

PRAGMATIC EQUIVALENCE IN LITERARY TRANSLATION

SHUSHANIK PARONYAN*
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6997-731x>
YEREVAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Abstract: The present paper addresses the issue of pragmatic equivalence in literary translation, which is considered to be one of the most important aspects of linguistic uniformity between the source and target texts. Pragmatic equivalence of translation is defined as the conformity of the translator's 'duplication' of the content with the author's communicative intent or the literary objective. The cross-cultural pragmatic analysis of translation equivalence carried out in the paper focuses on the interpretations of the verbal behavior of the heroes while performing speech acts. For the purpose of analysis, the novel by R. Bradbury "Dandelion Wine" and its Armenian and Russian translations are chosen. The research shows that the interpretative words nominating the heroes' verbal behavior, namely, the verbs of speaking, are culture sensitive. Therefore, in some cases the translator may diverge from the source text in order to sound authentic in the target language. The comparative analysis of the samples served as a mediated translation approach, revealing certain linguistic and culture-specific points at issue in the translation process.

Keywords: cross-cultural pragmatics; pragmatic equivalence; literary translation; verbs of speaking

1. Introduction

Translation is a process of communication during which replication of meaningful content from one language to another is performed. Since language and culture are closely related, this process needs to adopt a broad cultural outlook and show insight into linguaculture (Harding & Cortés 2018). In Translation Studies the successful realization of translation is often evaluated by considering different linguistic perspectives of uniformity like stylistic, word for word, paradigmatic and textual equivalence, or by observing the similarities between the original content and its translation on the pragmatic, situational, lexical (semantic), grammatical and structural levels (Nida 1964; Newmark 1988; Komissarov 1990; Hartono 2020). Translation through intermediary language brings forth another aspect of theoretical issues which is connected with the involvement of a third language in the translation process. Needless

* paronyan_shushan@hotmail.com



to say, the question of measuring equivalence, the criteria and strategies for evaluating the uniformity or, at least, closeness of the target and source texts may largely depend on the specific type and style of the writing, whether it is a literary or a scientific piece of writing, a sample of business communication, an official document, or any other piece of writing. The present paper addresses the issue of pragmatic equivalence in literary translation. The aim of the research is to penetrate into the cognitive-pragmatic sphere of the translation process in order to reveal the linguacultural propositions or fundamentals of the translation process. For the purpose of analysis the novel by R. Bradbury “Dandelion Wine” and its Armenian and Russian translations have been chosen¹. A cross-cultural pragmatic analysis of verbs of speaking which function as speech framing expressions will be conducted in order to reveal the linguacultural similarities and differences that exist in the Armenian and Russian translations as compared with the source text.

2. Pragmatic Equivalence of Literary Translations

Literary genres are closely related to everyday communication and most often replicate the intentional and emotional aspects of natural human language. Therefore, the pragmatic aspect of literary translations is of great importance (Paronyan 2011; Paronyan 2021). Pragmatic equivalence of translation can be defined as the conformity of the translator’s ‘duplication’ of the content with the author’s communicative intent or literary objective. The cross-cultural pragmatic survey of translation equivalence carried out in this paper focuses on the interpretations of the verbal behavior of the heroes while performing speech acts. According to the semantic typology of verbs adopted in semantics, the verbs, which indicate performance of the action of speaking, are called saying verbs or speaking verbs (Dixon 2005). In literary works they can also provide information as to how things are said. R. Caballero and C. Paradis call them speech framing expressions as they are considered “ narrators’ cues to how their readers should understand and assess what the characters say.” (Caballero & Paradis 2018). From the pragmatic viewpoint, these verbs, which are provided by the author of the literary work, and usually accompany the direct and indirect speech formulations of the heroes, are cognitive interpretations of the speakers’ mindset – their emotions, attitudes and motives. They nominate the communicative type of the verbal action, disclose the emotions and the psychological state of mind of the speakers. Furthermore, the speech framing expressions contribute to the interpretation of the illocutionary force of the speech act uttered by the literary heroes (Searle 1969; Verschueren 1980; Verschueren 1999; Alkston 2000). Admittedly, these interpretations or speech framing

¹ Among the numerous publications of the novel and its translations, the following texts were chosen for analysis:

Bradbury, Ray. *Dandelion Wine*. Accessed August 28, 2023. <https://pdfroom.com/books/dandelion-wine/ra517rEjgJO> Bradbury, Rey. 2016. *Khatutiki gini* [Dandelion Wine]. Armenian translation by Z. Boyajyan. Yerevan: Antares. Bradbury, Ray. 2008. *Vino iz oduvanchikov* [Dandelion Wine]. Russian translation by E. I. Kabalevskaya. Moskva, Sankt Peterburg: Eksmo, Domino. Accessed August 28, 2023. <https://coollib.com/b/461429-rey-duglas-bredberi-vino-iz-oduvanchikov>

expressions create the heroes' images and greatly contribute to the realization of the storyline as intended by the author. Therefore, adequate translation of these interpretative words greatly contributes to the uniformity of the source and target texts (Perman 2011; Honig 1997).

3. Pragmatic Interpretation of Verbs of speaking in “Dandelion Wine” by R. Bradbury

The cross-cultural pragmatic research carried out in this paper is based on the assumption that the interpretative words or framing verbs that nominate the heroes' verbal behaviors are culture-specific. In the process of translation, in order to sound more authentic in the target language, they may be replaced with some other verbs indicating the process of speaking, different from the source text. The question is: how far can a translator go when choosing a culturally adequate word in the target language without distorting the communicative intent of the author in that particular communicative context, and, moreover, without distorting the psychological portrait of the literary hero as intended by the author.

Before embarking on the analysis of the verbs of speaking, I would like to say a few words about the book itself. No doubt, Ray Bradbury, one of the most celebrated 20th-century American writers, does not need any introduction for our audience. He worked in a variety of literary modes but became especially famous as a fantasy and science fiction writer. “Dandelion Wine” is a hybrid of realistic fiction and fantasy, where the main hero Douglas, a teenager, reveals his identity and gets to know the world surrounding him through imaginative visions and fancy speculations.

The analysis of the novel revealed that the following verbs of speaking, which are presented according to their frequency, were used by Ray Bradbury: *say (said), cry, whisper, murmur, ask, scream, gasp, mumble, shout, roar, yell, continue, flunder, sigh, pant, frown, grin, snort, giggle, chortle, wail and sob*. In this paper I will illustrate the analysis of the three verbs that were most frequently used: *say, whisper and cry*.

The most extensively used verb of saying which frames the speech of the characters is *to say/said*. This verb has a neutral and overt denotative meaning, it literally nominates the fact of using words, without specifying the illocutionary force of the speech act performed by the speaker. In English linguaculture, the task of decoding the illocutionary force of the speech act framed with the help of the verb ‘to say’ is allotted to the decoders themselves – the readers or listeners. Both in ordinary speech and in a literary work this verb can be used by the speakers/writers repeatedly, as many times as needed, without creating an effect of dull redundancy or unnecessary repetitiousness. The Armenian translation of this verb is ‘*սոսել/սոսաց*.’ In Armenian linguaculture repetition of the same word is not encouraged and is seen as a stylistic gaffe. Interestingly enough, the comparative analysis of the source text and the target text reveals some interesting facts. Firstly, the Armenian translator does not often translate the verb ‘*to say/said*’ with the verb ‘*սոսաց*.’ Instead, some other verbs, describing the way how things are said, or indicating the communicative intent of the speaker, are used as shown in Table 1.

Representative speech acts	Verbs denoting staing: ասաց, արտասանեց, խոսեց, բլբլում էր	Verbs denoting as-serting: հաստատեց, նկատեց	Verbs denoting notifying: մեջ ընկավ, վրա բե-րեց, վրա տվեց, ավելացրեց, սկսեց, պատաս-խանեց, կանչեց, կրկնեց	Verbs denoting admitting: խոստովանեց
Directive speech acts	Verbs denoting urging: հորդորեց, պատվիրեց			
Commissive speech acts	Verbs denoting offer: առաջարկեց			
Questions	Verbs denoting inquiry: հարցրեց, հետաքրքրվեց			
Expressives	Verbs denoting exclamation: բացականչեց, գոռաց			

Table 1. Speech acts and verbs of speaking

As we can see, the range of illocutionary verbs used to transfer the idea of saying something to somebody is very wide in the Armenian translation. This can be explained by the fact that repetitiousness is discouraged in the communicative-semantic structure of the Armenian narrative. Therefore, the Armenian writers try to use synonymous words or expressions to avoid repetition. Repetitiousness, as mentioned above, is also against the cultural stylistic norms in Armenian writing. Secondly, in Armenian linguaculture it is more customary to show the illocutionary force of the speech act with the help of the verbs instead of indicating the mere fact of speaking. Hence, the decoding of the illocutionary force is not often allotted to the decoders themselves.

4. Pragmatic Equivalence of Verbs of Speaking

In this part of work, I will conduct a cross-cultural examination of the factual material and penetrate into the cognitive-pragmatic sphere of the translation process in order to reveal the nature of pragmatic equivalence. The comparative analysis of some samples of translation will reveal the linguacultural propositions that lead to the specific word choice in the target text. To carry out the research, first of all, I have retrieved the verbs

of speaking from the source text. Then I have examined the Armenian translation of these verbs and interpreted them from the perspective of Armenian linguaculture. Further, I have looked into the Russian translation, comparing the samples of these verbs both with the source text and with the Armenian translation. It goes without saying that the cultural context and the author's intended meaning served as a basis for evaluating the adequacy of the translations.

In Example (1) the verb of speaking '*said*' is translated into its corresponding Armenian counterpart – '*սուսաց*':

(1) "I'm alive," **said** Douglas. "But what's the use? They're more alive than me. How come? How come?" (p. 10)

- Ես ողջ եմ,- **սուսաց** Դաւրը,- բայց ի՞նչ օգուտ: Նրանք ինձնից էլ ողջ են: Էս ո՞նց է: Ո՞նց: (p. 26)

Though quite a lot of similar examples can be found in the Armenian translation, the analysis shows that in many cases this correspondence is broken. The verb '*say/said*' is translated either with the help of some other verbs of speaking, or with the help of verbs that denote the illocutionary force of the speech act uttered by the speaker, as in the following example:

(2) "Chug-a-chug," **said** John. "I can travel twelve years into the past. Wham-chug-ding!"

"Yeah," **said** Charlie, looking back at that quiet house, "but you can't go a hundred years." (p. 37)

- Դը՛ ժժ-դը՛ ժ,- **սկսեց** Ջոնը: - Մի տասներկու տարով գնում եմ անցյալ: Վը՛ զզ-դը՛ ժժ-դը՛ մ:

- Հա, **վրա բերեց** Չարլիին՝ հետ նայելով լռանիստ տանը,- բայց հարյուր տարով ուժդ չի պատի: (p. 110).

The verb '*said*' in the initiating remark is translated into Armenian as '*սկսեց*' (began) and in the reacting remark '*said*' is translated '*վրա բերեց*.' According to the Phraseological Dictionary of Armenian by A. Sukiasyan and S. Galstyan (Sukiasyan & Galstyan 1975: 551), '*վրա բերել*' is an idiomatic phrase which, among some other meanings, has two meanings which correspond to the verbs of saying: (a) to give an adequate answer, to say something to the point; (b) To add something to what was said previously. In this context meaning (b) is used, as in the initiating remark Speaker 1 begins to say something, which is translated as '*սկսեց*,' and in the reacting remark Speaker 2 gives additional information, makes a further remark '*վրա բերեց*.' Thus, we can say that in this exchange the translator has made an appropriate use of Armenian wordstock, without making any changes or adding any semantic components to the contextual meaning. The verbs '*սկսեց*' and '*վրա բերեց*' indicate that the illocutionary force of the utterance is notifying.

In Example (3) the idiomatic phrase ‘*վրա բերեց*’ is used in its meaning (a) - to give an adequate answer, to say something to the point:

(3) “She just can’t—oh, she can’t be out of order,” **said** Douglas, stricken.
 “She’s old,” **said** Tom. “Grandpa says she was here when he was a boy and before. So it’s bound to be some day she’d konk out and . . .” (p. 81)

- Ախր չէ... դժվար թե փչացած լինի, -**ասաց** Դազլասը ցնցված:
 - Պատավ է, -**վրա բերեց** Թոմը.- Պապի ասելով իր երեխա ժամանակ արդեն էստեղ է եղել ու դրանից առաջ էլ: Դե ուրեմն մի օր պիտի շունչը փչեր: (p. 238)

As we can see, the translator uses the tactics of replacing the verb ‘*to say*’ with an adequate phrase in Armenian, without changing the contextual meaning. The idiomatic expression ‘*վրա բերեց*’ denotes the illocutionary act of notifying performed by the speaker.

In Example (4) the verb ‘*said*’ is translated into Armenian with the idiomatic phrase ‘*վրա տվեց*’:

(4) “Shut your eyes, Doug. Now, tell me, what color eyes I got? Don’t peek. What color eyes I got?”
 Douglas began to sweat. His eyelids twitched nervously. “Aw heck, John, that’s not fair.”
 “Tell me!”
 “Brown!”
 John turned away. “No, sir.”
 “What do you mean, no?”
 “You’re not even close!” John closed his eyes.
 “Turn around here,” **said** Douglas. “Open up, let me see.” (p. 45)

Աչքերդ փակիր, Դագ. Դե ասա, ի՞նչ գույնի են իմ աչքերը: Չէ, չնայես: Ի՞նչ գույնի են իմ աչքերը:
 Դազլասը քրտինք կտրեց: Կոպերը թրթռացին նյարդայնորեն:
 - Է՛, Ջոն, լավ էլի, սա բանի նման չի:
 - Ասա՛:
 - Շագանակագու՛յն:
 Ջոնը շրջվեց:
 - Ոչ, ոչ:
 - Ո՞նց թե՛ ոչ:
 - Իսկի մոտ էլ չի: - Ջոնը փակեց աչքերը:
 - Շուտ արի մի, - **վրա տվեց** Դազլասը: Բաց արա տեսնեմ: (p. 133)

In this extract, there is a tension between the interlocutors. Douglas is annoyed as he is in an embarrassing situation. The author clarifies that he sweats, his eyelids twitch nervously. In order to show the emotional tension existing in the communicative situation, the translator preferred to use the idiomatic phrase ‘*վրա տվեց*’, which, according to Phraseological Dictionary of Armenian by A. Sukiasyan and S. Galstyan

(Sukiasyan & Galstyan 1975: 553), means ‘to attack.’ It denotes the aggressive behavior of the speaker, which is due to his agitated state of mind. The idiomatic phrase ‘*վրա տվեց*’ indicates the performance of a directive speech act by the speaker – order, which cannot be traced explicitly in the source text, framed with the verb ‘*said*.’ Hence, admittedly, the translator makes the illocutionary force more overt and guides the reader, which means that the pragmatic conformity of translation in this passage may be doubted.

In Example 5, the verb ‘*said*’ is translated with the verb of speaking ‘*կրկնեց*’ (repeated):

- (5) She lay down in bed. “I simply refuse to die.”
 “Beg pardon?” he **said**.
 “I won’t die!” she **said**, staring at the ceiling.
 “That’s what I always claimed,” **said** her husband, and turned over to snore. (p. 52)

Էլմիրան անկողին մտավ:

- Չեմ մեռնելու, չէ:

- Կներես, չլսեցի, -**ասաց** ամուսինը:

- Էդ էր պակաս, որ մեռնե՛մ, -**կրկնեց** Էլմիրան՝ հայացքն առաստաղին:

- Իմ ասածն էլ միշտ դա էր, էլի, **վրա բերեց** ամուսինն ու շուտ եկավ մյուս կողքին խոսվալու: (p. 153)

In this short passage, the verb ‘*said*’ is used three times. In English, this wording is normal and accepted. Meanwhile, Armenian prefers variety and descriptive narration of facts. Hence, in the first instance the husband’s answer is translated with the verb of saying – ‘*ասաց*.’ The husband apologizes to his wife and indirectly asks her to repeat what she said. That is why the Armenian translator preferred to translate the second verb of saying ‘*կրկնեց*’ (repeated), instead of ‘*said*,’ to avoid repetitiousness in a close context, which is stylistically inappropriate in Armenian. As for the third use of ‘*said*,’ it is replaced with the idiomatic phrase ‘*վրա բերեց*,’ which, as we said before, means ‘to give an adequate answer, to say something to the point.’ The verbs ‘*կրկնեց*’ and ‘*վրա բերեց*’ are verbs of speaking which indicate the illocutionary force of notifying. By using these equivalent words, the translator does not violate the pragmatic equivalence of the passage with the source text.

At this point, I would like to add the results of the analysis of the Russian translation, and my conclusion is that the Russian translator also prefers replacement of the verb ‘*say*’ in many cases. The cross-cultural pragmatic analysis shows that, interestingly enough, in some cases the Armenian and Russian translations are similar, the translators have used the same or similar verbs which are different from the English verb of saying ‘*said*.’ We can assume that repetitiousness is inadequate for the Russian cultural stylistic norm, too. Thus, ‘*վրա բերեց*’ is translated as ‘*подхватил*,’ ‘*ответил*,’ ‘*сказал*.’ The verb ‘*say*’ is replaced with verbs of speaking like ‘*заметила*’ ‘*объяснила*,’ ‘*вскрикнула*,’ ‘*переспросил*.’ In some cases, the Armenian

and Russian translations are similar, but differ from the English ‘said’ as in Examples (6) and (7).

(6) “Hey, that’s right,” **said** Charlie. “I always get a kick watching a trolley let down the step, like an accordion.” (p. 42)

- Հա, ճիշտ որ,- **վրա բերեց** Չարլին:

- Ուշքս գնում է, հենց տեսնում եմ՝ ոսնակն իջեցրեց, ոնց որ բացվող հարմն:

- А ведь верно, - **подхватил** Чарли.

- Страх люблю смотреть, когда трамвай спускает подножку: прямо гармоника! (p. 44)

“Sam, you’re home early,” she **said**.

“Can’t stay,” he **said** in a puzzled voice. (p. 48)

- Բայց շուտ ես եկել, Սամ,- **նկատեց** կինը:

- Էլի գնում եմ, -**պատասխանեց** ամուսինը շփոթահար ձայնով: (p. 142)

- Ты что-то рано сегодня, Сэм, — **заметила** жена.

- Я еще пойду, — **сказал** он, видимо, думая о другом. (p. 50)

The verb ‘said’ in the Armenian and Russian translations is replaced with the following verbs of speaking: ‘վրա բերեց,’ ‘подхватил’ (picked up) and ‘նկատեց,’ ‘заметила’ (noted). These verbs indicate the speech act of notifying and do not violate the author’s communicative intent.

(7) “You, Tom!” **said** Mrs. Brown. “I need moral support and the equivalent of the blood of the Lamb with me. Come along!” (p. 49)

- Լսի՛ր, Թոմ,- **կանչեց** տիկին Բրաունը: -Ես բարոյական աջակցության կարիք ունեմ, և դու Գառան արյանը կփոխարինես. Գնա՛նք: (p.144)

- Эй, Том, — **позвала** миссис Браун, — мне нужна моральная поддержка, и ты будешь мне вместо жертвенного агнца. Пойдем. (p. 51)

In Example (7) the verb ‘said’ is translated as ‘կանչեց,’ ‘позвала’ (called out). In this example the emotional state of the speaker is stressed and the translators indicate that the speaker speaks in a loud voice and is agitated. In English this outburst of emotion is denoted with the exclamation mark, in Armenian — with the stress, while in Russian the interjection ‘Эй’ creates the atmosphere of tension. Truly, the choice of the verbs ‘կանչեց’ and ‘позвала’ instead of the English ‘said’ is similar. This fact makes me think that the Armenian translation, which at certain places clearly echoes the Russian one, might be an intermediary translation.

In Example (8) Mrs Brown is talking to Mrs. Goodwater on the phone and tells her that she intends to take Tom to the meeting the following day. Tom, who is present at the conversation, reacts to this:

(8) ...I'll bring Tom here with me. An innocent good boy. And innocence and good will win the day."

"I wouldn't count on me being innocent, Mrs. Brown," **said** the boy. "My mother says – "Shut up, Tom, good's good! You'll be there on my right hand, boy."

"Yes'm" **said** Tom. "If, that is," **said** Elmira, "I can live through the night with this lady making wax dummies of me – (p. 51)

...Թումին էլ եմ բերելու: Անմեղ, լավ տղա է: Անմեղությունն ու բարի կամքը հաղթանակ կտանեն:

- Ես էնքան էլ անմեղ չեմ, տիկին Բրաուն,- **մեջ ընկավ** Թումը:-Մայրիկս ասում է...

- Մուս արա, Թոմ, լավը լավն է, վե՛րջ: Դու աջ կողմս կանգնած կլինես էնտեղ, տղա:

- Եղավ, մեմ, - **ասաց** Թումը:

- Եթե, իհարկե,-**ավելացրեց** Էլմիրան,- զիջերը լուսացնեմ... (p. 151)

Я приведу с собой Тома. Он хороший, добрый мальчик, чистая душа. А доброта и чистота завтра победят.

– Вы не очень-то надейтесь, что я такой уж хороший, миссис Браун, – **вмешался** Том. – Моя мама говорит...

– Замолчи, Том! Хороший – значит хороший. Ты будешь там по правую руку от меня, мальчик.

– Хорошо, мэм, – **сказал** Том.

– Если, конечно, я переживу эту ночь, – **продолжала** Эльмира. – Я ведь знаю... (p. 54)

The Armenian and Russian translators interpret Tom's words as interruption and translate the verb 'said' with the idiomatic phrase '*մեջ ընկավ*' in Armenian and the verb '*вмешался*' in Russian (cut in). These verbs of speaking do not break the pragmatic equivalence as they indicate the speech act of notifying. Furthermore, as Elmira reacted to Tom's speech and went on describing her thoughts about the upcoming meeting, the Armenian translator replaced the verb '*said*' with '*ավելացրեց*' (added) in Armenian. A similar word, '*продолжала*' (continued) is used in Russian. In these cases, we can state that the translation does not distort the intent of the source text and the pragmatic equivalence is maintained. At the same time, the word choice is stylistically adequate in both Armenian and Russian.

The verb '*said*' is also translated as '*առաջարկել*', '*предлагать*' (to suggest) as in Example (9).

(9) "Let's sing," **said** Lavinia.

They sang, "Shine On, Shine On, Harvest Moon . . ." (p. 71)

- Եկեք երգենք,- **առաջարկեց** Լավիինիան:
«Յոլա, ցոլա, հունձքի լուսին» - ը երգեցին: (p. 211)

— Давайте петь, — **предложила** Лавиния. И они запели «Свети, свети, осенняя луна...» (p. 76)

In this passage, both the Armenian and Russian translators have translated the illocutionary force of the hero's direct speech, suggestion. The illocutionary force of the speech act is indicated with the first person plural imperative form '*let us*.' We have to admit that the explicit mention of the speech act does not distort the communicative intent of the author and, moreover, is appropriate for the target linguacultures.

Let us look at another example where the first person plural imperative form '*let us*' is interpreted as suggestion — '*առաջարկեց*' (suggested).

(10) “Let’s not do anything,” said John.
“Just what I was going to say,” said Douglas. (p. 45)

- Արի ոչ մի բան չանենք,-առաջարկեց Ջոնը:
- Ես էլ նույնն էի ուզում ասել,- խոստովանեց Դաւլաւը:

— Давай ничего не делать, — сказал Джон.
— Вот и я хотел это сказать, — отозвался Дуглас. (p. 48)

In this example a divergence can be noted in the translation of the second speech act that contains the verb '*said*': “‘Just what I was going to say,’ said Douglas.’ This speech act is a statement expressing indirect agreement in answer to suggestion. Instead of indicating the act of agreement, the translator interprets this as a speech act expressing confession, an illocutionary force which is the translator's personal decision and is not intended by the author. In this case we can observe distortion of the pragmatic impact in the Armenian translation. Interestingly enough, in the Russian translation, the speech act expressing suggestion is framed with the verb '*сказал*' (said), while the speech act expressing agreement is framed with the verb '*отозвался*' (called back) which states a fact. Thus, in the Russian version the pragmatic coherence is maintained much better.

The next verb of saying, which is frequently used in the novel, is '*whisper*.' This verb has an important intent from the communicative perspective as the young characters of the novel often speak to themselves. This means that they speak in a low voice but clearly enough to be understood and heard. In Armenian the verb '*whisper*' is translated as '*շնչալ*' and has the following synonyms: *շնչել*, *փսփսալ*, *քշիչալ*, *մրմնջալ*, *հծծել*, *շշուկել* (Sukiasyan & Galstyan 1975:860). The analysis of the Armenian text shows that the translator has tried to use different words, most often the verbs *շնչալ*, *փսփսալ*, *հծծել*, in order to avoid unnecessary repetition of one and the same word. In Russian '*whisper*' is translated as '*шептать*' and has the following synonyms: *шусука́ть*, *шипеть*, *бормотать*, *мямлить*. In the Russian translation the verb of speaking '*шептать*' is mostly used. The lexico-grammatical forms of this

verb denote different ways the act of whispering is performed: ‘*зашептал*’ expresses beginning of action with the prefix *за-*; ‘*прошептал*’ expresses end of action with the prefix *про-*; ‘*шепнул*’ expresses completion of action. This is the communicative-semantic peculiarity of Russian which neither English nor Armenian has. For example:

(11) “Ready John Huff, Charlie Woodman?” **whispered** Douglas to the Street of Children. (p. 4)

Չոն Հաֆ, Չարլի Վուդմեն, պատրաստ եք, - **շշնջաց** Դալլասը երեխաների փողոցին: (p. 7)

– Джон Хаф, Чарли Вудмен, вы готовы? – **шепнул** Дуглас улице Детей. (p. 2)

(12) “Only two things I know for sure, Doug,” he **whispered**. (p. 20)

- Երկու բան կասեմ հաստատ, Դագ, - **փսփսաց** նա: (p. 56)

– Только две вещи я знаю наверняка, Дуг, – **прошептал** он. (p. 19).

The comparative analysis of the source text and the translations shows that the particular word choice of the translator adds some subjective interpretation to the text.

‘*Whisper*’ is also translated into Armenian with the verb of speaking ‘*փնթփնթալ*.’ This verb also means denotes the fact of speaking in a quiet voice but, unlike ‘*շշնջալ*’ and ‘*փսփսալ*,’ it has some negative semantic component, when somebody grouses or expresses discontent. In Russian this verb is translated as ‘*прошипел*,’ which expresses a short sound and stresses the end of action with the prefix *про-*.

(13) “What’s graphologist?” Elmira elbowed Tom twice.

“I don’t know,” **whispered** Tom fiercely, eyes shut, feeling that elbow come out of darkness at him. (p. 53)

- Չեռագրաբանն ի՞նչ է: - Էլմիրան երկու անգամ արմունկով հրեց Թոմին.

- Չգիտեմ, - **փնթփնթաց** Թոմն աչքերը փակ, կատաղած՝ զգալով արմունկի հրոցը խավարի միջից: (p. 156)

– Что такое «графолог»? – **шепнула** она.

– Не знаю, – **прошипел** Том; глаза у него были закрыты, и толчок локтем обрушился на него из темноты. (p. 55)

In the Russian translation the translator has used the verb ‘*шептать*’ twice: to show completion of action – ‘*шепнула*,’ and the end of action – ‘*прошипел*.’ As we can see, the communicative context contains a negative emotional impact. The interlocutors experience strain, nervousness, which is revealed in their actions. This antagonism is revealed in the translation. In Armenian, the negative emotion is stressed with the verb ‘*փնթփնթաց*,’ while in the Russian the abruptness of manner of speech is stressed with the verb ‘*прошипел*.’

Lastly, let us describe the translation of the verb of speaking ‘*cry*’ as a framing verb in direct speech. This verb, contrary to the verb ‘*whisper*,’ denotes loud speech,

shouting. People cry in the process of communication when they are nervous or they want to be overheard. In Armenian, the verb ‘cry’ is translated as ‘բղավել’. The synonymous verbs *գոռալ*, *գոչել*, *բարձր ձայնով՝ աղաղակելով մի բան ասել*, *ճչալ* also denote speaking in a loud voice. The Armenian translator most often uses the verbs ‘*գոչել*’, ‘*ճչալ*’, ‘*գոռալ*’ and ‘*բղավել*’. The study of the translation shows that the verbs ‘*գոչել*’ and ‘*գոռալ*’ are used to denote loud speech, shouting, and the verbs ‘*ճչալ*’ and ‘*բղավել*’ are used to denote the nervous, agitated state of the speaker. In the Russian translation the verb ‘*кричать*’ is mainly used indiscriminately, without marking any difference in the tension of the situation. The following extracts illustrate this communicative-semantic variation.

(14) “Watch out!” **cried** Tom.

Mrs. Elmira Brown fell right over an iron dog lying asleep there on the green grass. (p.49)

- Զգույ՛շ, - **գոչեց** Թոմը.

Էլմիրա Բրաունն ընկավ ուղիղ երկաթե շան վրա, որը փոված ննջում էր կանաչ խոտին: (p. 145)

– Осторожно! – **вскричал** Том. Эльмира Браун упала прямо на спящего железного пса, который украшал зеленую лужайку. (p. 51)

(15) “You run on home!” the woman **cried** suddenly, for she could not stand their eyes. “I won’t have you laughing.” (p. 31)

- Տո՛ւն փախե՛ք, - հանկարծ **ճչաց** կինը՝ այլևս չընմանալով նրանց հայացքներին. - Ես ծիծաղատեղ չեմ ձեզ համար:

– Ступайте домой! – вдруг **крикнула** миссис Бентли, ей стало невтерпех под их взглядами. – Нечего тут смеяться! (p. 31)

In the following passage the Armenian translator has also used the verb ‘*բացականչել*’ (to exclaim), to translate the verb ‘*cry*.’

(16) “Oh, no,” she **cried**, and recovered. In a quieter voice she **said**, “You know you can’t do that. (p. 63)

- Ախ, ո՛չ, - **բացականչեց** նա և միանգամից էլ իրեն հավաքեց: Ապա ավելի հանգիստ ձայնով **ասաց**: - Ձեզ քաջ հայտնի է, որ անհնար է: (p. 183)

– Что вы! – **воскликнула** она и тотчас опомнилась. – Это невозможно, вы и сами знаете, – **продолжала** она спокойнее. (p. 66)

“I’m not complaining!” she **cried**. “I’m not the one comes in with a list saying, ‘stick out your tongue. (p. 23)

- Ես չեմ գանգատվում, - **բացականչեց** Լինան: - Հո ես չեմ գիրքս արած գալիս քեզ մոտ, ասում «լեզուդ հանիր»: (p. 65)

– Я вовсе не жалуясь, – **закричала** Лина. – Я-то не прихожу к тебе со словарем и не говорю: «Высунь язык!» (p. 23)

The verb ‘*բացաղախնչել*’ is used to perform expressive speech acts. Exclaiming is a verb of speaking which means saying something suddenly and loudly. Anyhow, it also denotes agitation – loud speech because of strong emotion or pain. Thus, in the contexts where the speakers experience strong emotion, the Armenian translator has framed the speech of the characters with the verb ‘*բացաղախնչել*,’ denoting the illocutionary force of the speech act explicitly. Accordingly, in the same examples, the Russian translator has also denoted this emotional outburst by translating ‘*cry*’ ‘*воскликнул*’ (exclaimed), or ‘*закричал*,’ instead of ‘*крикнул*’ (cried out). The verb ‘*закричал*’ with the prefix *за-* denotes end of action and stresses the emotional outburst of the speaker.

5. Conclusion

Pragmatic equivalence in literary translation is to a certain extent determined by the linguacultural peculiarities of the target language. The cross-cultural pragmatic survey of translation equivalence, which focused on the interpretations of the verbal behavior of the heroes while performing speech acts, comes to prove that translators adapt the source text to the cultural mindset of the target language bearers. In doing so, they may somehow modify or alter the meaning intended by the author in the source language, making the translation pragmatically noncompliant. Furthermore, in English culture, the decoding of the illocutionary force of the literary hero’s speech is often a matter of educated guess and it is left open for the reader to interpret. Contrary to this, in Armenian culture and, most likely, in Russian culture as well, the translator can act more overtly, and encode the illocutionary force of the literary hero explicitly.

The high value of pragmatic equivalence in literary translation produces one more evidence that literary translation is a cultural product.

References

- Alkston, William P. 2000. *Illocutionary Acts and Sentence Meaning*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Bradbury, Ray. *Dandelion Wine*. Accessed August 28, 2023. <https://pdfroom.com/books/dandelion-wine/ra517rEjgJO>
- Bradbury, Ray. 2008. *Vino iz oduvanchikov* [Dandelion Wine]. Russian translation by E.I. Kabalevskaya]. Moskva, Sankt Peterburg: Eksmo, Domino. Accessed August 28, 2023. <https://coollib.com/b/461429-rey-duglas-bredberi-vino-iz-oduvanchikov>
- Bradbury, Ray. 2016. *Khatutiki gini* [Dandelion Wine]. Armenian translation by Z. Boyajyan. Yerevan: Antares.
- Caballero, Rosario, and Paradis, Carita. 2018. “Verbs in Speech Framing Expressions: Comparing English and Spanish.” *Journal of Linguistics*, 54(1): 45-84. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226717000068>
- Dixon, Robert Malcolm Ward. 2005. *A Semantic Approach to English Grammar*. New York: Oxford University Press. Accessed June 21, 2023.

- https://www.google.am/books/edition/A_Semantic_Approach_to_English_Grammar/5c8SDAAAQBAJ?hl=ru&gbpv=1&dq=semantic+typology+of+verbs&printsec=frontcover
- Harding, Sue-Ann, and Cortés, Ovidi Carbonell (Eds.). 2018. *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Hartono, Rudi. 2020. *Translation Techniques & Methods*. Semarang, Indonesia: LPPM UNNES Press.
- Honig, Hans G. 1997. "Positions, Power and Practice: Functionalist Approaches and Translation Quality Assessment." *Current Issues in Language and Society*, Vol. 4: 6-34.
- Komissarov, Vilen Naumovich. 1990. *Teoriya perevoda (lingvisticheskiye aspekty)* [The Theory of Translation (Linguistic Aspects)]. Moskva: Vishaya shkola.
- Newmark, Peter. 1988. *Approaches to Translation*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall.
- Nida, Eugene. 1964. *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: Brill.
- Paronyan, Shushanik. 2011. "Khoskayin akteri hamarzhok targmanutian mi qani usutsoghakan khndirneri shurj." [On Some Educational Problems of Equivalent Translation of Speech Acts]. *Targmanutian tesakan ev gorcnakan hartser. Gitakan hodvatsneri zhoghovatsu* [Theoretical and Practical Issues of Translation. Collection of Scientific Articles]. Yerevan: YSU Publishing, pp. 53-62.
- Paronyan, Shushanik. 2021. "Pragmatic Coherence and Equivalence in Literary Translation." *Translation Studies: Theory and Practice* 1(1):142-154. Yerevan: YSU Publishing. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.46991/TSTP/2021.1.1.142>
- Perman, Marcus. 2011. "The Challenge of Faithful Translation." In *Tsandra Foundation*. Accessed April 19, 2023. <https://www.tsadra.org/2011/03/26/the-challenge-of-a-faithful-translation/>
- Searle, John R. 1969. *Speech acts*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Sukiasyan, Ashot, and Galstyan, Sergey. 1975. *Hayots lezvi dardzvatsabanakan bararan* [Phraseological Dictionary of Armenian]. Yerevan: YSU Publishing.
- Verschueren, Jeff. 1980. *On Speech Act Verbs*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Verschueren, Jeff. 1999. *Understanding Pragmatics*. London, New York: Arnold.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no ethical issues or conflicts of interest in this research.

Ethical Standards

The author affirms this research did not involve human subjects.