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This article is devoted to the study of one of the most important questions of philology—translation which throughout its centuries-long and rich history has been considered a sphere of philological activity of utmost significance providing an exceptional possibility for recoding and bringing philological and cultural traditions within the reach of people at large. Through the application of a variety of methods (linguo-stylistic, linguo-poetic, and comparative), the author attempts to study the process of translation, the clash of difficulties inevitably arising in that process, and offers solutions that will help recreate the vitality of the original and the uniqueness of linguistic thinking. Emphasis on the importance of the consideration of intra- and inter-linguistic correlations of language units in the original work of literature drives the author to the conclusion that the most reliable approach to literary translation is to be guided by the principle of “metaphoric displacement”.
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Introduction

The conscious perception of language diversity gives birth to a subconscious wish to understand the peculiarities of this or that language group and linguistic thought, and here the role of translation is of utmost importance, for translating means being able to look at the perceived objects and phenomena from different angles, to reflect the world in its diversity by analyzing the psychology and mentality of others, and through this understanding to discover your own self. Perhaps this is the reason why from time immemorial people have made efforts to recode and reproduce works of verbal art created with national and individual originality.

In allusion to the legend of the construction of the “Babylonian Tower”, which symbolises the challenges of arriving at a mutual understanding through diverse languages, one might surmise that the enormous difficulties of the process should be connected with understanding one’s own feelings, emotions, and evaluations. Hence, the translation of verbal art—the appreciation, understanding, and interpretation of unique authorial reflections of reality, kaleidoscopic reverberations of the surrounding world accompanied by specific feelings, emotions, and evaluations—is not an easy task at all. Its successful accomplishment requires collaborative efforts for the co-reproduction of artistic images, the emotional and logical value inherent to their...
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phenomena, and an orientation of the translator toward concrete facts on the one hand and imaginative creativity on the other. This is achieved through language that helps the translator penetrate the most subtle corners of emotion and thought and convey their proper reproduction. Since each literary work is characterised by a unique writing style in which is contained a harmonious overall system of imaginative thinking, expressive means, content, and structure, judgements in regard to what is translation, what translatability means and what should be understood by equivalent translation, mostly and traditionally are associated with literary translation. The primary difficulties are related to this particular field.

If we refer to the second and general dictionary meaning of the term translation, defined as a transmission of information by means of another language (Akhmanova, 2005)\(^1\), then we can state that in the case of literary translation, this information is incomparably comprehensive, considering the inseparable unity of the content and form of the word. In a mature and aesthetically fulfilled work of verbal art, an author is not restricted merely to reporting content; rather, by harmonizing various linguo-stylistic and linguo-poetic elements, he/she intends to convey certain emotions and feelings to the readers along with their own emotional experience, and to boost the reader’s perception making one an active participant of the creative process. Consequently, each literary composition results in a piece of verbal art endowed with a specific proportionality and systematicity of linguistic elements.

In the process of translation, the translator encounters various difficulties. There can be no doubt that the translator of a literary composition must strive to stay as close to the source text as possible. However, this does not counteract the fact that translators reproduce the aesthetic value of the original composition in their own way; they do not create but recreate the whole environment of the original composition, transmitting the vitality of the original work anew, sometimes trying to combine the historical-cultural values of both languages and more often looking for ways to bypass the clash of differences in linguistic thinking and world perception. And as the centuries-old experience of translation works has proven, albeit the art of the proper use of words is the privilege of the mother tongue, nevertheless the equivalent transmission of semantic meanings and implications, emotionally expressive and evaluative overtones is not the sole difficulty in translation. Translation raises many other problems, the solution of which sometimes goes beyond the narrow scope of lexicology and enters the fields of psychology and psycholinguistics, history and sociolinguistics, culture and civilization. These difficulties are first and foremost closely related to comparative stylistics, since translation in general and literary translation in particular is first of all the comparison of two or more languages with the aim of finding semantic correspondences between their units. Moreover, the comparative-contrastive study of literary works and their translations not only allows a discovery of the similar and unique features of different languages, but also greatly helps penetrate into the secrets of the original text and reveal its inner subtleties.

In separate cases, different translations of an original work are seen as an overall background, a broad

---

\(^1\) Akhmanova (2005, p. 316), where the linguist presents this basic interpretation of the term translation as one of the three definitions of translation.
philological context for that given work, helping a reader uncover the multifarious diversity of the original (Zadornova, 1981; Gasparyan, 1995)\(^2\). Consequently, when translating, it is often advisable to refer not only to the original work, but also to existing translations, which allows the translator to employ and enhance the results of the attempts made by previous translators (Zadornova, 1976; Akhmanova & Zadornova, 1977a; 1977b).

The study of an original work helps to realise more thoroughly the aesthetic value and stylistic tricks of its translated versions. It is known that Charles Bally—a famous Swiss linguist—noticed certain relation between the discovery of a mother tongue’s emotional expressive means, the deliberacy and accuracy of their usage, and the study of stylistic phenomena similarly existent in other languages. By grounding his theory on the paramount importance of the principle of the correlation of language units in speech, which is an underlying principle for applying the comparative method, the scholar comes to the conclusion that all possible methods of analysis eventually come to one—the method of comparison (Bally, 1961)\(^3\). Indeed, when we deal with literary speech and imagery, the comparison can reveal vivid differences, which are the direct reflection of linguistic thinking and world perception.

**The Translation of “Polyphonic” Words**

It has already been established that “polyphonic” words and expressions cause significant difficulties in translation. By expanding the scope of semantic structure and accruing extra semantic depth and volume in a work of verbal creativity, a polyphonic word acts as an indivisible capacious entirety of meanings, connotations and associations, the complex correlation of which conditions the peculiar “sounding” of those elements in the literary context, both in the proper sense of the word “sounding” and semantically (Gasparyan, 2008). The polyphony of words, which in fact is one of the most powerful means of realizing authorial intent is always pragmatically justified.

The studies carried out in this field have shown that the phenomenon of “polyphony” explicitly revealed especially in translation when the polyphonic word meanings and stylistic nuances deriving from the same original text, reflected in various translations complement one another in the creation of the global image of the polyphonic word. When, for example, Zadornova (1976) think that in Hamlet’s soliloquy by Shakespeare, the word *time* (whips and scorns of time) can have several interpretations: *an epoch, an individual’s life, a super power which cannot be confronted*, one ascertains that this evidences the polyphonic actualization of the word *time* in the given context. The choice of the interpretive version of the word can often be ascribed to the subjective attitude of the translator, though sometimes objective reasons can also be observed. In fact, sometimes it is nigh impossible to introduce the polyphonic globality of the word in a translated version,
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\(^2\) In these works, the authors undertake the analysis of some Shakespearean passages and through the application of the comparative method succeed in penetrating into the linguo-stylistic features of both the original passages and their Russian and Armenian translations and reveal the stylistic specificities of the verbal texture.

\(^3\) Being the founder of linguistic stylistics, Charles Bally attached a lot of importance to the translation of ideas rather than form, thus differentiating between *communicative* and *mechanical* translations respectively.
because the same conceptual meaning is expressed differently in different languages (Gasparyan, 2008). The difficulties in translating polyphonic words are directly related to the problems of linguistic, linguo-poetic and aesthetic equivalence (Zadornova, 1981; Gasparyan, 1983; Gasparyan & Stepanyan, 1990). The problem is also related to the concepts of translatability and non-translatability, to the choice of appropriate forms and types of linguistic elements.

The translation of literary works, of course, demands supreme writing skills and thus not everyone can succeed in doing it. Attempts often made to bring before the reader’s judgment translations with delusional selections of distinctively accentuated stylistic imitations of the original, lacking creative value, are unacceptable. A case in point is the well-known Armenian linguist Sevak’s (1949) translation of Eugene Onegin into Armenian which is considered vulnerable from an aesthetic point of view. To be guided by the method of confrontative analysis as offered by the principle of philological translation is not a must at all. Translators are choice individuals who can master the art of literary translation because only they can notice and reflect all the details of the composition, find equivalents to particular language elements by creating linguo-stylistically relevant variations, modified forms, rhythmical verifications, and display the unique strength of introspection to fully comprehend, visualise, and recreate the composition. In studies devoted to the art of translation, there is a belief that the translation must provide stylistic equivalence, and preserve the “flavor and tone” of the original work. However, this is a privilege and priority that can be obtained by talent and wisdom. According to the literary scholar, Smirnov (1939), the translation can be considered equivalent only when the author’s intention is completely transferred to the target language, the work’s symbolism and flavor are represented with utmost creativity, and the aesthetic impact on the readers is achieved.

The issue of the stylistic equivalence of the original work and its translated versions has also been considered by Ter-Minasyan, who states that literary translation presupposes neither completely non-literal nor a strict word-for-word translation. Instead, it must be accomplished accurately at the root of the work’s creative meaning, with particular attention paid to the ideas expressed and from the perspective of stylistic equivalence between the original and translated versions. Without intending to deny L. Mkrtchyan’s statement about an original work having no equivalent to itself, and in agreement with H. Tumanyan’s idea that it is almost impossible for the translator to give the scent and allure of the original, Ter-Minasyan (1977) expressed his firm belief that the translator’s desire to reproduce the original in the most organic and intimate way does justify to the artist’s creative thought, his very taste and talent for recreation. However, even for a talented translator, the process of translation is a very difficult undertaking.

**Literary Translation as “Metaphoric Displacement”**

Two questions in translation theory never lose their importance: Whether translation based on the translator’s knowledge, talent, and imagination (Averkiev, 1811) should be considered an art, or whether it should be viewed as a science, as it presupposes a thorough and comprehensive philological analysis (Veresaev, 1949). As some scholars think, it has a dual function—art on the one hand and science on the other (Etkind,
1970)—and for Eugène Nida (1986), the mastery of a translator is of prime importance. It would not be unjust to assess that translation is the result of complicated and creative perception and recreation (Jacobson, 1958). Thus, it cannot be considered accidental that according to Dryden (1661), translation takes a mid-position between the creative and the imitative.

I have already mentioned the role played by the comparative method, the application of which allows for a clearer understanding between the significant differences of “word-for-word” (verbal) and “figurative” (non-verbal) translations (Akhmanova & Zadornova, 1980). In fact, the concept of free translation has almost acquired a terminological value in connection with fiction; however, I believe that the term free translation cannot clearly or most accurately reflect the complex and difficult process of literary translation. On the other hand, there is the concept of word-for-word translation, also unacceptable for verbal art, as it misrepresents the nature of the correlation between the units of the original and the target texts in the process of literary translation.

Meanwhile, in investigations of recent decades, particularly after the international conference in New Delhi in 1984, a good number of researchers imported the terminological concept of metonymic displacement to qualify the essence of literary translation (Talgeri & Verma, 1988). Drawing from the results of renowned linguistic studies, metonymy and metaphor can be considered manifestations of the dual nature of language (Jakobson, 1971); alternatively stated, the differentiation of the external relations of language units by contiguity and the internal relations, arising on the basis of internal contradictions of similarities and differences, can serve as a proceeding point in considerations of the translation process. Additionally, it is undoubtable that the nature of relations between linguistic units is of prime importance in the functional differentiation of speech. But when I examine this issue from the perspective of translation, it becomes clear that the process of literary translation can by no means be defined as metonymic displacement because the latter, in a broad sense, presupposes the substitution of one name for another, in other words, the reproduction of direct, nominative meanings of the linguistic units of the original in the target language. Observations confirm that this is not the case with literary translation but rather the translation of informative texts (scientific texts included).

Objections here would not provoke surprise, for research work in the scientific style has already established the possible inclusion of stylistically coloured, expressive, and emotional elements in scientific texts. However, even if this is taken for granted, these elements never become an inseparable part of the scientific narration, and, even more importantly, they can never endow scientific prose with aesthetic power, thus changing its functional orientation, i.e., its ultimate communicative aim. Hence, the principle approach to the translation of this functional type of texts should be anchored on the external relations of the language units in the original and the translation, and this approach to translation can be justly defined as metonymic displacement. For example:

Visual recognition involves storing and retrieving memories. Neural activity, triggered by the eye, forms an image in the brain’s memory system that constitutes an internal representation of the viewed object. When an object is encountered again, it is matched with its internal representation and thereby recognised. Controversy surrounds the question of whether recognition is a parallel, one-step process or a serial, step-by-step one. (Noton & Stark, 1971, Eye movements and visual perception. Scientific American, 224(6), pp. 34-43)
The given passage refers to one of the most important issues of biology—the physiology of an eye. This informative passage provides an explanation for the fact that in the translated version, the words in the target language mostly remain at the level of nominative meanings: visual recognition—տեսողական ճանաչում, neural activity—նյարդերի գործունեություն, brain’s memory system—ուղեղի հիշողության համակարգ, and many others. Those examples are translated with the principle of metonymic displacement, which is to say the linguistic units of the original are reproduced in the target language with their direct nominative meanings.

This example shows that reproduction via the method of metonymic displacement reflects the one-to-one correspondence between the expression plane and the content plane in the linguistic elements of both the source and target texts. This is quite appropriate and acceptable for the translation of scientific prose, where the main function is the transmission of information proper. This kind of translation does not spawn difficulties, as the main principle is simple “direct correspondence” between source and target language units.

As far as literary translation is concerned, it is a complicated process of metaphorization, by its nature, a unique metaphoric displacement which is aimed at discovering the intra- and extra-linguistic correlation of linguistic elements, which due to the unique talent and artistic skills of the translator, add to the recreation of the aesthetic and ideological unity of the composition.

The example below reflects the translational difficulties connected with the clash of nationally relevant cultural values. If we try to imagine, for example, how an Indian reader would have perceived Cordelia’s character from King Lear if the translator chose the metonymic displacement path, then it would probably be logical to assume that the Indian reader with his specific, traditionally oriented linguistic mentality would most probably have evaluated the character as negative (Talgeri & Verma, 1988).

Here is another example referred to the Uzbek tradition. The word “parrot”, which in certain Armenian and Russian contexts obtains negative shades of meaning, in Uzbek poetry symbolises the sincere feelings of the lover for his mistress (Давыдов, Конурбаяев, 1991). It is clear that the translator will face the problem of finding a similar unit which transfers the positive shades of meaning in the original use of the word to the target language, particularly if the features specific to the national linguistic mentality are taken into consideration. Otherwise, for the reader who is not aware of these nuances, the expression my lovely parrot will sound funny or even offensive. In other words, the translator has no other option than to be guided by the principle of metaphoric displacement, giving thought to the internal correlation between the peculiarities of units in the source and target languages.

I shall now try to ground my preference for the concept of metaphoric displacement over that of free
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4 Translated by S. K. Gasparyan.
5 My initial attempts to present my thoughts about the difficulties in the process of literary translation occurred years ago at a conference (“Shakespeare: his work, his times and his influence” at Instituto Superior del Profesorado Joaquin Gonzalez in...
I hasten to add that this, of course, is no mere preference of terminology. It is clear that the favouring of any term presupposes certain conventionality, but it is my firm belief, the terminological combination **metaphoric displacement** reflects the process of literary translation in a superior way, as it involves the adoption of the linguistic factors and expressive means of the original with the free choice of the translator, while ensuring the cultural equivalence of the original and the translation without disregarding all possible criteria of the context, including the characteristic features of the writer’s individual style. For example:

She could not help but remind me of that race of terrific queens which left behind them the ammoniac smell of their incestuous loves to hover like a cloud over the Alexandrian subconscious. (Durrell, 1957, p. 20)

The passage presents the spirit of the ambitious Egyptian sovereigns which, from ancient times, hangs on Alexandria like a cloud. The effect of the adventures of the almighty and power-driven queens upon the subconsciousness of the society has sustained them as a vital and inseparable part of Alexandria past and present.

The introduction of the attributive word combination *թանձր ավշահոտ* into the context is an attempt to reproduce in Armenian the English lexicalised combination *ammoniac smell*, the use of which enriches the context with additional associative shades of meaning. The substitution of the simile in the target text for the metaphoric description “ազգապիղծ սիրաբանությունից թանձր ավշահոտը՝ կախված Ալեքսանդրիայի ենթագիտակցության վրա” not only exaggerates the image but also draws the readers’ attention to the traditions of the ancient Egyptian city. Thus, guided by the principle of **metaphoric displacement**, the translator has managed to recreate the image of the Alexandrian morals and customs of the time, subconsciously inherited from the ancient epoch.

This type of translation is dominant in fiction where the speech obtains expressiveness, sensitivity, and emotionality. It is here that we deal with figurative concepts and phenomena, those with unusual combinations of linguistic elements, the adequate comprehension and interpretation of which requires attention not to words as separate constituent elements but to the globality of the work as an artistic whole. In this kind of translation, it is necessary to penetrate into the original text and find equivalent forms and images in the target language. In this process, the poetic imagination and creativity of the translator are of utmost importance—here the translator may rely on the principle of **metaphoric displacement**.

To rephrase: If verbal translation is mostly limited to the reproduction of the direct dictionary meanings of the words, often combined with the use of ready-made expressions, in the case of literary translation, stylistic devices, word polyphony, other expressive elements and the psychological processes typical to the unique individual style of the writer require a deeper insight and more scrupulous choice of words, expressions, and

---

6 Translated by S. K. Gasparian.
The translator is first and foremost a devoted reader. The creative literary message of the writer, transmitted to his readers through the work, should reach the translator consciously and subconsciously, should penetrate into the reader’s inner world, providing him an opportunity to traverse the writer’s creative life, understand his world-view and consequently reflect it back in translation. For this reason, an original composition often has different translation variants to the same target language.

The translator is free to choose the form the closest and most similar to the original. It is not a necessary task to distinguish between “right” and “wrong” translations. All variants of translation can be considered equally acceptable, as each translator has his own way of thinking and his own criteria of poetic perception. The notion that the translator is a blind imitator, is far from true: Each translation is a unique interpretation and recreation. Translations begin at the same source and end resultant in variety, often vastly different from one another, the reason being that translation is an endless process, the translator striving to remain as close to the original as possible in reproducing the aesthetic value of the composition. Thus, the translator’s task is to find equivalent devices in the target language capable of reflecting and interpreting the details of the original as accurately as possible, reproducing the whole environment of the original and recreating its vitality. All this requires good skills, not only insightful knowledge of the source and target languages but also an awareness of the cultural peculiarities. An understanding of the traditions and history of both languages is needed in making a valuable translation, as translation is an intercultural process hosting a comparison of cultures, a clash of national linguistic thinking and the representations of the world in both languages (Akhmanova & Zadornova, 1988).

The problem of the cultural component has proven to be of paramount importance in translation theory and in a comparative analysis of languages. Linguistic and linguo-cultural factors, which, in a broad sense, are of specific national relevance, have been given much attention. Baghdasaryan, in addition to linguistic factors (phonetic, orthographic, lexical, stylistic, syntactic, and textual dimensions), also highlights the importance of such linguo-cultural factors as, for example, proper idioms, ethnic and ethnographic features, notions of aesthetic perception, all transmitted from one generation to another in tandem with socio-historical changes and aesthetic and folkloric perceptions. All these factors obviously demand comprehensive analysis and clarification. Of course, the possibility of longstanding relationships between the source and target cultures should by no means be excluded. However, research shows that when viewed as linguistic cultures, there seem to be significant differences (Baghdasaryan, 1996).

The task is also difficult because, in addition to choosing the equivalent words, word combinations and images, the translator faces the difficulty of entering into the psychology of the “unknown” characters, of understanding their inner world and their mentality, their perceptions of good and bad, kind and unkind, fair and unfair. Literary translation is not a mechanical process of transferring a text from one language to another. The result of the transfer into the target language must be nearly identical to the original so as to convey the
artistic power of impact and the charm of the text. The translator can achieve this only when all figurative means of the target language are livened in his mind before he makes his choice. Thus, translation becomes a process of metaphorization, aimed at recreating the imaginative power of the original context. I describe this process as *metaphoric displacement*. I would hasten to add here that the term “*metaphoric displacement*” does not refer to the translation of metaphors only but in a broader sense is relevant to literary translation in general.

The two mentioned translational approaches “*metonymic displacement*” and “*metaphoric displacement*” are different though not isolated from each other, for speech itself is a complicated phenomenon presenting an intertwining of stylistically varied linguistic elements. Research has shown that the choice of approach depends on the nature of relations between the linguistic elements.

Let us now observe these processes in the following example. The original passage is confronted with its Armenian translation.

On Saturday, October 5, the sky had been blue all day deepened after sunset to the bloom of grapes. There was no moon, and a clear dark, like some velvety garment, was wrapped around the trees, whose thinned branches, resembling plumes, stirred not in the still, warm air. All London had poured into the park, draining the cup of summer to its dregs.

Couple after couple, from every gate, they streamed along the paths and over the burnt grass, and one after another, silently out of the lighted spaces, stole into the shelter of the feathery trees, where, blotted against some trunk, or under the shadow of shrubs, they were lost to all but themselves in the heart of the soft darkness.

To fresh-comers along the paths, these forerunners formed but part of that passionate dusk, whence only a strange murmur, like the confused beating of hearts, came forth. But when that murmur reached each couple in the lamp-light their voices wavered, and ceased, their arms enlaced, their eyes began seeking, searching, probing the blackness. Suddenly, as that murmur reached each couple in the lamp-light, their shadow of shrubs, they were lost to all but themselves in the heart of the soft darkness.

The instincts of self-forgetfulness, of passion, and of love, hiding under the trees, away from the trustees of their remorseless enemy, the “sense of property”, were holding a stealthy revel, and Soames, returning from Bayswater—for he had been alone to dine at Timothy’s—walking home along the water, with his mind upon that coming lawsuit, had the blood driven from his heart by a low laugh and the sound of kisses. He thought of writing to the Times the next morning, to draw the attention of the Editor to the condition of our parks. He did not, however, for he had a horror of seeing his name in print. (Galsworthy, 1906, pp. 302-303)
In the given passage, the abundance of metaphorical expressions is obvious. Of particular interest are the word combinations clear dark, feathery trees, soft darkness, and passionate dusk, which are all distinct from the point of view of their stylistic charge. It is necessary to begin with an analysis of the linguo-stylistic peculiarities of the passage (also of the translation version) for an appropriate assessment of the aesthetic effect of the passage.

The passage is full of various stylistic tricks. Although there are some neutral words in the extract, it is the stylistically-coloured words (clear—swaty, velvety—soft, soft—swaty, passionate—anguished, danger—anguished, disapproval—anguished, remorseless—anguished, love—anguished, and so on) that play an essential role in terms of the imaginative quality of the context.

We notice also many of the words’ semantic proximity (love—passion, ukp—ppp, soft—velvety, swaty—anguished; seek—search, npn—vnq), which, when interconnected and harmonised together, assemble the overall image of the mysterious night park.

Side by side with the attributive combinations, such as: clear dark—swaty garment; velvety—swaty surface, and still warm air—swaty, swyop np, there are also stable collocations (to draw smb’s attention to—mzamby nphyr np, idiomatic units (draining the cup of summer to its dregs—swyt in np, and so on).

Due to the figurative use of the expressions: clear dark—swaty garment, feathery trees—swyt np, passionate dusk—anguished, and soft darkness—anguished, the night park is depicted as a world of fairytale. The translator of the Armenian version has succeeded in choosing the equivalents of these metaphorical combinations, the preservation of their imaginative qualities and attendant associations, as colorful and impressive in the target text as they are in the original. From the point of view of the associations, these metaphorical combinations arouse they can even be viewed as introducing a kind of interesting gradation into the context—from the simple to the complicated.

The attributive word combination feathery trees, which plays a role in the creation of the image of the night park full of the mysterious beauty of not only the trees and their thinned branches, resembling plumes but also the couples stealing into the shelter of those trees to conceal their tender feelings to each other, is in fact a metaphorical expression, which, however, beautiful it might be, is just a photographic image based on the external similarity of the objects which can be easily visualised at first glance. But the image here is somewhat static, devoid of depth and inner dynamism.

In the case of the combination soft darkness, the picture slightly changes as there is no semantic correspondence between soft which is something positive and pleasant and darkness which, as a rule, gives rise
to negative emotions. Nonetheless, the presence of the adjective soft (smooth and delicate [of light, colours], restful to the eyes; mild, gentle, intended to please; sympathetic) (The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English, 1976) transfers positive coloring to the noun darkness, stirring the reader’s imagination and leading him to the depths of the park where the loving couples hidden under the thick veil of dusk revel in their passionate kisses.

The attributive combination clear dark (թափանցիկ մութ), though rather simple, is interesting in the sense that its epithetic nature makes it rather impressive particularly due to the preceding phrase there was no moon (լուսին չկար) and the following comparative construction like some velvety garment was wrapped around the trees (թավշե պատմուճանի նման փաթաթվելէր էր ծառերին). Here again, as in the above-mentioned case of soft darkness, the negative overtones in the adjective dark dissipate in the influence of the antonymous use of clear, and the epithetic combination clear dark, acquiring positive connotations and expressing the writer’s attitude of approval adds to the description of the atmosphere of the night park, awakening feelings of beautiful and pleasantly embodied moments in the readers’ memory.

As for the metaphoric word-combination passionate dusk, besides being unusual, it is not only capacious, deep and lively, but also alarms the reader to the complicated psychological relations of the couples blotted against some trunk, or under the shadow of shrubs; the confused beating of hearts; the myriad passions, hopes and loves of multitudes of struggling human atoms.

This is of course an artistic expression of reality, complicated psychological emotions, human relationships created by two conceptually incompatible components (passionate and dusk), especially characteristic of the works by great writers. The combination passionate dusk, which in fact constitutes a metaphor of dissimilarity, is the culminating point in the gradation of the description of the pleasant and very natural atmosphere of the night park.

The artistic figurative world created in the passage (particularly in the first three paragraphs) is achieved not only by metaphors and similes, but also by repetitions of rhythmic and prosodic features, as well as the so-called synonymic condensation which add to the prosodic arrangement of the passage as a whole (... their voices wavered and ceased; their arms enlaced, their eyes began seeking searching probing the blackness).

The passage can truly be considered an excellent example of extended metaphor, enriched with such contours of intonation and prosodic features that express the writer’s feelings of sympathy towards the mysterious feast in the night park. A shift to the lower interval of the diapason of the voice, particularly before the metaphoric combinations soft darkness, passionate dusk, is obvious; there are also pauses preceding the words soft and passionate, somehow preparing the reader for the perception of the figurative expressions. The breathiness of voice accompanying the unusual use of soft and passionate in soft darkness and passionate dusk is carried on and also characterises the utterance at the end of the given passage (particularly: seeking searching probing the darkness); the tempo increases when uttering the participle construction (blotted against some trunk), preceding the metaphoric combination soft darkness.

All these means implemented in the passage make the image more colorful and impressive, though it is worth mentioning that the impression received from the translation is not the same. The emphasis laid on the
syntactic constructions in the translation (... երաշխող այսօրյան արձակվել է ու ռազմական, ռոբոտայն գործարանը իր համբարձուղ արտահայտություն, այնուհետև համակարգի ցանկացած դեդակչությունը) is not as powerful as in the original. Despite the fact that there are no semantic violations, and the translation of the passage as a whole is adequate, certain divergence can be observed in their arms enlaced—թևեր էին պատկերված ու թևերը ըթվված. Speech reality demands a condensation of meaning for displaying richer content with limited linguistic sources, as in the original. In the intransitive use of the verb enlace in the original, different meanings, such as to bind, to encircle, to enfold, to entangle are moulded. This is missed in the translation.

As far as the cases of synonymous condensation are concerned, it is notable that in the original their components are introduced with the principle of gradation: movement increases according to the semantic depth of the components, from the uncertain to the steady (wavered and ceased; seeking-searching-probing the darkness).

The repetition of the word երաշխող (dusk) in the Armenian translation of the passage passionate dusk, whence only a strange murmur, like the confused beating of hearts, came forth is aimed at condensing and exaggerating the artistic image, the aesthetic effect of which is very high, as it symbolises the whole process going on in the night park.

Thus, the comparative analysis of the original and translated versions allows us to discover the intra- and inter-linguistic relations of the language units in the context of the passage and the work as a whole, to show its compositional peculiarities and the complex correlation of the words and the images created by them, to promote the appreciation of the most diverse manifestations of literary speech.

Let us consider another extract taken from Lawrence’s short story “The Prussian Officer”. The analysis is carried out with the comparative method between the original and its translation.

Suddenly he stood still with fear. There was a tremendous flare of gold, immense—just a few dark trunks like bars between him and it. All the young level wheat was burnished gold glaring on its silky green. A woman, full-skirted, a black cloth on her head for headdress, was passing like a block of shadow through the glistening, green corn, into the full glare. There was a farm, too, pale blue in shadow, and the timber black.

There was a church spire, nearly fused away in the gold. The woman moved on, away from him. He had no language with which to speak to her. She was the bright, solid unreality. She would make a noise of words that would confuse him, and her eyes would look at him without seeing him. She was crossing there to the other side. He stood against a tree:<…>Then there again stood a sweep of pallor for the land, dark shapes looming, and a range of clouds hanging overhead. The world was a ghostly shadow, thrown for a moment upon the pure darkness, which returned ever whole and complete. (Lawrence, 1914, pp. 114-115)

7 Translated by S. Seferyan.
The passage is completely descriptive, full with the vibration and shape of a man and nature, which proposed a linguo-stylistic texture that originated from complex form-content perception; moreover, dominancy especially is given to metaphors and comparisons. Here, metaphors of dissimilarity deserve special attention (the bright, solid unreality—պայծառ իթ պատրանք, a ghostly shadow—անմարմին մի ստվեր, and pure darkness—կատարյալ մթություն), because these metaphors more deeply reveal the mysteriousness of the moment, the clash of reality and dreams. The reader in this case is more anxious than the writer could have imagined.

The word units of the original, by keeping their place and position in the translation, maintained in tight equivalency, achieve heightened literary value of words, such as: bright—պայծառ, golden—նուղի, նուղագույն, dark—գորշ, and so on.

The imaginativeness of the passage is achieved by the frequent use of dark and darkness, contrasted with the words gold and golden. These words make the description of objects and phenomena, man and nature, more colorful and lively, real and eternal. Moreover, studies show that these words, with all their derivatives, are central to the Lawrence narrative. The examples below confirm it.

But he was struggling in silence, it seemed as though there were before him a solid wall of darkness that impeded him and suffocated him and made him mad. He wanted her to come to him, to complete him, to stand before him so that his eyes did not, should not meet the naked darkness. Nothing mattered to him but that she should come and complete him. For he was ridden by the awful sense of his own limitation. It was as if he ended uncompleted, as yet uncreated on the darkness, and he wanted her to come and liberate him into the whole. (Lawrence, 1915, p. 179)

Over him too the darkness of obscurity settled. He seemed to be hidden in a tense, electric darkness, in which his soul, his life was intensely active, but without his aid or attention. His mind was obscured. He worked swiftly and mechanically, and he produced some beautiful things. (p. 116)

Taking as a base the broad opportunities of the meanings of these word combinations (dark trunks; darkness fell like a shutter; pure darkness and flare of gold, soft gold, fused in the gold; golden, lustrous gleaming of the snow, etc.), and considering their relatively frequent use, it is possible to conclude that both in the passage and in the short story as a whole these words play the role of key elements in which the psychological crisis of the personages, their confused and obscured feelings, the awful sense of their own limitation is condensed (Empson, 1967; Toshikazu, 1980). Again, it deserves attention that the contradiction of dark (with no or very little light; hidden, mysterious; hopeless, sad) and golden (precious, excellent, flourishing) (Hornby, 1974) gives birth to an emotional tension.

The word combinations of the original text are also remarkable in ways which can be distinguished as metasemiotic. This distinction can be found in corresponding translations. For example: silky green—կանաչ, flame of gold—նուղագույն, շլացուցիչ ցոլք, and soft gold—մաքուր ոսկի, can be classified in a group of semantic word combinations, as their meaning is clearest mostly on the semantic level. The understanding of metasemiotic combinations is particularly difficult, because these combinations are endowed with depth and diversity. For example: faint flutter of a half-revealed world has been translated as “համատարած խավարի հազիվ էր նշմարվում աշխարհը” or a ghostly shadow is translated as “անմարմին մի ստվեր”. The latter can be considered successful translations and consequent reflections of the author’s feelings, thoughts, and mood.
Both in the original and in translation, along with metaphors there are also semantic oppositions. The combination of logically incompatible opposites results in oxymorons which enrich metaphors and make them more lively, for example: bright, solid unreality—պայծառ մի պատրանք, and pure darkness—կատարյալ մթություն.

In the last sentence (The world was a ghostly shadow, thrown for a moment upon the pure darkness, which returned ever whole and complete), there is a use of metaphors of dissimilarity (a ghostly shadow; pure darkness), which act as a conclusion to the whole meaning of the passage.

It looks like the Armenian version retained the original’s effectiveness (Աշխարհը անմարմին մի ստվեր էր սոսկ մի ակնթարթ հանձնված կատարյալ և համատարած մթությանը). The translation in general is successful, as the comparison of images in target and source languages is proximal, and the emotionality is kept and conferred in the metaphors. The translator could have chosen “ուրվային” or “ուրվա-կերպ” as an equivalent for the word ghostly, which however would have brought certain negative connotations. The word “անմարմին” perhaps is a more suitable variant for expressing the imaginativeness of the original. It indicates that the author not only enters the inner world of the characters, but also, with the help of figurative means, reveals their feelings, inner worries, the immediacy and warmth of the outbursts, the overarching divine and real-life philosophy, the characters introduced picture by picture in their daily and vibrant colour, density of word-image, backed by the powerful force of direct speech, to a degree that the reader feels like a participant in the fictional environment and plunges into the depth of poetic reality the author reached through every existing template and was free in his comments, assumptions, speech, and style. It is part and parcel of the Lawrence signature that each of his compositions is a rich factory of various figurative tricks, especially of metaphors and comparisons.

Conclusion

Thus, the comparative study of the original and translated versions of the passages analysed allows us to conclude that literary translation, which is rather a complicated process of metaphorization, is a specific interpretation, the successful accomplishment of which depends on the discovery of intra- and inter-linguistic correlation of the elements of language in the given composition. The application of the principle of **metaphoric displacement** enhances the value of the most diverse manifestations of literary speech, brings out the structural properties of the composition, the actualised argumentations of figurative and imaginative use of words, and shows the evident justifications of the creation of the personages.
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