The Function of Pragmatics in Translation and the Pragmatic Challenges Translators Face

Abdul Jalil Kahdistani*

*Department of English language and literature, Kabul Education University, Afghanistan

Abstract: This study sought to examine the role of pragmatics in English-Dari translation as well as the practical issues and challenges faced by translators. This study considered pragmatics to be a factor of significant relevance in translation processes since pragmatics has received recent attention and growth from several academics and linguists that is cause for concern. The analytical descriptive approach was utilized to accomplish the study's goals and pinpoint the issues and challenges faced by translators. Two parts of a questionnaire test were administered; each part had five questions about the importance of pragmatics in translation and the challenges and difficulties translators faced while translating pragmatic concepts from English into Dari. The twelve translators of Dari took part in this investigation. According to the study's findings, pragmatics plays a big part in translating between English and Dari. According to the first section of the questionnaire's results, a total average of 3.5% out of 4% and a percentage of 90% of the replies supported the use of pragmatics in translation. The results also demonstrated the importance of understanding pragmatics for successful translation, with a response rate of 90% and an overall average of 3.5% out of 3% for the five questions in the questionnaire's second section on the existence of pragmatic issues and challenges faced by translators.

Keywords: Translation, Pragmatics, Translation Difficulties, English- Dari Translation.

1. INTRODUCTION

Language is employed for more than only reporting global happenings. It is also used to express the rich mental models that different people and cultures contribute to the conversation. According to the pragmatic-based approach, texts do not have meanings; rather, humans intended meanings when they created the texts, Farewell and Helmreich (2004). This means that the translator makes an effort to comprehend the author's intentions while writing the original text for the intended audience and then seeks to convey those intentions, to the degree feasible, to the target audience by utilizing the target language.

According to the usual view, pragmatics is active during two stages of the translation process: the first is the processing of the source text (message), and the second is the conceptualization and reformulation of the target text (message). In order to accomplish an effective translation

that can fulfill its communicative role in the target language and culture, a strong understanding of the pragmatically significant distinctions is required in both phases. The translator serves as a mediator by first acting as a text receiver by attempting to comprehend and assimilate the meaning of the original text. The translator is constrained by the pragmatics of the source text during this comprehension phase, which he attempts to decode effectively and express the genuine and comprehensible meanings intended in the original text. The translator must, however, handle the pragmatic disparities between the source and destination contexts during the translation process.

According to House, Kasper, and Ross (2003), pragmatics is a sort of knowledge that enables individuals to recognize intercultural interaction patterns and speech act techniques in order to address communication issues that arise in cross-cultural social contexts. Through pragmatics training, translators will be able to recognize the many ways that cross-cultural languages are interpreted as well as become familiar with their various conventions, patterns, and form. Any disregard for such pragmatic considerations in this respect may result in pragmatic translation issues. For instance, much as social distance and intimacy are frequently culture-specific, speech events vary among cultures. It indicates that there are certain cultural circumstances in each culture where word-for-word translation cannot serve to express the source's intended meanings. Thus, the translator must use his understanding of cross-cultural pragmatics to accurately translate the content without offending anyone.

Statement of the problem
Being familiar with the outside world, which is one of the pragmatics' central concerns, may help one form appropriate perceptions in a variety of situations. Lack of this expertise might lead to practical translation issues. It is also important to note that the educational curriculum provided by the Translation Departments includes two distinct modules on translation and pragmatics. The students are required to grasp how these courses overlap even though they are often taught by different instructors. More crucially, students are not informed or given instructions on how to use their understanding of the interrelationship between pragmatics and translation to their performances as translators.
Translation of the pragmatic features, in general, is a challenge since the translators' task here is to match the proper cultural and traditional dimensions of the source and target languages in addition to rendering the linguistic particles. Therefore, the purpose of this essay is to examine the function of pragmatics in translation and identify the significant challenges and challenges that translators encounter when presenting pragmatic components in their translations.

Objectives of the Study
The following two goals are anticipated to be accomplished by the current study:
1. To investigate how pragmatics are used in English-Dari translation.
2. To determine the kind of issues and challenges that translators have while expressing the pragmatic elements.

Study-Related Questions

The research consists of the following two issues regarding the pragmatic function of translation and the challenges that translators must overcome:

1. Is pragmatics important in the translation of English into Dari?
2. What issues and challenges do translators encounter when conveying the pragmatic elements in English-Dari translation?

Literature Review
The Function of Pragmatics in Translation

Charles Morris (1974) provided the first contemporary definition of pragmatics, and many other experts have subsequently proceeded to conceptualize this area of linguistics, according to Leech (1983). The initial definition of pragmatics by Morris (1974) was that it was "the field that examines the connections of signs to interpreters, whereas semantics investigates the relations of signals to the objects to which the signs are relevant" (as cited in Leech, 1974, p. 172). Secondly, pragmatics was described by Crystal (1986:240) as "... the study of language from the point of view of the users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter when using language in social interaction, and the effects their use of language has on the other participants in an act of communication." From the viewpoint of its users, pragmatics is examined in this definition. It considers the many decisions speakers might make while utilizing the target language based on the social context of their communication. The idea of choice prompts the use of yet another crucial factor that language learners should take into account: learning to select the appropriate pragmatic components from a wide range of options. Later, pragmatics was described as "the study of people's perception and production of language activity in context" by Kasper and Blum-Kulka (1993, p. 3). Here, the phrases "activity" and "context," two essential components of speaking actions in language, are used. In 1993, Kasper and Blum-Kulka coined the phrase "linguistic action" to describe a learner's ability to make an utterance. Additionally, they differentiate between production and understanding, which is particularly important for second language learners' day-to-day interactions. Recent times have seen a shift in the definition of pragmatics, which is now understood to involve the study of language used in communication, interactions between phrases, and settings and circumstances. According to Yule (2010), pragmatics is "the study of what speakers mean, or "speakers' meaning," as well as the study of "invisible" meaning, or how we might discern what is meant even when it is not really uttered or recorded." Fromkin and Rodman (1993) have previously discussed the "context" of a sentence or conversation and the significance of context in language interpretation. They define pragmatics as the general study of how context affects how sentences deliver information. As complicated a subject as syntax or semantics is pragmatics. Research into signals. Semantics refers to "what signs imply or signal," Syntax refers to "the way signs are ordered," and pragmatics refers to "the interaction between signs and their users." Therefore, pragmatics is a component of what we have been referring to as "linguistic performance" since it deals with how individuals use language in different settings. In regards to this, Stalnaker's definition is more precise: "Pragmatics is the study of the purposes for which sentences are employed, of the real-world circumstances in which a phrase may be legitimately utilized as an utterance" (Mason and Hatim 1997, p. 9). To determine the "true" meaning, pragmatics uses and analyzes contextual meaning. The inferred and intended

meaning, presumptions, objectives, and aims of persons in communication and many forms of acts are crucial topics in pragmatics.

Pragmatics was created as a result of semantics' inability to adequately explain the sociolinguistic and other non-linguistic elements of verbal communication. Because of this, pragmatics is a relatively recent area of research that straddles sociolinguistics and semantics. Pragmatics is discourse in motion, with movement influenced by society or other participants. When social factors are at play, behavior tends or leans toward sociolinguistics, but when intentional meaning is more important, behavior tends or leans toward semantics.

Given that pragmatics is a relatively recent field of linguistics and offers a fresh perspective on language, According to Verschueren (1999), pragmatics is a broad cognitive, social, and cultural viewpoint on language phenomena in light of how they are used in different behavioral forms. The process of translating a text from its original language (the source language) into another language is known as translation (the target language). According to Skinner (1974), "the ideal definition of translation is a verbal stimulus that, on a different verbal community, has the same impact as the original (or as much of the same effect as feasible)." Roman Jacobson, a Russian formalist, separated translation into three categories: intralingual, inter-semiotic, and interlingua (1959). Rewording, or intralingual translation, is the interpretation of linguistic cues in the same language. The process of interpreting linguistic signs via non-linguistic signs is known as intersemiotic translation. Interlingual translation is a legitimate form of translation that involves interpreting linguistic cues from one language to another. Translation is as old as mankind, according to Roman Jakobson's perspective on the three different definitions of translation. The effective conveyance of the original message across various language forms is the main goal of translation. The translator frequently runs into issues with contextual meanings while trying to replicate a message and its intricacies from one language form into another. In this way, translation is related to sociolinguistics and semantics. Newmark (1981) asserts that translation has fascinating connections to a wide range of fields, including linguistics, the comparative study of cultures, comparative anthropology, computer science, comparative sociology, etc. The connection it has to linguistics is very strong. According to Newmark (1981) and Kwofie (1999), translation is a branch of linguistics. Such viewpoints considered translation to be a branch of applied or comparative linguistics. Due to its multidisciplinary nature, translation benefits greatly from many other fields while without necessarily being a part of them. Pragmatics is one of these fields. Although the connection can seem hazy at first, a closer look at the two fields reveals interesting areas of interest.

The connection between translation and pragmatics
The benefit of examining language via the lens of pragmatics is that it allows for discussion of people's intended meanings, assumptions, intentions or aims, and the sorts of acts (for example, requests) that they are doing when they speak (Yule, 2010). The process through which we communicate meaning through the context of a communication is called pragmatics. This meaning is made up of both verbal and nonverbal components, and it varies depending on the situation, the conversation's subject, the relationships of the interlocutors, and other social circumstances. An approach focused on pragmatics when it comes to translation. A much clearer framework for thinking about the numerous decisions that

translators must make when making their translation was offered by Farewell and Helmreich in 2004. However, the fundamental tenet of this strategy is that texts drastically underspecify their intended meaning due to language's ambiguity. Because of this, translators must evaluate utterances in light of their ideas about the world, the utterance's constituent parts, the issue at hand, and any relevant people or current events. It should be obvious that the focus of evaluation should be on, first, the similarity and difference between the participants' beliefs and the inferences made during the source and target language interactions, and, second, on the naturalness of expression of the target language, from the perspective of a pragmatics-based translation and in light of the widespread and significant translation variants to be expected from both human and machine translation systems. Additionally, it need to be obvious that there are a variety of translations that could be suitable for a certain interaction. Kitis (2009) was one of the many scholars who studied the interrelationship between translation and pragmatics. He looked at the various levels of linguistic analysis from a pragmatic perspective and demonstrated how they each contributed in unique ways that must be taken into account when translating into another language. These pragmatic levels are seen to make up the architecture of the translation process, and it is asserted that the translation result must demonstrate a greater understanding of their multifunctionality in this process. Similar to this, Pym (1992) suggested that materials produced in two or more languages would require translators to work on them more frequently. Working documents, meeting minutes, or similar interim reports on the operations of scientific research teams, international bureaucracies, or multinational corporations are typical examples of such materials. In fact, they were likely to come from any institutional setting that utilized many languages. As a result, numerous technical translators were required to work with documents in many languages, and they did so rather well. However, their triumph was also a failure for many conventional and unconventional approaches to translation. The representation of these texts requires a pragmatics mode that takes an economic-probabilistic stance toward the authorship and genealogy of texts, finally allowing that the generation of source texts may take place in a more multicultural, if not more mixed, and setting than that of translations. Bernardo (2011) further demonstrated how, particularly at the pragmatic level, the construction of a translated text differed from other writings generated within the restrictions of a single context. The translator must finally replicate textuality in all of its aspects since he is required to handle the pragmatic divergences between the source and target contexts. There are great expectations placed on the translator's textual proficiency in order to produce an appropriate effect with his translated material. Because of this, the latter should be incorporated into every translator's training program, and understanding pragmatics as the foundation of translation might make translators more productive. More crucially, although he wasn't the only linguist to do so, Nida (2000) was one of the first to stress the value of pragmatic information in translation. There are other literature that has sufficiently noted the interplay between pragmatics and translation. For example, Malmkjar et al. (1998) addressed certain issues with translation that arise because of pragmatic differences between the source language and the target language. In this spirit, Mason and Hatim (1997) offered a broad pragmatic approach and opined that maintaining the same pragmatic effect of the source text on the target text is necessary for a better translation. Additionally, Gut (1991) used the relevance theory of Sperber and Wilson (1986), who claimed that translation is a communication situation in which the translators analyze and express the communicative

cues in texts. In general, translators are prone to making pragmatic mistakes for a variety of reasons, including a lack of pragmatic proficiency in the target language and an ignorance of the significance of pragmatics in the translation process.

Given that pragmatic awareness has been recognized as one of the fundamental elements of communicative competence and that translation is regarded as a form of inter-lingual communication, there is a real need to improve pragmatic understanding and, more specifically, to improve translators' awareness and knowledge of other languages and cultures. To prevent translators from making potential pragmatic mistakes, pragmatic competency might be improved using pragmatic awareness. Thus, practical knowledge and increased awareness of its significance help translators' judgment become more acute. Robinson (2003). (2003). Modern translators need to be more conscious of the myriad facets that surround texts. If they can actively recognize and transmit the pragmatic determinants of texts, this will be accomplished. As a result, one of the fundamental building blocks of translation and effective cross-cultural communication is regarded to be translators' pragmatic knowledge. Understanding pragmatics and its significance aids in the discovery of hidden paralinguistic, cultural, and linguistic traits and differences across languages and the establishment of convergence between various cultures and languages. This viewpoint justifies an empirical study on the interaction between pragmatics and translation in situations of English-Dari and Dari-English translation by looking at studies on the link between translation and pragmatics with regard to particular source/target languages. The pragmatic differences between English and Dari can cause a variety of translation problems and misunderstandings.

2. METHODOLOGY

This section outlines the data collecting tool used in this study as well as the sample selection process and statistical and analytical techniques utilized to evaluate the data.

Research Instrument
This study employed the analytical descriptive technique. In order to do this, a ten-item questionnaire with a sample of translators from a certain community was created and distributed. The questionnaire, which was separated into two sections, was created to cover various areas of English-Dari pragmatic translation. Five questions were presented to the respondents in the first section to gauge their understanding of or agreement with the importance of pragmatics in translation. They were given an additional five things to use in the second section to analyze the issues and challenges they had when translating pragmatics.

Study Topics
Twenty male and female Dari translators made up the study's sample. The individuals that were chosen had all had some level of expertise translating from Dari into English and vice versa. These individuals hold B.A. degrees in translation from several Dari universities, including the University of Science and Technology and Sana'a University. After graduating,

they have at least three years of experience translating in a variety of disciplines, including media, politics, technical, and others.

Data Collection

The study's respondents were given the questionnaire along with brief instructions regarding the study's subject. The respondents were asked to complete the survey by clicking () at the "agree, neutral, or disagree" levels that appeared before each item. After receiving the completed questionnaires back, the replies were analyzed analytically and descriptively (all part 1: 5 items and part 2: 5 items were returned and no incomplete form was discarded). To display the data in relation to the two hypotheses and the study's goals, frequency tables and descriptive statistics were built.

Analysis of Data

The translators' replies were evaluated after they were tabulated on computer sheets and a software was run to determine the findings. This was done after distributing the questionnaire and receiving it back from the respondents. In order to evaluate the two hypotheses put forward earlier in this study, further analysis for each category of the questionnaire, the pragmatics' function in translation, and the issues and challenges, were tabulated and computed. The study's findings were presented in relation to its goals and hypotheses.

Pragmatics' function in translating

The respondents' responses to the first portion of the questionnaire's question about the function of pragmatics in English-Dari translation were as follows:

Table1. Analysis of Frequencies & Percentages −Role of pragmatics in E-A translation

Part One: the role of pragmatic in English-Dari Translation	Mean	Percent
The use of pragmatics in translation is essential and productive.	80	96.7%
Pragmatics aids in the accurate translation of the source language's intended meaning.	79	81.7%
Pragmatics aids in the creation of accurate and reliable translations.	30	83.3%
Translators cannot function as professional translators if they do not comprehend pragmatics.	83	86.7%
Translation requires the use of pragmatics.	66	85.0%
Total	338	86.7%

According to the first portion of the questionnaire's results, which were computed in table 1 above, 80 % of respondents believed that pragmatics is an important factor in translating. To deliver a good and sound message while practicing their translation responsibilities, nearly all of the translators in question needed to comprehend pragmatics. To give an example, the first item, which addressed the function of pragmatics in translation, received a ratio of 81 %. This fact illustrates the respondents' understanding of the critical and useful function that pragmatics plays in translation. The respondents had the lowest ratio in item No. 2, at 81.7%. This low level of agreement was most likely caused by the respondents' ignorance of the

significance of pragmatics in comprehending and interpreting both the source language and the target language.

The respondents demonstrated a higher degree of agreement and understanding than in item two when it came to the impact that pragmatics has on the quality of the translated text, with a percentage of 83.3%. This indicated that, to a large extent, the respondents believed that, when the practical elements of their careers were taken into consideration, their translation became better and more reasonable. The respondents displayed close ratios for the final two questions, items four and five, of 85.0% and 86.7%, respectively.

3.   CONCLUSION

Almost every translation or interpretation includes a pragmatic component of some kind. The study and practice of translation can be enhanced by having a solid grasp of pragmatics. Using his understanding of pragmatics, the translator was able to accurately interpret non-linguistic aspects of verbal communication in instances that were correctly contextualized. The major goals of this study were outlined in two hypotheses: (1) Pragmatics is important in translating English to Dari; and (2) Translators have trouble expressing pragmatics. An examination of the study done with 20 Dari translators produced a general finding that backed with the study's hypotheses. According to the study of the questionnaire, pragmatics accounts for 86.7% of the total number of translations between English and Dari, or 2.6% of all translations. Therefore, one may claim that pragmatics helps translators achieve a similar effect or reaction to that produced by the source language by enabling them to penetrate target readers' brains and have an analogous influence on them. In other words, learning pragmatics improves and streamlines the translation process.

Recommendations
The following suggestions are made based on the conclusions drawn from the study's findings and are meant to improve the quality of professional translation.
1)   Translators should become more knowledgeable about and sensitive to pragmatics in translation.
2)   Translation programs should incorporate more pragmatics instruction and practice.
3)   Translators should put more effort into identifying the lexical and semantic hurdles between TL and SL languages as well as intercultural differences.
4)   Consideration should be given to creating an atmosphere that is suitable and favorable to studying pragmatics.
5)   It is advised to conduct further research to uncover more answers to real-world issues.

4.   REFERENCES

1.   Austin, J. L. 1962. How to Do Things with Words. London: Oxford University Press.
2.   Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3.   Bernardo, A, M. (2011).Translation as Text Transfer-Pragmatic Implications. Universidade

4. Nova de Li15.
5. Crystal, D. (1986). Lexical Semantics. Cambridge University Press.
6. Farwell, D. and Helmreich, S. (2004). Pragmatics and Translation. Computing Research
7. Laboratory, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico.
8. Dingemanse, Mark and N.J. Enfield. 2015. "Other-initiated Repair across Languages: Towards a Typology of Conversational Structures." Open Linguistics 1(1): 96-118.
9. Fromkin, V. & Rodman, R. (1988).An Introduction to Language. (5th edition). Hercourt Brace
10. Jovanovich.
11. Grace Hui Chin Lin. (2007).The Significance of Pragmatics. Department of Applied English
12. Studies, MingDao University.
13. Gutt, E. A. (1991). Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context. Oxford: Blackwell.
14. House, J., Kasper, G. & Ross, S. (2003). Misunderstanding in Social Life: Discourse
15. Approaches to Problematic Talk. Harlow, UK: Longman/ Pearson Education.
16. Jakobson, R. (1959).On Linguistic Aspects of Translation.
17. Kasper, G. & Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). Interlanguage Pragmatics. Oxford University Press.
18. Putnam, Hilary. 1975. "The Meaning of 'Meaning.'" In Mind, Language and Reality: Philosophical Papers, Volume 2, 215–71. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
19. Nichols, J. 1984. "Functional Theories of Grammar." Annual Review of Anthropology13: 97– 117.
20. Ross, John Robert. 1970. "On Declarative Sentences." In Readings in English Transformational Grammar, edited by Roderick A. Jacobs and Peter S. Rosenbaum, 222–77. Waltham, MA: Ginn and Company.
21. Searle, John R. 1969. Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.