
TRANSLATION PECULIARITIES OF DETACHED CONSTRUCTIONS AND ELLIPSES IN R. P. WARREN'S "ALL THE KING'S MEN"

Isahakyan Ts. Heghine,
Shirak State University, Gyumri, Armenia

Antikyan S. Mariam
Shirak State University, Gyumri, Armenia

ABSTRACT

The article aims to study the general notion of detached constructions and ellipsis as stylistic devices, as well as their translation from English into Armenian within the framework of R. P. Warren's well-known novel "All the King's Men". The investigation showed that the notion of the above-mentioned terms has been commonly explored in both languages, although there are still rather controversial evaluations and definitions of those terms, as well as shared properties which often cause confusion and incorrect understanding, leading to inadequate conveyance of the devices. Expectedly, this caused certain difficulties regarding the translation of Warren's novel since it is abundant in both detached constructions and ellipses. The conducted research has revealed the following translation types: equivalent, partially equivalent, compensative and non-equivalent. Due to the ample usage of these devices, the author succeeded in creating a colloquial communicative situation and compelling characters.

Key words: stylistic device, ellipsis, detached construction, translation, equivalence, colloquial speech

I. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this article is to study the stylistic devices of detached constructions and ellipses in the translation of R. P. Warren's "All the King's Men" [4,5] from English into Armenian. The study of them will allow us to have an insight into the notion of the devices in general, as well as the difficulties and challenges that might occur during the translation process.

II. BRIEF OUTLOOK ON R. P. WARREN'S "ALL THE KING'S MEN":

Many people consider Warren's novel to be one of the best American novels about politics, therefore it is not surprising that the novel won the Pulitzer Prize for fiction in 1947. Through the prism of politics, the author explores the concepts of populism, responsibility and consequences with a realistic style matching the theme of personal and political corruption. Writing a political fiction novel narrated by Jack Burden and involving numerous characters of different backgrounds, Warren used various expressive means and stylistic devices, including detached constructions and ellipses, in order to create proper character portraits and communicative situations.

The novel has been translated into Armenian several times, however, we shall make a comparative analysis based upon the translation variant undertaken by Karlen Dallakian in 1976 [4].

III. DETACHED CONSTRUCTIONS AND ELLIPSES IN STYLISTICS:

Being a branch of applied linguistics, stylistics is the study and interpretation of texts concerning the usage and stylistic effect of various language elements. According to I. R. Galperin [1], the subdivision of expressive means and stylistic devices can be presented as follows; phonetic, lexical and syntactical.

Phonetic expressive means and devices refer to separate sounds or sound groups that might awake certain ideas, images or emotions in a definite context. The principle of classification in lexical devices is based on the interaction of different types of word-meanings, e. g. dictionary and contextual or primary and derivative, as well as the interaction of word combinations with the context. As for syntactical expressive means and stylistic devices, which cover the subject of our investigation, structural elements of the utterance are concerned that might apparently affect the lexical meaning and gain a specific stylistic effect.

Among other expressive means and stylistic devices, Galperin [1] also included detached constructions (often referred to as parcellations) and ellipsis. Unfortunately, due to having several common properties, e. g. being typical of the spoken language, seeming “incomplete” or brief in their form, etc., very often these stylistic devices are mixed up or merged and it is highly difficult to understand if we deal with a detached construction or an ellipsis. That is why being able to draw a borderline between these devices is of paramount importance for the translators.

As he stated, [1, p. 205-206] “sometimes one of the secondary parts of a sentence by some specific consideration of the writer is placed so that it seems formally independent of the word it logically refers to. Such parts of structures are called detached.” In other words, some secondary parts are separated from the main sentence through punctuation and/or intonation so that formally and visually they seem independent which results in the acquirement of a more important semantic value for those secondary parts. Due to this nature, detached constructions are typical of colloquial impromptu speech and are very often used for imitating the natural speech flow with its pauses, expressiveness, etc., as well as the development of the thinking process. Moreover, there have been attempts to classify detached constructions according to their function in oral or written speech. One of the function-based classifications has been proposed by Kh. Mamyán [2], who has suggested five types of detached constructions: evaluative, defining, emphasizing, supplementing, and describing.

When speaking of ellipsis, Galperin [1, p. 231-232] made interesting statements: “Ellipsis is a typical phenomenon in conversation, arising out of the situation (...). But this typical feature of the spoken language assumes a new quality when used in the written language. It becomes a stylistic device inasmuch as it supplies suprasegmental information. An elliptical sentence in direct intercourse is not a stylistic device. It is simply a norm of the spoken language.” As he continued, he explained that as a stylistic device, ellipsis always imitates properties of colloquial language, where a member of the sentence is not omitted, but absent. Thus, ellipsis is basically the omission or absence of a word, sentence or even a whole section from a text when the omitted or absent element is very likely to be recovered.

In Armenian-language sources, these phenomena have been investigated, too. Y. Avestisyan [3, p. 259] defines parcellation (մասնատում, պարզեցում) as “the pronunciational segmentation or lineation of sentence members, especially an important word (the formation of a sentence with its own pronunciation tone)”. As he states, ellipsis is a very important syntactic device since “it creates tension, emotions, gradual accumulation of moods, sharp speech and, of course, a corresponding rhythm and tone of simultaneous movement, at the same time emphasizing the content side of this or that member of the sentence. It is usually expressed in writing by a full stop (...). Parcellation is accompanied by other stylistic devices: asyndeton, ellipsis, unique types of repetition.” [3, p. 260]

As for ellipsis, Avestisyan [3] distinguishes between grammatical and rhetorical ellipses (քերականական զեղչում և ճարտասանական զեղչում/խոսքի ընդհատում). This is how the author refers to this device: “As it is well known, in order to avoid repetition or to create an emotional

coloring of speech, some word units (word, word-combination, phrase) are omitted from the utterance. The ellipses used for stylistic purposes, which is also called rhetorical ellipsis, should not be confused with the grammatical ellipsis, in case of which conjunctions, auxiliaries, predicates and other sentence members are ellipted" [3, p. 258]. The author then explains that in the case of rhetorical ellipsis, it is hardly possible to accurately restore the ellipted item. Due to rhetorical ellipsis speech becomes brief and sharp, and emotionally intense. However, the grammatical ellipsis has got stylistic value and function, too. Being popular and widely-used in colloquial speech, the latter makes it concise, impressive, and emotional.

As mentioned above, the devices concerned share several common features, and due this fact a lot of misinterpretations and mistranslations take place. Moreover, very often one of them is merged with the other, hence and it is even more challenging to understand whether one deals with a detached construction or an ellipsis in the first place and only then think about proper translation strategies. That is why it is utterly essential for translators, in particular, to explore their distinct peculiarities before undertaking the translation.

IV. TRANSLATION OF DETACHED CONSTRUCTIONS

As one might observe in the former parts of this article, there are apparently no differences in the notions of detached constructions in English and Armenian, therefore it would be natural to think that there might be no trouble conveying this device into Armenian. Nevertheless, let us take a look to find out whether it is so or not.

Equivalent Translation: By saying equivalent translation, we mean the full conveyance of the device and its stylistic function and effect to the other language. In the following instances, the translator managed, first of all, to detect and then transfer the given detached constructions from one language into the other, Armenian. In some cases, minor lexico-grammatical transformations can be observed, e. g. additions ("այն էլ" in example 1, or, paraphrasing; cf. "To fool" and "Որ մեզ ֆոռագնեն" in example 3).

1. In case you changed your mind, somebody might figure you had stooped to a low political deal with the Boss. *In the dark of night.*" [5, p. 65]

Եթե պատահի, որ միտքներդ փոխեք, ոմանք կմտածեն, թե դուք նսեմացել եք մինչև Տնօրենի հետ կեղտոտ քաղաքական գործարքը: *Այն էլ գիշերվա խավարում:* [4, p. 74]

2. "That is what he seems to depend on. *The bribe or the threat.*" [5, p. 298]

– Նրա հիմքը դա է: *Կաշառք կամ սպառնալիք:* [4, p. 366]

3. (...) they've fooled you, too, a thousand times, just like they fooled me. For that's what they think we're for. *To fool.* [5, p. 122]

(...) նրանք էլ ձեզ են հիմարի տեղ դրել, մի հազար անգամ, ինչպես ինձ հիմարի տեղ դրին: Նրանք կարծում են, որ մենք հենց դրա համար ենք ստեղծված: *Որ մեզ ֆոռագնեն:* [4, p. 142]

These slight variations, surely, do not hinder the conveyance of an equivalent stylistic effect of emphasizing some particular thing. Moreover, the equivalent transference of the device helps to preserve the imitation of the natural flow of speech and its intonation, originally created by the author.

Partially Equivalent Translation:

In cases of partial equivalence, the conveyance of the device and its stylistic function and effect is partial or incomplete. One should especially pay attention to chains of detached constructions, an instance of which is illustrated below.

1. You'll go past the little white metal squares set on metal rods, (...). *For this is the country where the age of internal combustion engine has come into its own. Where every boy is Barney Oldfield, (...), and they sit low in the seat with their little spines (...). Where the smell of gasoline and the burning brake bands and red-eye is sweeter than myrrh. Where the eight-cylinder jobs come roaring round the curve (...).* [5, p. 8]

Սուրում եք մետաղյա ձողերի վրա տնկված փոքրիկ թիթեյա քառակուսիների կողքից (...): Որովհետև սա այն երկիրն է, ուր վաղուց իր տիրապետությունն է հաստատել ներքին այրման շարժիչի դարը: Ուր ամեն մի տղա Բարնի Օլդֆիլդ է (...): Առջիկները խոր ընկղմվում են նստոցների մեջ (...): Սա այն երկիրն է, ուր բենզինի և այրվող արգելակների բույրը ու կանգառի կարմիր ազդանշանը ավելի քաղցր են, քան մյուռոնը: Ուր ութ ցիլինդրանոց հսկաները ռոնոնով պտույտներ են գործում կարմիր բլուրների մեջ (...): [4, p. 3-4]

This particular example has got a really interesting solution from the translator. As one can see, with the help of the relative pronoun “where”, Warren created a kind of “cascade” for a definite place’s description, each time adding more details and information. The complexity and length of the sentences, in our opinion, also play a significant role in this description, leaving an effect of messiness and confusion. In Armenian, however, we have got a different approach; the translator created two cascades, not just one and successive. First of all, Dallakian segmented the third long sentence into two parts, relieving the syntactic “load” for Armenian readers. Next, he preferred not to keep the second detached sentence and made it syntactically and visually complete, by adding “սա այն երկիրն է”, which means that the parcellation chain was broken. However, as one can clearly notice, the reoccurrence of the device was further restored (“ուր ութ ցիլինդրանոց...”). Taking into account that due to different grammatical structures and longer words the Armenian sentence looks significantly longer and knottier compared to the original, this was probably a nice solution.

Non-Equivalent Translation

In this case, a loss of the given stylistic device and consequently its stylistic effect and value in the context is observed. Interestingly, this occurs not only due to the impossibility of conveyance but also as a result of translators’ individual choices.

1. "Don't be a fool. I had lunch with him. *On business.*" [5, p. 264]
– Ապուշ մի լինիր: Ես նախաճաշել եմ նրա հետ հանուն գործի: [4, p. 324]
2. "No, he's not all right," she repeated. "And won't be. *Unless you make him.*" [5, p. 290]
– Ոչ ամեն ինչ չէ, որ կարգին է, - կրկնեց կինը: - Եվ կարգին չի էլ լինի, եթե դու վերջ չտաս դրան: [4, p. 357]

In the instances above, the translator did not preserve detached constructions as a stylistic device originally used by the author, although we may not insist that it was impossible to do it. In this way, surely, the special stylistic effect and value produced by the usage of this device are affected, too, moreover, the loss is not further compensated.

V. TRANSLATION OF ELLIPSIS

Ellipsis, which is sometimes confused with detached constructions as stated above, has also got wide use in Armenian, although due to a different grammatical and syntactical structure, there are differences in the languages, for instance, between items that can be ellipsed which, in its turn, results in certain difficulties translators often face with.

Equivalent Translation

By this label, we refer to instances where the usage of ellipsis and its stylistic effect and value are fully preserved in translation.

1. "The Boss isn't any fool. You don't think he was trying to buy you?" - "*He couldn't,*" he said. [5, p. 298]
– Տնօրենը այնքան էլ ապուշ չէ: Դու միթե իրոք կարծում ես, որ նա ուզում է քեզ գնել: / - *Նա չէր կարողանա:* [4, p. 366]
2. "A thing does not grow except in its proper climate, and you know what kind of a climate that man creates. *Or ought to know.* [5, p. 301]

Որևէ բան կարող է աճել միայն յուրահատուկ կլիմայում, իսկ դու գիտե՞ս, թե ինչ կլիմա է ստեղծում այդ մարդը: *Պարտավոր ես իմանալ:* [4, p. 369]

In the examples illustrated above, the translator, though sometimes with minor lexico-grammatical transformations, managed to preserve the elliptical structures without violating the generally adopted rules and norms of the target language, e.g. "He couldn't" vs. "Նա չէր կարողանա" (ellipsis in verb phrase – **buy you** is ellipsed both in English and Armenian) and "Or ought to know" vs. "Պարտավոր ես իմանալ" (clausal ellipsis – the clause **what kind of a climate that man creates** is ellipsed both in English and Armenian). In this way, the utterance remained brief and concise and the stylistic effect of colloquialism was also transferred to the other language.

It should be noted that in many instances, including examples 1-2 and some further ones, elliptical structures are detached constructions, i.e. the detachment of these or those members is accompanied by ellipsis as well. Moreover, we assume that this might be another major reason for coming across difficulties when classifying these devices.

Partially Equivalent Translation:

By implementing this term, we refer to cases where ellipsis is preserved by changing the type of ellipsis, due to which the stylistic value and effect are rather successfully translated.

1. "You're going to get him." / "*Get who?*" I asked. [5, p. 295]
– Դու կբերես նրան: / – *Այսինքն ո՞ւմ,* - հարցրի ես: [4, p. 362]
2. Anyway, I could cross 1913 off the ticket. Anne Stanton had settled that. *Or has she?* [5, p. 272]
Ինչևէ, ես խաչ քաշեցի 1913 թվականի վրա: Դա պարզեց Աննա Սթանտոնը: / *Թե՞:* [4, p. 333]

Thus, in example 1, we observe the ellipsis of the subject (**I** is ellipsed both in English and Armenian), and partial ellipsis of the predicative group (Whom I **am going to get?**), however in Armenian, the predicative group is fully ellipsed, as well as the word "այսինքն" is added, while in English "get" was originally kept. In the case of example 2, a clausal ellipsis is observed (**had settled that** is ellipsed both in Armenian and English). Nevertheless, if the predicative group is partially preserved in the English sentence due to the auxiliary "has", there is full clausal ellipsis in Armenian where the only word left is the conjunction "or" ("թե").

These changes, of course, do not affect the stylistic value of the utterance both in these particular cases and other similar instances.

Compensative Translation

The impossibility or inconvenience of transferring the device into the other language is sometimes compensated by other means, including creating ellipsis in another part of the utterance or using translation strategies that manage to convey the stylistic effect and value of the original device.

1. "Was I, was I polite? (...) "Was I, God damn it?" the Boss demanded. [5, p. 293]
– Հը՞, ես քաղաքավարի՞ էի: (...) Հը՞, գրո՞ղը տանի, - պահանջեց Տնօրենը: [4, p. 360]
2. "He needn't think he can flatter me," he said, fiercely. / "Nobody can flatter you," I said, softly, "nobody in the world." [5, p. 299]
– Միրաշահելու վրա էլ թող հույս չդնի, - ասաց կատաղությամբ: / - Ոչ միայն նա, - ասացի ես, - քեզ առհասարակ սիրաշահելով գրավել չի լինի: [4, p. 367]

Both of the illustrated cases are rather interesting to analyze. Thus, in the first instance, the difficulty the translator came across is the following; the Armenian language does not have any generally adopted norms when the auxiliary "to be" (եմ, էի) is used in isolation as a disjunctive question. Consequently, the translator attempted to fulfill the function of ellipsis (**polite** is ellipted in English) with the interjection "հը" which perfectly saves the situation, raising the same question as it was in the original, at the same time keeping the utterance brief and colloquial.

One can easily notice that the elliptical construction "nobody in the world (**can flatter you** is ellipted in English)" was not preserved in the Armenian variant, but the translator compensated for the loss in the following sentence (**սիրաշահելու վրա էլ թող հույս չդնի** is ellipted in Armenian), thus simply changing the position of the device's occurrence, which seems to be a clever solution for this particular case.

Non-Equivalent Translation:

As mentioned above, sometimes the grammatical differences existing between the two languages sometimes cause obstructions in the process of translation. Therefore, it is frequently impossible to provide equivalent or partially equivalent translations, and if the compensative method is not practical or desirable either, then the only way might be the complete loss of the device concerned. Nevertheless, this may also occur as a result of translators' personal and subjective choices. Here are some examples;

1. I made a mistake not busting you. But I figured you'd stay bought. *You're scared not to.* [5, p. 293]
Ես սխալ եմ գործել, որ քեզ չեմ ճգնել: Բայց ես կարծում էի, թե քեզ ընդմիշտ եմ գնում, թե *դու վերավաճառվելուց սուկում ես*: [4, p. 360]
2. No doubt you thought Sugar-Boy was a Negro, from his name. *But he wasn't.* [5, p. 10]
Դուք, անկասկած, մտածում եք, թե Շաքար-Մանչը նեգր էր, դատելով նրա անունից: *Ոչ, նա նեգր չէր*: [4, p. 7]
3. "There is always something." And I said, "Maybe not on the Judge." [5, p. 240]
«Միշտ էլ որևէ բան լինում է»: / Իսկ ես ասացի. «Դատավորի վրա կարող է և չլինել»: [4, p. 295]

In the first two examples, the unique construction of elliptical sentences (**stay bought** is ellipted in ex. 1, and **a Negro** – in ex. 2) in English, and does not have any direct or preferably close analogues in Armenian, that is why the translator eventually had to make several lexico-grammatical additions ("վերավաճառվել, նեգր") not to damage the overall meaning of the utterance, sacrificing the ellipses.

In contrast with these, the third instance (here **there is not always something** is ellipted in English) is the result of the translator's personal and subjective decision, most likely to make the emphasis stronger for the readers, though it was grammatically possible to preserve the device without violating the target language's norms.

Unsurprisingly, the utterances might have lost their briefness and colloquial character gained due to the original device, however, the general meaning and message of the text are not damaged or altered at all, which is very principal for any adequate translation.

VI. CONCLUSION

To sum it up, the comparative analysis of R. P. Warrens' novel "All the King's Men" and its Armenian translation showed that the translational variants often have significant differences and alterations from the original text, sometimes due to differences in the grammatical and syntactical structures of the languages, and sometimes, as a result, the translator's individual and subjective choice which have been reflected in equivalent, partly-equivalent, compensative, and non-equivalent types of translation. Having a unique place among other literary devices, detached constructions and ellipsis are undoubtedly worth further investigation and research both within the frameworks of a book of high literary value as Warren's "All the King's Men" is, and the whole literature in translation, including, the Armenian language as well.

REFERENCES

1. Galperin I.R. Stylistics, Moscow: "Higher School", second edition, 1977.
2. Mamyán Kh., Functional Peculiarities of Parcelled Constructions in Post-Modernistic English Fiction, Yerevan, YSU, 2015.
3. Ավետիսյան Յու. և ուրիշներ, «Հայոց լեզու և խոսքի մշակույթ», Երևան, ԵՊՀ հրատարակչություն, 2016
4. Ուորեն Ռ. Փ., «Արքայի ամբողջ թիկնագործը», Երևան, «Սովետական գրող» հրատարակչություն, 1976
5. <https://www.pdfdrive.com/all-the-kings-men-e163200262.html>.