մթին տունը, որտեղ, նույնիսկ չորս տարի անց, թվում էր, թե հորաքույրը կանգնած է բոլոր դռների ետևում, ձեռքը՝ բռնակին, և որն էլենը տասը-տասնհինգ րոպե լցնում էր ճղճղոցով ու հեռանում՝ իր հետ տանելով երազկոտ ու անկամ դստերը, որը ոչ մի բառ չէր ասել. իսկ Օրիորդ Ռոզան, որն իրոք ազգկա մորաքույրն էր, բայց համարյա նրա հասակակիցը, հետևում էր հեռացող ամնասչելի քրոջ աղգկան՝ կարճատև և անհողաբաշխ կարոտով, առանց խանդի նշույլի, Ջուդիթի վրա սփռելով իր դատապարտված և խափանված մանկության բոլոր տհաս երազանքներն ու պատրանքները – աղջկան առաջարկում էր (էլենն է պատմել այս մասին, մի քանի անգամ, զվարճանքի ճիչերով) իր իշխանության տակ գտնվող միակ շնորհը՝ ինչպես մաքրել տունը, ճաշ պատրաստել, հաշվել սպիտակեղենը, իսկ որպես պատասխան՝ դատարկ անչափելի մի հայացք, անլսելի մի հարց՝ «Ինչ, ինչ ասացիր», մինչ էլենը ճղճղում էր իրադրության զարմացական գնահատանքով: Հետո նրանք գնում էին – կառք, կապոցներ, էլենի փքուն զվարճությունը, նրա դստեր անթափանցելի երազկոտությունը: Հաջորդ անգամ, երբ նրանք քաղաք եկան ու կառքը կանգ առավ միսթր Քոլդֆիլդի տան առագ, սևամորթ կանանցից մեկը դուրս եկավ ու ասաց, որ Օրիորդ Ռոզան տանը չէ: (Faulkner 2001: 95)

In the passage there are a number of transformations the translator has made: the phrase *dim grim tight light little*, translated as *մռայլ ու մթին* has undergone quantitative/qualitative transformation. The phrase *ignoring mother* (a relative participial construction) which appears to be dangling in the air in the original is omitted in the translation. The translator chose to express via punctuation the phrase *receiving for the offer*, thus again the case of omission is present. While following is the case of lexical expansion/clarification, when *unhearing* is unfolded and translated as *անլսելի մի հարց*. There is also a word-class shift in the translation of *peacock*

*amusement* as *վիքուն զվարճությունը*, noun is translated as adjective to match with the Armenian sounding.

*That summer she saw Henry again too. She had not seen him since the summer before although he had been home Christmas with Charles Bon, his friend from the University, and she had heard about the balls and parties at Sutpen's Hundred during the holidays, but she and her father had not gone out.* (Faulkner 2005: 71)

*Այդ ամառ Օրիոնը Ռոզանն ևս տեսավ Հենրիին: Մի տարի չէր տեսել նրան, թեպետ Սուրբ Ծնունդին Հենրին տուն էր եկել Չարլզ Բոնի իր համալսարանական ընկերոջ հետ, ու ինքը լսել էր Մաթիենի Հարյուրում արձակուրդի ժամանակ անցկացրած պարահանդեսների ու հավաքույթների մասին, բայց ինքն ու միայր Քոլդֆիլդը չէին գնացել:* (Faulkner 2001: 94)

In the Armenian translation the chronology of events is polished by the use and addition of the comma before the subordinate clause of concession, while Faulkner places two conjunctions immediately following each other, not separated by any punctuation marks and creating the chaotic atmosphere floating both in the mind of Rosa and in the events going on. Again this does not contribute to reproduce the specific properties of the “stream of consciousness” literary technique. There is also case of lexical reference when her father is translated as *միայր Քոլդֆիլդ*.

*He was the biggest single landowner and cotton-planter in the country now, attained by the same tactics with which he had built his house – the same singleminded unflagging effort and utter disregard of how his actions which the town could see might look and how the ones which the town could not see must appear to it.* (Faulkner 2005: 72)

*Հիմա նա շրջանի ամենախոշոր հողատերն ու բամբուկ աճեցնողն էր, ամեն ինչ ձեռք էր բերել այնպես, ինչպես տունն էր կառուցել – նույն նպատակալաց աներեր նկրտումը և բացարձակ արհամարհանքն առ այն, թե իր գործողություններին ինչպես կնայի քաղաքը, եթե տեսնի, և ինչպես կմեկնաբանի եթե չտեսնի:* (Faulkner 2001: 97)

The given passage is an almost literal translation keeping close to the sentence structure and the appropriate choice of words.

*He was not liked (which evidently he did not know, anyway) but feared, which seemed to amuse, if not actually please, him. But he was accepted; he obviously had too much money now to be rejected or even seriously annoyed any more. He accomplished this – got his plantation to running smoothly (he had an overseer now; it was the son of that same sheriff who had arrested him at his bride-to-be's gate on the day of the betrothal) within ten years of the wedding, and now he acted his role too - a role of arrogant ease and leisure which, as the leisure and ease put flesh on him, became a little pompous.* (Faulkner 2005: 72)

Մաթփեէնին չէին սիրում (մի բան, որ նրա սրտովն էր), բայց նրանից վախենում էին. մի բան, որ զվարճացնում էր, եթէ չասենք՝ զոհացնում էր նրան: Բայց նրան ընդունում էին անտարակույս: Նա հիմա շատ փող ուներ՝ մերժվելու կամ լրջորէն անհանգստանալու համար: Նա լրացրեց իր գործը – հասավ նրան, որ ամուսնության տասը տարվա ընթացքում տնկադաշտի աշխատանքը կարգավորեց (նա հիմա վերակացու էլ ուներ՝ որդին այն նույն շերիֆի, որը նրան ձերբակալել էր ապագա հարսնացվի դռան մոտ՝ նշանդրեքի օրը), իսկ հիմա անցավ իր դերին՝ ամբարտապան դյուրակեցությունն ու ժամանց, որոնցից նա փոքր ինչ գերացավ ու դարձավ ավելի փքաշուք: (Faulkner 2001: 99)

In the given sentence there is an obvious error in translating *which evidently he did not know, anyway* as *մի բան, որ նրա սրտովն էր*, since the two sentences convey semantically opposite meaning. There is a case of *lexical inflation and clarification* in translating *he was accepted* as *ընդունում էին անտարակույս*. And the same sentence in the original goes on to explain the reasons for explaining his unanimous acceptance by the society, while in the Armenian translation we see a syntactic shift, when the sentences is divided into two separate ones. In the sentence, following the translator has translated literally, keeping not only the syntactic structure and identical wording, but also preserving the English punctuation, namely the dash before expanding on the idea stated before, which is not very typical of the Armenian punctuation rules. There is also omission of the phrase *within ten years of the wedding*. And in the last section of the sentence it is again possible to see polished syntax – the repletion of the word *role* is omitted and definitely produces certain *qualitative impoverishment*, since it is imprinted in mind that for Sutpens it is a role he has to play. The inserted subordinate clause of reason in the English version - *as the leisure and ease put flesh on him* - and the repetition of *leisure* which again bears quite a high intentional and semantic loading, is appropriated and expressed in a very thorough and logical syntactic structure, without any trace of interrupted thought chain.

### 3. Conclusion

The comparative analysis of the original of *Absalom, Absalom!* with the Armenian translation of the novel by Samvel Mkrtchyan came to reveal some noteworthy points:

- It should be mentioned that on the word level there are numerous lexical expansions with the aim of clarifying and commenting on the text.
- At the same time the translator applies the technique of omission to overcome the cultural barrier of certain specific phenomena and events.
- The phrases and collocations are mostly translated quite close to the original, meanwhile preserving the meaning.

Mostly deviations from the original text are apparent on the syntactic and textual levels:

- quite often longer sentences are separated and translated as discrete sentences;

- there are also cases when separate sentences are combined into one sentence, thereby disrupting the rhythm of the narration;
- in certain cases there are deviations in the use of punctuation marks, however it should be mentioned that the translated tried to keep as close as possible to original, at times at the expense of the rules of the punctuation of the Armenian language, which is justified by stylistic and literary purposes;
- translation of conjunctions into the Armenian is not very accurate in a number of cases;
- the most conspicuous observation made during the analysis is the transfer of infinite sentences into the Armenian. The specificity of infinite clauses, the extensive and key role they have in the stream-of-consciousness narration due to the peculiar morphological, syntactic and textual properties that the given constructions have in the English contributes to their organic and purposeful use in the novel discussed. Since these constructions are not as flexible in the Armenian, the translator mostly transfers these constructions into Armenian via subordinate clauses, as separate sentences, puts them into brackets, or separates by other punctuation marks. This is the most fundamental deviation in the Armenian translation which comes to destruct the contextual network of the novel and to a certain extent, its literary intent and value.

## References

- Baker, Mona. 1992. *In Other Words. A Coursebook on Translation*. Routledge.
- Faulkner, William. 2005. *Absalom, Absalom!*. London: Vintage Books.
- Faulkner, William. 2001. *Abisoghom, Abisoghom* [Absalom, Absalom!]. Yerevan: Van Aryan.
- Faulkner, William. 1940. *Go Down, Moses*. New York: the Modern Library. Accessed February 15, 2023. <https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.509930/page/n3/mode/2up?q=which+touch+heart>
- Berman, Antoine. 2000. "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign." *The Translation Studies Reader* (ed.) L. Venuti. Routledge.
- Vinay, Jean-Paul, and Jean Darbelnet. 2000. "A Methodology for Translation." In *The Translation Studies Reader* (ed.) L. Venuti. Routledge.