

**Hanna Mijas**

*Holy Cross Academy n. a. Jan Kochanowski in Kielce*

*ul. Kościuszki 13, Kielce, Polska*

*Tel.: (48-41) 344 23 20*

*E-mail: hannamijas@yahoo.co.uk*

## THE CO-OPERATIVE PRINCIPLE AND ITS MAXIMS AS A TRANSLATION TOOL

*The subject matter of the present article is an overview of H. P. Grice's theory of conversation, as formulated in his university publications, and its application in translation studies. The article focuses on the notion of implicature based on the Gricean Co-operative Principle and its maxims. The main objective is to show through various examples of translations from English into Polish that such a notion proves to be particularly useful in highlighting areas of difficulty in cross-cultural communication. What is more, it can successfully serve as a tool for the translator who is aware of the fact that any given text should not be considered as a static example of language, but as a verbalized expression of the author's intention, which in turn, needs to be understood and recreated by the translator for another reader in a different culture.*

**KEY WORDS:** *pragmatics, implicature, Co-operative Principle, maxims, translation, translator, pragmatic equivalence, cultural substitution, cross-cultural communication.*

### **Introduction**

*"It is utopian to believe that two words belonging to different languages, and which the dictionary gives us as translations of each other, refer exactly to the same objects. Since languages are formed in different landscapes, through different experiences, their incongruity is natural".*

It cannot be disputed that one of the major problems in translation is caused by the clash of two cultures. Languages often seem to separate us instead of facilitating communication, not simply because they are different languages, but because they proceed from different mental pictures, different intellectual systems, and different philosophies. In

any type of translation training, be it vocational or academic, special attention is paid to the notion that translating is not only a linguistic process, but also a cultural transfer in which the translator transforms a world into a world not just a word into a word. *"Translation never communicates in an untroubled fashion because the translator negotiates the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text by reducing them and supplying another set of differences, basically domestic, drawn from the receiving language and culture to enable the foreign to be received there"*<sup>2</sup>.

In this paper I will try to discover how a given text "makes sense" to a given readership by loo-

<sup>1</sup> ORTEGA-Y-GASSET, J. The Misery and the Splendor of Translation In VENUTI, L (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*. London; New York, 2003, p. 51.

<sup>2</sup> VENUTI, L. (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*. London; New York, 2003, p. 468.

king at the way utterances are used in communicative situations and the way we interpret them in context. I will look at the correlations between the form and the content of a section of language together with hidden insinuations and implied meaning shedding light on the pragmatic equivalence in translation. Paul H. Grice's theory of conversation, formulated in his university publications (Grice 1957, 1975, 1978, 1989), served as the tool of my research. The innovation of his method lies in the fact, that while verbal communication had been treated as a univocal and finite exchange of information, Grice reached the depths and managed to discover and formulate techniques of research which are to uncover not only the sphere of verbal, explicit meaning, but also what is hidden in a text (intentionally or unintentionally), ambiguous or evasive.

One may ask what the purpose is and who needs such analysis and research. One can try to impair their credibility and scientific character, which is a well known practice. But one cannot be indifferent to various errors and manipulations in translation. There are many sources of such manipulations, like ignorance, vanity, self-indulgence, a wish to change one's image, which may then lead to confusion in the mind of an immature reader who is not alert enough.

The continuation of such research might have "pragmatic" value, in the sense that it will lead to reflection amongst translators, enabling them to discover things previously difficult to notice. While exploring the question of "making sense" I will pay special attention to the notion of Gricean implicature, which seems to have particular relevance when learning translation.

### 1. Pragmatics

Some observation of apparently simple, brief or even trivial conversations may show us subtleties

in the most straightforward uses of language. It is pragmatics which gives us an explanation regarding how to produce and understand such simple but apparently peculiar uses of language. What is more, it makes us aware that it is not so much what the sentence literally means that matters, but rather in what way it reveals the intentions and strategies of the speakers. According to Atkinson, Kilby and Roca pragmatics is: "the distinction between what speaker's words literally mean and what the speaker might mean by his words"<sup>3</sup>. The appropriate ways of using language to properly communicate the message, together with the relation between the appropriacy of language use and those who use it, or are addressed by it, is one of the central features of pragmatics. Let us have a look at one example given by Grundy:

A receptionist at a garage, who can never remember the name of a customer although he knows that he should, starts the conversation:

"What is your name again?"<sup>4</sup>.

Such a sentence is an appropriate way of using language to get some business done. It is polite and at the same time enables the speaker to receive the necessary information. In addition, the utterances, being appropriate to the context in which they are used, frequently seem indirect. When we take a close look at everyday conversations, we realize that literal and stated meaning is only one aspect of the meaning conveyed in a given utterance, and that indirectness is typical of real-world language use. Again let us have a look at the following exchange:

A: *Pomalujmy ten pokój na zielono.*

B: *Dobrze się dzisiaj czujesz?*

From what B says we can understand that he is against the idea, although we could not infer this from just looking at the literal meaning of his utterance. By drawing inferences or coming to some conclusions based on guesses, we are able to get

<sup>3</sup> GRUNDY, R. *Doing Pragmatics*. London, 1995, p. 5.

<sup>4</sup> GRUNDY, footnote 3, p. 6.

<sup>5</sup> Translation from Polish: A: *Let's paint this room green.* B: *Do you feel OK today?*

an indirect meaning from an utterance that appears to have a literal meaning only. Such a process is an indispensable part of communication, which is not merely about a speaker encoding a message and a hearer decoding it. The receiver, to communicate successfully, must draw inferences as to what is conveyed beyond what is stated.

The existence of inferences implies that the utterances we hear are in some ways unclear, undetermined. An utterance has one of several possible meanings and through inferences that we draw, we are able to determine the meaning intended by the speaker. As Grundy puts it: "Pragmatics is partly about trying to account in systematic ways for our ability to determine what speakers intend even when their utterances are so dramatically undetermined"<sup>6</sup>.

There are examples, when our utterances do not produce the intended reaction among the receivers. Such "misfires" are a kind of pragmatic failure, which happens when a language is used in a way not appropriate to the context. Let us consider the following example:

A is walking with B down the street and they meet C, whom they have not seen for a long time.

A (to C): *O, jak dobrze cię widzieć. Nic się nie zmieniłaś.*

B: *Wręcz przeciwnie?*

The reason why misfires are so important to pragmatics is because they make us aware that there are some norms when talking. We are able to understand them when we see the effect when such norms are violated.

Now we can understand that the notions of appropriacy and relevance, non-literal and indirect meaning, context and indeterminacy of language as well as the role of inference in language un-

derstanding, are at the heart of pragmatics and should constitute an essential tool for any translator to apply in their translation work.

## 2. Paul Grice's theory of conversation

There are two essential views of communication. One of them, held by most linguists, treats communication as something that we use language to do. We study linguistic structure on its own terms and at the same time we study the communicative use of language as a separate matter. Another view assumes that essential aspects of language arise as part of the process of communication and thus cannot be studied outside that context. The connections of language to the world (the connection to physical acts of speaking – phonetics, or the connection to "meanings" – semantics and pragmatics, or the connection to social situations – sociolinguistics) are at least as curious as language itself. Much of 20<sup>th</sup>-century philosophy centered around this question of the connections between language and the world. Its main representatives, to mention the most important names, were L. Wittgenstein, J. L. Austin and H. P. Grice.

### 2.1. Implicature

A few years after publishing his paper on meaning<sup>8</sup>, Grice sketched out his theory of pragmatic implication, which served as a tool for resolving certain problems in the theory of perception and shed new light on how people communicate. Grice published reviews on implicature in "Logic and Conversation"<sup>9</sup>, the series of seven William James Lectures that he delivered at Harvard University in 1967–68.

Grice observed that conversations, like other human interactions, are governed by the Coopera-

<sup>6</sup> GRUNDY, footnote 3, p. 10.

<sup>7</sup> Translation from Polish: A (to C): *Good to see you! You haven't changed at all.* C: *On the contrary.*

<sup>8</sup> GRICE, H. P. Meaning. In GRICE, H. P. *Studies in the Way of Words*. London, 1989.

<sup>9</sup> GRICE, H. P. Logic and Conversation. In COLE, L.; MORGAN, J. L. (eds). *Syntax and Semantics, 3: Speech Acts*. New York, 1975.

tive Principle, and since all our talk exchanges do not consist of a succession of disconnected remarks but are cooperative efforts, each participant, as a rational human being, recognizes and understands the following Cooperative Principle: "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged"<sup>10</sup>. It implies that you need not and should not supply information which you assume that your audience already has, and simply should make your contribution appropriate to the conversation.

From the Cooperative Principle, Grice derived a set of maxims concerning what should be said in a conversation and how it should be said:

**I Maxim of quality:** Super maxim: Try to make your contribution one that is true. 1. Do not say what you believe to be false. 2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence<sup>11</sup>.

For example, we go up to someone wearing a watch.

We: *Do you have the time?*

Them: *No.*

The person blatantly failed to observe the Maxim of Quality. In other words, he flouted it and did not make his contribution, one that is true.

In our conversational exchanges we must assume that people do not lie and give factual information, thus we are able to detect falsehood. If lies were the norm for conversation, then we would never be able to find out what the truth is.

**II. Maxim of Quantity:** 1. Make your contribution as informative as required. 2. Do not try to make your contribution more informative than required<sup>12</sup>.

For example you see John, whom you haven't seen for a long time.

You: *How is it going?*

John: *Oh, no, everything is horrible. I just got back from the doctor. I have got a bunion on that is driving me crazy. What is more, my girlfriend has just left me. Did you know that we had been going out for 10 years? And my dog threw up on my shoe today. I cannot believe all this crap is happening to me.*

John clearly violated the Maxim of Quantity making his contribution more informative than required and thus completely unsuitable to the circumstances. This maxim is especially valid in the modern society we are living in. As we have too many pieces of information all of which we cannot possibly make use of, more often we seem to be saying: Give me what I want, not more.

**III. Maxim of Relation** containing a single maxim: Be relevant<sup>13</sup>. For example, you have a short exchange with your friend from school.

You: *How is it going?*

He: *Good, how about you?*

You: *Good. I have been rather busy lately.*

He: *I don't know why he didn't tell his mother all that stuff.*

Again, the maxim has been violated as what the friend said was simply not relevant to the conversation and did not provide the information required.

**IV. Maxim of Manner:** Super maxim: Be perspicuous. 1. Avoid obscurity of expression. 2. Avoid ambiguity. 3. Be brief. 4. Be orderly<sup>14</sup>. For example:

You: *I am glad you were able to make it to study linguistics with me.*

He: *The moon sheds light upon the hounds, and the evil hounds...*

The maxim is definitely violated as the expression is obscure – what are the hounds?

<sup>10</sup> GRICE, footnote 5, p. 47.

<sup>11</sup> GRICE, footnote 5, p. 47.

<sup>12</sup> GRICE, footnote 5, p. 47.

<sup>13</sup> GRICE, footnote 5, p. 47.

<sup>14</sup> GRICE, footnote 5, p. 47.

The above mentioned maxims together with the Cooperative Principle are all unstated by the communicator. They do not explicitly tell us what to do. However, we assume that other people observe them in order to make communication effective. Of course, there are some stated rules of conversation like all sorts of aesthetic, social or moral maxims<sup>15</sup> which are usually observed in talk exchanges, the example of which might be the maxims: Do not interrupt, Look your conversational partner in the eye.

Grice argues that observing the Cooperative Principle together with the maxims is a reasonable and rational behaviour, because it tends to benefit the speaker's interest.

However, in any talk exchange a participant may fail to fulfill a maxim in various ways. When faced with such violation, a competent hearer may draw one of the possible conclusions, depending on the particular case:

1. The speaker may opt out from the operation of the maxim and the CP. He may make it clear that he is not willing to cooperate. Let us take a look at the following sentence:

*John is either in Minneapolis or in St. Paul; I know where but I will not tell you.*

It is a good example of opting out from the Maxim of Quantity and the speaker does not make his contribution as informative as required.

2. The speaker may deliberately and secretly subvert the maxim and the CP. He can also mean to observe the CP, but fails to fulfill a particular maxim through inaptitude. For example, he may use words that are too technical for the audience and the occasion, thus violating the first sub maxim of the Maxim of Manner.

3. The speaker may flout or exploit a maxim, that is "he may blatantly fail to fulfill it"<sup>16</sup> or exploit it. A woman, when asked what she thinks of a new restaurant, replied:

*They have some handsome carpets.*

She appears to be violating the first Maxim of Quantity, but if she means to observe the Cooperative Principle and at the same time she is capable of doing so, then her remark must mean something other than what it literally asserts – such as for example, that the food there is not good enough.

And finally:

4. The speaker means to observe the CP, and yet he is obviously violating the maxim, because of a clash with another maxim. Again, in such cases he may mean something additional to what he is merely saying. Let us look again at the sentence:

*John is either in Minneapolis or in St. Paul.*

The speaker fails to fulfill the first sub-maxim of the Maxim of Quantity (make your contribution as informative as required and say neither too little nor too much), because to say which city John is would infringe the second Maxim of Quality (make your contribution one that is true and do not say what you believe is false or for which you lack evidence). So the speaker, by violating one maxim, invokes another and at the same time implies that he does not have the evidence to say in which city John is.

Summarizing, a speaker may violate a maxim (and mislead his audience), he may explicitly opt out, he may be faced with a clash between different maxims, or he may flout a maxim in such a way that the listener understands why this is being done. The latter case gives rise to "conversational implicature" which is at variance with the literal meaning of the utterance. Contemporary philosophy seems to owe a lot to Grice's theory of conversational implicature as it provides an orientation towards the concept of communication in general. According to Grice, conversational implicature exists where the speaker uses nonconventional means of communication to enable the hearer to re-

<sup>15</sup> GRICE, footnote 5, p. 47.

<sup>16</sup> GRICE, footnote 5, p. 49.

cognize the thought he tries to convey. Such a conception supports the theory that there is a relation between thought and language in which the thought content has a kind of priority over linguistic meaning.

### 3. Coherence, implicatures and common problems and strategies in translation

#### 3.1. Violation of maxims

Let us now have a look at how Grice's maxims can be helpful in the translator's work. An interesting example of the violation of maxims comes from *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* by Carroll:

*William the Conqueror, whose cause was favoured by the pope, was soon submitted to by the English, who wanted leaders, and had been of late much accustomed to usurpation and conquest. Edwin and Morcar, the Earls of Mercia and Northumbria <...> declared for him: and even Stigand, the patriotic archbishop of Canterbury found it advisable <...> to go with Edgar Atheling to meet William<sup>17</sup>.*

Carroll purposefully violated the maxims of Quantity and Manner in order to create a passage of elevated and dry style. By doing so, he implied his ironic attitude towards academic pursuits as a whole and parodied academic lectures. The translator's task was to produce a target version in the same style. Let us have a look at the Polish translation by Kozak:

*Wilhelm Zdobywca, popierany przez papieża, rychło przyporządkował sobie Anglików, od lat nawykłych do tego, że ich kraj jest notorycznie podbijany i łupiony. <...> Edwin i Morcar, władcy Mercji i Northumbrii, opowiedzieli się za Wilhelmem, a nawet Stigand, znany z patriotyzmu arcybiskup Canterbury, <...> zna-*

*lazł to zasadnym, aby wraz z Edgarem Athelingiem ruszyć na spotkanie Wilhelmowi i ofiarować mu koronę<sup>18</sup>.*

Apart from obvious mistranslations ("submitted to by the English" translated as "przyporządkował sobie Anglików"), the lecture in the Polish version is not consistent in terms of its pseudo-intellectual style. It seems, unfortunately, that the translator, ignoring the obvious violation of maxims in the original and translating the passage in a way which does not differ much in style from the surrounding narration and dialogues, fails to convey to Polish readers the essential intention of the author: the notion of irony.

#### 3.2. An exhaustive list of maxims

One may suggest, as has been put forward by Grice himself, that his Co-operative Principle, together with the maxims, are not just a linguistic phenomenon, but are a feature of any rational behaviour. While asking somebody for a loaf of bread we expect them to be co-operative and give it to us instead of giving us a bun. On the other hand, however, the translators have to be aware that, especially while working with the languages and cultures that are considerably different from each other, the maxims are not by any means universal.

*A certain type of implicature, say quality implicature, is never used by the speakers of particular languages, ... and the contexts in which a type of implicature will be used will differ from one language community to the text<sup>19</sup>.*

Another question, also highlighted by Grice in his papers, is whether the list of the maxims is exhaustive and whether they have the same value in different cultures. There are other maxims, such as „Be polite”, that may be added to the list and,

<sup>17</sup> CARROLL, J. *Alice's Adventure in Wonderland*. Warszawa, 1990, p. 62–64.

<sup>18</sup> CARROLL, J. *Alicja w Krainie Czarów*. Warszawa, 1999, p. 34.

<sup>19</sup> THOMSON, G. An Introduction to Implicature for Translators. In *Notes on Translation 1*, 1982, p. 11.

indeed, may prevail over the others. Different cultures have different norms and standards of polite behaviour, which may cause some problems for the translator. In some translation contexts, being polite is definitely more important than being accurate. Some interesting examples come from the translation of Davies's "Europe" by Elżbieta Tabakowska. The following passage is the author's commentary on a particular incident from which the legend of Europe began. The Polish translation runs:

*Herodot <...> nie uległ urokowi tej legendy. Jego zdaniem, porwanie Europy było zaledwie jednym z incydentów, jakie zdarzyły się podczas wiecznych wojen, które wybuchaly z powodu porywania sobie nawzajem kobiet. Zgraja Fenicjan z Tyru uprowadziła Io – córkę króla Argos, i wobec tego zgraja Greków z Krety wyruszyła do Fenicji i uprowadziła córkę władcy Tyru<sup>20</sup>.*

In the original version, the passage ends with a sentence: „It was a case of tit for tat”, which is a travesty of the English saying: “tit for tat”, which means something unpleasant done in return for something unpleasant from which one has suffered. The English word „tit”, however, which could have been rightly translated as „wet” means „a nipple”, which is in Polish „sutek” or „cycek”. The translator, however, being aware of the maxim „Be polite” produces an excellent Polish translation of the passage concluding it with the following sentence: „Jeden z wielu podobnych przypadków: piękna za nadobną”.

This is how Tabakowska justifies her choice:

*Przekład mógłby więc na przykład brzmieć tak: „Jeden z wielu podobnych przypadków: cyc za cyc”. Oryginalną grę słów rekompensuje tu rytm i brzmieniowe podobieństwo polskiego odpowiednika, a gdzieś w tle pobrzmiewa nawet polskie „wet za wet”. Ale wobec potęgi polskiego stereotypu nie odważyłam się na to rozwiązanie <...>. W polskim tekście znalazła się wersja dość „ugrzeszczona”<sup>21</sup>.*

Another example concerns the quotation of a memorable sentence of General Bazaine. In the French original, the sentence goes: “*Nous sommes dans le pot de chambre, et demain nous serons emmerdes*”. In the Polish translation, Tabakowska decided to use a less vulgar word, using a play on words. The Polish Bazaine says: „*Znaleźliśmy się w nocniku i jutro nas zaleją*”<sup>22</sup>. The existence of the maxim „Be polite” and the overriding importance it tends to assume in Polish culture explains the intelligent decisions taken here by the translator.

### 3.3. Translation by cultural substitution

In order to maintain the coherence of a text, as well as to draw correct inferences, the translator has to possess the essential ability to identify references to participants and entities. Proper names, for example, which are unknown to the target reader, may obscure the relevance of a given text associated with them. To be able to identify a reference does not just mean to be able to identify who or what the referent is. Above all, it means that the translator knows enough about the referent and correctly interprets the associations it is meant to trigger in the reader's mind. Indeed, it is this ability to

<sup>20</sup> TABAKOWSKA, E. *O Przekładzie na Przykładzie*. Kraków, 2003, p. 145.

<sup>21</sup> TABAKOWSKA, footnote 20, p. 145. The translation could, for instance, be as follows: „Jeden z wielu przypadków: cyc za cyc”. The original play of words is compensated here by the rhythmic and sonic similarity of the Polish equivalent, and somewhere in the background one could even hear the Polish “wet za wet”. But in the face of the strength of the Polish stereotype, I did not dare apply this solution (...). In the Polish text, I decided on a rather polite version.

<sup>22</sup> TABAKOWSKA, footnote 20, p. 145. Translation into English: *We have found ourselves in a chamber-pot and tomorrow we will be flooded.*

interpret the significance of a given reference that enables the translator, and in turn the target reader, to draw any intended implicatures.

Let us have a look again at some examples from "*Alice's Adventures*". In his book, Carroll conveyed most of his riddles, poems and word-plays in poetic form. What is more, the poems are mostly parodies of well-known pieces of English poetry. They constitute independent, but yet integral parts of the whole text and, as such, cannot be neglected by the translator. *How Doth The Little Crocodile* which is a parody of *How Doth The Little Bee* by Watt has been substituted with *Pan Lew był raz chory*, which is a mockery of a famous Polish nursery rhyme *Pan Kotek był chory* by Jachowicz. Another example is a poem based on another children's classic *Ojciec Wirlgiliusz uczył dzieci swoje*, which substitutes *You are Old Father William*, a parody of *The Old Man's Comforts and How He Gained Them*. In both cases in the Polish version, the translator decided to introduce the reader to characters which are familiar and interesting rather than use foreign characters with which it would be difficult to identify. It seems that in both cases the translator managed to render the connotations that those sentences evoke in the original.

## Conclusions

Despite the fact that the maxims on which the Cooperative principle is based have been criticised for their vagueness<sup>23</sup>, it cannot be disputed that Grice's notion of implicature can prove extremely useful not only to translators, but also to anyone en-

gaged in cross-cultural communication. The conviction that his principle and maxims are universal may be difficult to justify, but it is certainly true that any discourse in any language is essentially co-operative, just as is our non-linguistic behaviour, and that the phenomenon of implicature is universal. The interpretation of a given maxim may differ between various linguistic communities, but the very process of conveying intended meaning while exploiting or violating the maxims used in a given language is the same.

At various levels of intellectual development the process of communication between individuals assumes different shapes, from simple announcements of a quite definite character to abstract mental constructions. Language is an important form of personal expression, showing and communicating moods, emotions, intellectual attitudes or the facets of one's philosophy of life. The translator's task is to translate all these aspects – to "translate cultures". Of course, we may say this will never be fully possible, that every time we are engaged in translating, we are marching towards failure. But on the other hand, we may follow the view of the good utopian, who "*...thinks that because it would be desirable to free man from divisions imposed by languages, there is little possibility that it would be attained; therefore, it can only be achieved to an approximate measure. But this approximation can be greater or lesser, to an infinite degree, and the efforts at execution are not limited, for there always exists the possibility of bettering, refining, perfecting: "progress" in short*"<sup>24</sup>.

<sup>23</sup> See: SPERBER, D.; WILSON, D. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford, 1986 for an alternative view of inferential process in communication.

<sup>24</sup> ORTEGA-Y-GASSET, footnote 1, p. 53.



**Hanna Mijas**

Akademia Świętokrzyska im. Jana Kochanowskiego w Kielcach

## ZASADA KOOPERACJI I JEJ MAKSYM JAKO NARZĘDZIE TRANSLACJI

**Streszczenie**

Niniejszy artykuł dotyczy teorii konwersacji stworzonej przez H.P. Grice'a, sformułowanej w jego publikacjach uniwersyteckich, oraz jej zastosowania w nauce translacji. Autorka skupia się przede wszystkim na pojęciu implikatury, opartej na Zasadzie Kooperacji oraz jej maksymach. Innowacją tej metody polega przede wszystkim na tym, że, podczas gdy komunikacja werbalna była dotąd traktowana głównie jako jednoznaczna i skończona wymiana informacji, Grice zdołał odkryć i sformułować techniki badań, które pozwoliły na odkrycie nie tylko sfery werbalnego, wyraźnego znaczenia, ale przede wszystkim tego, co jest w tekście (intencjonalnie lub nie) ukryte, dwuznaczne czy też celowo wymijające.

Opierając się na analizie przykładów tłumaczeń z języka angielskiego na język polski, autorka wspiera przekonanie, iż zasady Grice'a stanowić mogą pomocne narzędzie tłumacza, którego zadaniem jest przeciwie tłumaczenie „światów”, a nie tylko tłumaczenie słów.

**SŁOWA KLUCZE:** pragmatyka, implikatury, Zasada Kooperacji, maksymy, tłumaczenie, tłumacz, ekwiwalencja pragmatyczna, substytucja kulturowa, komunikacja międzykulturowa.

**Hanna Mijas**

Jano Kochanovskio Šventojo Kryžiaus akademija  
Kielcuose

## KOOPERACIJOS PRINCIPAS IR JO MAKSIMOS KAIP VERTIMO PRIEMONĖ

**Santrauka**

Šiame straipsnyje apžvelgiama H. P. Grice'o pokalbio teorija, pateikta jo universiteto leidiniuose, ir šios teorijos pritaikymas vertimo studijoms. Straipsnyje analizuojama implikatūros sąvoka, pagrįsta Grice'o kooperacijos principu ir jo maksimomis. Pagrindinis tikslas yra įvairiais vertimo iš anglų į lenkų kalbą pavyzdžiais parodyti, kad šis principas yra ypač naudingas ryškinant sudėtingas tarpkultūrinės komunikacijos sritis. Be to, jis gali pagelbėti vertėjui, suprantančiam, kad tekstas yra ne statiškas kalbos pavyzdys, bet verbalizuota autoriaus intencija, kuri turi būti vertėjo suprantama ir atkurta kitos kultūros skaitytojui.

**REIKŠMINIAI ŽODŽIAI:** pragmatika, implikatura, kooperacijos principas, maksimos, vertimas, vertėjas, pragmatinis ekvivalentumas, kultūrinė substitucija, tarpkultūrinė komunikacija.

Gauta 2005 02 09

Priimta publikuoti 2005 08 02