

ON THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF “HISTORY OF ARMENIA” BY MOVSES KHORENATSI: PROBLEMS OF EQUIVALENCE

SEDA GASPARYAN, LUISA GASPARYAN

It is common knowledge that cognitive perception of language variation gives the opportunity to understand and evaluate the peculiarities of foreign thinking and culture. As far as the question of perceiving, understanding, and appreciating a piece of verbal art is concerned, we should hasten to mention that it can never be divorced from the all-important problem of translation, as it is through translation that people try to find their way in the enormous sphere of world literature and use it as a key to studying the nature of human experience, familiarizing themselves with other cultures and other worldviews, thus identifying the specific features of their own mentality and psychology. Consequently, it is not surprising why people make efforts to “decode” pieces of verbal creativity which bear national identity¹.

It has been established both theoretically and practically that the translation of historical texts is not an easy task, not only from the point of view of the transposition of generic features, but also the questions touched upon in historiographic literature which besides historical facts also reflects traditional, symbolic and various other national values. It is a well-known fact that historiography is the entity of veracious and factual accounts of events, hence the crucial importance of its equivalent translation in the target text, especially from the point of view of the truthful transference of national history to coming generations².

A historical piece of literature is a unique manifestation of style and genre expressed by means of the variability of functional, imaginative and linguistic elements (especially historical words and realias). On the one hand, it aims at transferring truthful information on the historical events of the time; on the other, against the background of the accumulated knowledge and experience of mankind, it reveals the historical, cultural, traditional perception of a nation thus becoming an indispensable part of its literary tradition and the system of its national values.

The actual importance of the above mentioned philological statements can well be revealed on the material of the “History of Armenia” by Movses Khorenatsi, where with no retreat from scientific objectivity and truthfulness of facts the historian presents the history of the Armenian nation (up to the 5th

¹ See **S. Gasparyan**, “Metaphoric Displacement”- a Reliable Guide in Literary Translation // *Armenian Folia Anglistika*, № 1(2), Yerevan, 2006, pp.106-110; **S. Gasparyan**, *Lezvakan miavorneri haraberkutyun khndiry targmanutyun mej* // *Otar lezunery Hayastanum*, № 1, 2008, pp. 3-12.

² The question of truthfulness can always be verified by the evidence of additional or secondary sources. See **Ed. Jrbashyan**, *Grakanagitutyun neratsutyun*, Yerevan, 1984; **V. Parsamyan**, *Movses Khorenatsi ev hay patmagrutyan tsagumy ev zargatsumy*, Yerevan, 1983.

century)³. “History of Armenia” is an impeccable gem of linguistic, stylistic and generic features, which require a careful and objective translation first of all because the translation of a piece of historical literature should with utmost adequacy reproduce the predominance of the informative function meant to reflect the significant historical events of the period and the peculiar features of national identity. The originality of the author's imaginative thinking and the subtleties of his aesthetic taste which are displayed in the use of phraseological units, metaphorical expressions, as well as other stylistic devices cannot be neglected. Extracts abounding in such elements make the peculiarities of Armenian national identity more vivid and bring out the value of its cultural treasures. The research has shown that when in the 5th century historical literature was not differentiated from literary genres, the work in question was meant to meet the literary interests of the readers as well. This tendency can be traced not only in Movses Khorenatsi's historical writings, but also in the works of such historians as Buzand, Agatangelos and others who presented historical facts and characters in a specific style. This resulted in a harmonious intertwinement of historicism and artistic value. It is only on the basis of the “natural” choice of informative and metasemiotically coloured elements that an equivalent translation of such a piece of historical literature can be best carried out. The representation of the harmonic coexistence of the two polarly opposed types of elements can provide equivalence of verbal texture and adequacy of the work as a global whole.

The investigation has shown that in every translation (and the translation of Khorenatsi's work by R. Thomson cannot be an exception)⁴ the problem of equivalence should be based not only on form, but also on the function various linguistic elements are meant to carry out in the context. This is accounted for by the fact that the system of the original is a dialectical unity of heterogeneous functions (in the case in question the communicative function, the informative function and the function of impact) though there is always the predominance of this or that function in any text. However, it has long and generally been established that this fact can never be neglected in the process of translation. In other words, in the process of translation it is always preferable to be guided by the functional approach. In R. Thomson's translation we unfortunately face a completely different picture.

³ The truthfulness and objectivity of Movses Khorenatsi's sources were borne out by foreign and Armenian historians. See **G. Ter-Mkrtychyan**, *Khorenatsi Patmutesan usumnasiutjun*, Vagharshapat, 1896, pp. 45-46; **F. C. Conybeare**, *The Date of Moses of Khoren*, // *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, № 3-4, Munich, 1901; **Bardughimeos yepiskopos Georgean Chukhuryants**, *Khorenatsin E dari arajin qarordits matenagir*, Vagharshapat, 1908, pp. 20; **N. Bjuzandatsi ev Martiros Minasean**, *Movsisi Khorenatsvov Patmutyun Hayots, Zhnev*, 1991, pp. 22-230; **G. Sargsyan**, *Movses Khorenatsi Hayots Patmuttuny*, Yerevan, 1991, p. 31; **E. Shutz**, *The Northern Nomads in the “History of Armenia” of Movses Khorenatsi and the Geography and the Testimony of Place Names in Hungary* // *Movses Khorenatsi 1550-amyakin nvirvats gitazhoghovi drujtner*, Yerevan, 1991; **A. Ayvazyan**, *Hayastani patmutyan lusabanumy amerikyan patmagrutyan mej (qnnakan tesutyun)*, Yerevan, 1998, pp. 122-155; **A. Topchyan**, *Movses Khorenatsi hunakan aghbyurneri khndiry*, Yerevan, 2001; **A. Musheghyan**, *Movses Khorenatsi dary*, Yerevan, 2007.

⁴ “Moses Khorenatsi's History of the Armenians” (translation and commentary on the Literary Sources by R. W. Thomson), Harvard University Press, 2006.

In fact, Khorenatsi was the first to present the full history of Armenia (up to the 5th century) in a systematic way. He was also the first historian who studied, analysed and evaluated historical events considering their concrete place and time, thus working out the principle of historicity⁵. One of the virtues of his style is that while presenting pure historical facts he decorates his speech with expressive-emotional-evaluative overtones, thus availing his reader of an opportunity to understand the peculiarities of the 5th century imaginative thinking and psychology, and the values of national culture. In other words, the historian did not confine his narrative to presenting the bare chronology of historical facts only, but bridged communicative, scientific and literary intentions.

The investigation of R. Thomson's translation has revealed a violation of this trinity. We should hasten to add that we are well aware of the objectively existing semantic and structural differences between languages in general and languages from different families in particular which could have laid some obstacles on his path to equivalent translation. But this is not all. The translator makes a very wide use of translation borrowings (calques) in the target text without any comments in the footnotes or elsewhere that could spread some light on the semantic structure of the borrowed elements or make their application by the author of the original understandable to the readers of the translation. This, of course, adds to the insufficiency of equivalence to a great extent.

It has been established that calquing is an applicable method in the process of translation. More than that, in certain cases they are even preferable (though not without comments) as they reproduce the cultural atmosphere of the time, the peculiar features of the linguistic thinking and national identity of the given people. But when calquing is applied to the translation of phraseological units and idiomatic expressions which do have their equivalent counterparts in the target language vocabulary the situation becomes very grave. It makes the expressive-emotional-evaluative overtones conveyed by these elements very obscure, and this certainly prevents from achieving the expected adequacy of translation. Why not at least be guided by the principle of content equivalence applying the method of description? This could ensure the functional adequacy of the text.

Translating the culturally marked phraseological units word for word, let alone leaving them out from the target text, the translator misrepresents the meaning of the phrases, sometimes making them absolutely senseless for the target text reader thus neglecting the possible correlation of the logical and the imaginative in the elements of the original text. This deprives the text of the translation of its semantic and stylistic colourings.

Our study of the original text by M. Khorenatsi (in Old Armenian) reveals quite a number of phraseological units the adequate interpretation and translation of which require not only linguistic competence but also background knowledge and awareness of extralinguistic factors. Thus, for example,

Բայց Երուանդայ զմտաւ ածեալ, թէ որպիսի չար
թագաւորութեան սնանին ի Մարս՝ խէթ ի սրտի լեալ՝ ոչ

⁵ See V. Parsamyan, the given work; Ed. Jrbashyan, H. Makhchanyan, Grakanagitakan bararan, Yerevan, 1980; G. Sargsyan, the given work, and others.

հեշտալի էր նմա քուն: Հանապազ ի յարթնութեան յայն հոգալով, նաև ի քուն անուրջս ահագինս նմին իրի տեսանէր (Ս. Խորենացի, էջ 192):

Բայց Երվանդը շարունակ մտածում էր, թե ինչպիսի չարիք է սնվում նրա թագավորության համար Մարսուն [Մարաց երկրում–Ս. Գ.]. Նրա **սիրտը լիքն էր կասկածներով**, և քունը քաղցր չէր թվում: Արթուն ժամանակ միշտ այս մասին հոգալով՝ քնի մեջ էլ սարսափելի երազներ էր տեսնում այդ առիթով (թարգմ. Ստ. Մալխասյանց, էջ 192):

When Eruand considered what sort of enmity to his kingdom was being nourished in Media, his **heart rankled** and sleep no longer was sweet for him. While awake he thought continually of that, and even in sleep he saw terrible dreams about the same problem (R. Thomson, 2006, p. 177).

The extract refers to Eruand’s anxiety about the fact that Artashes was still alive and under the protection of the Persian king. Eruand was concerned with the idea that Artashes might one day undermine the unity of his kingdom and create favourable conditions for his dethronement⁶. The historian represents the tension of the episode very skillfully. This is especially emphasized by means of the phraseological unit *խէթ ի սրտի լնալ* which according to the dictionary Nor Bargirk’ Haykazezian Lezui (1979, chapter 1, p. 943) has the following meanings *խէթ* - վախ, կասկած, երկյուղ (fear, suspicion, fright) *խէթ սրտի* - կասկածոտ (suspicious). Though the word combination *heart rankled* (to rankle - to continue to be remembered with bitterness and anger; if something such as an event or a remark rankles, it makes one feel angry or upset for a long time)⁷ introduced into the target text reflects the general idea of the source context, it is unable to transfer the tension and the connotational implications of the extract, namely, the anxiety which haunted Eruand like a ghost, tortured him even in his dreams, and his doubts never dissipated. The thorough examination of the phraseological units in the vocabulary of the target language reveals elements such as *lie (heavy) at somebody’s heart*, *lose heart*⁸ which are the interlingual equivalents of the classical Armenian phrase *խէթ ի սրտի լնալ*. However, they are left unnoticed by the translator.

Phraseological units being closely and obviously connected with culture often serve the purpose of stylizing the discourse, and if these units are not decoded and

⁶ See: **Movses Khorenatsi**, Patmutyun Hayots, Yerevan, 1981, pp. 190-192; **Мовсес Хоренаци**. История Армении, Ер., 1990, с. 91-92.

⁷ See: “Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English”, Harlow & London, Longman, 1978, p. 912, “Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, Oxford”, Oxford University Press, 2001, p. 1048.

⁸ See: **A. Kunin**, Anglo-russkiy slovar, Moscow, Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya, 1984, pp. 375-376; **Longman**, Dictionary of Idioms, Harlow & London, Longman, 1979, p. 204.

recoded adequately, the text is sure to lose the characteristic features of its language and style. Thus, for example,

Նոյնպէս էր և սան նորա խոսրովիդուխտ, կուսան համեստ որպէս զօրինաւոր ոք, և ոչ ամենեկին ունել **անդուռն բերան**, նման այլոց կանանց (Մ. Խորենացի, էջ 272):

Նրա պէս էր և նրա սանը, խոսրովիդուխտը, մի օրինավոր համեստ կույս, և չունէր բոլորովին **անդուռն բերան**, ուրիշ կանանց նման (թարգմ. Ստ. Մալխասյանց, էջ 272):

Similarly his foster-daughter Khosrovidukht was a modest maiden, like a nun, and did not at all **have an open mouth** like other women (R. Thomson, 2006, p. 228).

Khorenatsi's choice to use the phraseological unit *անդուռն բերան* in the chapter adduced above is not random. He obviously intends to represent the image of garrulous women of the period (or possibly women in general) who are gullible and prattling by nature. The use of the idiomatic expression which is metaphoric in its base helps the historian to not only introduce into the context his humouristic attitude towards women who, he believes, are simpletons but against this background also depict Khosrovidukht's character which, in fact, symbolizes the reserved and dignified bearing possessed by Armenian women of noble origin.

By translating ունել *անդուռն բերան* as *have an open mouth* the translator has carried out partial calquing (ունել *անդուռն բերան* - *have an open mouth*) which hardly rings a bell for the reader of the translation. It could of course be assumed that the translator has applied the deformed variant of the English idiom *to open one's big mouth*. But this would add to the negative connotative charge of *անդուռն բերան*, whereas the original context of the passage makes the impression of the author's mild and inclusive humour⁹ which could probably be expressed by the English phrase *loose tongue* - an interlingual equivalent of *անդուռն բերան* registered in lexicographic sources¹⁰.

In the next extract M. Khorenatsi recreated and reinterpreted the image of one of the well-known characters of Armenian folklore (Tork Angegh) endowing him with outstanding abilities and features of a superman.

⁹ See about mild and inclusive humour in: **M. Davidov, M. Konurbaev**, Snizhennye temby angliyskoy prosodii v kognitivnom osveshchenii // Vestnik moskovskogo universiteta. Ser. 9. Philologiya, № 6, Moscow, 1991, pp. 50-54; **S. Gasparyan**, Figura sravneniya v funktsionalnom osveshchenii, Yerevan, 2000.

¹⁰ See: **J. Seidl, W. McMordie**, English Idioms, Oxford, 2003; "Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary", Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2006; **Longman** "Dictionary of Contemporary English", Harlow & London, Longman, 1978; "Webster's Collegiate Dictionary", Fifth Edition, USA, Mass. Merriam Co. Publishers, 1947; **A. Nazaryan**, Anglereni dardzvatsqneri usumnakan hamarot bararan, Yerevan, 2000; **S. Seferyan & others**, Imastakhos zhoghovrdi (Angleren-Hayeren, Hayeren-Angleren asatsvatsqneri ev artahaytutunneri usumnakan bararan), Yerevan, 2005.

Իսկ զայր խոշորագեղ և բարձր և կոպտարանձն և տափակաքիթ, խորակն և դժնահայեաց, ի զաւակէ Պասքամայ, ի Յայկայ թռնէ, Տորք անուն կոչեցեալ, որ վասն առաւել ժահադիմութեան ձայնէին Անգեղեայ, վիթխարի հասակաւ և ուժով: Քանզի կարի իմն անյարմար թուէին և նմա երգ բանից վասն ուժեղութեանն և սրտեայ լինելոյն: Քանզի երգէին նմա **բուռն հարկանել** զորձաքար վիմաց ձեռօք, ուր ոչ գոյր գեզութիւն, և ճեղքել ըստ կամաց մեծ և փոքր. և քերել եղնգամբքն և կազմել որպէս տախտակ (Մ. Խորենացի, էջ 129):

Իսկ Տորքին, որ սերված էր Յայկի թռ Պասքամից, մի տգեղ, բարձր, կոպիտ կազմվածքով, տափակ քթով, փոս ընկած աչքերով, դժնյա հայացքով մարդու, որին սաստիկ տգեղության պատճառով կոչում էին Անգեղայ, որ վիթխարի հասակ և ուժ ուներ: Որովհետև նրա ուժեղության և սրտոտ լինելու պատճառով երգերը պատմում էին նրա մասին չափազանց անհարմար բաներ, երգում էին նրա մասին, իբր թէ **ձեռք էր զարնում** որձաքար ապառաժներից, որոնց վրա ոչ մի ճեղքվածք չկա, ուզածին պէս ճեղքում էր մեծ ու փոքր, եղունգներով տաշում էր, տախտակներ էր ձևացնում (թարգմ. Ստ. Մալխասյան, էջ 129):

As governor of the west he appointed a man called Turk', who was deformed, tall, monstrous, with a squashed nose, deep-sunk sockets, and fearsome aspect, from the offspring of Pask'am, grandson of Hayk; they called him Angl because of his great ugliness, a man of gigantic size and strength. The songs about his strength and spiritedness seem very exaggerated. They sang that he **took in his fist** granite rocks in which there was no crack, and he would crunch them into large and small pieces at will, polish them with nails, and form them into tablet shapes (R. Thomson, 2006, p. 139).

The historian skillfully applied different language units, especially the phraseological unit *ի բուռն հարկանել* which particularly emphasizes Tork' Angegh's unique power and strength. It is of paramount importance to stress that among the various meanings of the polysemantic word *հարկանել* of special interest are the meanings *կոտորել* (crush, cut into pieces) and *հատանել*¹¹ (divide into parts). In the target context we come across the word combination *took in his fist* which does not fully reflect the unreal strength and the power of Tork' Angegh who displayed the ability to split and punch rocks. One cannot fail to observe that using the word *crunch* in the target context the translator tried to provide the impact achieved by the original, but he failed as the word *crunch* is first of all associated with cutting something with one's teeth.

¹¹ See "Nor Bargirk' Haykazean Lezvi", Yerevan, 1981, ch. 2, p. 68.

In certain cases the translation difficulties of the historiographic text under investigation are connected with the polyphonic words which reflect the fifth century imaginative perception of the world and can be analysed and interpreted on the level of the author's general worldview and intention. The research has shown that similar difficulties arising in the process of translation may have their objective reasons¹²; however the inadequate translation of the subtitle in the "History of Armenia" cannot be considered an objectively motivated instance. For example,

Ի վարդապետսն, յինքն և ի ճանապարհորդութիւն ուսմանն, օրինակաւ **երկնային զարդու** (Ս. Խորենացի, էջ 426):

Ուսուցիչների, իր և ուսումնական ճանապարհորդության մասին, **երկնային զարդի** նմանությամբ (թարգմ. Ստ. Մալխասյանց, էջ 426):

On the doctors, (Moses) himself, and his journey for study, with a simile from *the celestial system* (R. Thomson, 2006, p. 332).

It is relevant to note that this subtitle can be understood and interpreted against the background of the wider horizontal context the thorough examination of which shows that the Armenian aspiration for knowledge and education was an important and multifarious goal for Movses Khorenatsi. That is why his journey was associated in his mind with sunlight. He emphasizes the vitality of this goal by means of the metaphoric comparison *օրինակաւ երկնային զարդու*¹³. The inner meaning of this comparison is the desire to possess spiritual enlightenment, to cognize the world and the enigmatic secret of nature. The stylistically charged combination *երկնային զարդ* presents a mental pattern typical of thinking in Hellenistic era: just as the Sun illuminates the Earth, so the educated teacher "constantly being illuminated by the wisdom of his spiritual precepts"¹⁴ transfers the light of his knowledge to his common people. In the classical Armenian metaphoric combination *երկնային զարդ*, the word *զարդ*, according to the dictionary Nor Bargirk' Hajkazean Lezvi (1979, ch. 1, p. 718) has the following meanings: *decency, decorum, luster, splendor, gorgeousness, object ornamentation or decoration*. Having subtle emotional-expressive-evaluative overtones potentially this word acquires new, additional connotations in the above-mentioned extract, especially when the diamond of the Heavens is associated with the journey for educational purposes.

The translator could not appreciate the semantic subtleties in this comparison and transferred it with the unmarked word combination *celestial system* which is not infrequently used as a terminological combination¹⁵. Moreover, this substitute

¹² See S. Gasparyan, *Lingvopoetica obraznogo sravneniya*, Yerevan, 1991, 2008:

¹³ See S. Gasparyan, *Figura sravneniya v funktsionalnom osveshchenii*, Yerevan, 2000.

¹⁴ See **Movses Khorenatsi**, *Patmutjun Hajoc (targmanutjun St. Malkhasyani)*, Yerevan, 1981, p. 429.

¹⁵ It is proved by the notes of *A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles* (founded mainly on the material collected by the philological society), (Oxford, 1967, vol. 12, p. 393).

comprised of neutral elements does not adequately transfer the connotative meaning of the word *զարդ* which in the source context expresses the vitally important capability of disseminating knowledge and enlightenment supporting the existence of the Armenian nation for ages. The neutral terminological element *celestial system* widely used in various sciences, particularly astrology, could by no means acquire any additional overtones in this context. Consequently, the translator failed in transferring adequately the associative meanings of *երկնային զարդ*, i.e. the Sun spreading light over the planet of the Earth and the spiritual power acquired by means of education and knowledge¹⁶. This parallel drawn by Movses Khorenatsi helps the historian to emphasize the efforts and desire of Armenian intellectuals to accumulate more information and knowledge in the Hellenistic period. As far as the word *celestial* is concerned, it has, of course, some metaphorical shades of meaning in its semantic structure (celestial - suggestive of heaven, spiritual, divine) and may in appropriate speech situations manifest some polyphonic properties. However, in combination with the noun *system* it loses its metaphoric potential and appears in its terminological meaning. Consequently, in the target text we face a non-equivalent transposition which not only deprives the text of its imaginative quality, but also distorts the all-important cognitive function realized by the comparison. The fact that there are a number of imaginative and symbolic uses of the word *celestial* in the tradition of world literature and culture (*the source of light and life, the good eye of the Heavens, the Heart of the Heavens, the diamond of the Heavens, the intellect of the world, the gem of the Sun in the Heavens* *և այլն*¹⁷) has unfortunately been neglected as well.

The research has shown that one of the violations of the principle of diachronic translation is the inappropriate choice of the noun *doctors*. The source text which belongs to the fifth century and correlates with the Armenian spiritual fathers' activity for national enlightenment should obviously have oriented the translator to choose the word *precept*. The semantic field of the word *preceptor* covers the meanings of both the spiritual and moral education (*precept /fml./ - a rule or principle imposing a particular standard of action or conduct*¹⁸, e.g. "Just follow these few basic precepts and you won't go far wrong in life."¹⁹):

The analysis of the English version of "History of Armenia" has revealed an array of inadequate translation instances, particularly in the sphere of historical realias. It is indisputable that adequate translation of historical realias, let alone in a fifth century original text, may cause some difficulties because of time and space factors, as well as the complexity of the problem which has not so far received all the attention it deserves. The main difficulty of translation in this case is accounted for by the fact that these linguistic elements have very specific, culture-bound nominative meanings. Besides, they belong to a certain socio-historical period and reflect the peculiar features of the national mentality and cultural colouring of the

¹⁶ It is well-known that it was in the period described by the historian that travelling to Egypt, Edessa and other centres of culture for purposes of enlightenment was particularly encouraged.

¹⁷ See, for example, **J. Chevalier & Alain Gheerbront**, *Dictionary of Symbols*, London, Penguin Books, 1996.

¹⁸ See: "The Heritage Illustrated Dictionary of The English Language", New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1973.

¹⁹ See: "The Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture", England, Eddison Wesley Longman, 1998.

era. Consequently, in the adequate translation of these elements the role of the diachronic factor can never be overestimated²⁰. **Otherwise it can be perceived and interpreted as the intended effort of the translator to pervert his readers from the established historical and cultural facts of the period, to distort and misrepresent the history of an ancient country which is believed to be one of the cradles of world civilization.**

To avoid such kind of mutilation and perversion of the historical atmosphere presented in the source text, it has been believed to be of crucial importance in the theory of translation to proceed from the differentiation of two theoretically and practically grounded principles: the principle of diachronic translation and the principle of synchronic translation²¹. The adoption of the former is even more decisive in the translation of historiographic works the translator of which is at a remarkably great time and space distance from the author of the original. The only choice for the translator in this case is to be guided by the principle of diachronic translation, as well as take into consideration his formerly accumulated background knowledge of the historical period, the country in question, its culture, its people, their traditions, their mentality and psychology, the peculiarities of the language they speak and the changes the language system eventually undergoes.

Our study of “History of Armenia” has brought out a number of realias which are of great historical and cultural value in the context due to the national colouring they are charged with. Thus, for example,

Եւ կոչեցեալն Բագարատ, որ ի Զրեիցն, շնորհակալութիւն նմա վասն յառաջագոյն անձնատուր ձեռնտուութեանն առ թագաւորն և միամտութեանն և քաջութեանն, գյառաջասացեալ **տանուտիրական** պատիւն ազգին պարգևելով և իշխել նմա թագ ի գլուխ դնել թագաւորին, և կոչել թագադիր, այլ և **ասպետ** (Մ. Խորենացի, էջ 122):

Եվ Բագարատ կոչվածին, որ հրեաներից էր ծագում, շնորհակալություն ցույց տալով հենց սկզբից անձնատուր լինելու և թագավորին օժանդակելու համար, ինչպես և նրա հավատարմության և քաջության համար՝ պարգևում է նրան՝ ցեղի վերը հիշված **տանուտիրական** պատիվը, իրավունք տալով թագ դնել թագավորի գլուխը և կոչվել թագադիր, այլև **ասպետ** (թարգմ. Ստ. Մալխասյան, էջ 122):

He recompensed the Jew called Bagarat for his previously rendered services to the king and his fidelity and valor by granting to his family the aforementioned rank of *tanuter*; he also gave him the authority to place the crown on the king's head, to be called coronant and *aspēt*, and to wear the lesser diadem of three rows of pearls

²⁰ S. Vlahov, S. Florin, *Neperevodimoe v perevode*, Moscow, Visshaya shkola, 1988; I. Levij, *Iskusstvo perevoda*, Moscow, Progress, 1974; A. Feodorov, *O khudozhestvennom perevode*, Sovetskiy pisatel, Leningrad, 1941.

²¹ V. S. Vinogradov, *Perevod (Obshchie i leksicheskie voprosi)*, Moscow, UDK, 2006.

without gold or gems when he was in attendance at court and in the king's house (R. Thomson, 2006, p. 134).

In the above-mentioned extract king Vagharshak appoints Bagarat to be a tribal ruler and honours him with the title of *aspēt* for his fidelity and valour. In the target text the words *տանուտեր* and *ասպետ* appear in their transliterated forms (*tanuter, aspet*)²². Though transliteration is an accepted method of transformation in the theory of translation, it cannot be considered reliable in the process of translating historical realias as transliterated forms without any additional explanations do not reveal the significance of the culture-bound elements in the context (in the present case the words *tanuter* and *aspet*). *Տանուտեր* is explained as *ցեղասպետ, ազգասպետ, նահասպետ, իշխան*²³ and has a number of interlingual variants in English (*tribal head, tribal lord, tribal ruler*)²⁴.

The word *aspet* is derived from the old Persian word *aspa-pati* (*aspa* - horse, *pati* – lord, master)²⁵, which, according to several sources, entered into the Armenian word-stock in the meaning of *noble horseman or rider*²⁶. In this connection relevant interpretation can be found in the notes of the Ashkharabar (New Armenian) translation by St. Malkhasyants, where referring to Sebeos he tends to claim that *aspet* in Armenia was the ruler of the whole country, the commander who issued the king's orders. While interpreting this title St. Malkhasyants draws a parallel between the Persian *hazarapet* who was the king's person in attendance, his best advisor who had the right to rule the country on behalf of the king²⁷.

Borrowing the word *aspet* as a translation loan word R. Thomson explains it in the footnotes of his translation as *master of the horse (owner of a horse)*²⁸ which gives rise to bewilderment and doubts for it almost obviously sounds improbable that a master of the horse could be given the right to coronate the king. On the other hand in this case the principle of transliteration leads to the choice of unmarked elements in the target text and the latter makes impression of artificiality²⁹.

Thus, we come to the conclusion that in the process of translating works of historical literature it is of paramount importance for the translator to make a thorough investigation of the cultural differences (historical realias in particular) of the source and target languages, make his choice of the methods that can most effectively be applied to the translation of the original text and provide not only semantic, but also cultural equivalence of the source and target texts. This will

²² Cases of transliteration can be found in different extracts of R. Thomson's translation of the work in question: -ostan (pp. 116, 136), -artakhur (p. 118), -tits (p. 118), - bdeashkh (p. 138), -vishaps (p. 187), -hazarapet (p. 193), -dev (p. 412), -mardapet (p. 265), etc.

²³ See: "Nor Bargirk' Haykazean Lezvi", Yerevan, 1981, ch. 2, p. 843.

²⁴ "Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary", Oxford, 2001, p. 1387.

²⁵ H. Acharyan, Hayeren armatakan bararan, Yerevan, 1971, ch. 1, p. 274.

²⁶ "Nor Bargirk' haykazean lezvi", Yerevan, 1981, ch. 2, p. 316.

²⁷ Movses Khorenatsi, Hayoc patmutyun (targm. St. Malkhasyan), Yerevan, 1990, pp. 258-259.

²⁸ A. S. Hornby, Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English, Oxford, 1974, p. 523.

²⁹ Such kind of translation borrowings which are not reflected in the target language dictionaries as loan words are considered to be occasional equivalents and necessarily require appropriate explanation.

surely become a token of mutual understanding between the author of the original and the reader of the translation.

ՍԵՂԱ ԳԱՍՊԱՐՅԱՆ, ԼՈՒԻԶԱ ԳԱՍՊԱՐՅԱՆ – Սովսես Խորենացու «Պատմություն Հայոց» երկի անգլերեն թարգմանությունը. համարժեքության խնդիրներ – Աշխատանքի նպատակն է Մ. Խորենացու «Պատմություն Հայոց» երկի և դրա անգլերեն թարգմանության (թարգմ.՝ Ռ. Թոմսոն) զուգադրական վերլուծության հիման վրա քննել և վեր հանել բնագրի ու թարգմանության միջև առկա անհամապատասխանությունները: Ուսումնասիրությունը ցույց է տալիս, որ Մ. Խորենացու երկը պատմականության, գիտականության և գեղարվեստականության դիալեկտիկական ամբողջություն է, որի անգլերեն թարգմանության վերլուծությունից հստակ երևում է, որ նրանում տեղ են գտել բառային, ձևաբանական, շարահյուսական, ինչպես նաև դարձվածային կապակցությունների անհամարժեքության բազմաթիվ դեպքեր, որոնք խանգարում են բնագրի պատմամշակութային մթնոլորտի համապատասխան ընկալմանը:

СЕДА ГАСПАРЯН, ЛУИЗА ГАСПАРЯН – “История Армении” Мовсеса Хоренаци и её английский перевод: проблемы эквивалентности. – Работа посвящена весьма актуальной проблеме – эквивалентности при переводе текста на английский язык. Материалом исследования послужила “История Армении” Мовсеса Хоренаци и её английский перевод, исполненный Р. Томсоном с древнеармянского языка. Изучение обширного теоретического и практического материала показывает, что раннесредневековые тексты (в частности, “История” Хоренаци) представляют собой диалектическое единство, возникшее при взаимодействии различных стилей – научного, исторического, художественного. В статье на основе как исторических, так и языковых фактов установлены конкретные случаи неадекватного перевода, обнаруженные на лексико-фразеологическом, морфологическом, синтаксическом и стилистическом уровнях. Эти переводческие несоответствия препятствуют адекватному восприятию культурно-исторической значимости оригинала.